Appendices

Appendix 1

Overview of Public Participation

Appendix Figure 1.1

(LCFM 5/11/18)

WORKING DRAFT OF
OUTLINE OF AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHARGE
CHIPPEWA COUNTY LAND AND WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION

The ad hoc committee is advisory to the Chippewa County Dept. of Land Conservation & Forest Management, and is established to assist the Department to revise the current Chippewa County Land and Water Resource Management Plan.

The stated purpose of the plan is to:

1. Meet statutory requirements for County Land and Water Plan content, outlined in WI Stats. 92.10(6)1-8, as it applies to land conservation and nonpoint source pollution control.

2. Document procedures used to plan and coordinate land and natural resource management programs administered by Chippewa County departments.

3. Define local program objectives and activities that will be used to implement land conservation and resources management efforts administered by the County.

4. Compile information and recommendations that may contribute to the cultural, natural resource, and agricultural protection components of the Chippewa County Comprehensive Plan.

Duties and Responsibilities

The ad hoc committee is responsible for reviewing the content of the Chippewa County Land and Water Resource Management Plan and providing structured feedback on the plan goals, objectives, and proposed activities.

Specific duties and tasks are as follows:

1. Review natural resource conditions and issues, as defined in the current Chippewa County Land and Water Resource Management Plan. Review and provide comment on revised issue statements.

2. Review resource management goals and objectives, as defined in the current Chippewa County Land and Water Resource Management Plan. Review and provide comment on existing land and resource management goals and objectives.

3. Review and provide comments on proposed program objectives that have been developed to address environmental issues and to pursue resource management goals.

4. Review and provide comments on planned program activities, as proposed to achieve program objectives.

5. Review draft revisions to the land and water plan and solicit comments from stakeholder organizations on the public hearing draft of the plan.

Term of Ad Hoc Committee and Anticipated Meetings

The Committee will serve during the plan development, committee outreach, and plan adoption phase of the land and water planning process.

The anticipated meeting schedule and meeting focus is as follows:

July 1, 2018 – December 31, 2018
Meeting 1 (7/11/18) Duties 1, 2
Meeting 2 (7/25/18) Duties 3, 4
Meeting 3 (8/22/18) As needed
Wrap up.

Public Hearing – (Tentative) Week of 10/22/18

Agency Team Advisors
DNR
DATCP
NRCS
FSA
UWEX

Planning & Zoning Dept.

Citizen Advisory Group of Stakeholder Interests
Agricultural Interests
-Farm Bureau
-Farmers Union
Conservation Nonprofits/Land Trusts Interests
Woodlot Owners & Forestry Interests
Streams, Lake, and Water Interests
Non-Metallic Mining Interests
Outdoor Recreational Interests

Student Advisors
UW-Eau Claire
-Geology/Physical Geography
-Public Health
-Biology

Chippewa Co. FFA

CITIZENS AD HOC ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS
2018 Chippewa Co. Land & Water Resource Management Planning Process

Agricultural Interests

Farm Bureau
Bob Panzer
5413 State Hwy 27
Cadott, WI 54727-5102
#920-539-8728
Tbpanzer@gmail.com

Farmer's Union
Leslie Danielson
11543 270th Street
Cadott, WI 54727
#715-313-0309
farmerles@yahoo.com

Matthew Holub
16140 322nd Street
Boyd, WI 54726
#715-313-4130
holub.matthew13@gmail.com
holubcustomwork@gmail.com

Ken Schmitt
4988 120th Avenue
Colfax, WI 54730
#715-568-5508
kls2@bloomer.net

Travis Lueck
20876 State Highway 40
Bloomer, WI 54724
#715-933-2358
NH8970NH@yahoo.com

Paul Michels
8451 County Hwy C
Bloomer, WI 54724
#715-271-1942
paulbmichels@gmail.com

Non-Metallic Mining Interests

Candy Anderson
Mathy Materials
P.O. Box 1246
Eau Claire, WI 54702-1246
#715-492-0065
Candy.Anderson@monarchpaving.com

Kaitlynn Filkins
768 US 8
Amery, WI 54001
715-554-7274
Kaitlynn.Filkins@monarchpaving.com

Outdoor Recreational Interests

Don Dukerschein
12616 43rd Avenue
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729
#715-723-0639
dbduke@charter.net

Walker Jones
26300 310th Street
Holcombe, WI 54745
715-312-0471
wdjones33@gmail.com

Sonny Gygi
25800 266th Street
Holcombe, WI 54745
#715-595-4158

Woodlot Owners & Forestry Interest

Jim Skorczewski
18916 54th Avenue
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729
#715-944-4897
jimskor@icloud.com

Conservation Nonprofits/Land Trusts Interests

Richard Smith
27200 145th Street
New Auburn, WI 54757
#715-933-0252
rbsmith@mac.com

Caryn Treiber
Chippewa Valley Sierra Club
N9021 590th Street
Colfax, WI 54730
#715-684-9374
ctreiber@discover-net.net

Gary Bergstrom
722 21st Avenue
Bloomer, WI 54724
#715-568-4527

Streams, Lakes, & Water Interests

Paul Laliberte
3109 Milton Road
Eau Claire, WI 54703
#715-379-7048
Paul.Lalib@charter.net

Steve Hilger
11147 147th Avenue
Bloomer, WI 54724
#715-568-1715
hilgersc@bloomer.net

Terry Bowe
13541 85th Avenue
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729
#715-723-7664
Tbostudio@gmail.com

Buck Steele
27260 269th Avenue
Holcombe, WI 54745
#715-312-0361
HS3779@aol.com

Student Advisors

UW-Eau Claire
Amanda Jinkerson
32 E. Greenville Street
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729
#715-210-0756
Jinkeral4822@uwec.edu

Chippewa Co. FFA
Jace McMullen
1819 Main Street
Bloomer, WI 54724
#715-226-2508
jacemcm@gmail.com

ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS

Federal

Tammy Lindsay
NRCS
1160 Weatheridge Road
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729
#715-299-0441
tammy.lindsay@wi.usda.gov

Kristi Lentz
FSA
1160 Weatheridge Road
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729
#715-723-8556 (103)
Kristine.Lentz@wi.usda.gov

State

Terry Kafka
WI DNR
5301 Rib Mountain Drive
Wausau, WI 54401
#715-355-1363
terence.kafka@wisconsin.gov

Mark Hazuga
WI DNR
1300 W. Clairemont Avenue
Eau Claire, WI 54701
#715-839-1603
mark.hazuga@wisconsin.gov

Jodi Lepsch
WI DNR
1300 W. Clairemont Avenue
Eau Claire, WI 54701
#715-838-8385
Jodi.Lepsch@Wisconsin.gov

Chris Willger
WI DNR
1300 W. Clairemont Avenue
Eau Claire, WI 54701
#715-839-3746

ChristopherJ.Willger@Wisconsin.gov

Stephanie Schneider
WI DATCP
1304 N. Hillcrest Pkwy, Suite A
Altoona, WI 54720
#715-832-6547

Stephanie.Schneider@wisconsin.gov

County

Jerry Clark
Chippewa Co. UWEX
711 N. Bridge Street
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729
#715-726-7955
jerome.clark@ces.uwex.edu

Doug Clary
Chippewa Co. Planning & Zoning
711 N. Bridge Street
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729
#715-726-7941
dclary@co.chippewa.wi.us

Mike Dahlby
Chippewa Co. LCFM
711 N. Bridge Street
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729
#715-726-7921
mdalby@co.chippewa.wi.us

Renee Yohnk
Chippewa Co. LCFM
711 N. Bridge Street
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729
#715-726-7999
ryohnk@co.chippewa.wi.us

Caleb Meyer
Meyer Environmental
711 N. Bridge Street
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729
#715-797-3069
meyer.environmental.wi@gmail.com

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING ACTIVITIES
CHIPPEWA COUNTY LAND & WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION

The following schedule is proposed to guide and complete the planning process:

2/21/18 LCFM Mtg.
- Introduce planning approach & activity schedule.

5/11/18 LCFM Dept.
- Initiate public participation process.
  - -Send letter of invitation to stakeholder's advisory group.
  - -Issue public notice and press release of planning process.

6/20/18 LCFM Mtg.
- Introduce and refine planning approach and activity schedule.

7/11/18 Stakeholder's Meeting #1.
- Introduce available baseline data & trend statistics (2007-2018).
- Introduce & receive feedback on existing Issue Statements.

7/18/18 LCFM Mtg.
- Introduce available baseline data & trend statistics (2007-2018).
- Introduce & receive feedback on existing Issue Statements.
- Review existing program management objectives and status of activities implemented to achieve objectives (2014-2018).

7/25/18 Stakeholder's Meeting #2.
- Review existing program management objectives and status of activities implemented to achieve objectives (2014-2018).
- Review revised Issue Statements and receive feedback on revised program objectives and activities to pursue those objectives (2019-2023).

8/22/18 Stakeholder's Meeting #3
- Refine proposed activities and consider general activity schedule.
- Identify resources required to pursue activities.
- Introduce and receive feedback on methods to track and monitor progress toward achieving program management objectives.

9/19/18 LCFM Mtg.
- Review outcome of stakeholders meetings; revised Issue Statements, program objectives, and activity schedule.
- Consider refinements.
- Introduce working concepts to advance resource management and program objectives.

10/17/18
- Review responses to focus questions received to date, as outcome of stakeholders meetings.
- Introduce expanded working concepts and general activities to advance resource management and program objectives.

1/23/19	Stakeholder's Meeting #4 •Review responses to focus questions received to date, as outcome of stakeholders meetings. •Introduce expanded working concepts and general activities to advance resource management and program objectives. •Review working draft of revised Land & Water Resource Management Plan showing strikeouts and new text.
2/6/19	Stakeholder's Meeting (Voluntary) •Review plan line by line.
2/13/19	•Final comments on plan by Ad Hoc members to LCFM.
2/15/19	•Complete a revised draft of Land & Water Resource Management Plan.
Week of 2/18/19–2/22/19	•Conduct two (2) public informational meetings (east/west) •Present PPT summary report to explain the plan & address public questions on revised draft Land & Water Resource Management Plan.
2/27/19	LCFM Mtg. •Conduct joint LCFM/Stakeholders Meeting.
3/11/19	•Conduct public hearing on the revised Land & Water Resource Management Plan.
3/20/19	LCFM Mtg. •Review public hearing testimony and consider action on final revised/updated plan.
4/9/19	County Board Mtg. •Present updated plan to County Board.
6/3/19 or Before	WI Land & Water Conservation Board Mtg. •Present revised/updated plan to Land & Water Conservation Board.

h:\admin\sec\land_water planning\2019 plan revision\final schedule 2_26_19.doc

Appendix Figure 1.3

Chippewa County Dept. of Land Conservation & Forest Management.
February 5, 2019

NEWS RELEASE
Public Invited to Land and Water Plan Listening Sessions

Residents of Chippewa County are invited to attend one of three (3) listening sessions being held by the Chippewa County Dept. of Land Conservation & Forest Management to explain proposed updates being made to the Chippewa County Land and Water Resource Management Plan.

The plan is used by the County to guide its conservation and natural resource programs, and to coordinate its efforts with cooperating state and federal agencies. The plan update has been developed using input from a Citizens Advisory Group representing a wide-range of farm, forest, economic development, and environmental interests.

The listing sessions are being held to explain issues of local concern, and to present recommendations for future program focus. Opportunities for public comment will be provided.

The sessions will be held Tuesday, February 19, 2019, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. at the Goetz Town Hall on Highway O, north of Cadott; on Thursday, February 21, 2019, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. at the Bloomer Town Hall on Highway 40, north of Bloomer. A third listening session will be held on Wednesday evening, February 20, 2019, from 7:00 – 9:00 p.m. in Room 3 of the Chippewa County Courthouse.

The plan clarifies how the County will use conservation programs to respond to climate change, and how it will work to control nonpoint pollution to surface and groundwater from both agricultural and non-agricultural sources.

In agricultural areas, public funds will be used to establish stream buffers, restore wetlands, and to assist producers to meet state mandated agricultural performance standards. This voluntary effort will be augmented by a regulatory program, administered using the County's Manure Storage and Livestock Facility Ordinance, and its Zoning and Sanitary Ordinances.

The plan explains the County's intended approach to preserve blocks of agricultural "working lands" and forests, using "Agricultural Enterprise Areas" (AEA's) and voluntary conservation agreements. This approach to preserving working lands will be augmented through the use of agricultural zoning, if adopted by individual towns.

In urbanizing areas, the County will work with municipalities in the Chippewa Falls/Eau Claire urban area to administer a joint storm water management program to meet state storm water permit requirements.

Importantly, as part of its program efforts, the County intends to place greater emphasis on community outreach, targeted education, and civic engagement, working through existing educational institutions and local conservation organizations.

With regard to the management of public lands, the County will continue to manage the Chippewa County Forest for timber production, resource protection, and public use using designated management areas, as defined in the County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plan. In doing so, it is recommended that the County will continue to work with state agencies and nonprofit organizations to purchase select parcels or conservation easements from willing sellers with land located in or adjacent the County Forest Blocking Boundary.

For more information about the upcoming listening sessions or the Chippewa County Land and Water Plan revisions, please contact the Chippewa County Dept. of Land Conservation & Forest Management at 715-726-7920. Copies of the existing plan and core elements of the plan upgrade are available for public review upon request, and can be viewed on the Internet at www.co.chippewa.wi.us/lcfm.

The general public, with an interest in conservation and local environmental quality, are encouraged to mark their calendars and to attend one of these sessions.

Appendix Figure 1.4

SUMMARY OF MEETING SCHEDULE, INFORMATION PRESENTED, AND PUBLIC ATTENDANCE TO EXPLAIN THE UPDATED CHIPPEWA COUNTY LAND AND WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Date	Location	Time	Public Attendance	Information Presented at Meeting
2/19/19 Listening Session	Town of Goetz	1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	(3)	-Power Point Presentation: Chippewa County Land & Water Resource Management Plan Update
2/20/19 Listening Session	Chippewa Co. Courthouse	7:00 – 9:00 p.m.	(2)	-Handout titled: Overview of New or Expanded Concepts to Advance a Revised Land & Water Resource Management Plan, (LCFM 1/18/19)
2/21/19 Listening Session	Town of Bloomer	1:00 – 3:00 p.m.	(4)	

Appendix Figure 1.5

(715) 726-7920
www.co.chippewa.wi.us
711 North Bridge Street
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729-1876

LCFM 2/25/19

OFFICIAL PUBLIC NOTICE

Public Hearing on Updates to the Chippewa County Land & Water Resource Management Plan

Notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be conducted by the Chippewa County Land Conservation & Forest Management Committee regarding updates to the Chippewa County Land & Water Resource Management Plan.

The plan is used by the County to guide its conservation and natural resource management programs, and to coordinate them with cooperating state and federal agencies. The plan update has been developed using input from a Citizens Advisory Group representing a wide-range of farm, forest, economic development, and environmental interests.

The hearing will be held on Monday, March 11, 2019, at 6:30 p.m. in Room 302 at the Chippewa County Courthouse, 711 N. Bridge Street, Chippewa Falls, WI 54729.

The public hearing draft under consideration will be available for review on February 28, 2019, at the Dept. of Land Conservation & Forest Management, and will be posted on that date at the Department's website at https://www.co.chippewa.wi.us/government/land-conservation-forest-management/land-water-conservation/chippewa-county-land-water-resource-management-plan

For more information about the public hearing or the Chippewa County Land and Water Plan revisions, please contact the Chippewa County Dept. of Land Conservation & Forest Management at 715-726-7920.

Publish 3/2/19

Appendix 2

Resource Management Information Provided by DNR

Appendix Figure 2.1

Appendix 6 - Watershed Tables for the Lower Chippewa River Basin & Upper Chippewa River Basin

Understanding the Watershed Tables

The tables in Appendix 6 contain a wealth of information about the surface water resources in the Lower Chippewa River Basin. They include current and potential water quality conditions; the extent of assessment work that has been conducted; water quality trends; sources of pollution that are impacting the water body; the types of impacts of those pollutant sources; and recommendations for monitoring and management.

The tables are organized by the Lower Chippewa Basin's 24 watersheds (Map 1). Within each watershed, the stream tables appear first, followed by the lake tables.

Stream Table Codes

This section describes the information contained in each column of the stream table, and defines the abbreviations used in each column. *A blank space anywhere in the table means that data is unassessed or unavailable.*

Stream Name

All named streams and some unnamed streams are listed. Stream names are those found on U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle maps unless the Wisconsin Geographic Names Council has established a different name. Unnamed streams are identified by location of the stream mouth as indicated by township, range, section and quarter-quarter section.

Waterbody ID Code (WB ID Code)

All waterbodies require a unique waterbody identification code in order to link them to other databases.

Town Range Section

This column identifies the Township, Range, and Section where the mouth of the stream is located.

County

This column indicates the county or counties in which the stream is located.

Codified Use

The codified use of a waterbody is a classification that is formally and legally recognized by NR102 **and** NR104, Wis. Adm. Code, and is used to determine water quality criteria and effluent limits. The codified use classification for a stream is determined by applying formal stream classification procedures, which are undergoing revision. This column includes the codified use and the approximate length in miles of the stream portion meeting this classification, for example: Cold II/8.0.

Codified use categories, known as "Fish and Other Aquatic Life Uses" (NR102.04 (3)) are:

COLD (Cold Water Community): This codified use category includes surface waters that are capable of supporting a community cold water fish and other aquatic life or serving as a spawning area for cold water fish species. A COLD water community may be further classified based on trout populations, as identified in *Wisconsin Trout Streams* (DNR Publ. 6-3600[80]).

Class I: High-quality stream where populations are sustained by natural reproduction.

Class II: Stream has some natural reproduction but may need stocking to maintain a desirable fishery.

Class III: Stream has no natural reproduction and requires annual stocking of legal-size fish to provide sport fishing.

Note 1: The Bureau of Fisheries Management has classified some streams as trout streams under NR1.02 (7) *after* the publication of *Wisconsin Trout Streams* (1980). These streams are not formally classified as COLD trout waters until code revisions of NR102 and NR104 are completed and approved. Currently, the "default" code (WWSF-Warm Water Sport Fish) is used for these streams and stream segments.

WWSF (Warm Water Sport Fish Communities): This category includes waters capable of supporting a community of warm water sport fish or serving as a spawning area for warm water sport fish. WWSF is the default Codified Use classification for streams that do not otherwise have an identified Codified Use.

WWFF (Warm Water Forage Fish Communities): This category includes surface waters capable of supporting an abundant, diverse community of forage fish and other aquatic life.

LFF (Limited Forage Fishery): This category includes surface waters of limited aquatic life use capacity due to low flow, naturally poor water quality or poor habitat. These surface waters are capable of supporting only a limited community of tolerant forage fish and aquatic life.

LAL (Limited Aquatic Life): This category includes surface waters that are severely limited for aquatic life use because of low flow and naturally poor water quality or poor habitat. These surface waters are capable of supporting only a limited community of aquatic life.

In addition, the codified use column identifies ORW (Outstanding Resource Waters) and ERW (Exceptional Resource Waters) streams listed in NR102.10 and NR102.11. Technically, ORW/ERW waterbodies are not "Fish and Aquatic Life Use" designations. The ORW/ERW designation was developed for the WDNR antidegradation program. These waterbodies also receive a "Fish and Aquatic Life Use" designation, as listed above, for the purpose of determining water quality criteria.

ORW (Outstanding Resource Waters): These waters have excellent water quality and high-quality fisheries. They do not receive wastewater discharges. No point source discharges will be allowed in the future, unless the quality of such discharges meets or exceeds the quality of the receiving water. This classification includes national and state Wild and Scenic Rivers and the highest quality Class I trout streams, as listed in NR102.10.

ERW (Exceptional Resource Waters): These waters have excellent water quality and valued fisheries but may already receive wastewater discharges or may receive future discharges necessary to correct environmental or public health problems. This classification includes all Class I trout streams identified in *Wisconsin Trout Streams* (1980) that are not listed as ORW, as well as additional cold and warm water streams listed in NR102.11.

Existing Biological Use

This column indicates the *biological* use that the stream or stream segment currently supports. The Existing Biological Use categories are defined in NR102 (04)(3) under "Fish and Aquatic Life Uses", and are the same categories used for the Codified Use column, as described above. The Existing Biological Use designation is based on the current condition of the surface water and the associated biological community. Information in this column is not used for regulatory purposes.

Additional biological use categories identified in this column include:

303(d): These streams have been identified as a 303(d) listed impaired water. The 303(d) list identifies waters that are not currently meeting water quality criteria for specific substances or designated uses. See Chapter 3 for a discussion of Impaired Waters.

INT (Intermittent): These streams are identified as *intermittent* (not continuously flowing).

A stream may not have the same Codified and Existing Biological uses. For example, a stream may have biological conditions of a COLD trout stream. However, if the stream is not identified as COLD in *Wisconsin Trout Streams* (1980) or NR102 or NR104, it will receive the "default" Codified use of WWSF until code revisions change its Codified use.

Attainable Biological Use (Attainable or Potential Biological Use)

This column indicates the biological use that the investigator believes the stream or stream segment could achieve through proper management of "controllable" pollution sources. Beaver dams, hydroelectric dams, low gradient streams, and low flows that are naturally occurring are generally not considered to be "controllable" problems. The Attainable Biological (or potential) use may be the same as the Existing Biological Use or it may be higher. Abbreviations for "Attainable Biological Use" are the same as those used in the "Existing Biological Use" column.

Supporting Use Level (the extent to which a stream supports its Attainable Biological Use)

This column indicates the extent to which a stream meets, or is threatened in meeting, its Attainable Biological Use. This column shows the relationship between the stream's Existing and Attainable Biological Use. Chemical, physical (habitat, morphology, etc.) and biological information or direct observation and professional judgment are used to make this determination. Biological data is considered to be the most important information in determining the Supporting Use designation. Supporting Use categories are:

FULLY (Fully Supporting): The Existing Use is the same as the Attainable Use. The stream or stream segment is *not affected* by "controllable" pollution sources. Stream segments that are impacted by *culturally irreversible* pollution sources are also designated as FULLY Supporting. For example a river system with an "optimally operating" dam (minimal to no effect on the fish and aquatic life community assemblage, productivity, and diversity) is considered FULLY Supporting. On the other hand, poorly operating dams are *not* considered "culturally irreversible" and their effect on biological resources is factored into the Supporting Use designation (see PART - Partially Supporting, below).

FULLY-THR (Fully Supporting, but Threatened): The Existing Use is the same as the Attainable Use, but there is a *clear and imminent* "threat" to the existing level of biological productivity and ecological health. Examples of threats include rapid commercial, residential, and/or industrial development in the watershed, the advent of large-scale industrial operations in the watershed, or channel modifications that have been, or will be permitted, or cannot be regulated under existing state or federal rules (i.e., drainage districts).

PART (Partially Supporting): The Existing Use is classified as the same as the Attainable Use, except that improved management practices could enhance the overall ecological health of the biological community. For example, dam operations could be modified to reduce the impact of hydrologic regimes on the biological community.

NOT (Not Supporting): The Existing Use is one or more Codified Use classifications below the Attainable Use. These Codified Use categories include COLD (I, II and III), WWSF, WWFF, LFF and LAL. For example a stream is considered NOT supporting if its Existing Use is WWFF while its Attainable Use is WWSF. The Existing Use impairment is considered reversible by improving management practices.

Assessment Level (Level of assessment the stream has received)

This column describes the quality of resource information that is available on a waterbody. These categories have been agreed upon for information included in Wisconsin's Water Quality Assessment Report to Congress (305[b]).

Mon (Monitored): A stream or stream segment is classified as "monitored " if *site-specific* data has been collected in the past five years, and is adequate to assess the quality or integrity of a resource. The WDNR or others can collect the data. The data must be adequate to develop a best professional judgment determination of the Existing and Attainable uses, and to determine the extent to which a stream supports it Attainable Use.

Eval (Evaluated): A stream is classified as "evaluated" if information *other than* site-specific data is adequate to determine the Existing and Attainable uses, and to determine the extent to which a stream supports its Attainable Use. Data sources that are adequate to "evaluate" a stream include site-specific data that is more than five years old, information on file provided by the public or others, and best professional judgment of a WDNR biologist or a WDNR fish manager.

Un (Unassessed): The available data on a stream is inadequate to consider the stream to be either Monitored or Evaluated

Resource Trend

This column indicates resource changes over time, and can be based upon best professional judgment alone or in combination with resource data trends. The trend category should indicate an actual change in waterbody condition, and not be an artifact of increased data collection. Trend categories include:

Imp - Improving
Stab - Stable
Dec - Declining
Unk (or blank) - Unknown

Sources and Impacts

These two columns indicate probable **sources** of impact to the stream and the **impacts**, or water quality problems that are present in the stream. Sources and impacts are identified using the best professional judgment of field staff. The following table explains the source and impact codes used in these columns. There is almost always a complex relationship between pollutant sources and resource impacts.

SOURCE
BY - Barnyard or exercise lot runoff **LF** - Landfill
CE - Construction site erosion **MS** - Mine wastes and/or roaster piles
CL - Cropland erosion **NMM** - Non-metallic mining
CM - Cranberry marsh **NPS** - Unspecified nonpoint sources of pollution
DEV - Intense development pressure **OBS-M** - Manmade obstructions to flow such as culverts bridges fences & stream crossings (excluding dams)
EX - Exotic species **OBS-N** - Natural obstructions to flow, including thick streambank brush, debris, dams and reed canary grass
EX-PL - Exotics - purple loosestrife **PSB** - Pastured streambank
EX-RC - Exotics - reed canary grass **PSI** - Point source industrial discharge
F - Forestry activities **PSM** - Point source municipal treatment plant discharge
FL – Flooding **PWL** - Pastured woodlot
FS- BrN - A natural barrier to fish and aquatic organisms. Examples: Waterfalls and Rapids **RS** - Roadside erosion
HM-DM - Hydrological modification caused by dam **SB** - Streambank erosion
HM-DR - Hydrological modification caused by ditching or dredging **URB** - Urban storm water runoff

IMPACT
CL - Chloride toxicity**NH3** - Ammonia toxicity
COM - Competition or encroachment by introduced species **NUT** - Excessive nutrient enrichment
DO - Low dissolved oxygen concentration **ORG** - Organic chemical toxicity or bioaccumulation
FAD - Fish advisory **pH** - Extreme high or low pH or fluctuations
FLOW - Stream flow fluctuations caused by unnatural conditions **PCB** - Bioaccumulation of PCBs
HAB - Habitat degradation (scouring etc.)**PST** - Pesticide/herbicide toxicity
HG - Mercury advisory **SC** - Sediment contamination
HM - Heavy metal toxicity **SED**-In-stream sedimentation
MAC - Undesirable rooted aquatic plant (macrophyte) or algal growth **TEMP** - Extreme high or low temperature or fluctuations
MIG - Fish migration interference **TOX** - General toxicity problems
TURB - Turbidity problems

Monitoring Activity/Status/Date/Rank

The monitoring activity column includes a list of monitoring activities that have taken place on the waterbody in the past 5 years *or* are recommended for the future. These activities are described in the list below. Monitoring activities that do not include a status, rank or dates are simply suggestions for future monitoring. Examples include:

- ATOX/R/H (Aquatic Toxicity testing is Recommended, and is a High priority)
- BASE/C/1999 (Baseline monitoring was Completed in 1999).

Status: This indicates the status identified for each monitoring activity.
R=Recommended, **P**=Planned, **O**=Ongoing, **C**=Complete

Date: If the monitoring activity is planned or has already been completed, the planned or completion date is included.

Rank: Each of the listed monitoring activities are also assigned a priority rank, based on the best professional judgment of field staff.
L=Low, **M**=Medium, **H**=High

Monitoring Activity Codes

ATOX (Aquatic Toxicity Monitoring) - The collection of information on the concentrations of priority toxic pollutants in sediments and fish in Wisconsin's surface waters by collecting and analyzing samples from a subset of the baseline sites to obtain a broad scale coverage of the condition of surface waters.

BASE (Baseline-Wadeable & Non-Wadeable Stream Monitoring) - The collection of a suite of physical and biological parameters that identify the status or baseline condition of a stream. Those parameters include stream flow, physical habitat measurements, catch per unit effort for all species of fish and selective invertebrate sampling. Indices are calculated for fish habitat (HAB), fish community health (IBI), fish abundance (CPE) and organic pollution (HBI).

BUG - The collection of aquatic macroinvertbrates to characterize the overall biological health of a stream.

AMB (Ambient Stream Monitoring) - The collection of ambient stream water chemistry samples to provide an index of water quality conditions.

CT - Continuous temperature monitoring with the installation of data recorders at monitoring sites.

DO - Continuous dissolved oxygen monitoring with the installation of data recorders at monitoring sites.

FL - Stream flow monitoring.

FS-Comp (Comprehensive) - The collection of a suite of fisheries information on streams specifically aimed at identifying the abundance of fish populations. This includes catch per unit effort and/or population estimates. Data is often quantified as number per mile or pounds per acre.

FS-Hab - The collection of physical data used to evaluate the condition of fish habitat before and after implementation of an in-stream habitat management action. There are standardized Habitat Rating Systems used for streams greater than 10 meters and for streams less than 10 meters in width.

FS-Other – The collection of all other fisheries data that is not specifically taken to document the baseline (BASE) or comprehensive (FS-Comp) condition of fisheries resources. These monitoring activities tend to be stand-alone sampling techniques such as fish abundance (CPE), or fish community heath (IBI).

FS-Regs Eval – The collection of fisheries information used to assess the net impact of a new regulation such as size and bag limit changes, seasons, quotas, refuges, bait and gear restrictions, etc.

FS-Stk Eval (Stocking) – The collection of fisheries data used to determine the success or failure of stocking various strains, sizes and densities of fish.

FS-MaxMin – The collection of water temperature range data using maximum/minimum thermometers.

FS-Tis - The collection of fish tissue for fish toxicity evaluations. Examples include mercury and PCBs.

STOX (Sediment Toxicity Testing) - The collection of sediment samples for toxicity testing. Examples include toxic metals and organic compounds.

WC - Water chemistry sampling includes a collection of samples for dissolved oxygen, temperature, pH, phosphorus or other parameters.

Management Activity/Status/Date/Rank

The management activity column includes a list of management activities that have taken place on the waterbody in the past 5 years *or* are recommended for the future. These activities are described in the list below. Management activities that do not include a status, rank or dates are simply suggestions for future management. Examples include:

- AB/O/H (Agriculture Best management practices are Ongoing, and are a High priority)
- BS/C/98 (Bank Stabilization was Completed in 1998)

Status: This indicates the status identified for each management activity.
R=Recommended, **P**=Planned, **O**=Ongoing, **C**=Complete

Date: If the management activity is planned or has already been completed, the planned or completion date is included.

Rank: Each of the listed management activities are also assigned a priority rank, based on the best professional judgment of field staff.
L=Low, **M**=Medium, **H**=High

Management Activity Codes

AB (Agricultural Best Management Practices) - Practices designed to reduce pollutant loads carried to surface waters and groundwater from agricultural land uses. Examples include grassed waterways, nutrient and pest management, barnyard controls, cropland practices to reduce erosion.

BC (Beaver Control) – Practices that reduce the thermal or physical impacts of overabundant beaver populations and their dams on cold water resources. This may include activities such as trapping, dam removal, and vegetative management.

BFR (Base Flow Regulation) - Activities that promote maintenance of stream base flow. Examples include regulating flow regimes of dams, and restoration of wetlands.

BS (Bank Stabilization) – A practice used to reduce bank erosion and sediment deposition in waterways. Examples include planting riparian buffer strips, rip rapping, sloping, grading and seeding or bioengineering techniques.

DR (Dam Removal and Restoration) - Removal of a dam and associated activities to restore a natural and/or functional river or stream ecosystem.

EXC (Exotic Species Control) - Control or removal of exotic and nuisance species by chemical, biological or physical means.

ES (Endangered Species) - Management actions to protect identified endangered or threatened aquatic or terrestrial species and associated habitats.

FC (Flood Control) – Upland management actions to reduce the impacts of downstream flooding on stream banks and fish habitat. Examples include dry dams, grass waterways, gully stabilization, and improved infiltration through establishment of vegetative cover.

FE (Fencing) –Upland management actions to limit or prevent livestock from damaging stream banks, fish habitat and stream corridors. Techniques may include rotational grazing, livestock watering areas or devices and fencing.

FS-Br (Fish Barrier) - In-stream management actions used to prevent or exclude upstream or downstream movement of detrimental species of fish. Examples include low head dams, electric weirs, gates or screens.

FS-PS (Fish Passage) - Modifications to manmade or natural fish barriers to allow fish passage, providing systemic benefits to the aquatic community.

FS-Ctrl (Rough Fish Control) –Instream management actions to reduce or control over abundant or nuisance fish populations. Examples include rough fish removal by commercial fishing, netting, seining, shocking or chemical treatment of waterways.

FS-Regs (Fish Regulations) - Management actions that restricts the harvest or harvest method of sport fisheries. Examples include regulation of size and bag limits, season length, refuges, and gear and bait restrictions.

FS-ST (Stocking and Transfer) –The stocking of fish raised in hatcheries or the transfer of fish from other waterways to supplement natural reproduction of native species or to create a fishery for a new species.

IHI (Instream Habitat Improvement) – Instream management actions to improve habitat and sport fish populations. Examples include the installation of artificial banks (boom covers), large woody debris, rip rap, boulder retards and other similar devises.

LA (Land Acquisition and Streambank Protection) - Acquisition of protective easements or fee title lands to protect or enhance important or critical habitat, and to provide recreational access.

NPS (Nonpoint Source) - Control of nonpoint sources of pollution, through selection of a stream or lake watershed for Priority Watershed Program funding.

PDR (Point Discharge Regulation) - Control of pollution from point source discharges through regulatory programs.

PLAN (Planning Grant) - Support of management planning through state-funded planning grants.

PROT (Protection Grant) - Support of resource protection activities through state-funded protection grants.

TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) - Establishment of a total maximum daily load for pollutant sources that are impairing the water body.

UB (Urban or Industrial Best Management Practices) - Management practices that reduce pollutant loads carried to surface waters and groundwater from non-agricultural land uses. Examples include stormwater infiltration, stormwater detention, construction site erosion control, and other pollutant reduction practices.

WR (Wetland Restoration) - Management actions to restore or enhance wetland habitat. Examples include breaking of drain tile and ditch plugs.

Refs (References)

Information included in the stream tables is derived from the knowledge of agency staff and from various studies conducted by the DNR and other agencies. The information is now housed in DNR files. For more in-depth information contact the Eau Claire DNR Service Center.

CHIP CO-1996 - Chippewa County Land Conservation Department Study 1996
LCRSNA - Lower Chippewa River State Natural Area 2000 Study
FH-1961 - 2001 - Studies completed by the DNR Fisheries & Habitat Bureau
Schreiber-1995 - Study completed by Ken Schreiber - Eau Claire Service Center 1995
UWEC-1999 - University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire 1999 Study
UWSP-1993 - University of Steven's Point 1993 Study
WR-1991 - DNR Water Resources Bureau 1991 Study
WRM-1992 - DNR Water Resources Management Bureau 1992 Study

Lake Table Codes

This section describes the information contained in each column of the lake table, and defines the abbreviations used in each column. *A blank space anywhere in the table means that data is unassessed or unavailable.*

Lake Name

All named lakes and some unnamed lakes larger than 10 acres in size are listed. Cold water spring or trout ponds that are smaller than 10 acres in size may also be listed. Lake names are those found on U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle maps unless the Wisconsin Geographic Names Council has established a different name. Some lakes are known locally by other names; where available, local names have been listed with the official name. Township, range, section and quarter-quarter section identify unnamed lakes.

Waterbody ID Code (WB ID Code)

All waterbodies require a unique waterbody identification code in order to link them to other databases.

Town Range Section

This column identifies the Township, Range, and Section where the lake is located.

County

This column indicates the county or counties in which the lake is located.

Surface Area

This column indicates the surface area, in acres, as listed on the WDNR Master Waterbody File, *Wisconsin Lakes* (WDNR PUBL-FM-800-95REV) and the *Lower Chippewa River Water Quality Management Plan (1996).*

Max Depth and Mean Depth

These two columns indicate the maximum depth and mean depth as listed in *Wisconsin Lakes* (WDNR PUBL-FM-800-95REV) and the *Lower Chippewa River Water Quality Management Plan (1996)*

Access

This column categorizes the type of public access available on the lake. If there is more than one access on a lake, only the most highly developed type of public access is listed in this column.

BR = Boat Ramp
BF = Barrier-free boat ramp (boating dock and/or wheelchair access)
P = Barrier-free pier (wheelchair access)
T = Walk-in trail
R = Roadside access
W = Wilderness access
BW = Barrier-free wilderness access (wheelchair access)
NW = Navigable water access to lake
X = Some type of access available, but not specified

Lake Type

This column categorizes the limnological characteristics of the lake based on physical and chemical properties. Each lake type category generally supports characteristic aquatic plant and animal communities. Lake type classifications and qualifying criteria are:

DG (Drainage lake) - Impoundments and natural lakes which have both a surface water (stream) inlet and outlet. The main water source to these lakes comes from stream drainage.
DR (Drained lake) - Natural lakes with the main water source dependent on the groundwater table and seepage from adjoining wetlands. These lakes seldom have an inlet but will have an outlet of very little flow. They are similar to the seepage lakes (below) except that they have an outlet.
SE (Seepage lake) - Landlocked lakes which have no surface water (stream) inlet or outlet. The groundwater table, and sediments that seal the bottom of the lake maintain water level. On some lakes, an intermittent outlet may be present.
SP (Spring lake) - Spring lakes seldom have an inlet, but always have an outlet of substantial flow. The main water source to these lakes comes from groundwater (springs).
IMP (Impoundment) - This code following the lake type code (above) indicates that an impounding structure (dam) located on a stream created that lake.
NLD (Dammed Natural Lake) - This code following the lake type code (above) indicates that dam is present on a natural lake.

Winterkill

Winterkill (winter oxygen depletion) is a common problem in many shallow Wisconsin lakes. A kill can occur when at least four inches of snow cover the lake, which prevents sunlight from reaching the water. All photosynthesis stops and plants begin to die and decompose. The extent of oxygen loss depends on the total amount of plant, algae and animal matter that decays. Drought increases the chance of winterkill by reducing the volume of water in the lake.

YES - Indicates the lake has experienced winterkill at least once.
NO (or blank) - Indicates winterkill is not known to have occurred.
NO-A - No winterkill has taken place since aeration units were installed in the lake.

Map

YES - An official lake map is available for the lake.
NO (or blank) - An official lake map is not available for the lake.

Phosphorus Sensitivity

This column indicates a lake's classification, based on an analysis of the lake's relative sensitivity to phosphorus loading and existing trophic (water quality) conditions. These phosphorus sensitivity classifications are used to prioritize lakes for nutrient control management. Lakes in each general classification are subdivided into management groups based on data needs or existing water quality conditions, and to establish appropriate management recommendations and priorities.

CLASS 1	CLASS 2
GROUP A	Existing water quality fair to excellent
	Potentially most sensitive to increased phosphorus loading. May not be as sensitive to phosphorus loading as Class 1 lakes
	High priority for protection management. Medium to high priority for protection or use impairment management
	Recommend impact assessment monitoring if water quality is less than achievable
GROUP B	Existing water quality poor to very poor
	Less sensitive to increased phosphorus loading. Low sensitivity to increased phosphorus loading
	Use impairment management recommended where appropriate. Low priority for protection management
	Medium priority for protection management
GROUP C	Data inadequate to assess trophic condition
	Classification monitoring recommended. Classification monitoring recommended
GROUP D	Water quality cannot be adequately assessed with trophic status index
CLASS 1	CLASS 2
	Physical and/or biological attributes make lake potentially less sensitive to increased phosphorus loading. Physical and/or biological attributes make lake potentially less sensitive to increased phosphorus loading
	Should be evaluated for re-classification if conditions change. Should be evaluated for re-classification if conditions change

Trophic Class and TSI (Trophic Status Index)

These two columns indicate a lake's classification based on water quality factors including concentrations of dissolved oxygen, phosphorus and chlorophyl in water samples. Trophic State Index (TSI) values are calculated for a lake based on a series of water quality sample data. These categories are general indicators of lake productivity.

Olig (Oligotrophic) - TSI values of 39 or less: These lakes are generally clear, cold and free of many rooted aquatic plants or large blooms of algae. Because they are low in nutrients, oligotrophic lakes generally do not support large fish populations. However, they often have an efficient food chain with a very desirable fishery of large predator fish.

Meso (Mesotrophic) - TSI values of 40 - 49: These lakes are intermediate between oligotrophic and eutrophic. The bottoms of these lakes are often devoid of oxygen in late summer months, limiting available habitat for cold water fish and resulting in release of phosphorus from lake sediments into the water column.

Eutr (Eutrophic) - TSI values of 50 or greater: These lakes are high in nutrients. They are likely to have excessive aquatic vegetation and/or experience frequent or severe algae blooms. They often support large fish populations, but are also susceptible to oxygen depletion. Small, shallow lakes are especially vulnerable to winterkill (see above), which can reduce the fishery diversity and quality.

Biological Use

This column indicates the *biological* use that the lake currently supports. The Biological Use designation is based on the current condition of the surface water and the associated biological community. Information in this column is not used for regulatory purposes.

CWSF (Cold Water Sport Fish Communities): This category includes lakes capable of supporting a community of cold water sport fish or serving as a spawning area for cold water sport fish.

TSSF (Two-Story Sport Fishery): This biological use category includes lakes that are capable of supporting a community cold water fish and also a community of warm water sport fish.

WWSF (Warm Water Sport Fish Communities): This category includes lakes capable of supporting a community of warm water sport fish or serving as a spawning area for warm water sport fish.

WWFF (Warm Water Forage Fish Communities): This category includes lakes capable of supporting an abundant, diverse community of forage fish and other aquatic life.

LFF (Limited Forage Fishery): This category includes lakes of limited aquatic life use capacity due to low flow, naturally poor water quality or poor habitat. These lakes are capable of supporting only a limited community of tolerant forage fish and aquatic life.

LAL (Limited Aquatic Life): This category includes lakes that are severely limited for aquatic life use because of low flow and naturally poor water quality or poor habitat. These surface waters are capable of supporting only a limited community of aquatic life.

Additional biological use categories identified in this column include:

303(d): These lakes have been identified as 303(d) listed impaired lakes. The 303(d) list identifies waters that are not currently meeting water quality criteria for specific substances or designated uses. See Chapter 3 for a discussion of Impaired Waters.

ORW (Outstanding Resource Waters): These waters have excellent water quality and high-quality fisheries. They do not receive wastewater discharges. No point source discharges will be allowed in the future, unless the quality of such discharges meets or exceeds the quality of the receiving water.

ERW (Exceptional Resource Waters): These waters have excellent water quality and valued fisheries but may already receive wastewater discharges or may receive future discharges necessary to correct environmental or public health problems.

Rec Use (Recreational Use)

This category indicates the type of recreational activities known to be taking place on the lake, and the intensity of use.
BT - Boating,
FS - Fishing,
SW - Swimming,
WS - Water Sports

Use Intensity: L=Low, **M**=Medium, **H**=High, **U (or blank)**=Unknown.

LMO (Lake Management Organization)

This column indicates whether or not a lake management organization (LMO) exists for the lake. A LMO can range from a small, loosely organized group of lake property owners, to an association or to a district, complete with by-laws and taxing authority.

Y - Indicates that a LMO does exist
ASSC (Lake Association) - Criteria for Lake Association status are spelled out in Section 144.253(1), Wisconsin Statutes. Generally, an Association must be at least 25 members in size, allow membership to anyone living within one mile of the lake for at least one month per year, and have lake protection and improvement as its primary purpose.
DIST (Lake District) - Criteria for Lake District status can be found in Chapter 33, Wisconsin Statutes. A Lake District is a special purpose unit of government, which is formed through local government approval processes. It has specified boundaries, and its main purpose is to improve or protect a lake and its watershed.
Rec (LMO Recommended) - It is recommended that a LMO be developed.
If blank - no lake management association exists.

Sources and Impacts

These two columns indicate probable **sources** of impact to the lake and the **impacts**, or water quality problems that are present in the lake. Sources and impacts are identified using the best professional judgment of field staff. The following tables explain the source and impact codes used in these columns. There is almost always a complex relationship between pollutant sources and resource impacts, and the table below is not intended to show a relationship between specific sources and impacts.

SOURCE
AGSPR - Agricultural land spreading site. **NPS** - Unspecified nonpoint sources of pollution
BY - Barnyard or exercise lot runoff (animal operations)**PS** - Point sources of pollutants
CE - Construction site erosion. **PSB** - Streambank pasturing
CL - Cropland erosion. **PWL** - Woodlot pasturing
DEV - Intense development pressure. **RS** - Roadside construction erosion
EX-CP - Exotics – curly leaf pondweed. **SB** - Streambank erosion
EX-EWM - Exotics -eurasion milfoil. **SEP** - Septic systems are or may be causing water quality problems
EX-PL - Exotics - purple loosestrife. **URB** - Urban storm water runoff
HM - Hydrological modification caused by damming, ditching, or wetland drainage. **WLF** - Water level fluctuations
INT - Internal loading

IMPACT
ACC - Access problems. The general public is unable to access a navigable waterbody, which is considered a water of the state. **NUT** - Excessive nutrient enrichment
ALG - Undesirable algae growth. **SED** - Excessive Sedimentation
BAC - Bacteria monitoring. **TOX** - General toxicity problems
DO - Low dissolved oxygen concentration **TURB** - Turbidity problems
HAB - Aquatic or terrestrial habitat degradation. **WKILL** - Winterkill that occurs as a result of human activity
HG – Mercury advisory
MAC - Undesirable macrophyte plant growth

Monitoring Activity/Status/Date/Rank

The monitoring activity column includes a list of monitoring activities that have taken place on the lake in the past 5 years *or* are recommended for the future. These activities are described in the list below. Monitoring activities that do not include a status, rank or dates are simply suggestions for future monitoring. Examples include:

- FS-Comp/R/M (Comprehensive Fish Survey is Recommended, and is a Medium priority)
- StkEval/C/98 (Fish stocking evaluation was Completed in 1998.

Status: This indicates the status identified for each monitoring activity.
R=Recommended, **P**=Planned, **O**=Ongoing, **C**=Complete

Date: If the monitoring activity is planned or has already been completed, the planned or completion date is included.

Rank: Each of the listed monitoring activities are also assigned a priority rank, based on the best professional judgment of field staff.
L=Low, **M**=Medium, **H**=High

Monitoring Activity Codes

AMB (Ambient Lake Monitoring) - The collection of ambient lake water chemistry samples to provide an index of water quality conditions.

BASE-T (Baseline Trend Monitoring) - The collection of a suite of physical and biological parameters that provide an assessment of trends in lake quality between lakes and over time. On a set number of lakes, water chemistry data are collected every other year and data on habitat and the fish community are collected every five years. Parameters include the levels of a variety of chemical components, physical habitat measurements, and the catch-per-unit-effort for all fish species collected.

BASE-S (Baseline Status Monitoring) - The collection of a suite of physical, chemical and biological parameters that supplements more intensive data gathered from lakes included in the trends monitoring program. This data also establishes a baseline of information or status of a number of other lakes in the basin. The types of sampling are similar to the trends monitoring program, however water chemistry data are collected every five years.

CLA - chlorophyll a sampling

DF - Diagnostic or feasibility study, to determine watershed and lake management needs to protect or improve water quality.

DOT - The collection of a dissolved oxygen and water temperature profile, generally at regular depth intervals at the deepest spot of the lake.

FS-Comp (Comprehensive) - The collection of a suite of fisheries information on lakes specifically aimed at identifying the abundance of fish populations. This includes catch per unit effort and/or population estimates. Data is often quantified as number per acre.

FS-Hab – The characterization of habitat available to fish and other aquatic life in a lake. Habitat is identified in terms of both quantity and quality to determine needs for protection and/or enhancement of the current condition.

FS-K (Fish Kill) - An assessment of the extent and duration of fish kills, most often caused by low oxygen conditions, to identify further management needs including fish stocking.

FS-Other – The collection of all other fisheries data that is not specifically taken to document the baseline (BASE) or comprehensive (FS-Comp) condition of fisheries resources. These monitoring activities tend to be stand-alone sampling techniques such as fish abundance (CPE), fish community heath (IBI), or fish habitat condition (HAB).

FS-Regs Eval – The collection of fisheries information used to assess the net impact of a new regulation such as size and bag limit changes, seasons, quotas, refuges, bait and gear restrictions, etc.

FS-Stk Eval (Stocking) – The collection of fisheries data used to determine the success or failure of stocking various strains, sizes and densities of fish.

FS-Tis - The collection of fish tissue for fish toxicity evaluations. Examples: mercury and PCBs.

FS-YOY (Young Of Year Fish) - Monitoring conducted to assess the level of natural reproduction of a specific year class of fish (usually sportfish species such as walleye or musky).

LTT (Long Term Trend Monitoring) - This is an intensive monitoring program which involves collecting data on water quality and other biological and physical conditions, five times per year for a period of 10 years, from 1986 - 1996.

MOD - Modeling of lake and watershed conditions to assist in development of management plans.

SED (Sediment) - The collection of sediment samples for chemistry testing. Samples are analyzed for bulk chemistry, metals and organic compounds.

SH-C (Self-Help Program - Chemistry) - Collection of water chemistry data by Lake Self-Help Program Volunteer Monitors. Data collected includes water clarity, chlorophyll concentration, phosphorus concentration and temperature profiles.

SH-E (Extended Self Help Program - Chemistry and DO) - Collection of water chemistry and dissolved oxygen data by Lake Self-Help Program Volunteer Monitors.

SH-P (Self-Help Program - Plants) - Collection of aquatic plant data by Lake Self-Help Program Volunteer Monitors

SH-S (Self-Help Program - Secchi) - Collection of water clarity (Secchi depth) data by Lake Self-Help Program Volunteer Monitors.

VEG (Vegetation Surveys) - Collection of data about the aquatic plant community by WDNR staff. Information collected includes species presence, frequency, density and maximum rooting depth along specified transects.

WC - Water chemistry sampling includes a collection of samples for dissolved oxygen, temperature, pH, phosphorus or other parameters.

Management Activity/Status/Date/Rank

The management activity column includes a list of management activities that have taken place on the lake in the past 5 years *or* are recommended for the future. These activities are described in the list below. Management activities that do not include a status, rank or dates are simply suggestions for future management. Examples include:

- SR/R/H (Shoreline habitat restoration is Recommended, and is a High priority)
- AER/O/H (Aeration is Ongoing, and is a High priority)

Status: This indicates the status identified for each management activity.
R=Recommended, **P**=Planned, **O**=Ongoing, **C**=Complete

Date: If the management activity is planned or has already been completed, the planned or completion date is included.

Rank: Each of the listed management activities is also assigned a priority rank, based on the best professional judgment of field staff.
L=Low, **M**=Medium, **H**=High

Management Activity Codes

AER - Installation of an aeration system to prevent winterkill conditions.

APMP - Development of an aquatic plant management plan.

APM-C (Aquatic Plant Management-Chemistry) - Control nuisance aquatic plants through chemical applications.

APM-M (Aquatic Plant Management-Mechanical) - Control nuisance aquatic plants by mechanical means, such as harvesting.

BS (Bank Stabilization) – A practice used to reduce bank erosion and sedimentation to waterways. Examples include planting riparian buffer strips, rip rapping, sloping, grading and seeding or bioengineering techniques.

CHP (Critical Habitat Protection) - Management activities which protect the current state of habitat critical to the survival of fish and other aquatic life, especially endangered, threatened, and rare species. Activities may include land acquisition, no-wake zones, and more restrictive criteria applied to aquatic plant management and water regulation activities.

CR (Chemical Rehabilitation) - Chemical treatments used to rehabilitate a lake ecosystem. Examples include removal of carp through chemical treatment.

D-SC (Dredging/Sediment Control) - Dredging or removal of lake sediments to improve lake water quality or habitat conditions.

ES (Endangered Species) - Management actions to protect identified endangered or threatened aquatic or terrestrial species and associated habitats.

EXC (Exotic Species Control) - Control or removal of exotic and nuisance species by chemical, biological or physical means.

FS-Br (Fish Barrier) - In-lake management actions used to prevent movement of detrimental species of fish. Examples include low head dams, electric weirs, gates or screens.

FS-Ctrl (Rough Fish Control) –Management actions to reduce or control over abundant or nuisance fish populations. Examples include rough fish removal by commercial fishing, netting, seining, shocking or chemical treatment of waterways.

FS-Regs (Fish Regulations) - Management actions that restricts the harvest or harvest method of sport fisheries. Examples include regulation of size and bag limits, season length, refuges, and gear and bait restrictions.

FS-ST (Stocking and Transfer) – Lake management actions to restore or enhance sport and nongame species. Examples include stocking fish raised in a hatchery or field transfer of wild stocks.

IHI (In-lake Habitat Improvement) - In-lake management actions to improve habitat for fish populations. Examples include the installation of log fish cribs, large woody debris, riprap, spawning reefs, half-logs and other similar devises.

INT-M (Internal Loading Management) - Management activities intended to reduce internal phosphorous loading such as alum treatment or summer aeration.

LA (Land Acquisition and Habitat Protection) - Acquisition of protective easements or fee title lands to protect or enhance important or critical habitat, and to buffer upland uses.

LMP (Lake Management Plan) - Development of a comprehensive lake management plan.

MAP - Development of a hydrographic (contour) map of the lakebed.

NPS (Non-Point Source) - Control of non-point sources of pollution, through selection of a stream or lake watershed for Priority Watershed Program funding.

PLAN (Planning Grant) - Support of management planning through state-funded planning grants.

PROT (Protection Grant) - Support of resource protection activities through state-funded protection grants.

SR (Shoreline Habitat Restoration) - Protection or restoration of shoreland vegetative habitat to promote native species diversity.

SZ (Shoreland Zoning) - Implementation and enforcement of shoreland zoning regulations.

TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) - Establishment of a total maximum daily load for pollutant sources that are impairing the water body.

WLM (Water Level Management) - A practice or strategy for managing water levels and water level fluctuations to enhance recreation, wildlife, habitat and property protection.

WR (Wetland Restoration) - Management actions to restore or enhance wetland habitat. Examples include breaking of drain tile and ditch plugs.

Refs (References)

Information included in the stream tables is derived from the knowledge of agency staff and from various studies conducted by the DNR and other agencies. The information is now housed in DNR files. For more in-depth information contact the Eau Claire DNR Service Center.

FH-96 - 99 - Studies completed by the DNR Fisheries & Habitat Bureau

PRATT 1994-2000 - Studies completed by Frank Pratt - DNR Northern Region

Pine Creek and Red Cedar River Watershed - LC07

Lake Name	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Surface Area	Max Depth	Mean Depth	Access	Lake Type	Winter Kill	Map	Phosphorus Sensitivity	Trophic Class	TSI	Biological Use/Status	Rec Use	LMO	Source	Impact	Montoring Activity/Staius/Date/Rank	Management Activity/Status/Date/Rank	Refs
Dallas Flowage	2088000	32 12W 14 NW SE	Barron	27	9		BR	DG-IMP	NO		2B	Eutr	58	CWSF	BT-L FS L SW-L WS-L		CL,PSB	HAB		FS-ST/O/L	
Mirror Lake	2082600	29 11W 16 NE NW	Dunn	10	13	4	T	DG	NO	X	2C										

LC013

ID Code	Lake Name	Watershed Code	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Surface Area	Maximum Depth	Mean Depth	Access	Lake Type	Winter Kill	Map	Phosphous Sensitivity	Trophic Class	TSI	Biological Use/Status	Lake Use	LMO	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Management Recc/Status/Date/Rank
2121000LC13	Elk Creek Lake	LC13	2121000	27 11W 13 SE SE	Dunn	54	17	6	BR	DG, "IMP"	NO	YES	2B	E		WWSF	BT-L FS-L SW-L	DIST	BY, CL, SB	TURB,SED	VEG/R, BASE-S/R-02/M, SH-C/R, WC/R/M, SED/R	
2125400LC13	Halfmoon Lake	LC13	2125400	27 10W 24 SE SE	Eau Claire	132	9	6	BRP	SE, "NLD"	NO, YES	X	2A	E	63-70	WWSF	BT, FS-H, SW, WS	DIST	URB, EX-CP	MAC, ALG, TURB, DO, NUT	VEG/C'95, DF/99, FS-COMP/C'00, BASE/S/P'01/H	APM/M-O, NPS, PLAN/'00, PROT, AER/O/H, FS-ST/O/M
1871400LC13	Old Elk Lake	LC13	1871400	27 11W 16 NW NW	Dunn	200	6			SE	YES	NO	2C	E	51-63		wildlife?		PSB, BY, SB, CL, AGSPR	ALG, TURB, ACC	WC/C/'01, VEG/R/H	MAP/M, NPS, PROT, PLAN, SZ/H
1881800LC13	Sneen Lake	LC13	1881800	26 11W 03 NE NW	Dunn	14	4			SE	YES		2C								WC/R/M, VEG/R/M	MAP/L, SZ/H, PROT, PLAN

Last Updated on 12/06/2000
By Wisconsin DNR

LC15

ID Code	Lake Name	Watershed Code	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Surface Area	Maximum Depth	Mean Depth	Access	Lake Type	Winter Kill	Map	Phosphorus Sensitivity	Trophic Class	TSI	Biological Use/Status	Lake Use	LMO	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Dat	Management Recc./Status/Dat
2135600LC15	Coon Fork Flowage	LC15	2135600	26 05W 29 SE SW	Eau Claire	75	20	8	BR (should be BRP)	DG-IMP	NO	X	2B	E	50-66	WWSF	BT-H, BT-L FS-H, FS-L SW-H, SW-M WS-L		BY,CL,PSB	NUT,BAC,ALG	VEG/C'97,SH-E/O,DFS/C/'97,BASE/S/P'02/H	NPS/R/H,PLAN/R/H,PROT/R/H
2133200LC15	Eau Claire Lake	LC15	2133200	26 06W 05 SW SW	Eau Claire	860 (lake map indicates 1,118)	25		BR (should be BRP)	DG-IMP	NO	X	2B	E	62-65	WWSF	BT-H FS-H SW-H WS-H	ASSC	CL,BY,IL,NPS,DEV	DEV(should be under source),NUT,SB,ALG,SED,HAB	DFS/C/'98,SH-E/R/H,BASE/S/P'02/H, FS-COMP/R'07/H, FS-YOY/R/H	SR,CHP,NPS/R/H,INT-M/R/M,PLAN/R/H,PROT/R/H,D/SC/R/H,CHP/R/H, D/SC/R/M, FS-ST/O/H, IHI/R/H
2136200LC15	Fairchild Pond	LC15	2136200	25 05W 35 NW NE	Eau Claire	18	9	3	BR	DG-IMP	NO	X	2C	E	51-59	WWSF	BT-L FS-H, FS-L SW-L WS-L		BY,CL,NPS	SED, ALG, HAB, MAC, NUT	SH-S/O,VEG/C/'95,BASE/S/R/M	NPS/R/H,PLAN/R/H,PROT/R/H,SR, D/SC/R/H
2133700LC15	Unnamed Pond T27n R6w S2-2	LC15	2133700	27 06W 02 SW NE	Eau Claire	30	7			these are man-made gravel pits	NO		2C									

Last Updated on 12/06/2000
By Wisconsin DNR

A22-23

LC17

ID Code	Lake Name	Watershed Code	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Surface Area	Maximum Depth	Mean Depth	Access	Lake Type	Winter Kill	Map	Phosphorus Sensitivity	Trophic Class	TSI	Biological Use/Status	Lake Use	LMO	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Management Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Refs
2147200LC17	Chapman Lake	LC17	2147200	29 05W 26 SE SE	Chippewa	34	9		BR	DG-IMP	YES (none since dredging)		2C			WWSF	BT-M SW-M FS		DEV,NPS	MAC, ALG, SED, NUT	SH-S/C'67,SH-E/R,VEG/R, BASE/S/R/M	SR, MAP/R/L	
2149400LC17	Unnamed Lake T30N R3W S20-2	LC17	2149400	30 03W 20 SW NE	Taylor	23	6				YES												

Last Updated on 12/06/2000
By Wisconsin DNR

LC18

ID Code	Lake Name	Watershed Code	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Surface Area	Maximum Depth	Mean Depth	Access	Lake Type	Winter Kill	Map	Phosphorus Sensitivity	Trophic Class	TSI	Biological Use/Status	Lake Use	LMO	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Management Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Refs
2152600LC18	Chippewa Falls Flowage	LC18	2152600	28 08W 06 SE SE	Chippewa	282	29	11	R (should be BRP)	DG-IMP	NO	X	2B	E	58-59	WWSF	BT-M FS-H FS-L		EX-PL,URB, HM, WLF	HAB, HG	BASE/S/P'02/H, FS-COMP/R/H	FS-REGS/R/M	FS-REGS/R/M
2152100LC18	Como Lake	LC18	2152100	30 09W 08 NW NE	Chippewa	98	6		BRP	DG-IMP	NO	X	2B	E	50-90	WWSF	FS-M SW-L	ASSC	NPS, DEV,URB,CL,BY	MAC, ALG,NUT,SED,HAB	SH-S/O,WC/R/L,FS-COMP/C'00, BASE/S/R'04/H	APM/M/R, SR,D/SC/R/L,CHP/R/H, D/SC/R/H, SR/R/H, NPS/R/H, FS-	
2149900LC18	Dells Pond	LC18	2149900	27 09W 18 NE NE	Eau Claire	739	30	9	BR (should be BF)	DG-IMP	NO	X	2B	E	58-68	WWSF	BT-H FS-H, FS-L SW-H, SW-L WS-H		WLF,EX-CP,URB, HM, NPS	HAB,ALG,TURB,NUT,SED, HG	FS-COMP/C'97	BS/R/M, CHP/R/H, FS-ST/O/H, WLM/R/H, FS-REGS/R/M	
2151000LC18	Glen Loch Flowage	LC18	2151000	29 08W 31 NE NW	Chippewa	39	17		T (should be BR)	DG-IMP	NO		2B	E	50-90	WWSF	FS-L		NPS,DEV,URB, SB, CL	MAC, ALG, TURB, SED	SH-S/C'92,WC/R/L,BASE/S/R/M	APM/M/R, BS/R/H	
2150200LC18	Hallie Lake	LC18	2150200	28 09W 27 NE NE	Chippewa	79	13	6	R (should be BF)	SE DG-IMP	NO	X	2A	E	45-62	TSSF	BT-H, BT-L FS-H	ASSC	EX-CP,URB,DEV,SED	MAC, ALG,DO,HAB, NUT, SED	SH-S/O,WC/R/L,VEG/R/L,FS-COMP/P'01/H, BASE/T/P'01/H, DOT/R'01/H	APM/O/R,NPS/R, AER/R/H, FS-ST/O/M, SR/R/H, D/SC/R/M	
2151200LC18	Tilden Mill Pond	LC18	2151200	29 09W 24 NE NW	Chippewa	61	11	3	R (should be BR)	DG-IMP	NO	X	2B	E	45-90	WWSF	FS-L		NPS,DEV,CL, SB, PSB	MAC, ALG, SED, HAB, NUT	SH-S/C'92,WC/R/L,BASE/S/R/M,	APM/M/R,BS/R/H, D/SC/R/H	

Last Updated on 12/06/2000
By Wisconsin DNR

LC19

ID Code	Lake Name	Watershed Code	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Surface Area	Maximum Depth	Mean Depth	Access	Lake Type	Winter Kill	Map	Phosphorus Sensitivity	Trophic Class	TSI	Biological Use/Status	Lake Use	LMO	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Management Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Refs
2155800LC19	Cadott Flowage	LC19	2155800	29 06W 31 SE NE	Chippewa	20	10		T	DG-IMP	NO		2C			WWSF	FS-L SW-L		CL,BY,PSB, HM, SB	BAC, NUT, SED	NOTE TO JOE ABOUT DAM		
2157000LC19	Otter Lake	LC19	2157000	30 05W 11 SW SE	Chippewa	661	43	11	BR BF	SE-NLD	YES	X	1B	E	53-65	WWSF	BT-H, BT-L FS-H SW-H, SW-L WS-H	DIST-R or ASSC-R	EX-CP,DEV,NPS	HAB, NUT, DO	SH-C/C'92, VEG/C'96,BASE/R,WC/R, FS-COMP/R-'08/H, BASE/S/R-'03/H	AER/O/H,SZ/R,CHP/R/H, FS-ST/O/H, LA/R/M	
2157900LC19	Pike Lake	LC19	2157900	30 06W 14 SE NW	Chippewa	192	37	12	BR	SE	NO	X	1A	E	43-55	WWSF	BT-H FS-H SW	DIST-R or ASSC-R	DEV,NPS,BY, PSB	HAB, NUT, ACC	VEG/C'96,BASE/R,WC/R, FS-COMP/R-'08/H, BASE/S/R-'03/H	NPS/R, SZ/R, CHP/R, LA-ACC	

Last Updated on 12/06/2000
By Wisconsin DNR

ID Code	Lake Name	Watershed Code	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Surface Area	Maximum Depth	Mean Depth	Access	Lake Type	Winter Kill	Map	Phosphorus Sensitivity	Trophic Class	TSI	Biological Use/Status	Lake Use	LMO	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Management Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Refs
1832700LC21	Bass Lake T32N R9W S15	LC21	1832700	32 09W 15 NE NW	Chippewa	39	23			SE		X	1C			WWSF				ACC			
1834400LC21	Beaver Lake T31N R08W S16	LC21	1834400	31 08W 16 NE SW	Chippewa	15	15		R, NW	SE	NO YES	X	1C			WWSF	FS			DO			
2170300LC21	Big Buck Lake	LC21	2170300	31 08W 15 NW SE	Chippewa	17	45		R	SE	NO	X	1C	E	50-59	WWSF	BT-L SW-L FS		RS,NPS	NUT, ACC	SH-S/0,WC/R/L	SZ/R/L	
2178400LC21	Bob Lake	LC21	2178400	31 08W 23 NE NE	Chippewa	97	68	27	BR	DG	NO	X	1A	E	40-59	WWSF	FS		DEV	HAB	WC/R/L,VEG/R/L, BASE/S/P-'03/H, FS-COMP/R/H	SZ/R/L	
1836600LC21	Boot Lake	LC21	1836600	30 08W 10 NE SE	Chippewa	27	14		R	SE	YES	X	1C			WWSF	FS			DO, ACC	SH-S/0, DOT/R/H	AER/R/M, LA-ACC/R/H	
1838200LC21	Burnt Wagon Lake	LC21	1838200	31 08W 10 NW SE	Chippewa	15	12		W	SE	YES	X	1C			WWFF				DO			
1841200LC21	Clear Lake T31N R08W S23	LC21	1841200	31 08W 23 NW SE	Chippewa	19	11			SE	NO YES	X	2C			WWSF	FS			DO			
2161400LC21	Cornell Flowage	LC21	2161400	31 06W 18 SW SE	Chippewa	836	54		BRP	DG-IMP	NO	X	2B		56-58	WWSF	FS-M, SW-L, WS-L, BT-L		EX-PL, NPS, HM, WLF	NUT, HAB, HG	FS-COMP/R-'09/H, FS-REG EVAL/R/M, FS-YOY/R/M	EXC/R/H, FS-REGS/R/H, FS-ST/O/H, MAP/R/H,	
2171000LC21	Cornell Lake	LC21	2171000	31 08W 34 SE SE	Chippewa	194	39	16	BR	SE	NO	X	1C	E	47-59	WWSF	FS		IL, DEV, SEP	HAB,NUT	SH-S/O, VEG/C'96,BASE/R or WC/R, FS-COMP/R-'08/H, BASE/S/P-'03/H, FS-STK/R/H	SR, SZ/R, CHP/R/H, FS-ST/R/M	
1845300LC21	Dog Island Lake	LC21	1845300	32 08W 35 SE SW	Chippewa	5	9			SE	YES	NO	1C			WWFF				DO			
1846600LC21	Eagle Lake	LC21	1846600	31 08W 16 NE NW	Chippewa	15	15		W	SE	NO	X	1C			WWSF	FS						
2183100LC21	Ellis Flowage	LC21	2183100	32 04W 03 SE NW	Taylor	15	5			SE	YES		2C										
1847600LC21	Evans Lake	LC21	1847600	31 08W 15 SW NW	Chippewa	12	8			SE	YES	X	1C			WWSF							
2175700LC21	Finley Lake	LC21	2175700	30 08W 01 SE SE	Chippewa	56	27		NW	DG	NO	X	1C	E	51-71	WWSF	FS		PWL,NPS,BY,INT	TURB, NUT, ACC	VEG/C'96,WC/R,INM/R	SR, NPS/R, INT-M/R, LA-ACC	
2176200LC21	Firth Lake	LC21	2176200	31 07W 02 NW SW	Chippewa	51	18		W	SE	NO YES	X	1C			WWSF				DO	DOT/R/M		
1849200LC21	Fishpole Lake	LC21	1849200	31 08W 03 NE SE	Chippewa	20	12		W	SE	NO YES	X	1C			WWSF				DO			
2183800LC21	Flowage #3 - Pershing	LC21	2183800	32 04W 26 SW NW	Taylor	14	4			SE	YES		2C										
2178900LC21	Hay Meadow Flowage No. 1	LC21	2178900	31 08W 14 SW NE	Chippewa	24	40		BR	DG, "NLD"	YES		1C			WWSF	FS			DO	DOT/R/H, BASE/S/R/M	AER/R/M	
2180100LC21	Hay Meadow Flowage No. 2	LC21	2180100	31 08W 11 SE SW SE	Chippewa	40	9		BR	DG, "IMP"	YES		2C			WWSF				DO			
2180700LC21	Hay Meadow Flowage No. 3	LC21	2180700	31 08W 11 NE SE	Chippewa	19	4		T	DG, "IMP"	YES		2C			WWFF				DO			
2180900LC21	Hay Meadow Flowage No. 4	LC21	2180900	31 08W 11 SW NE	Chippewa	24	22		T	SE, "IMP"	YES		1C			WWSF				DO			
1853400LC21	Hemlock Lake	LC21	1853400	31 08W 16 NW SE	Chippewa	28	17		T BR	SE	YES	X	1C			WWSF	FS			DO, HG	WC/R, VEG/R, DOT/R/M		
2173300LC21	Highland Lake	LC21	2173300	32 08W 34 SW SW	Chippewa	10	16		W	SE	YES	X	1C			WWSF	FS			DO			
1854200LC21	Horseshoe Lake T31N R08W S10	LC21	1854200	31 08W 10 SW SE	Chippewa	17	16		W	SE	NO	X	1C			WWSF							
1854400LC21	Horseshoe Lake T32N R9W S25	LC21	1854400	32 9W 25	Chippewa	14.6	15		W	SE	YES	X	2B	E	57-59	WWSF				DO			
1855100LC21	Howe Lake	LC21	1855100	30 08W 14 NW NE	Chippewa	68	39	18	BR	SE	NO	X	1C	M	44-54	WWSF	FS		DEV	HG	WC/R,VEG/R, BASE/S/P-'03/H	SZ/R, LA-ACC/R/H	
1856300LC21	Jeanslow Lake	LC21	1856300	32 9W 36 NW NE	Chippewa	8.6	30		T, W	SE	NO	X	1B	E	50-59	WWSF							

2168800LC21	Jir	LC21	2168800	30 08W 22 SE NW	Chippewa	58	20			SE	YES	X	C			WWSF	FS			DO, ACC		LA-ACC	
1860500LC21	Little Bass Lake	LC21	1860500	32 09W 10 SW SW	Chippewa	12	7			SE	YES	X				WWSF							
1862800LC21	Long Lake T31N R07W S05	LC21	1862800	31 07W 05 SW SW	Chippewa	22	11		W no access	SE	YES	X	2C			WWFF				DO			
2173400LC21	Lowland Lake	LC21	2173400	32 08W 33 SE SE	Chippewa	11	24		BR	SE	YES	X	1C			WWSF	FS			DO			
2171200LC21	Marsh-Miller Lake	LC21	2171200	31 08W 29 NW SW	Chippewa	436	14	7	BR	DG, *IMP*	NO	X	2B	E	63-74	WWSF	FS-H	RECC	EX-CP,NPS,DEV	TURB, MAC, ALG,NUT, DO	VEG/C'94,WC/R, WR/R, FS-COMP/R-'04/H, BASE/S/P-'04/H, DOT/R/H	APM/M/R, AER/R/H, CHP/R/H, LA/R/H, LA-ACC/R/H	
2171500LC21	Mary Jane Lake No. 1	LC21	2171500	31 08W 16 SE SE	Chippewa	11	20			SE	NO	X	1C			WWSF	FS						
2171400LC21	Mary Jane Lake No. 2	LC21	2171400	31 08W 21 NE NE	Chippewa	25	15			SE	NO YES	X	1C			WWSF	FS			DO			
1867500LC21	Moon Lake	LC21	1867500	31 08W 15 NW NW	Chippewa	15	11		W	SE	YES	X	1C			WWSF				DO			
2174400LC21	Mud Lake T30N R08W S24	LC21	2174400	30 08W 24 SW SE	Chippewa	18	14			SE	YES	X	1C			WWSF				DO			
2171800LC21	Mud Lake T31N R08W S08	LC21	2171800	31 08W 08 SE NE	Chippewa	23	4			SE	YES	X	2C			WWSF				DO			
2174700LC21	Old Abe Lake	LC21	2174700	30 07W 20 SW SW	Chippewa	1072	36		BRP	DG-IMP	NO	X	2B	E	59-60	WWSF	FS-L BT-L WS-L		EX-CP, HM, WLF	HAB, HG	FS-COMP/C-'89, FS-REG EVAL/R/M, FS-[illegible]	SZ/R/L, FS-ST/O/H, IHI/R/M, WLM/R/H	
2178100LC21	Oliver Lake No. 1	LC21	2178100	31 08W 24 NW SE	Chippewa	14	32		T	SE	NO YES	X	1B		45-83	WWSF			BY	NUT, DO		WR/R	
2178200LC21	Oliver Lake No. 2	LC21	2178200	31 08W 24 SW SW	Chippewa	4	62			SE	NO	X				WWSF							
2178300LC21	Oliver Lake No. 3	LC21	2178300	31 08W 23 SE SE	Chippewa	6	48			SE	NO	X				WWSF							
1874200LC21	Pheffercorn Lake	LC21	1874200	30 07W 29 SW SE	Chippewa	15	4			SE	YES		2C			WWFF				DO			
2180500LC21	Pickerel Lake T31N R08W S01	LC21	2180500	31 08W 01 SW SE	Chippewa	15	46			SE	NO	X	1C			WWSF							
1874900LC21	Planning Lake	LC21	1874900	31 07W 08 SW NW	Chippewa	16	8			SE	YES	X	2C			WWSF				DO			
2173900LC21	Popple Lake	LC21	2173900	30 08W 25 SE NW	Chippewa	90	25	13	BR	SE-NLD	NO	X	1B	E	56-63	WWSF	FS, BT, WS		SEP	NUT	BASE/S/P-'03/H, FS-COMP/R-'08/H, FS-STK/R/H, AMR/R	CHP/R/H, FS-ST/O/H, LA/R/H, SR/R/H, MOD/R	
2171600LC21	Rock Lake T31N R08W S04	LC21	2171600	31 08W 09 SW NW	Chippewa	94	35		NW BR	DG	NO	X	1C	E	40-65	WWSF	FS			NUT, INT	SH-S/O, FS-COMP.R-'09/H, BASE/S/P-'04/H, FS-STK/R/H, SED/R	LA-ACC/R/H, MOD/R	
1880000LC21	Sand Lake	LC21	1880000	31 08W 15 NE NW	Chippewa	12	8		W	SE	YES	X	2C			WWSF				DO			
1869300LC21	Shalluck Lake, North	LC21	1869300	32 09W 25	Chippewa	39	52		BR	SE	NO YES	X	1A	E	49-55	WWSF	FS			TURB, DO, HG, NUT	BASE/S/R/M, DOT/R/H, SED/R, [illegible]	MOD/R	
1879300LC21	Shalluck Lake, South	LC21	1879300	32 08W 31	Chippewa	59	25		BR	SE	NO YES	X	1A	E	48-55	WWSF	FS			TURB, DO, NUT	BASE/S/P-'01/H, DOT/R/H, SED/R	AER/R/H, CHP/R, NPS/R, MOD/R	
2177600LC21	Smith Lake	LC21	2177600	32 07W 28 SE NW	Chippewa	5	41			SE	NO	X	1A	M	41-55	WWSF						NPS/R, CHP/R	
2183500LC21	Sotak Flowage	LC21	2183500	32 04W 26 SW NE	Taylor	75	5			DG	YES		1C			WWSF	FS						
2176500LC21	Spring Creek Flowage No. 1	LC21	2176500	32 07W 33 SW NE SW	Chippewa	16	7		BR T	DG	YES		2C			WWFF							
2177300LC21	Spring Creek Flowage No. 2	LC21	2177300	32 07W 33 NW NE SW	Chippewa	19	4		BR T	DG	YES		2C			WWFF							
1883300LC21	Stanley Lake	LC21	1883300	31 08W 15 NE SE	Chippewa	12	12			SE	NO	X	1C			WWSF							
2172600LC21	Town Line Lake	LC21	2172600	32 08W 33 NE SW	Chippewa	48	26		BR	SE	NO YES	X	1A	E	37-57	WWSF	FS			TURB, DO, NUT	VEG/C'96, DOT/R/H, BASE/S/P-'04/H	AER/R/H	

1886300LC21	Tram Lake	LC21	1886300	31 08W 02 SW SE	Chippewa	20	34		W	SE	NO YES		1C	M	44-53	WWSF	FS-L BT-L SW-L WS-H			DO	BASE/R/M-L, VEG/R/M-L	NPS/R, CHP/R	
1913400LC21	Unnamed Lake T32N R8W S33 NWSW	LC21	1913400	32 08W 33 SW NW SW	Chippewa	4	27						1C										
2184400LC21	Unnamed T31N R07W S13-3 (local name Perch Lake)	LC21	2184400	31 07W 13 NW NE	Chippewa	14	7		R	SE	NO		2C			WWSF	FS		HM	WLF		WLM/R/H	
1898500LC21	Unnamed T31N R08W S22-3	LC21	1898500	31 08W 22 SW NE	Chippewa	11	10				YES		1C										
2177400LC21	Unnamed T32N R07W S28-9	LC21	2177400	32 07W 28 NE SW	Chippewa	11	23				NO		1C										
2043700LC21	Upper Twin Lake	LC21	2043700	30 08W 11 NE SE	Chippewa	36	25			SE	NO	X	1C			WWSF	FS			ACC		LA-ACC/R/M	
1846500LC21	Weeks Lake, East	LC21	1846500	32 09W 25 SE SE	Chippewa	4	7		W	SE	YES	X	1C			WWFF				DO			
2044900LC21	Weeks Lake, West	LC21	2044900	32 09W 25 SW SE	Chippewa	5	11		W	SE	YES	X	1B		52-55	WWSF				DO			
2152800LC21	Wissola Lake	LC21	2152800	28 08W 03 SE NW	Chippewa	6300	72		BR BF, P	DG-IMP	NO	X	1B		53-64	WWSF	FS-H, BT-H, SW-M, WS-H	ASSC	HM, CL, SB, PSB, SEP, DEV, WLF	WLF, DEV, EX-CP (these should be under source) HAB, SED, NUT, ALG, TURB, HG	SH-E/O, VEG/C'90, FS-COMP/R-'02/H, BASE/S/P-'02/H, FS-REG EVAL/R/H, FS-YOY/R/H	WLM, CHP, BS/R/H, CHP/R/H, FS-REGS/R/H, FS-ST/O/H, HI/R/H, LA/R/M, NPS/R/H, SR/R/M, WLM/R/H	
2184100LC21	Wilt Flowage	LC21	2184100	32 04W 24 NW SE	Taylor	72	5			SE	YES		2C										

Last Updated on 12/06/2000
By Wisconsin DNR

LC07

ID Code	Stream Name	Watershed Code	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Codified Use	Existing Use	Attainable Use	Supporting Use	Assessment	Trend	Integrity Indicator /Result	Data Level	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Management Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Refs
2084700LC07	Beaver Creek	LC07	2084700	31 11W 26 SE SW	Chippewa, Dunn	DEF	Cold Ia /4.0	Cold Ia /4.0	PART/4	E	U		B2 H P/C T	BDAM, PSB, OBS-N	MIG, HAB	BASE/R/	BC, FE, IHI	FH-1994
2083300LC07	Bronken Creek	LC07	2083300	30 11W 33 NE SW	Dunn	Cold II/4.5	Cold II/4.5	UNK/4.5	UNK/4.5	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R/		
2088600LC07	Cruikshank Creek	LC07	2088600	32 11W 27 NW SE	Barron	DEF	WWFF/2	WWFF/2	UNK/2	E	D		B1 H1 P/C T	PSB,CL	HAB		AB/R/L	
2088100LC07	East Branch Upper Pine Creek	LC07	2088100	32 12W 14 NW NE	Barron	Cold II	Cold II/3.5	Cold II/3.5	PART/3.5	E	S		B1 H1 P/C T	BDAM,PSB,CL	HAB	FS-Other/R/M	AB/R/M	
2083900LC07	Eddies Creek	LC07	2083900	30 11W 16 NE NW	Dunn	DEF	UNK/2	UNK/2	UNK/2	U	U		B H P/C T	BDAM	HAB			
2082400LC07	Eighteen Mile Creek	LC07	2082400	29 11W 16 NE NW	Chippewa, Dunn	ERW Cold II/3.5 Cold III/2.0	Cold Ia/1.9 Cold IIb/ 5.0	Cold Ia/1.9 Cold IIa/ 5.0	PART/6.9	M	I	IBI-C/G HAB/G	B4 H4 P/C1 T	HM-DM(BEAVER), SB,FL,URB	HAB, TEMP, SED	BASE/R/	AB,BC,BS,FL,UB ,FS-STK/EVAL, IHI, LA, FE	FH-1997
2084900LC07	Hay Creek	LC07	2084900	31 11W 27 NE SE	Dunn	Cold II/8.4	Cold IIb/8.4	Cold IIa/8.4	PART/8.4	E	I		B H P/C T	PSB	HAB,SED,TEMP	BASE/R/	FS-STK/EVAL	FH-1961
2085300LC07	Lower Pine Creek	LC07	2085300	31 11W 23 NW NE	Barron, Dunn	Cold III	Cold III/3.6 WWFF/8	Cold III/3.6 WWFF/8	PART/11.6	M	U S		B1 H1 P/C T	BDAM,PSB,BY, NPS	BAC,HAB, TEMP,SED	BASE/R/	FS-STK/EVAL, AB/R/M	FH-1971
2088200LC07	North Branch Upper Pine Creek	LC07	2088200	32 12W 11 SW NE	Barron	Cold II	Cold II/2.5	Cold II/2.5	PART/2.5	E	S		B1 H1 P/C T	BDAM,PSB,CL	HAB	FS-Other/R/M	AB/R/M	
2084500LC07	Popple Creek	LC07	2084500	30 11W 04 SE SW	Dunn	Cold II/4.5	Cold IIa/4.5	Cold IIa/4.5	PART/4.5	E	U		B2 H P/C T	SED	TEMP,SED,HAB	BASE/R/	FS-STK/EVAL	FH-1972
2063500LC07	Red Cedar River	LC07	2063500	26 12W 30 SE NW	Sawyer, Barron, Dunn, Washburn,		WWSF/40	WWSF/40	FULLY/40	M		IBI-W/E HAB/G	B4 H4 P/C T	FL,SB,NPS,CL	NUT,DO,HAB	FS-COMP,IBI,HAB,FL/1992	AB,BS,FE,NPS, PLAN, PROT	FH-1992
2082700LC07	Running Valley Creek	LC07	2082700	29 11W 11 SE SE	Dunn, Chippewa	Cold II/4.0	Cold IIb/4	Cold IIa/4	PART/4	M	U	IBI-C/P HAB/G	B4 H4 P/C1 T	HM-DR,PSB,HM-DM(BEAVER)	TEMP,SED,HAB	FS-COMP,IBI,HAB,FL/1997	AB,BC,FE	FH-1997
2086100LC07	Sand Creek	LC07	2086100	31 11W 14 SE SE	Dunn, Chippewa	ERW Cold II/1.5 ERW Cold I/6.0	Cold I/6 Cold II/1.5	Cold I/7.5	PART/1.5 FULLY/6 FULLY/7.5	E M	D		B4 H P/C T	PSB,CE,BY,BDAM (do no see CE as a source) CL, EX-PL, EX-RC, OBS-N, OBS-M	SED,HAB, MAC, MIG, COM	FS-COMP/C-'96, BASE/R	AG/R/M, BC/R/H, EXC/R/H, FE/R/H, FS-REGS EVAL/R/M, IHI/R/M, LA/R/H	FH-1996
2088700LC07	Sioux Creek	LC07	2088700	32 11W 22 NE NW	Barron	DEF	WWFF/4	WWFF/4	PART/4	E	S		B1 H1 P/C T	PSB	HAB,SED		AB/R/M	
2085600LC07	South Fork Lower Pine Creek	LC07	2085600	32 12W 28 SE SW	Barron, Dunn	Cold II/3.2 Cold III	Cold IIb/3.2 Cold III/2.1	Cold II/3.2 Cold III/2.1	PART/5.3	M	U S		B H P/C T	PSM,NPS,PSB,BY	DO,BAC,HAB	BASE/R/	AB/R/M	FH-1971
2084300LC07	South Fork Trout Creek	LC07	2084300	30 10W 08 SW SW	Chippewa		UNK/4	UNK/4	UNK/4	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2086300LC07	Spring Brook	LC07	2086300	31 10W 18 NE NE	Chippewa	ERW Cold I/2.3	Cold I/2.3	Cold I/2.3	FULLY-THR/2.3	E M	S		B4 H P/C T	BDAM,BY,PSB, EX-RC, OBS-M, OBS-N	HAB,SED, MAC, MIG, COM	FS-COMP/C-'96, BASE/R	BC/R/H, EXC/R/H, FE/R/H, FS-REGS EVAL/R/M, IHI/R/M, LA/R/H,	FH-1996
2085900LC07	Spring Creek	LC07	2085900	32 12W 29 SE NW	Barron	Cold II	Cold II/0.5 WWFF/3.5	Cold II/0.5 WWFF/3.5	PART/4	E	S		B1 H1 P/C T	FL,PSB	HAB,SED,TURB		AB/R/M	
2088900LC07	Tiller Creek	LC07	2088900	32 11W 15 SE SW	Barron	DEF	WWFF/4	WWFF/4	FULLY/4	E	S		B1 H1 P/C T	PSB			AB/R/M	
2084000LC07	Trout Creek	LC07	2084000	30 11W 09 SW NE	Dunn, Chippewa	Cold III/2.3	Cold III/2.3	Cold III/2.3	PART/2.3	E	U		B H P/C T	PSB	HAB	BASE/R/		FH-1971
2087300LC07	Upper Pine Creek	LC07	2087300	31 11W 03 NE SW	Barron, Dunn	ORW WWSF	Cold I/2.5 Cold II/1 WWSF/16.5	Cold I/2.5 Cold II/1 WWSF/16.5	THR/3.5 FULLY/16.5	E	U S		B1 H1 P/C T	BY,FL,SB,PSB,HM-DM	HAB,SED,TEMP	BASE/R/,FS-Other/R/H	AB/R/H,DR/R/H, FE/R/H	

2083150LC07	Creek 12-13, Trib. To 18 Mile Ck.	LC07	2083150	29 11W 12 NE SE	Dunn, Chippewa		Cold IIb/0.1	Cold IIa/0.1	PART/0.1	M	I	IBI-C/G HAB/G	B4 H4 P/C1 T	NPS	HAB,SED,TEMP	FS-COMP,IBI,HAB,FL/1997	AB	FH-1997
	Creek 11-16, Trib. To 18 Mile Ck.	LC07		29 11W 11 SE SE	Dunn,Chippewa		Cold IIb/3.0	Cold IIa3.0	PART/3.0	M	I	IBI-C/G HAB/G	B4 H4 P/C1 T	NPS	HAB,SED,TEMP	FS-COMP,IBI,HAB,FL/1997	AB	FH-1997
2082650LC07	Creek 15-1,Trib to 18 Mile Ck.	LC07	2082650	29 11W 15 NE NE	Dunn		Cold IIb/2.8	Cold IIa/2.8	PART/2.8	M	I	IBI-C/F HAB/G	B4 H4 P/C1 T	NPS	HAB,SED,TEMP	FS-COMP,IBI,HAB,FL/1997	AB	FH-1997
2082620LC07	Creek 16-4, Trib to 18 Mile Ck.	LC07	2082620	29 11W 16 NE NE	Dunn		WWFF/1.8	WWFF/1.8	PART/1.8	M	U	IBI-C/P HAB/F	B4 H4 P/C1 T	NPS,HM-DR,PSB	HAB,SED,TEMP	FS-COMP,IBI,HAB,FL/1997	AB	FH-1997
2082800LC07	Creek 1-12, Trib. To Running Valley Ck.	LC07	2082800	29 11W 01 SE SW	Dunn,Chippewa		Cold IIb/0.9	Cold IIa/0.9	PART/0.9	M	I	IBI-C/G HAB/F	B4 H4 P/C1 T	NPS	HAB,SED,TEMP	FS-COMP,IBI,HAB,FL/1997	AB	FH-1997
2083000LC07	Creek 1-8, Trib. To Running Valley Ck.	LC07	2083000	29 11W 08 SW NW	Dunn		Cold IIb/2.8	Cold IIa/2.8	PART/2.8	M	I	IBI-C/G HAB/G	B4 H4 P/C1 T	NPS	HAB,SED,TEMP	FS-COMP,IBI,HAB,FL/1997	AB	FH-1997
2086400	Creek 8-3, Trib to Sand Ck	LC07	2086400	30 10W 08 SW NE	Chippewa	ERW Cold I/1.5	ERW Cold I/1.5	Cold I/1.5	FULLY-THR/1.5	E	S			BY, CL, EX-RC, PSB, BDAM, OBS-N	HAB, MAC, SED, COM	BASE/R	AB/R/H, BC/R/H, EXC/R/H, FE/R/H, IHI/R/M, LA/R/H	
	22 Unnamed Streams						WWFF/38 WWSF/40 Cold III/10 Cold II/37.1 Cold I/12.2 UNK/9	WWFF/38 WWSF/40 Cold III/10 Cold II/22.6 Cold I/17.7 UNK/18	FULLY/68.6 PART/39.3 NOT/THR/14.2 UNK/24									

Last Updated on 12/06/2000
By Wisconsin DNR

LC13

ID Code	Stream Name	Watershed Code	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Codified Use	Existing Use	Attainable Use	Supporting Use	Assessment	Trend	Integrity Indicator /Result	Data Level	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Dat e/Rank	Management Recc./Status/Dat e/Rank	Refs
2121900LC13	Big Elk Creek	LC13	2121900	28 10W 08 NE SW	Chippewa, Dunn	ERW Cold I/4.9	Cold I/4.9	Cold I/4.9	FULLY-THR/4.9	E M	S		B4 H P/C T	BDAM,PSB, BY, CL, OBS-N, OBS M	SED,HAB, MIG	BASE/R, FS-COMP/C-'97, FS-REGS EVAL/R	AB, BC, NPS, IHI, LA, FE, FS-REGS EVAL, PLAN, PROT, BS	FH-1996
2050000LC13	Chippewa River	LC13	2050000	22 14W 04 SW SE	Rusk, Dunn, Sawyer, Pepin, Buffalo, Eau Claire, Chippewa	DEF	WWSF/32	WWSF/32	PART/32	E M	S	IBI-W/E	B H P/C T	SB,URB,HM-DM, NPS, DEV, NMM	BAC,HAB, NUT, FLOW, HAB, MIG, SED, HG	BASE/C-'00, FL/R, FS-OTHER	AB, BFR, BS, FS-PS, FS-Regs Eval, IHI, LA, NPS, PROT, ES	FH-2000, LCRSNA
2121700LC13	Creek 17-11 (Trib to Elk Creek)	LC13	2121700	28 10W 17 NW SW	Chippewa	ERW Cold I/3.0	Cold I/3.0	Cold I/3.0	FULLY-THR/3.0	M	U		B4 H P/C T	OBS-M, OBS-N, BDAM, HM-DR, NPS, SB	HAB, SED, MAC, MIG	FS-COMP/C-'97, BASE/R	AB, BC, FS-PS, IHI, LA, NPS	FH-1996
	Creek 2-8 (Trib to Big Elk Creek)	LC13		28 11W 02 SE NW	Dunn		Cold I/1.9	Cold I/1.9	FULLY-THR/1.9	M	U		B4 H P/C T	DEV, OBS-N, CL	HAB, SED	FS-COMP/C-'97, BASE/R	AB, BC, IHI, LA	FH-1997
2122200LC13	Creek 04-01 (Trib to Elk Creek)	LC13	2122200	28 10W 04 NW NE	Chippewa	ERW Cold I/1.7	Cold I/2.1	Cold I/2.1	FULL/2.1	M	U		B4 H P/C T	BDAM, HM-DR, NPS, SB, OBS-N, OBS-M	HAB, SED, MIG	FS-COMP/C-'97, BASE/R	AB, BC, BS, FS-PS, IHI, LA, NPS	FH-1997
2122300LC13	Creek 35-12 (Trib to Elk Creek)	LC13	2122300	29 10W 35 SE SW	Chippewa	ERW Cold I/2.5	Cold I/5.3	Cold I/5.3	FULLY-THR/5.3	M	D		B4 H P/C T	BY, FL, HM-DR, PSB, SB, BDAM, OBS-M, OBS-N, CL	HAB, MAC, MIG, SED, TEMP, TURB	FS-COMP/C-'97, BASE/R, FS-REGS EVAL	AB, BC, BS, FC, FE, FS-PS, FS-REGS EVAL, IHI, LA, NPS, WR	FH-1997
2122100LC13	Creek 5-16 (Trib to Elk Creek)	LC13	2122100	28 10W 05 SE SE	Chippewa	ERW Cold I/1.8	Cold I/2.8	Cold I/2.8	FULL/2.8	M	U		B4 H P/C T	NPS, BDAM, OBS-N, OBS-M	HAB, SED, MIG	FS-COMP/C-'97, BASE/R	AB, BC, FS-PS, IHI, LA, NPS	FH-1997
2120800LC13	Elk Creek	LC13	2120800	27 11W 36 SE NW	Eau Claire, Chippewa, Dunn	ORW Cold I/10.8, ERW Cold I/3.0	Cold I/13.8 Cold II/3.9	Cold I/13.8 Cold II/3.9	FULLY-THR/17.7	E M	I		B4 H P/C T	CE, BDAM, SB, BY, CL, FL, PSB, OBS-M, OBS-N, HM-DM	HAB, SED, MAC, MIG, TURB	BASE/R, FS-COMP/C-'97, FS-REGS EVAL/R	AG, BC, IHI, LA, FE, BS, DR, FC, NPS, FS-REGS EVAL, PLAN, PROT	FH-1997
2118400LC13	Iron Creek	LC13	2118400	27 11W 07 SW SE	Dunn	DEF	WWFF/5	WWFF/5	PART/5	E			B H P/C T		HAB,SED,TEMP	BASE/R/	AB	
2118300LC13	Muddy Creek	LC13	2118300	26 11W 06 NW NW	Dunn	Cold II/2.5 Cold III/3.5	Cold II/2.5 Cold III/3.5 WWFF/20	Cold II/2.5 Cold III/3.5 WWFF/20	PART/26	E			B H P/C T	FK	HAB,SED,TEMP	BASE/R/	AB	FH-1971
2125100LC13	Sherman Creek	LC13	2125100	27 10W 25 NE NE	Eau Claire	DEF	WWFF/14	UNK/14	UNK/14	E U	U		B H P/C T	URB, HM, BDAM, SB	HAB, SED	BASE/R/	UB	
	14 Unnamed Streams						WWFF/39 WWSF/32 Cold III/3.5 Cold II/6.4 Cold I/18.7 UNK/	WWFF/25 WWSF/32 Cold III/3.5 Cold II/6.4 Cold I/18.7 UNK/14	FULLY/63 PART/ NOT/ THR/22.6 UNK/14									

Last Updated on 12/06/2000
By Wisconsin DNR

LC15

ID Code	Stream Name	Watershed Code	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Codified Use	Existing Use	Attainable Use	Supporting Use	Assessment	Trend	Integrity Indicator //Result	Data Level	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Management Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Refs
2135700LC15	Black Creek	LC15	2135700	26 05W 32 SW NE	Eau Claire, Clark	Cold III/9.0	Cold III/9	UNK/9	UNK/9	E U	U	HBI/G	B2 H P/C2 T	HM-DM, BDAM	TEMP	BUG/C/1995, AMB/C/1995, BASE/R, CT/R		
2133400LC15	Cold Creek	LC15	2133400	27 06W 27 SE NW	Eau Claire	Cold II/0.8	Cold II/0.8	UNK/0.8	UNK/0.8	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2135100LC15	Coon Fork Creek	LC15	2135100	26 05W 17 SW SW	Eau Claire		UNK/7	UNK/7	UNK/7	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2135000LC15	Coon Gut Creek	LC15	2135000	26 06W 13 NE SE	Eau Claire	Cold II/1.2	Cold II/1.2	UNK/1.2	UNK/1.2	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2136500LC15	Creek 10-6 (Schoolhouse Cr. Tributary)	LC15	2136500	24 05W 10 NW NW	Jackson	Cold III/0.6	WWFF/1.5	WWFF/1.5	FULLY/1.5	E	S					BASE/R		FH-1994
2133500LC15	Darrow Creek	LC15	2133500	27 06W 22 NE SW	Eau Claire	ERW Cold I/1.4	Cold I/1.4	UNK/1.4	UNK/1.4	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2125600LC15	Eau Claire River	LC15	2125600	27 09W 20 NE NW	Eau Claire	WWSF	WWSF/12	WWSF/12	FULLY/12	U	U	U	B H P/C T	DEV, HM-DM,SB	MIG, SED	Comp/R/2001/H, BASE/R	FS-PS, PLAN, PROT, BS,	
2134800LC15	Hathaway Creek	LC15	2134800	26 06W 12 NE SW	Eau Claire	Cold II/3.0	Cold III/3	UNK/3	UNK/3	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2133300LC15	Hay Creek	LC15	2133300	26 06W 03 NE NW	Eau Claire, Chippewa	DEF	WWFF/11	WWFF/12	WWFF/13	E	U	HBI/G	B2 H P/C T			BUG/C/1995, BASE/R		FH-1975
2136000LC15	McGaver Creek	LC15	2136000	25 05W 26 NW NW	Eau Claire	Cold II/1.8	Cold II/1.8	UNK/1.8	UNK/1.8	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2134200LC15	Muskrat Creek	LC15	2134200	26 06W 03 NW NE	Eau Claire, Chippewa	Cold II/3.0	Cold II/3	UNK/3	UNK/3	E U	U	HBI/G	B2 H P/C T			BUG/C/1995, BASE/R		
2135200LC15	Pea Creek	LC15	2135200	26 05W 20 NE SW	Eau Claire		UNK/4	UNK/4	UNK/4	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2135900LC15	Schoolhouse Creek	LC15	2135900	25 05W 15 NE SE	Jackson, Eau Claire	Cold II/3.8 WWSF/3.3	Cold I/4.3 WWFF/3.3	Cold I/4.3 UNK/3.3	FULLY 7.6	E	S	HBI/G	B2 B4 H P/C T	HM-DM, BDAM, PSB	SED, TEMP, HAB, MIG	BUG/C/1995, BASE/R	AB, BC, DR, FE, FS-PS	FH-1994
2134900LC15	Whippoorwill Creek	LC15	2134900	26 05W 18 SW NW	Eau Claire	Cold II/2.2	Cold II/2.2	UNK/2.2	UNK/2.2	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
	11 Unnamed Streams						WWSF/12 Cold III/9 Cold II/19.5 Cold I/1.4 UNK/32	WWSF/12 Cold III/ Cold II/ Cold I/ UNK/61.9	FULLY/12 PART/ NOT/ THR/ UNK/ 61.9									

Last Updated on 12/06/2000
By Wisconsin DNR

LC17

ID Code	Stream Name	Watershed Code	WBID Code	Town Range Section	County	Codified Use	Existing Use	Attainable Use	Supporting Use	Assessment	Trend	Integrity Indicator /Result	Data Level	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Date/Reply	Management Recc./Status/Date/Reply	Refs
2145500LC17	Beeman Creek	LC17	2145500	26 05W 10 NE NE	Eau Claire	Cold II/2.2	Cold II/2.2	UNK/2.2	UNK/2.2	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R, CT/R		
2148800LC17	Goggle-Eye Creek	LC17	2148600	29 04W 22 SE SE	Clark		WWFF/7	WWFF/7 UNK/7	FULLY/7 UNK/7	E U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2147300LC17	Little Otter Creek	LC17	2147300	29 05W 23 SE SE	Clark, Chippewa		WWFF/6	WWFF/6 UNK/6	FULLY/6 UNK/6	E U	U		B H P/C T	PSB, SB	HAB	BASE/R		
2145900LC17	Loper Creek	LC17	2145900	27 05W 14 SE SW	Eau Claire	Cold II/1.8	Cold II/1.8	UNK/1.8	UNK/1.8	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R, CT/R		
2148700LC17	McGrogan Creek	LC17	2148700	28 04W 03 NE NE	Clark		WWFF/3	WWFF/3	FULLY/3	E U	U		B H P/C T	PSI	PDR	BASE/R		
2145400LC17	North Fork Eau Claire River	LC17	2145400	26 05W 15 SE SW	Clark, Eau Claire, Taylor		WWSF/56	WWSF/56	FULLY/56	M U	U		B2 H1 P/C1 T	FLOW,DO,SED, PSM, NPS	FLOW,DO,SED, PDR	BASE/R	AB	
2148300LC17	Robinson Creek	LC17	2148300	27 04W 16 NW SW	Clark		UNK/2	UNK/2	UNK/2	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2146600LC17	Roger Creek	LC17	2146600	28 05W 01 SE SE	Clark, Chippewa		UNK/7	UNK/7	UNK/7	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2145800LC17	Shambaugh Creek	LC17	2145600	27 05W 34 NE SE	Eau Claire	Cold II/1.8	Cold II/1.8	UNK/1.8	UNK/1.8	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R, CT/R		
2147800LC17	Simes Creek	LC17	2147800	27 05W 13 SW NE	Clark, Eau Claire		WWFF/3	WWFF/3 UNK/3	WWFF/3 UNK/3	E U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2148500LC17	Sterling Creek	LC17	2148500	28 04W 27 NE SE	Clark	Cold III/3.5	Cold III/3.5	Cold III/3.5 UNK/3.5	FULLY/3.5 UNK/3.5	E U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R, CT/R		FH-1975
2146100LC17	Swan Creek (Swim Creek)	LC17	2146100	27 05W 02 SE SE	Chippewa, Eau Claire	ERW Cold I/2.6, Cold II/1.0	Cold I/2.6 Cold II/1	Cold I/2.6 Cold II/1	FULLY/3.6 UNK/3.6	E U	U		B H P/C T	BDAM, PSB, SB		BASE/R, CT/R	FE, BC, LA	
2146000LC17	Wolf River	LC17	2146000	27 05W 14 SW NE	Taylor, Clark, Eau Claire, Chippewa		WWFF/2.5 UNK/30.5	WWFF/2.5 UNK/30.5	FULLY/2.5 UNK/30.5	M U	U		B H P/C T	PSB,BDAM, HM-DM, PSI	DO, SED, HAB, MIG	BASE/R	AB	
	10 Unnamed Streams						WWFF/21.5 WWSF/56 Cold III/3.5 Cold II/6.8 Cold I/ 2.6 UNK/39.5	WWFF/21.5 WWSF/56 Cold III/3.5 Cold II/1 Cold I/2.6 UNK/45.3	FULLY/84.6 PART NOT THR UNK/45.3									

Last Updated on 12/06/2000
By Wisconsin DNR

LC18

ID Code	Stream Name	Watershed Code	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Codified Use	Existing Use	Attainable Use	Supporting Use	Assessment	Trend	Integrity Indicator /Result	Data Level	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Management Recc./Status/Date/Rank	Refs	
2150300LC18	Beaver Creek	LC18	2150300	28 09W 10 SW SE	Chippewa		Cold I/3	Cold I/3	UNK/3	E	U	HBI/E	B2 H P/C2 T	SB,CE,FL	SED,HAB	DO/C/1991, BUG/C/1990, FS-COMP/C/1991, BASE/R, CT/R	BS, FL, AB	WRM 1992, WR-1991	WR-1991
2050000LC18	Chippewa River	LC18	2050000	22 14W 04 SW SE	Rusk, Dunn, Sawyer, Pepin, Buffalo, Eau Claire, Chippewa		WWSF/11.5	WWSF/ 11.5	FULLY/11.5 PART/11.5	M	S		B4 H3 P/C3 T	URB,SB, HM-DM, DEV, NPS, PSI, PSM, FL	SED, MIG, FLOW, HAB, HG	AMB/O/2000, Comp/C/2000, BASE/C-'00, FS-OTHER, FS-REGS EVAL, FL/R	FS-PS, PROT, BFR, FS-PS, FS-REGS, IHI, PDR, UB	FH-2001, FH2000	
2152300LC18	Como Creek	LC18	2152300	30 09W 06 NW SE	Chippewa	ERW Cold I/2.8	Cold I/2.8	Cold I/2.8	UNK/2.8	E U	U	HBI/F	B2 H P/C2 T	BDAM, BY, PSB, CL, OBS-N	HAB, TEMP,SED,DO, MIG	BUG/C/1990, DO/C/1991, CT/C/1991, FS-COMP/C/1991, BASE/R, CT/R	LA, FE, BS, AB, BC, IHI	WRM 1992	
2150600LC18	Duncan Creek	LC18	2150600	28 09W 06 SE SE	Chippewa	ORW Cold I/6.5, DEF/ 19.7	Cold I/6.5 WWSF/19.7	Cold I/6.5 WWSF/19.7	FULLY-THR/15.7 NOT/12.5	E M (partial)	S	HBI/G	B2 B3 H P/C T	BY,SB,HM,CE, URB,PSM, EX-RC, CL, PSB, OBS-N, BDAM	SED, HAB, COM, MIG, Ph, TEMP	BUG/C/1990, DO/C/1999, CT/C/1999, BASE/R, CT/R, FS-REGS EVAL, FS-COMP, FS-HAB	PLAN, PROT, BS, LA, IHI, FE, AB, BC, EXC, FS-BRS, FS-REGS, FS-ST, UB, DR	WRM 1992, FH-1995	
2151500LC18	Hay Creek	LC18	2151500	30 09W 33 SW SE	Chippewa	Cold II/6.0	Cold II/6	Cold I/6	PART/6	E M	I	HBI/VG	B2 B4 H P/C2 T	BDAM,BY,CE, PSB, CUL, CL, OBS-M, FL	SED, HAB, TEMP, MIG	BUG/C/1990, DO/C/1991, CT/C/1991, BASE/R, CT/R, FS-STK EVAL/C-'95, FS-COMP/R, FS-REGS EVAL	PLAN, PROT, IHI, AB, BC, FC, FE, FS-REGS, IHI, LA	WRM 1992, FH-1995	
2151400LC18	Little Hay Creek	LC18	2151400	29 09W 04 NW NE	Chippewa		WWFF/1.8	Cold II/1.8	NOT/1.8	E	U	HBI/VG	B2 H P/C T	SB,CE,PSB,BY, BDAM, OBS-N, CL	HAB,DO,TEMP ,SED, TURB	BUG/C/1990, DO/C/1991, CT/C/1991, FS-COMP/C/1991, BASE/R, CT/R	IHI, LA, FS-ST, AB, FE	WRM 1992, WR-1991	
2152400LC18	North Fork Como Creek Creek 1-16 (Trib to Como Creek)	LC18	2152400	30 10W 01 SE SE	Chippewa	ERW Cold I/1.0	Cold I/3	Cold I/3	UNK/3	U	U		B H P/C T	PSB, BDAM, BY, CL	SED, HAB, TEMP, MIG	BASE/R, CT/R	AB, BC, FE, IHI, LA		
2151300LC18	Tilden Creek	LC18	2151300	29 09W 13 SW NW	Chippewa		WWFF/5	WWFF/5 Cold II/5	FULLY/5 NOT/5	E	U	HBI/G	B2 H P/C T	BY,PSB,CE, CL	DO, HAB,SED,NH3	BUG/C/1990, DO/C/1991, FS-COMP/C/1991, BASE/R, CT/R	AB, FE, LA, IHI, FS-ST	WRM 1992, WR-1991	
2150400LC18	Trout Creek	LC18	2150400	28 09W 10 SW NE	Chippewa	ERW Cold I/2.8	Cold I/2.8	Cold I/2.8	FULLY-THR/2.8	E	U	HBI/VG	B2 H P/C T	FL,SB,CE,PSB, BY,	SED, HAB, TEMP, TURB	BUG/C/1990, DO/C/1991, CT/C/1991, FS-COMP/C/1991, BASE/R, CT/R	AB, BS, FL, FE, IHI	WRM 1992, WR-1991	
2151550LC18	Creek 32-3 (Trib to Hay Creek)	LC18	2151550	30 09W 32 SW NE	Chippewa	ERW Cold/I/1.4	Cold I/1.4	Cold I/1.4	FULLY-THR/1.4	M	U		B3 H P/C T	PSB, CL, BDAM	HAB, SED	BASE/R, CT/R, FS STK EVAL/C-'95	AB, FE, BC, LA	FH-1995	
2151600LC18	Creek 36-6 (Trib to Hay Creek)	LC18	2151600	30 10W 36 NW NW	Chippewa	ERW Cold I/1.0	Cold I/1.0	Cold I/1.0	FULLY-THR/1.0	M	U		B3 H P/C T	CL, OBS-N, BDAM	HAB, SED	BASE/R, CT/R, FS STK EVAL/C-'96	AB, BC, LA	FH-1996	
	7 Unnamed Streams						WWFF/20.3 WWSF/17.7 Cold/3 Cold II/6 Cold I/14.1	WWFF/6 WWSF/17.7 Cold/ Cold II/20.3 Cold I/17.1	FULLY/16.5 PART/3 NOT/14.3 THR/27.3										

Last Updated on 12/06/2000

LC19

ID Code	Stream Name	Watershed Code	WBID Code	Town Range Section	County	Codified Use	Existing Use	Attainable Use	Supporting Use	Assessment	Trend	Integrity Indicator /Result	Data Level	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Dat a/Rank	Management Recc./Status/Dat a/Rank	Refs
2154000LC19	Alder Creek	LC19	2154000	28 06W 30 SE NE	Eau Claire, Chippewa		UNK/3	UNK/3	UNK/3	U	U		B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2154800LC19	Big Drywood Creek	LC19	2154800	29 07W 28 NE NE	Chippewa		UNK/16	UNK/16	UNK/16				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2153600LC19	Brown Creek	LC19	2153600	28 07W 23 NE NW	Chippewa		UNK/3	UNK/3	UNK/3				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2155000LC19	Chap Creek	LC19	2155000	29 06W 05 SW NE	Chippewa		UNK/3	UNK/3	UNK/3				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2153700LC19	Clear Creek	LC19	2153700	28 07W 23 NE NE	Chippewa		UNK/4	UNK/4	UNK/4				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2156300LC19	Coldwater Creek	LC19	2156300	29 05W 06 NE SE	Chippewa		UNK/3	UNK/3	UNK/3				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2154600LC19	Drywod Creek	LC19	2154600	29 07W 33 NE SW	Chippewa		UNK/4	UNK/4	UNK/4				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2154700LC19	Dutch Creek	LC19	2154700	29 07W 28 SW SE	Chippewa		UNK/4	UNK/4	UNK/4				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2152900LC19	Frederick Creek	LC19	2152900	28 08W 14 SE NE	Chippewa		UNK/2	UNK/2	UNK/2				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R, CT/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2157700LC19	Hay Creek	LC19	2157700	30 05W 04 NW NW	Chippewa		UNK/11	UNK/11	UNK/11				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2155900LC19	Hennon Creek	LC19	2155900	29 06W 32 SE NE	Chippewa		UNK/3	UNK/3	UNK/3				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP..CO.- 1996
2155200LC19	Iron Creek	LC19	2155200	29 07W 16 SW NW	Chippewa		UNK/2	UNK/2	UNK/2				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2156100LC19	Lotz Creek	LC19	2156100	29 06W 33 SE NE	Chippewa		UNK/4	UNK/4	UNK/4				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R, CT/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2155100LC19	Little Drywood creek	LC19	2155100	29 07W 28 NE NE	Chippewa		UNK/19	UNK/19	UNK/19				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2156800LC19	Otter Creek	LC19	2156800	30 05W 04 NW SE	Chippewa, Taylor		UNK/19	UNK/19	UNK/19				B H P/C T	PSB, NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2153200LC19	Paint Creek	LC19	2153200	28 07W 07 NW SE	Chippewa		UNK/21	UNK/21	UNK/21				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R, CT/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2157800LC19	Pike Creek	LC19	2157800	30 05W 05 NW NW	Chippewa		UNK/5	UNK/5	UNK/5				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2153300LC19	South Fork Paint Creek	LC19	2153300	28 07W 16 NW SW	Chippewa, Eau Claire		UNK/6	UNK/6	UNK/6				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R, CT/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2154900LC19	Selh Creek	LC19	2154900	29 07W 14 NW SE	Chippewa		UNK/7	UNK/7	UNK/7				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R, CT/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2154200LC19	Sherman Creek	LC19	2154200	28 06W 29 NW SW	Chippewa		UNK/4	UNK/4	UNK/4				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2153500LC19	Silver Creek	LC19	2153500	28 07W 15 SW SE	Chippewa		UNK/3	UNK/3	UNK/3				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2156000LC19	Slaughterhouse Creek	LC19	2156000	29 06W 33 NW SW	Chippewa		UNK/1	UNK/1	UNK/1				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2153000LC19	Stillson Creek	LC19	2153000	28 08W 13 SW NW	Chippewa		UNK/3	UNK/3	UNK/3				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2156200LC19	Turner Creek	LC19	2156200	28 06W 03 NW NE	Chippewa		UNK/2	UNK/2	UNK/2				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2153800LC19	Wildcat Creek	LC19	2153800	28 07W 24 SE SE	Eau Claire, Chippewa		UNK/2	UNK/2	UNK/2				B H P/C T	NPS	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB	BASE/R	NPS, AB, FE, BS	CHIP. CO.- 1996
2154500LC19	Yellow River	LC19	2154500	29 07W 31 NE SE	Chippewa, Taylor		WWSF/64	WWSF/64	UNK/64				B H P/C T	SB,CE,BY, NPS, HM-DM, FL,	SED, TURB, NUT, HAB, MIG	BASE/R, FS-COMP, FS-	NPS, AB, FE, BS, PDR, DR, FS-	CHIP. CO.- 1996
	10 Unnamed Streams						WWSF/64 UNK/153	WWSF/64 UNK/153	UNK/217									

Last Updated on 12/06/2000

By Wisconsin DNR

LC21

ID Code	Stream Name	Watershed Code	WB ID Code	Town Range Section	County	Codified Use	Existing Use	Attainable Use	Supporting Use	Assessment	Trend	Integrity Indicator /Result	Data Level	Source	Impact	Monitoring Recc./Status/Dat e/Rank	Management Recc./Status/Dat e/Rank	Refs
2182000LC21	Beaver Creek	LC21	2182000	32 05W 20 SW NW	Chippewa		UNK/3	UNK/3	UNK/3	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2181600LC21	Buck Creek	LC21	2181600	31 06W 04 SE SW	Chippewa		UNK/4	UNK/4	UNK/4	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2050000LC21	Chippewa River	LC21	2050000		Chippewa		WWSF/27	WWSF/27	FULLY/27 PART/27	M E	S		B H P/C T	HM,SB, EX-PL, HM-DM, CL, PSI, PSM	HAB, SED, MIG, COM, FLOW, HG	BASE/R, FL, FS-OTHER, FS REGS EVAL, FS STK EVAL	PLAN, PROT, AB, BFR, EXC, PDR, FS-PS, FS-REGS, FS-STK	FH-1988
2181200LC21	Clark Creek	LC21	2181200	31 06W 19 NE NE	Chippewa		UNK/3	UNK/3	UNK/3	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2174900LC21	Cobban Creek	LC21	2174900	30 07W 11 NW NW	Chippewa		UNK/2	UNK/2	UNK/2	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2174750LC21	Creek 17-13 (Trib to Chippewa River)	LC21	2174750	30 07W 17 NE SE	Chippewa	ERW Cold I/1.2	Cold I/1.2	Cold I/1.2	UNK/1.2	U	U					BASE/R, CT/R		
2174800LC21	Cushing Creek	LC21	2174800	30 07W 16 NW NE	Chippewa		UNK/1	UNK/1	UNK/1	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2175900LC21	Firth Lake Creek	LC21	2175900	31 07W 16 SE SE	Chippewa		UNK/4	UNK/4	UNK/4	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2181500LC21	Fisher River	LC21	2181500	31 06W 08 NW NW	Taylor, Chippewa		WWSF/33	WWSF/33	UNK/33	U	U		B H P/C T	PSB, BY, CL, SB		BASE/R	AB, FE	
2181100LC21	French Creek	LC21	2181100	31 06W 19 SW SW	Chippewa		UNK/6	UNK/6	UNK/6	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2168700LC21	Jim Creek	LC21	2168700	29 08W 16 NE NW	Chippewa		UNK/9	UNK/9	UNK/9	U	U		B H P/C T	CL	TURB, SED, HAB	BASE/R	AB	
2181000LC21	Lehman Creek	LC21	2181000	31 07W 25 SW NW	Chippewa		UNK/2	UNK/2	UNK/2	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2169000LC21	McCann Creek	LC21	2169000	30 08W 18 NE SE	Chippewa	ORW Cold I/13.2	Cold I/13.2	Cold I/13.2	FULLY-THR/13.2	E M	D		B4 H P/C T	CE,BDAM,PSB, BY, CUL, CL, EX-RC, OBS-M, OBS-N, NMM	SED, HAB, TURB, TEMP, COM, FLOW, MIG, MAC	BASE/R, CT, FL, FS-COMP/R, FS-HAB, FS-COMP/C-'96	PLAN, PROT, IHI, AB, BC, EXC, RE, FS-PS, FS-REGS, LA, NPS,	FH-1996
2175000LC21	Minnie Creek	LC21	2175000	31 07W 35 SE SW	Chippewa		UNK/1	UNK/1	UNK/1	U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2175100LC21	No. Fk. Bob Creek	LC21	2175100	31 07W 35 NW NW	Chippewa		UNK/15	UNK/15	UNK/15	U	U		B H P/C T	NPS, PSB, CL	HAB, SED	BASE/R	AB, FE	
2168900LC21	O'Neill Creek	LC21	2168900	29 08W 16 SW NW	Chippewa		WWSF/17	WWSF/17	FULLY/17	E U	U		B H P/C T			BASE/R		
2175200LC21	So. Fk. Bob Creek	LC21	2175200	31 07W 35 NW NW	Chippewa		UNK/10	UNK/10	UNK/10	U	U		B H P/C T	SB, PSB, CL	HAB, SED	BASE/R	AB, FE	
2176300LC21	Spring Creek	LC21	2176300	31 07W 16 SW SE	Chippewa		UNK/7	UNK/7	UNK/7	E	U		B H P/C T	HM-DM	FLOW, TEMP, HAB	BASE/R, CT/R, FI	DR	FH-1972
	39 Unnamed Streams						WWSF/44 Cold I/13.2 UNK/100	WWSF/44 Cold I/13.2 UNK/100	FULLY/ 44 PART/ NOT/ THR/ 13.2 UNK/ 100									

Last Updated on 12/06/2000
By Wisconsin DNR

WATERSHED NARRATIVES

HOW TO USE THE WATERSHED TABLES

The following information is included in the watershed tables.

Name of Stream: All named streams and some unnamed streams are listed. Stream names are those found on U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle maps unless the Wisconsin Geographic Names Council established a different name. Unnamed streams are identified by location of the stream mouth as indicated by township, range, section and quarter-quarter section.

Length: Stream length is either the total length of the stream, or the starting and ending mile of the portion of the stream described based on data from the Fish Distribution Study conducted by the Bureau of Research (WDNR Research Report 126, 1984). The stream mile at the stream mouth is zero ("0") and increases as one moves upstream.

Existing Use: This column indicates the existing biological use supported by the stream as defined in NR 102(04)(3) under fish and aquatic life uses. A blank space indicates the existing use is unassessed. The following abbreviations for stream uses are used in the tables:

COLD; Cold Water Communities; includes surface waters capable of supporting a community of cold water fish and other aquatic life or serving as a spawning area for cold water fish species. This use includes, but is not restricted to, surface waters identified as trout waters in the publication (6-3600[80]) *Wisconsin Trout Streams*.

WWSF; Warm Water Sport Fish Communities; includes surface waters capable of supporting a community of warm water sport fish or serving as a spawning area for warm water sport fish.

WWFF; Warm Water Forage Fish Communities; includes surface waters capable of supporting an abundant diverse community of forage fish and other aquatic life.

LFF; Limited Forage Fish Communities; includes surface waters of limited capacity because of low flow, naturally poor water quality or poor habitat. These surface waters are capable of supporting only a limited community of forage fish and aquatic life.

LAL; Limited Aquatic Life; includes surface waters severely limited because of very low or intermittent flow and naturally poor water quality or poor habitat. These surface waters are capable of supporting only a limited community of aquatic life.

The table also includes the "class" of trout streams based on "Wisconsin Trout Streams" [DNR Publ. 6-3600(80)] and Outstanding/Exceptional Resource Waters, Wisconsin Administrative Code NR 102.10 and NR 102.11.

Class I streams are high-quality streams where populations are sustained by natural reproduction.
Class II streams have some natural reproduction but need stocking to maintain a desirable fishery.
Class III streams sustain no natural reproduction and require annual stocking of legal-size fish for sport fishing. The approximate length or portion of stream meeting each of the use classes is indicated.

Potential Use: This column indicates the biological use, and trout stream class, a stream or stream segment could achieve if it was well managed and pollution sources were controlled. In many cases potential use is the same as the existing use classification. In other streams potential use may be higher than the existing use. Abbreviations are the same as those used in the existing use columns. The sources of information are indicated by footnotes on each table. The classification for trout streams came from "Wisconsin Trout Streams" [DNR Publ. 6-3600(80)], Wisconsin Administrative Code NR 102.10 and NR 102.11 and the professional judgments of area Fish Managers. If the potential biological use is unknown, a blank space indicates the potential biological use is unassessed.

Supporting Potential Use: This column indicates whether a stream is threatened, or is fully, partially, or not meeting its potential biological use. An entry in any of the columns indicates the relationship between actual stream use and potential use. For example, if the entire length of a stream is listed under the "Fully" column, the stream has no problems which can be controlled. When a portion or all of a stream length is listed under another heading, the stream is affected or threatened by some manageable factor and the biological use of the stream can probably be improved. **In this plan, this column is used only if there is recent information on the stream, or if a fisheries manager or aquatic biologist familiar with the stream is able to make a determination based on best professional judgment. A blank space indicates that use support is unassessed.**

Assessment Category/Monitored or Evaluated: It is important to detail what information was used to derive a potential biological use designation and the degree to which a stream meets that potential use. If the potential use decision was based upon site-specific data, then "M," for monitored, is entered. If the decision is based on information other than site-specific data (citizen complaints, best professional judgment of a biologist or fish manager) then "E," for evaluated, is entered. "Evaluated" includes decisions based on data more than five years old.

Stream Classification (water quality standard designation): This column indicates the formal stream classification of a particular stream. All state waters are classified as one of the following:

Fish and Other Aquatic Life Use Waters: All surface waters are classified into one of the following fish and other aquatic life subcategories. Only the first three are considered suitable for the protection and propagation of a balanced fish and other aquatic life community. The last two are not capable of supporting a balanced community because of naturally limited habitat or water quality. These limited forage fishery and limited aquatic life waters are listed in NR104 if they receive a permitted point source discharge.

Cold Water Communities (COLD) are capable of supporting a community of cold water fish and other aquatic life. This classification includes all the streams referenced in the Wisconsin Trout Streams publication.

Warm Water Sport Fish Communities (WWSF) are capable of supporting a community of warm water sport fish or of serving as a spawning area for warm water sport fish.

Warm Water Forage Fish Communities (WWFF) are capable of supporting an abundant diverse community of forage fish and other aquatic life.

Limited Forage Fishery (LFF) communities capable of supporting only a limited community of forage fish and aquatic life.

Limited Aquatic Life (LAL) communities capable of supporting only a limited community of aquatic life.

Great Lake Communities consist of the waters of Lakes Michigan and Superior, including Green Bay and all arms and inlets, as well as tributaries to these waters which serve as a spawning area for anadromous fish species. These waters have their own category because of their unique characteristics. Also, they will receive special protection from the impacts of toxic substances under the new antidegradation rules.

Note: Any water which is not formally classified is assumed by the Federal Clean Water Act to meet the Clean Water Act goals of supporting a balanced warm-water fish and other aquatic life community and will appear in the table as DEF.

Outstanding Resource Waters (ORW) have the highest quality water and fisheries in the state and are therefore deserving of special protection. No discharge is allowed to these waters unless the quality of the wastewater discharged is equal to or better than background conditions. These streams are listed in NR 102.

Exceptional Resource Waters (ERW) have excellent water quality and valued fisheries but already receive discharges. In some cases, new discharges to exceptional waters may be allowed to correct an environmental or public health problem. These streams are listed in NR 102.

Use Problems, Source/Impact: This column indicates the probable sources of pollution in the stream and the types of water quality problems present (impact). Some streams shown as fully meeting potential use may still show up in this column as having a use problem. When this occurs it may mean there is a problem but it cannot be managed for some reason, or there is a potential threat to the use. These situations are explained in the narrative or in the references.

Following is a key to the abbreviations in the watershed tables:

Source (cause of problem)

BDAM - Beaver dam
CM - Cranberry marsh
DRDG - Dredging
GR.Pit - Gravel Pit Washing Operation
HM - Hydrologic modification
LF - Landfill
NPS - Unspecified nonpoint sources
  BY - Barnyard or exercise lot runoff
  CL - Cropland erosion
  CON - Construction site erosion
  PSB - Streambank pasturing
  RS - Roadside erosion
  SB - Streambank erosion
  PSB - Streambank pasturing
PSM - Point source, municipal treatment plant discharge
PSI - Point source, industrial discharge
SP - Spill

Impact (effect or impact of source on a stream)

BAC - Bacteriological contamination
DO - Dissolved oxygen
FAD - Fish advisory
FLOW - Stream flow fluctuations caused by unnatural conditions
HAB - Habitat (lack of cover, sedimentation, scouring, etc.)
MIG - Fish migration interference
NUT - Nutrient enrichment
SC - Sediment contamination
SED - Sedimentation
TURB - Turbidity

Narrative/Recommendations: This column indicates if there is a narrative or if there are monitoring or management recommendations relating to the stream. The column is marked with an "N" if there is a narrative. The column is marked with an "R" if there are recommendations.

References: The reference material used to complete the table for each stream is indicated by a number. A corresponding list of references is provided at the end of each watershed write-up.

HOLCOMBE FLOWAGE WATERSHED (UC01)

The Holcombe Flowage Watershed is the southwestern-most watershed in the Upper Chippewa River Basin. Approximately 70 percent of the watershed is wooded, with the remainder open woodland and agriculture. The watershed is divided into roughly equal parts between Rusk and Chippewa Counties, and contains the Holcombe Flowage in its eastern tip. The flowage is an impoundment formed by the Northern States Power Company dam on the Chippewa River near the town of Holcombe. Holcombe Flowage supports a very good sport fishery, although a fish consumption advisory exists for walleye due to mercury. Shore vegetation consists of upland woods and wetlands with heavy development around the entire perimeter of the flowage. The flowage is fed by the Chippewa, Flambeau and Jump rivers, and Main, Deertail, Cranberry, and Birch creeks.

Stream surveys from the 1960s provide the only data for most of the streams in the watershed. We have virtually no documentation describing nonpoint source threats to water quality of streams in the Holcombe Flowage Watershed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Northwest and Western District Water Resources Management (WRM) should evaluate nonpoint source water pollution impacts on **all** named streams in this watershed, Birch, Cranberry, Mud, Tealey, Willow, Foster, Rick, Swift, Cedar, Potato, and McDermott creeks to allow for ranking as potential priority watershed project under Wisconsin's Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Abatement Program (Type B).

2. District WRM, together with the U.S. Geological Survey should identify the sources of sediment inputs into the Chippewa River, and document the extent and rate of sedimentation (Type B and C).

Chippewa River

The Chippewa River supports an excellent warm water sports fishery that is intricately linked to the Holcombe Flowage. Besides containing fish such as walleye, muskellunge, northern pike, bass, and rough fish species, the Chippewa River provides an important lake sturgeon spawning habitat (Bur. of Fisheries Management). We have little water quality information on this segment of the Chippewa River. Long-time residents observe, however, that the character of sections of the river bottom has changed from cobble to shifting sand over the past 20 years (Pratt, 1993). Despite the serious impact sedimentation can have on the river's biological health, the severity and extent of sand deposition in the Chippewa River is unknown.

The Chippewa River segment in this watershed is very significant for endangered resources. Rare dragonflies, two listed fish species, and several other Wisconsin Special Concern Species have been found here. Many populations of rare species have been declining in the Chippewa River (Bur. of Endangered Resources). It is thus important to identify water quality or habitat threats, and reduce any degradation of water quality in the Chippewa River.

Table 6. Holcombe Flowage (UC01) Streams

COUNTIES: Chippewa, Rusk SQUARE MILES:
WATERSHED NUMBER: UC01

NAME OF STREAM	LENGTH (MILES)	EXISTING USE/MILES	POTENTIAL USE/MILES	FULLY-PART-NOT-(MILES)	CLASS.	USE PROBLEMS SOURCE/ IMPACT	MILES EVALUATED/ MONITORED	NARR./ RECS.	REFERENCES
Chippewa River	19	WWSF[c]	same	X	DEF	SED	E	R/N	2,4
Birch Creek	4	WWFF	same		DEF		E	R	2
Cranberry Creek	5	WWFF	same		DEF		E	R	1
Mud Creek	13	WWFF	same		DEF		E	R	1
Tealey Creek	5	WWFF	same		DEF		E	R	1
Willow Creek	5	WWFF	same		DEF		E	R	1
Foster Creek	4	WWFF	same		DEF		E	R	1
Rice Creek	1	WWSF	same		DEF		E	R	2
Swift Creek	3	WWSF	same		DEF		E	R	2
Cedar Creek	7	WWFF	same		DEF		E	R	1
Potato Creek	8	WWSF	same		DEF		E	R	2
McDermott Creek	6					NPS,BY	E	R	3
Manitou Wetland	<1	LAL[d]	Same		LAL[d]				
Unnamed Streams	49								

[a]A formal use classification (COLD, WWSF, WWFF) published by the department.
[b]Trout stream identified in the "blue" Wisconsin Trout Streams book (WDNR, 1980).
[c]A formal variance use classification published by the department and correctly listed in NR 104.
[d]A formal variance use classification published by the department and incorrectly or not listed in NR 104.
[e]Recent studies or the professional judgment of a fish manager or aquatic biologist familiar with the water indicates this is the biological use the stream is now meeting or has the potential to meet.

DEF - Waters not formally classified are assumed by default to meet the Federal Clean Water Act goals of supporting a balanced warm-water fish and other aquatic life community.

USE PROBLEMS
SED - Sedimentation
NPS - Unspecified nonpoint sources
BY - Barnyard or exercise lot runoff

HOW TO USE THE LAKE TABLES

LAKE NAME: All named lakes 10 acres or larger and unnamed lakes 25 acres or larger for each watershed in the Upper Chippewa River Basin are listed on each watershed's lake table. Lake names are those found on U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle maps unless the Wisconsin Geographic Names Council has established a different name. Some lakes are known locally by other names. Where available, those names have been listed along with the lake's official name. Lakes are identified by name unless multiple lakes with the same name occur in any county when township, range and section locators are added.

CO.: Counties are identified by number as alphabetically listed for Wisconsin's 72 counties. Counties in the Upper Chippewa River Basin are:

Ashland (02)	Bayfield (04)	Chippewa (09)	Iron (26)
Oneida (44)	Price (51)	Rusk (55)	Sawyer (58)
Taylor (61)	Vilas (64)	Washburn (66)	

RF. AREA: The surface area is the size of the lake, in acres, as listed in WDNR publication "Wisconsin Lakes".

MAX DEPTH: Maximum depths are those listed in "Wisconsin Lakes," WDNR.

LK. TYPE: Each lake type displays unique limnological characteristics based on physical and chemical properties. Production of plant and animal life generally varies with lake type. The identifying number used in the tables and the basic classifications and qualifying criteria are:

(1) Seepage lake: Landlocked. Water level maintained by groundwater

table and basin seal. Intermittent outlet may be present.

(2) Drainage lake: Natural lakes and impoundments the main water source of which is stream drainage. Has at least one inlet and one outlet.

(3) Drained lake: Natural lake the main water source of which is dependent on the water table and seepage from adjoining wetlands. Seldom has an inlet but will have an outlet of very little flow. Similar to the seepage lake except for the outlet.

(4) Spring lake: Seldom has an inlet, but always has an outlet of substantial flow. Water supply dependent upon groundwater rather than surface drainage.

(5) Impoundment: A drainage lake that has an impounding structure (dam) located on the outlet stream that contributes significant depth to the waterbody. Shallow impoundments commonly exhibit problems with sedimentation, turbidity, excess vegetation and algae, rough fish and water level fluctuations.

WBN: The unique seven digit number assigned for each lake, using the WDNR Master Waterbody File.

PUB. ACC.: The type of public access facility available as described in the WDNR "Wisconsin Lakes" publication:

BR = boat ramp T = walk-in trail R = roadside
W = wilderness NW = navigable water.

TSI: Trophic status index values were calculated for waters where sufficient water quality data was available. Wisconsin trophic state index equations were used to calculate these values (Lillie, et al. 1993).

EVAL: An X indicates lake was evaluated using TSI data more than five years old rather than being monitored recently.

LK. CLASS: The purpose of this analysis is to classify lakes according to their relative sensitivity to phosphorus loading and existing trophic condition. The screening identifies high quality lakes that should receive highest priority for nutrient control management. The analysis first separates lakes into two major categories; lakes that are sensitive to increased phosphorus loading (Class 1) and lakes less responsive to changes in phosphorus loading (Class 2). Lakes in each general classification are then subdivided into management groups based on data needs or existing water quality conditions.

Class 1: A = Existing water quality fair to excellent; potentially most sensitive to increased phosphorus loading
B = Existing water quality poor to very poor; less sensitive to

increased phosphorus loading than Group A

C = Data inadequate or insufficient to assess trophic condition; classification monitoring recommended

D = Stained, dystrophic lake, or aquatic plant-dominated lakes.

Class 2:

A = Existing water quality fair to excellent; may not be as sensitive to phosphorus loading as Class I lakes

B = Existing water quality poor to very poor; low sensitivity to increased phosphorus loading

C = Data inadequate or insufficient to assess trophic condition

D = Stained, dystrophic lake, or aquatic plant-dominated lakes.

These classifications are used to establish management recommendations and priorities.

WINT. KILL: An indication of past history of winterkill based primarily on information from the Surface Water Inventory database.

FISH ADV.: Numerous lakes in Wisconsin contain fish with elevated levels of mercury. Fish consumption advisories are issued semi-annually for lakes with fish mercury levels of 0.5 ppm or greater. Generally, predator fish from soft water, poorly buffered, low pH lakes have the highest concentrations of mercury. An X in this column denotes that a fish consumption advisory exists for this lake.

The recommendations column for fish tissue mercury monitoring (Hg) denotes those waters recommended for fish sampling with a 1 through 5 priority rating dependent upon the degree of public access and the type of fishery.

ALK.: A measure of the amount of available carbonates and other materials that reflect the buffering capacity of the water.

ACID SENS: This column identifies lakes highly susceptible to acid deposition. Monitoring is recommended for lakes most susceptible and having inadequate water quality information.

N = not sensitive.

N = lakes with alkalinities of 3-5 mg/l as calcium carbonate (CaCO3); moderate priority for monitoring

Y = lakes most susceptible to acid deposition, recommend monitoring to confirm sensitivity status; high priority

RES. MGMT POTN: This column identifies lakes that have the potential to benefit from cooperative resource management efforts. Cooperative efforts may include Bureaus of Water Resources Management, Water Regulation and Zoning, Fisheries Management, Game Management, other WDNR staff, other state or federal agencies and local interest groups.

Management Groups:

Group A - protection management recommended
- high value fishery and/or recreational use

- sensitive to phosphorus loading

Group B
- high potential for cooperative management efforts
- high value fishery and/or recreational use
- public access available
- potential for water quality improvement

Group C
- current management appropriate
- no further recommendations at this time

Group D
- additional fishery and/or water quality data needed to make management recommendations
- high priority for data collection

Group E
- additional fishery and/or water quality data needed to make management recommendations
- low priority for data collection

Group F
- lakes with limited fishery potential
- evaluate cooperative management potential

Group G
- lakes with very limited or no fishery potential
- low priority for water resources management/fisheries management efforts
- manage for wildlife, aesthetics, etc.

ORW: In the basin, 31 lakes are classified as "Outstanding Resource Waters" as described in Administrative Code NR 102. These waters may be identified with an X. For those 15 lakes classified as "Exceptional Resource Waters" under NR 102, an "ERW" appears in this column. For more information on this classification see "How to Read the Watershed Tables" in the Surface Water Quality Report.

MONITORING: These columns identify existing or recommended monitoring:

SH = Self-Help Lake Monitoring Volunteer
TM = Long-Term Trend Monitoring Lake
Hg = Fish tissue mercury monitoring
AD = Acid deposition monitoring
TS = Trophic status monitoring
ILR = Lake District Feasibility Study conducted in 1970s
IM = Inventory monitoring (update Surface Water Inventory)
SENS = Aquatic plant "sensitive area" designation

The following letters in each column signify that monitoring is:

R = recommended X = completed C = current activity

COMMENTS: Additional information that was available for the lakes has been included in the comments column. Abbreviations were used to conserve space as follows:

LMO	= Lake Management Organization exists for this lake
Mig Birds	= Significant use/stop for waterfowl and migratory water birds
N	= See the narrative section for this watershed/county for a more detailed description
NPS	= Nonpoint source pollution impacts
Rec	= High quality recreational experience for listed activities: (eg. Rec: S, F, CA)

S - Swimming	B - Boating	C - Canoeing
H - Hunting	W - Waterfowling	
F - Fishing	CA - Camping	

LAKES NARRATIVES BY WATERSHED

HOLCOMBE FLOWAGE WATERSHED (UC01)

The Holcombe Flowage watershed includes the Chippewa River drainage from below Soft Maple Creek down to the Holcombe Flowage dam. This area, which includes the southwestern portion of Rusk County and the northwestern corner of Chippewa County, contains an abundance of lakes, including 22 in Rusk County and 45 in Chippewa County.

Most of this watershed lies in a terminal moraine area and is characterized by irregular, hilly topography, and features numerous pothole lakes and swamps. Several lakes have physical characteristics that make them sensitive to increases in nutrient loading. These lakes generally have relatively small watersheds, are deep enough to stratify and have relatively low flushing rates. Most of the larger natural lakes have good water quality and measures should be taken to protect water quality.

Table 29 lists water quality and management conditions and recommendations, which includes five lakes that winterkill and have marginal fishery and water quality recreational values and thus should be managed primarily for wildlife and/or aesthetic values. Five lakes lack adequate public access facilities and thus should be relatively low in priority for water quality assessment monitoring and other intensive lake management activities. Monitoring for fish tissue contamination by mercury was conducted on seven lakes in this watershed and one lake is under a fish consumption advisory. Participation in the Self-Help Monitoring Program is an ongoing activity on five lakes and one of the volunteers has requested involvement at the "TSI" level of monitoring. Four lakes were designated outstanding resource waters under NR102 and should be managed with water quality protection as a high priority. Water quality in one cluster of lakes is threatened by riparian and residential development and forestry activities. These lakes require special attention and are thus recommended for a priority lakes "cluster" project.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Water Resources Management should consider Fireside Lake watershed, and Round, Axehandle, Bradley, Pine, and Spence lake watersheds as a high priority for selection as a lake cluster priority lakes project under the Wisconsin Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Abatement Program, the cluster would include Sand, Henneman, Long, Chain, McCann and Island lakes (Type B).

2. WRM should encourage lake communities to pursue lake management planning grants for water quality assessment studies on Axehandle, Boot, Bradley, Cadotte, Calkins, North Calkins, Dumke, Fireside Lakes, Goose, Henneman, Hodge, Holcombe Flowage, Horseshoe, Knickerbocker, Lake Four, Larrabee, Little Plummer, Logger, Long, Meadows, Picnic, Pine, Plummer, Potato, Pulaski, Riley, Roedecker, Ruby, Rusk, Salisbury, Sand, Spence, East & West Triple, Turk, Two Island, Unnamed (T32N R07W S30-1), Wesley, Willow Creek Flowage #1, and Worden lakes (Type B).

3. WRM should conduct water quality assessment monitoring including trophic status on Boot, Bradley, Cadotte, Calkins, North Calkins, Fireside Lakes, Goose, Henneman, Hodge, Horseshoe Lake (T32N R9W S25), Lake Four, Larrabee, Little Plummer, Logger, Long, Meadows, Picnic, Pine, Potato, Pulaski, Riley, Roedecker, Ruby, Rusk, Salisbury, Sand, Spence, East & West Triple, Turk, Two Island, Unnamed (T32N R07W S30-1), Wesley, Willow Creek Flowage #1, and Worden lakes, which lack up-to-date information.

4. WRM and Fisheries Management should conduct an aquatic ecosystem assessment to evaluate resource potential on Axehandle, Dumke, Horseshoe, Knickerbocker, and Plummer lakes (Type B)

5. WRM and Fisheries Management should conduct sampling for fish tissue contamination by mercury on Boot, Dumke, Pulaski, and Rusk Lakes (Type B).

6. WRM should encourage participation in the Self-Help Monitoring Program on Bear, Dark (T32N R08W S19), Dumke, Fireside Lakes, Foster, Goose, Granger, Harwood #2, Henneman, Hodge, Horseshoe (T32N R9W S25), Knickerbocker, Lake Four, Little Plummer, Meadows, Pine, Potato, Pulaski, Rusk, Sand, Spence, Star, East & West Triple, Turk, Two Island, and Unnamed (T32N R07W S30-1) lakes, with priority given to lakes that have an association and an interested and willing volunteer (Type B).

7. District WRM should conduct aquatic plant management "sensitive area" designation surveys on Boot, Chain, Clear, Fireside Lakes, Island, McCann, Potato, Pulaski and Sand lakes (Type B).

8. WRM should conduct Surface Water Inventory monitoring to update this important database on Axehandle, Bear, Boot, Bradley, Brush, Cadotte, Chain, Clear, Dark (T32N R08W S19), Dumke, Fireside, Foster, Goose, Granger, Harwood #2, Henneman, Hodge, Hogskin, Horseshoe, Hungry, Island, Jacks, Knickerbocker, Lake Four, Larrabee, Leo Joerg, Little Plummer, Logger, Marsh, McCann, Meadows, Picnic, Pine, Plummer, Potato Creek Flowage, Potato, Pulaski, Riley, Roedecker, Round, Ruby, Rusk, Salisbury, Sand, Spence, Star, Sugar, East & West Triple, Turk, Two Island, Unnamed (T32N R07W S30-1), Wesley, Whiplash, Willow Creek Flowage #1, and Worden lakes (Type B).

9. WRM should conduct monitoring to assess the impact of acid deposition on Round Lake (Type B).

10. WRM should continue to assist the Island Chain of Lakes Protection and Rehabilitation District with protection of these high quality waters.

11. District WRM and the Rusk and Chippewa County Zoning Offices should be encouraged to pursue a sanitary survey to answer the shoreline septic concerns on the Island Chain of Lakes (Types B,C).

12. WRM should encourage the development of lake management organizations on Boot and Potato lakes and Fireside Lakes (Type B).

13. WRM should assist the Potato Lake community with an application for a lake management planning grant to assess current lake water conditions and watershed status (Type B).

14. WRM should conduct water quality monitoring to verify the water quality modeling results for Bradley and Henneman lakes (Type B).

15. WDNR should use the Henneman and Bradley Lakes Watershed Study to evaluate using the Stewardship Program to purchase water quality easements and sensitive areas within watersheds of high quality, phosphorus-sensitive lakes (Type B).

16. WRM and Water Regulation and Zoning should continue to work with the Chippewa County Zoning Department to improve the implementation of shoreland zoning (Type B).

17. WRM, Fisheries Management and Northern States Power should develop and conduct an EPA Clean Lakes Phase I Diagnostic and Feasibility Study Project for the Holcombe Flowage (Type B).

18. WRM should continue to work with the Holcombe Flowage Improvement Association, Inc. to control purple loosestrife (Type B).

19. WRM and Fisheries Management should conduct additional sampling of game fish species for mercury in Holcombe Flowage to monitor trends (Type B).

20. The Bureau of Forestry and the Chippewa County Forest and Parks Department should review all timber harvest within the Horseshoe Lake and Knickerbocker Lake watersheds to insure best management practices are implemented to protect water quality (Types B and C).

21. WRM, Water Regulation and Zoning, the Long Lake Protection and Rehabilitation District, and the Chippewa County Zoning Department should develop a cooperative agreement to ensure the effective implementation of shoreland zoning on Long Lake (Types B and C).

22. The Chippewa County Zoning Department should correct all shoreland zoning violations for Long Lake identified in the Chippewa County Lakes Shoreland Zoning Study 1988 (Type C).

23. WRM should assist the Long Lake Protection and Rehabilitation District in updating the Long Lake Water Quality Management Plan (Type B).

24. WRM, Water Regulation and Zoning, and the Rusk and Chippewa County Zoning Departments should develop a cooperative agreement to insure the effective implementation of shoreland zoning on Sand Lake (Types B and C).

25. WRM, University of Wisconsin-Extension and the Wisconsin Association of Lakes should assist the residents of Sand Lake in developing an citizens lake management organization to assist in protecting Sand Lake (Type C).

26. The Round Lake management organization should consider adopting a boating use ordinance that would either limit time of use or designate the entire lake "slow-no wake" (Type C).

Boot Lake

A resident on this lake recently volunteered for the Self-Help Monitoring Program. Sparse information indicates Boot Lake has good water quality.

Fireside Lakes

Recent contacts from lake residents raises the concern for a possible decline in water quality. This 302-acre lake comprising of Mud and Rice lakes, has an intermittent connection with the Chippewa River. During high runoff the river backs up into the lakes, leading to potential nutrient loading. Fireside Lake has an excellent fishery but the potential problems from vegetation and algae growths leads to a high priority ranking for trophic assessment monitoring.

Island Chain of Lakes

This chain of lakes includes 468-acre Chain Lake, 95-acre Clear Lake, 133-acre McCann Lake and 526-acre Island Lake. The aggressive lakeshore community has a long history of lake management activities. An official lake management district was formed in 1977 and a feasibility study was completed in 1980. These lakes were found to be high quality water resources with trophic assessments in the mesotrophic range. A Lake Management Planning Grant Study in 1991 included trophic assessment monitoring and an attempt to document the persistently rumored leakage of septic tank effluent to the lakes. The study revealed the continued high quality of this chain of lakes but the bacteriological testing was inconclusive in revealing any serious septic effluent leakage.

Potato Lake

We have a lack of water quality information for this important, 534-acre lake. File information indicates that portions of the lake have abundant vegetation and algae blooms have been noted. This lake would benefit from the formation of a lake management organization and the implementation of a lake management planning grant study to assess water quality conditions.

Axehandle Lake

Current self-help monitoring data indicates that Axehandle Lake has good water quality based on secchi depth information collected during the summers of 1990 through 1992. Lake physical data and watershed size indicate this lake will be sensitive to increases or decreases in phosphorus loading from the watershed.

Bradley Lake and Henneman Lake

A eutrophication modeling assessment (Voss 1989) was conducted for these two lakes. The lakes were chosen because they were thought to have good water quality, are sensitive to increases in nutrient loading and have watersheds and riparian shorelands which have the potential to be developed. Both lakes are seepage lakes which are managed as two-story fisheries. The modeling assessment evaluated the potential water quality impacts of various residential development scenarios in the watersheds. The study concluded that if the remaining undeveloped shorelands are converted to residential development under current land use restrictions it is likely that both lakes would experience significant water quality degradation.

Currently no residential development exists on Bradley Lake but a significant portion of the shoreline is in private ownership and could be developed. Henneman Lake currently has six seasonal riparian dwellings with the remainder of the shoreline undeveloped. These lakes are representative of a large group of smaller lakes that have remained relatively undeveloped. As development pressures increase it is likely that shorelands will be developed.

Lakes similar to Bradley and Henneman Lakes should also be considered sensitive to increased nutrient loading. These lakes are characterized as smaller deep lakes with small watersheds and relatively low flushing rates. The undeveloped watersheds tend to retain nutrients and preclude their transport to the lake. The conversion of these watersheds to low density residential development will significantly increase nutrient runoff unless proper land use controls are implemented at the time of development. Research conducted in Maine (Dennis 1986) found that runoff from residential development on large wooded lots (1.1 dwellings/acre) contained 5 to 10 times as much phosphorus as runoff from adjacent undeveloped watersheds. This research was conducted in a area of Maine with soil types similar to those in northern Chippewa County.

Dumke Lake

A water quality assessment in 1988 and 1989 indicated this lake is eutrophic and experiences occasional winterkill conditions. The assessment included predicting mercury concentrations in fish tissue based on lake alkalinity and calcium concentrations. This analysis predicted that fish tissue for a 17-inch walleye would be above the .5 ug/l mercury fish tissue standard. The entire shoreline is owned by the State of Wisconsin.

Holcombe Flowage

Holcombe Flowage is a 3,890-acre impoundment on the Chippewa River in northeastern Chippewa County. The impoundment was created in 1950 when Northern States Power completed construction of a 34,000 kilowatt hydroelectric generating facility. The impoundment provides an important recreation resource of regional significance.

Water Resources Management, Fisheries Management and Northern States Power (NSP) currently have several issues and concerns associated with Holcombe Flowage. Water Resources Management and NSP conducted a water quality assessment in 1989. Water quality data for chlorophyll a, total phosphorus and secchi depth indicated that the portion of Holcombe Flowage influenced by the Jump River had poorer water quality than the remainder of the impoundment. The monitoring site in the Jump River portion of the impoundment was compared with 11 additional monitoring sites within all the impoundments from Holcombe Flowage downstream. The Jump River site in Holcombe Flowage ranked eleventh for chlorophyll a and secchi depth and twelfth for total phosphorus. An infestation of purple loosestrife is presently invading the shorelines and wetlands associated with Holcombe Flowage. Northern States Power is currently evaluating low dissolved oxygen problems in back water embayments. NSP changed its winter operating procedures in the early 1980s to facilitate surging high dissolved oxygen water into the backwater embayments weekly. The current concern is that the high dissolved oxygen water remains near the surface and does not mix throughout water column. This problem may result in severe dissolved oxygen depletion during late winter drawdown when many of the embayments are hydraulically cut off from the main basin. Several of the backwater embayments experience heavy growths of aquatic plants. The decomposition of the plants is likely contributing to the winter dissolved oxygen problems. Holcombe Flowage currently has a fish tissue consumption advisory for mercury in walleye.

Other issues of concern for Holcombe Flowage include the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing of the Holcombe dam and the discharge from the Flambeau Mining Co. Copper Mine. Northern States Power will begin the relicensing process in 1995 as the current license expires in 2000. Water Resources Management collected sediment samples in 1992 to establish background metals concentrations. These results will help assess if the Flambeau Mining Co. Copper Mine discharge has any impact on Holcombe Flowage. The environmental impact statement for the mine stated that effluent limits in the Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (WPDES) permit are designed to prevent the adverse accumulation of metals in aquatic organisms.

Horseshoe Lake T32N R8W S33

A water quality assessment was completed for Horseshoe Lake in 1988 and 1989. Summer trophic state index values for chlorophyll a, total phosphorus and secchi depth were 54, 67 and 48 respectively. These values indicate the lake has fair water quality and is eutrophic. Late winter dissolved oxygen monitoring indicated severe oxygen depletion typical of winterkill conditions. The lake also has a fish consumption advisory for mercury in walleyes larger than 15 inches. The entire shoreline of this lake is in the Chippewa County Forest.

Knickerbocker Lake

A water quality assessment conducted in 1988 and 1989 indicated the lake has poor water quality and is eutrophic. Late winter dissolved oxygen monitoring found severe oxygen depletion and near winterkill conditions. The entire shoreline of this lake is in the Chippewa County Forest.

Long Lake

Long Lake is the largest natural lake and one of the highest quality lakes in Chippewa County. Water quality is still perceived as good but water quality data collected by the department in the Long-Term Trends Monitoring Program indicates water quality is declining. Pre-1980 dissolved oxygen data indicates only 3-4 percent of the lake bottom became anoxic during the summer. Current data indicates complete anoxia in the hypolimnion by late August.

A comprehensive lake management plan was prepared for the Long Lake Protection and Rehabilitation District by Water Resources Management. This plan developed several recommendations which would protect water quality. Several of the recommendations identified effective implementation of shoreland zoning as a critical management activity to minimize increases in nutrient loading to the lake.

A 1988 shoreland zoning evaluation study conducted in Chippewa County, which included Long Lake, was conducted by the Chippewa County Zoning Department and Water Resources Management. The study evaluated if shoreland zoning requirements were being effectively implemented for lakes within the county. The study found that shoreland zoning was not being effectively implemented. The study found that for 70 percent of the activities requiring shoreland zoning permits, the riparian owners either did not obtain a permit or did not adhere to permit requirements.

It is critical that effective lake protection management activities be implemented in the Long Lake watershed. Without effective lake protection activities water quality will continue to decline in Long Lake.

Plummer Lake

A 1989 water quality assessment indicated water quality to be fair. Plummer Lake has moderate nutrient and algal levels. Late winter oxygen concentrations indicated significant depletion and the lake experiences occasional winterkills.

Sand Lake

Sand Lake is included as one of 50 lakes in the department's Long-Term Trends Monitoring Program. Extensive water quality data has been collected from Sand Lake since 1986. The Long-Term Trends Monitoring data indicates that water quality is good and the lake has a diverse high quality aquatic plant population. Physical data for Sand Lake indicate that the lake is sensitive to increases in nutrient loading. Water quality is threatened by existing and future development in the Sand Lake watershed. The lake currently experiences late summer anoxia in the hypolimnion which is indicative of increasing eutrophication.

Round Lake

Round Lake has been monitored since 1986 as one of 50 lakes in WDNR's Long-Term Trend Monitoring Program. Water quality data is collected annually and aquatic plant surveys were conducted in 1988, 1991 and 1994.

Currently the lake has good water clarity and low phosphorus levels, though seasonal monitoring reveals short periods when phosphorus levels significantly increase. For example, during the summer of 1993 the phorphorus levels increased until in August the lake experienced a blue green algal bloom.

With a maximum depth of 18 feet, this shallow lake experiences resuspension of sediments from boat traffic and wind. The Bureau of Research has conducted several studies on Round Lake sediments, finding the majority of sediment in the lake is loosely consolidated with a low specific gravity and high--more than 50 percent--organic content. This sediment resettles slowly after agitation by wind or boat traffic and can release phosphorus to the surface water.

As part of a boating-impact survey conducted on Round Lake during the summer of 1994, water samples and Secchi disk readings were taken before and after high use boating weekends. The most significant change occurred during Memorial Day weekend: total phosphorus went from 23 micrograms per liter (ug/l) on Friday to 66 ug/l on Sunday. Secchi disk depth readings decreased from 2.3 meters on Friday to 1.5 meters on Sunday.

Aquatic plant survey data also raised concerns about effects of motorcraft on Round Lake. The lake supports 37 rooted aquatic plant species including four listed as rare and of special concern by the Bureau of Endangered Resources: waterthread pondweed, Robbin's spikerush, purple bladderwort and small purple bladderwort. These four plants share a characteristic of very fine submersed stems that are particularly susceptible to being cut by propellers. A number of plants in the lake are indicators of good water quality but are sensitive to disturbance and increased turbidity.

The plant surveys also revealed a dramatic change in the Round Lake plant community from 1988 and 1991. Various-leaved water milfoil went from no presence in the 1988 survey to occurring at 48 percent of the sampling sites in 1991. This plant can be locally aggressive and spreads effectively from cuttings. The appearance and spread in Round Lake coincided with a period of heavier reacreational boating use.

Increased recreational usage and boating activity are likely to occur on this lake as a result of a new full-service boat landing, completed in 1995, and a new county park with beach frontage that is currently under construction on the northern shoreline. In response to the threat increased usage may pose to the lake, the Round Lake Protection and Rehabilitation District and Town of Sampson adopted a slow, no-wake zone that parrallels the 10-foot depth contour along the western and southern shorelines. This protected zone encompasses the majority of the fragile plant beds and some of the most easily resuspended sediments.

As trend monitoring continues on Round Lake, an evaluation can be made about the effectiveness of this protection. It is possible that the whole lake may eventually need to

be designated as slow, no-wake or limited to trolling motors and non-motorized watercraft.

NAMED LAKES >= 10 ACRES UPPER CHIPPEWA BASIN (Unnamed Lakes >= 25 acres)
Holcombe Flowage Watershed (UC01)

LAKE NAME (T-R-S)	CO.	SURF. AREA	MAX DEPTH (FT.)	LK. TYPE	WBN	PUB. ACC.	TSI	EVAL	LK. CLASS	WINT. KILL 1=YES 2=NO	FISH ADV.	ALK.	ACID SENS	RES. MGMT POTN	ORW	Monitoring SHTM	Hg	AD	TS	ILR	IM	SENS	COMMENTS
AXEHANDLE L.	9	84	73		2092500	Y	40	X	1A	2				A		C			R		R		
BEAR LAKE	55	29	12	1	1833800		47	X	2A	1		10	N	E		R					R		
BOOT LAKE	55	87	44	1	1836700	BR			1C	2		14	N	D		C		5	R		R	R	
BRADLEY LAKE	9	11	38		2346000	Y			1A	2		9	N	A					R		R		
BRUSH LAKE T33N R08W S30	55	17	39	1	1837400				1C	2		7	N	E							R		
CADOTTE LAKE	9	14	44		1838400				1C	1		4	N	D					R				
CALKINS LAKE	9	43	20		2361100				1C	2		8	N	D					R				
CALKINS LAKE, NORTH	9	14	17		1869000				1C	2		5	N	D					R				
CHAIN LAKE	9,55	468	74	2	2350500	NW	44		1A	2		60	N	A	X	C		X		X	R	R	LMO
CHICK LAKE T32N R9W S3	9	10	8		1840600					1		10	N	G									
CLEAR LAKE	55	95	74	2	2350600	BR	42		1A	2		88	N	A	X	C		X		X	R	R	LMO
DARK LAKE T32N R9W S10	9	13	62		2092700	Y		X	1A	2				A		R			R		R		
DARK LAKE T32N R8W S19	9	21	65		2361800	Y		X	1C	2		14	N	D		R					R		
DUMKE LAKE	9	11	16		1846100	Y	58	X	1B	1		12	N	D		R		R	X,R		X,R		
FIRESIDE LAKES (RICE & MUD)	55	302	30	2	2349500	BR			1C	2		52	N	D		R		X	R		R	R	
FOSTER LAKE	9	28	21		2346100				1C	2		62	N	C		R					R		
GOOSE LAKE	55	20	52	1	2353500	T			1C	2		43	N	D		R			R		R		
GRANGER LAKE	9	10	31		2361000			X	1C	2		10	N	C		R					R		
HARWOOD LAKE NO. 2	9	14	9		1852900			X	2C	1		6	N			R					R		
HENNEMAN LAKE	9	64	60		2362500	Y		X	1A	2		11	N	A		R			R		R		
HODGE LAKE (L.HARRIET)	9	19	28		1853700			X	1C	2		5	N	D		R			R		R		
HOGSKIN LAKE T33N R09W S33-13	55	16	8	1	1853900				2D	1		11	N	G							R		
HOLCOMBE FLOWAGE	9	3890	61		2184900	Y	63	X		2	X	50	N	A		C			X				
HORESHOE LAKE T32N R8W S33	9	24	23		1854300	Y	54	X	1A	2		7	N	A		R			X,R		X,R		
HUNGRY LAKE	55	20	20	1	1855300				1C	1		9	N	E							R		
ISLAND LAKE	55	526	54	2	2350200	BR	45		1A	2		65	N	A	X	C		X		X	R	R	LMO
JACKS LAKE	9	14	58		1855700			X	1C	2		11	N										
KNICKERBOCKER LAKE	9	14	24		1868300	Y	62	X	1B	1		17	N	B		R			X,R		X,R		
LAKE FOUR	55	21	49	1	2356200	W			1C	2		32	N	D		R			R		R		
LARRABEE LAKE	9	50	31		2352000			X	1C	2		8	N						R		R		
LEO JOERG LAKE	9	12	16		1860100			X	1C	2		7	N								R		
LITTLE PLUMMER LAKE	9	10	25		2348800	Y		X	1C	2		50	N	C		R			R		R		
LOGGER LAKE	9	19	19		1862700				1C	1		6	N						R		R		
LONG LAKE T32N R8W S8	9	1062	101		2351400	Y		X	1A	2		42	N	A		C	C						
MARSH LAKE	55	43	4	1	2349200				2D	1		18	N	G							R		
MCCANN LAKE	55	133	38	2	2350400	BR	46		1A	2		68	N	A	X	C		X		X	R	R	LMO
MEADOWS LAKE	9	10	20		2345500			X	1C	2		54	N			R			R		R		
PICNIC LAKE	9	25	48		2347000			X	1C	2		5	N						R		R		
PINE LAKE	9	262	115		2092900		32	X	1A	2				A		R			X,R		X,R		
PLUMMER LAKE	9	41	28		2348700	Y	55	X	1A	1		91	N	A					X,R		X,R		

Holcombe Flowage Watershed (UC01)

LAKE NAME (T-R-S)	CO.	SURF. AREA	MAX DEPTH (FT.)	LK. TYPE	WBN	PUB. ACC.	TSI	EVAL	LK. CLASS	WINT. KILL 1=YES 2=NO	FISH ADV.	ALK.	ACID SENS	RES. MGMT POTN	ORW	Monitoring SHTM	Hg	AD	TS	ILR	IM	SENS	COMMENTS
ROUND LAKE	55	105	5	1	1878200	BR			2D	1		4	N	G				R			R		
RUBY LAKE	9	17	65		1878500			X	1C	2		4	N	E					R		R		
RUSK LAKE	55	12	71	1	1878800	BR			1C	2		15	N	D	R		5		R		R		
SALISBURY LAKE	9	76	10		1879700			X	2C	1		11	N	E					R		R		
SAND LAKE	9,55	262	100	1	2353600	BR	45	X	1A	2		54	N	A	R		X		R		R	R	
SPENCE LAKE	9	13	57		2346400			X	1C	2		5	N	D	R				R		R		
STAR LAKE T33N R09W S33	55	13	21	1	1883500				1C	2		9	N	E	R						R		
SUGAR LAKE	55	34	20	1	2356000		65	X	1B	1		14	N	E							R		
TRIPLE LAKE, EAST	9	18	18		1846400				1C	2		5	N	D	R				R		R		
TRIPLE LAKE, WEST	9	15	21		2044700				1C	2		5	N	D	R				R		R		
TURK LAKE	9	17	18		1886800				1C	1		14	N	E	R				R		R		
TWO ISLAND LAKE	9	29	18		1887500	Y		X	1C	2		5	N	D	R				R		R		
UNNAMED T32N R7W S30-1	9	35	4		2348500				2C	1		34	N	E	R				R		R		
WESLEY LAKE	9	44	10		2046700	Y			2C	1		4	N	E					R		R		
WHIPLASH LAKE	55	12	19	1	2045900				1C	1		10	N	G							R		
WILLOW CREEK FLOWAGE # 1	9	21	7		2345000	Y			2C	1		37	N	C					R		R		
WORDEN LAKE	9	17	6		2047200				2C	1		11	N	E					R		R		

Appendix Figure 2.2

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR EACH CLASS OF WATER

CATEGORY	STANDARD
Outstanding Resource Waters ● National wild and scenic rivers ● State wild and scenic rivers	Waters may not be lowered in quality, except as provided in ch. NR 207 (Water Quality Antidegradation).
Exceptional Resource Waters ● Class I trout waters listed in WI Trout Streams publication 6-3600 ● Other Class I trout waters	Waters may not be lowered in quality, except as provided in ch. NR 207 (Water Quality Antidegradation).
Great Lakes System	Waters identified are to be protected from the impacts of persistent, bioaccumulating toxic substances by avoiding or limiting practicable increases in these substances.
Fish and Aquatic Life Waters ● Cold water communities ● Warm water sport fish communities ● Warm water forage fish communities ● Limited forage fish communities ● Limited aquatic life	Except for natural conditions, all waters in this category shall meet the following criteria: ● Dissolved oxygen content no less than 5 mg/L at any time. ● There shall be no temperature changes that may adversely affect aquatic life. ● pH shall be within the range of 6.0 to 9.0. ● Unauthorized concentrations of substances are not permitted that alone or in combination with other materials present are toxic to fish or other aquatic life. ● Temperature and dissolved oxygen for cold waters may not be altered from natural background temperature and dissolved oxygen levels to an extent that trout populations are affected.

Appendix 3

Chippewa County Stewardship Fund Policy & Procedures for Program Administration

CHIPPEWA COUNTY STEWARDSHIP FUND POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Chippewa County Land Conservation Committee
December 7, 1999

CHIPPEWA COUNTY STEWARDSHIP FUND
POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Table of Contents

CHIPPEWA COUNTY STEWARDSHIP FUND POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

INTENT AND PURPOSE

1.0 •Introduction

In Wisconsin, counties have been given the authority and responsibility to plan and to administer local land use and resource conservation programs.

In recent years, Chippewa County has experienced a steady rate of growth.

As part of this growth, there has been widespread development of residential and commercial properties in unincorporated areas. This growth trend is expected to accelerate in response to expansion of the regional highway network, and ongoing efforts by Chippewa County to encourage tourism and economic development.

The Congress and State legislature have recently reduced Federal and State allocations which have been applied to implement resource conservation and pollution control programs in the County. It is anticipated that in the future, public agencies will distribute grants to the County based upon the County's capacity to generate local matching funds.

Chippewa County has relied heavily on outside funding sources to develop and implement its local land use and resource conservation programs. Given current development trends and associated pressures on land resources, there is an inherent need to maintain and possibly expand the County's resource conservation efforts. This accelerated need comes at a time when traditional revenue sources are being reduced or eliminated.

To address this issue, it is in the County's interest to develop a fiscal strategy and alternative funding source which will be used by the County to leverage local funds to meet local land use and conservation needs.

1.1 •Purpose

Establish a County Stewardship Fund to assist landowners, municipalities, local units of government, and non-profit organizations to meet land conservation and resource management objectives in Chippewa County.

This fund may be used to:

1. Purchase land through fee title for future community needs. This may include acquisitions for public parks and open spaces; access corridors to lakes or rivers; recreational trail corridors; County or School Forests; or other environmental or land conservation related uses.

2. Purchase development rights or conservation easements in order to achieve land use policy objectives, as specified in an approved Town or County land use plan. This may include purchase of easements to preserve prime farmland, woodlots, environmental corridors, shorelands, wetlands, municipal well recharge areas, or planned open space.

3. Purchase land or easements in support of local fish and wildlife habitat development and improvement projects.

To expand the utility and cost of efficiency of this concept, the County Stewardship Program will be administered to:

1. Encourage tax-exempt community contributions from corporate interests, local conservation organizations, community service organizations, estates, and private individuals.

2. Acquire matching grants available from public agencies or private non-profit foundations.

3. Distribute matching grants to local municipalities, land trusts, and nonprofit organizations which meet grant criteria established by Chippewa County.

ADMINISTRATION

2.0 •Administrative Authority and Responsibility

The Land Conservation Committee shall administer, in the name of the County, the Chippewa County Stewardship Fund.

To administer the Chippewa County Stewardship Program, it is the intent of the Chippewa County Board to authorize the Land Conservation Committee to exercise statutory authority assigned to the Committee in WI Stats. 92.07.

SOURCE AND MANAGEMENT OF FUNDS

3.1 •Fiscal Management and Accounting

The County Stewardship Fund will be established as a nonlapsing special revenue fund with partial proceeds available from the County Sales Tax and other funding sources, including public grants, private contributions, service or development fees, and other sources of revenue deemed appropriate by the County.

The Stewardship Fund will be managed by the Land Conservation Department, working with the County Auditor's Office. The account will be managed and audited following standardized accounting procedures adopted and employed by the County.

The Land Conservation Committee will evaluate ongoing project needs and will request an annual allocation from the sales tax fund as part of the annual County budget process. If funds are available, the Finance Committee and the County Board will make annual appropriations to the fund following a schedule of appropriation adopted through the enabling Resolution #76-98, as adopted by the County Board on 11/03/98.

3.2 •Use of Funds and Eligible Expenses

Funds from the account may be used for expenses related to the Stewardship Program as follows:

1. Matching grants for land or easement acquisition as allocated to eligible individuals, municipalities, or organizations.

2. Capital costs of land acquisitions incurred through direct purchase by the County, including appraisals, surveys, and legal fees.

3. Capital costs of conservation easement acquisitions incurred through direct purchase by the County or through donation, including appraisals, surveys, and legal fees.

4. Limited custodial maintenance costs associated with property and easement management.

3.3 •Solicitation of Contributions to Stewardship Fund

The Land Conservation Committee will solicit contributions to the County Stewardship Fund from individuals, businesses, corporations, public agencies, and non-profit organizations.

3.4 •Gifts of Financial Instruments, Capital Assets, or Personal Property

The Land Conservation Committee will evaluate all offers of contribution made by individuals, businesses, corporations, local units of government, or non-profit organizations.

When offered, financial gifts, including cash, stock, or other financial instruments, will be accepted and formally acknowledged. Proceeds from monetary gifts will be deposited directly in the special revenue Stewardship Fund account.

When offered, gifts of personal property will be evaluated for acceptance on a case-by-case basis. In circumstances where a capital asset, other than land or a financial instrument, is offered and accepted, the asset will be immediately sold and the proceeds will be placed in the County Stewardship Fund.

USE OF FUND TO ACCEPT GIFTS OF LAND OR INTEREST IN LAND

4.0 •Gifts of Land or Interests in Land

Offers of land will be evaluated in the interest of acquiring the property outright, obtaining future purchase options on the property, or acquiring rights or interests in the property.

4.1 •Procedures for Evaluating Land Donation Offers

When approached with a gift of land, the Committee will implement the following procedure:

1. Prepare a draft letter of intent to be considered and executed by the contributor. The letter of intent will be nonbinding and will document the contributor's interest in negotiating an agreement of land transfer.

2. Conduct or commission a general title search to verify ownership.

3. Conduct or commission an environmental site assessment to document the history of land use and the potential risk of environmental contamination.

4. Estimate the value or commission an appraisal of the property.

   If the parties agree that an appraisal is needed to determine the value, the County may incur the initial expense of the appraisal from funds provided by the Stewardship Fund, with the condition that the landowner will repay the cost of the appraisal to the County if the transfer of land is not completed. In the event the landowner chooses to incur the appraisal expense and the transfer is completed, reimbursement for the appraisal may be provided to the landowner through the Stewardship Fund.

5. Evaluate and negotiate the terms of the offer. Take action to accept the offer, accept the offer with conditions, or decline the offer.

6. Prepare a formal letter of response. The letter of response will inform the contributor of the Committee's extent of interest and basis of decision.

4.2 •Criteria for Evaluating Offers of Land

In circumstances where the Land Conservation Committee is approached with a gift of land, the Committee will evaluate and accept or deny the offer after considering the following criteria:

1. Conditions placed on the donation by the individual or group making the donation.
2. Consistency with local land use goals, as defined in an approved Town land use plan.

3. Consistency with local environmental or land use objectives, as defined in a County-wide land use or environmental plan, as approved by Chippewa County.

4. Assessed or appraised fair market value.

5. Extent and condition of capital improvements.

6. Resource condition and environmental value.

7. The capacity of the Land Conservation Committee to conduct ongoing custodial responsibilities or to convey such responsibilities to a registered land trust, government agency, municipality, or private party.

8. Commitment by the County Forest & Parks Committee and County Board to designate and manage the property as a component of the County Forest and Parks System.

9. Options for resale with agreement to assign proceeds toward other property acquisition or maintenance of other inventory property.

4.3 •Offers of Conservation Easement or Interests in Property

In circumstances where rights in a property are offered, the Land Conservation Committee will evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of the easement acquisition, and may exercise its authority to negotiate and execute conservation easements on behalf of the County.

4.4 •Procedures for Evaluating Offers of Conservation Easement

When approached with an offer of a conservation easement, the Land Conservation Committee will follow the same procedures as those specified for an outright land donation or fee title purchase.

4.5 •Custodial Responsibility for Conservation Easements

In circumstances where the County secures a conservation easement through the County Stewardship Program, the County will:

1. Assume custodial responsibility of the conservation easement.

2. Actively seek a land trust or public agency to jointly enter the easement agreement in the interest of sharing custodial responsibility.

3. Systematically monitor compliance with provisions of the easement.

4. Assure compliance through an escalating sequence of enforcement action.

4.6 •Criteria for Fee Title Acquisition

In circumstances where a property is offered for sale and funds are requested through the County Stewardship Fund, the Land Conservation Committee will evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of the fee titled acquisition after considering the following criteria:

1. The parcels proximity to designated "acquisition area" as defined and mapped in a public land use, resource management, or recreational plan (i.e. County Forest 10 Year Plan, public recreational plan, or Town open space plan).

2. The approximate value of the property in relation to the sale price.

3. The availability of outside funds secured for the acquisition from other public agencies or units of government.

4. Commitment by the County Forest and Parks Committee and County Board to designate and manage the property as a component of the County Forest and Parks System.

USE OF FUND BY COUNTY AS LOCAL MATCH TO ACQUIRE OUTSIDE GRANTS

5.0 •Authority for County to Use Stewardship Fund to Secure Outside Grants

The Land Conservation Committee shall have the authority to apply the funds from the County Stewardship Fund as local match for State and Federal grants which may be available to acquire land or conservation easements.

5.1 •Use of Stewardship Funds for Outside Appraisals

In the circumstance where the Land Conservation Committee solicits grant funding from an outside agency and the contributing agency requires an independent appraisal as a condition of property acquisition, the County will incur the front-end costs of the appraisal.

In circumstances where acquisition funding is secured and the property is acquired, the County will seek reimbursement for the appraisal, if available from the outside agency.

USE OF FUND BY COUNTY TO DISTRIBUTE LOCAL MATCHING GRANTS

6.0 •Local County Stewardship Grant Awards

The Land Conservation Committee shall reserve and apply a portion of the Stewardship Fund to establish and administer a County Stewardship Fund matching grant program.

6.1 •Public Notice and Solicitation of Projects

The Land Conservation Committee shall actively solicit project proposals through an annual Stewardship Fund grant process.

The Land Conservation Committee shall, on an annual basis, establish objectives and set priorities for funding allocations. These annual objectives will be considered in addition to general standing criteria used to evaluate and fund project proposals.

The Land Conservation Committee shall develop minimum content requirements and a standardized format to solicit grant proposals.

6.2 •Time Cycle for Evaluating and Selecting Projects

The Land Conservation Committee shall publish a Class II Notice before April 1 of each calendar year to inform eligible parties of grant opportunities and to solicit project land proposals.

Application for County Stewardship project funds will be compiled and systematically evaluated before October 1 of each calendar year.

6.3 •Criteria for Evaluating and Selecting Projects

All project requests submitted through the Stewardship grant process will be evaluated based upon the following criteria:

1. Annual grant criteria formally adopted by the Committee.

2. Commitment by grant applicant to carry out perpetual responsibilities of custodial management.

3. Cost efficiency of the grant request recognizing:
   a. The proportion of funding provided by outside groups.
   b. The total cost per acre as determined in a land appraisal conducted by a State licensed certified appraiser or fair market value as determined by the County.

4. Total cost of project in relation to funds available.

6.4 •Matching Grant Requirements and Eligible Expenses

To be eligible for project funds, the applicant must provide a 50% local match. Local expenses which may be counted toward the local 50% match are as follows:

1. Property appraisals.

2. Survey costs.

3. Recording fees.

4. Donations toward an endowment for custodial management.

5. Other expenses as included in the annual grant criteria formally adopted by the Committee.

6.5 •Use of Other Public Grant Sources

In circumstances where other public grant sources are applied in a project proposal, State and Federal grant funds will not be recognized toward the local match.

6.6 •Project Limitations

To be eligible for funding, projects must be located in an unincorporated area of Chippewa
County. No project shall receive more than $100,000 from the County Stewardship Fund without County Board approval.

6.7 •Excluded Organizations

The following entities will not be considered eligible for consideration under the local Stewardship Grant Program:

- •State of Federal agencies.
- •Organizations not covered under Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3).
- •Religious organizations or fraternal organizations.
- •Any organization which discriminates on any basis.

6.8 •Project Tracking, Audits, Compliance, and Enforcement

The Land Conservation Committee shall require that a land use agreement be developed as a condition of any grant allocation. The land use agreement will clearly specify land use and development restrictions which will be applied in the interest of land conservation.

To verify compliance with terms of the agreement, the Land Conservation Committee shall conduct an annual project review before October 1 of each year for each project funded under the program. Results of all annual project reviews will be documented in an annual project compliance report.

The Land Conservation Committee will maintain the authority to require that the land use agreement be recorded with the property deed to limit future use and development of the property.

The Land Conservation Committee shall maintain the authority to review and inspect the financial records of any grant recipient through a formal financial audit.

If, as a result of the annual project review or financial audit, the Land Conservation Committee determines that the land is not being managed in accordance with the land use agreement, the Committee shall take measures to seek compliance.

In circumstances where measures are not adopted and compliance reached, the Land Conservation Committee shall enforce provisions of the agreement through citation authority, court action, or other mechanisms.

PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY

7.0 •Program Evaluation, Reporting, and Accountability

The Land Conservation Committee shall evaluate the County Stewardship Program on an annual basis. The program evaluation shall assess the success of the program based upon the following criteria:

1. Level of program participation as measured by the number of donators and amount of donations.

2. Level of program participation as measured by the number of grant applicants.

3. The number, size, and location of parcels conserved through the Stewardship Fund.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND OUTREACH

8.0 •Information and Education; Responsible Parties

The Land Conservation Committee shall develop a public information and education component of the County Stewardship Program. In developing the public information and education component of the program, the Land Conservation Committee shall seek the assistance of the UWEX Agriculture and Extension Committee and public agency advisors, as defined in WI Stats. Chapter 92.

8.1 •Information and Education Program; Content

The information and education component shall, at a minimum, inform the public of the intent of the program, explain opportunities for making contributions to the Stewardship Fund, and the procedure for applying for grants through the Stewardship Program.

Appendix 4

Addendum to the Chippewa County Operational Agreement Between DNR & Chippewa County Land Conservation Department for the Administration and Implementation of Agricultural Nonpoint Pollution Performance Standards and Prohibitions Under NR151 and NR243, April 16, 2004

Appendix 4

ADDENDUM TO THE CHIPPEWA COUNTY OPERATIONAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN DNR & CHIPPEWA COUNTY LAND CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT FOR THE ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AGRICULTURAL NONPOINT POLLUTION PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND PROHIBITIONS UNDER NR151 AND NR243

Table of Contents

Purpose

This memorandum of understanding is an addendum to a multi-agency operational agreement that exist between the Chippewa County Land Conservation Committee, WI Department of Natural Resources, WI Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection, Chippewa County Extension and USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (date).

This MOU has been developed by the Chippewa County Land Conservation Committee (LCC) and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to clarify their respective roles and responsibilities as needed to:

- Implement and enforce agricultural nonpoint pollution performance standards and prohibitions established in ch. NR 151, Wis. Adm. Code.
- Implement ch. NR 243, Wis. Adm. Code as it applies to the permitting of livestock operations and the investigation of livestock facility complaints.
- Systematically phase out the Duncan Creek Priority Watershed Project, initiated and implemented under ch. NR 120, Wis. Adm. Code.

This agreement defines the commitment of each party to conduct administrative tasks that have been defined by Wisconsin conservation agencies as standardized components of a program delivery system. The standardized components are in a guidance document titled *Implementation Strategy for NR 151 Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions*[1] (hereafter referred to as the State-wide Implementation Strategy).

Specifically, this agreement clarifies how the DNR and the County will:

- Incorporate the State-wide Implementation Strategy into routine agency operations.
- Systematically evaluate and define the level of agency commitment to the NR 151 and NR 243 workload using a county-sponsored annual needs assessment and interagency work planning process.
- Conduct information and education activities.
- Systematically select and evaluate parcels to determine compliance with standards and prohibitions.
- Prepare compliance reports and notify landowners of compliance status.
- Provide technical assistance and cost-sharing funding as needed to allow landowners to meet performance standards and prohibitions.
- Issue notice letters under NR 151.09 and NR 151.095 as appropriate.
- Monitor compliance.
- Conduct enforcement activities.
- Develop annual reports.

[1] *This document was prepared jointly by WI Dept. of Natural Resources, WI Dept. of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection, the WI Land and Water Conservation Association, and the WI Association of Land Conservation Employees (April, 2002). It has been approved by the Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Board as Appendix E to the Land and Water Resources Management Plan Guidelines. The document can be found at http://dnr.wi.gov/org/water/wm/nps/rules/NR151strategy.htm.*

I. Component 1: Plan the Implementation Approach

A. The parties agree:

1. The State-wide Implementation Strategy provides a structural framework that can be used to discuss and plan how the parties will cooperate to implement the agricultural performance standards and prohibitions.

2. This memorandum of understanding and the County Land and Water Plan can be used as the means to document procedures for implementing NR 151.

3. Guidance prepared by DNR and incorporated as an appendix to this agreement *(Working with Landowners to Implement Agricultural Performance Standards & Prohibitions Under NR 151)*, is useful for making formal correspondence with landowners concerning compliance issues.

4. The agricultural performance standards and prohibitions are designed to achieve water quality standards by limiting nonpoint source water pollution.

5. NR 151.004 contains a process for developing targeted performance standards where implementation of statewide performance standards and prohibitions may not be sufficient to meet water quality standards.

6. Sections NR151.09, NR 151.095, ATCP 50.04 and ATCP 50.08 require agricultural landowners and operators to meet agricultural nonpoint performance standards and manure management prohibitions. These requirements are contingent upon sufficient cost sharing for existing facilities and practices.

B. Chippewa County will:

1. Use this memorandum of understanding to coordinate implementation of agricultural performance standards and prohibitions.

2. Implement select portions of the administrative rules and components of the State-wide Implementation Strategy, as defined in this agreement.

3. Revise the County Land and Water Resource Management Plan by August 1, 2004, and include a comprehensive strategy to ensure compliance with the performance standards and prohibitions required by NR151.

4. Focus NR 151 implementation activities on new and expanding cropland practices and livestock facilities.

5. Cooperate with DNR to identify priority areas where the county may apply for funding under the Targeted Runoff Management Program to alleviate violations of performance standards and prohibitions that result in significant pollutant loadings or impacts to waters of the State.

A. **As a basis for this agreement, the parties agree:**

1. State statutes and associated administrative rules establish the requirement that agricultural performance standards and prohibitions, established in NR151, must be implemented. (ss. 92.07, 92.10, 92.105, 92.14 and 281.16, Wis. Stats., chs. NR 151 and ATCP 50, Wis. Adm. Code.)

2. The responsibility and authority to administer and implement the agricultural performance standards and prohibitions has been delegated through State statutes and administrative rules to DNR, DATCP, and local municipalities, including the County Land Conservation Committees.

3. DNR is the state agency responsible for administering NR 243, and for implementing NR 151.09, and NR 151.095. Notes in NR 151.09(2) and NR 151.095(2) state the DNR's intent to rely on County Land Conservation Committees to fully implement performance standards and prohibitions and to develop intergovernmental agreements to guide implementation.

4. DATCP is the lead state agency responsible for administering staffing grants under ATCP 50.26 for base level conservation, priority watershed activities and performance standards & prohibitions compliance.

5. DNR has authority, but limited funding, to support staff under Targeted Runoff Management grants.

6. The Chippewa County Land Conservation Committee employs qualified staff with the necessary contracting, planning, and engineering expertise needed to implement the NR151 standards.

7. Implementation of agricultural nonpoint standards and prohibitions is contingent upon the availability of trained technical staff and public cost share. Without funding and staff support for contracting and technical assistance, few, if any, contracts will be executed, or conservation practices constructed to implement performance standards and prohibitions.

8. Chippewa County and the DNR share common goals and objectives toward water resources management and nonpoint source pollution control.

9. Chippewa County and DNR have an existing operational agreement that encourages interagency cooperation to pursue common resource management objectives.

10. To optimize use of available State and County staff and program funding, it is in the mutual interest of the County and DNR to clarify program responsibilities and to make commitments necessary to implement State law and administrative rules.

11. This agreement will be reviewed annually. Either party may cancel its agreement with 90 days written notice.

6. Cooperate with DNR in identifying the need for targeted performance standards.

C. DNR will:

1. Use this memorandum of understanding to coordinate implementation of agricultural performance standards and prohibitions.

2. Implement select portions of the administrative rules and components of the State-wide Implementation Strategy, as defined in this agreement.

3. Assign an agency representative to actively participate in the County Land and Water Resource Management planning process and provide input into the development of the County strategy to implement agricultural nonpoint performance standards and prohibitions.

4. Target its efforts, including education, evaluation, issuing notification letters under NR 151.09 and NR 15.095, and enforcement, toward:

   a. Areas draining to Outstanding and Exceptional Resource Waters. In doing so, the Department's efforts will be directed toward *achieving* compliance for new and expanding cropland practices and livestock facilities and at *maintaining* compliance for all existing and new practices and facilities.
   b. Areas draining to waters on the federal list of impaired water bodies (303d list), waters not meeting water quality standards or designated uses and source water protection areas. In doing do, the Department's efforts will be directed toward *achieving and maintaining* compliance for all existing and new practices and facilities.

5. Work jointly with Chippewa County to set mutual priorities for implementing agricultural performance standards and prohibitions.

6. Provide Chippewa County with guidance needed to fulfill its agreed-upon roles and responsibilities to implement portions of NR 151.

7. Conduct high priority implementation activities as needed to supplement county roles and responsibilities agreed upon in this agreement.

8. Discuss with DATCP ways in which the staffing funds from state agencies may be adjusted to categorize local county land conservation department efforts, and provide grant incentives, based upon the scope of implementation responsibilities assumed.

9. Pursue mechanisms to provide some level of county staff funding for implementing Targeted Runoff Management projects.

10. When appropriate, identify the need for targeted performance standards.

II. Component 2: Define Level of Agencies' Commitment to NR151 Workload

A. The parties agree:

1. There must be a mutual understanding of each agency's responsibilities and level of commitment in carrying out implementation of agricultural performance standards and prohibitions, including implementation and enforcement activities identified under NR151.09 and NR151.095.

2. The extent of each agency's commitment is dependent upon the availability of public funds and agency priorities and, therefore, may be expected to change through time.

B. Chippewa County will:

1. Sponsor an annual interagency work planning session, following procedures in the interagency operational agreement. Through this process, the County will formally solicit, document, and record the level of agency and county commitment towards carrying out the NR151 workload, under Components 3-10 of this agreement.

Note: Through this process, the County will seek to determine the number of full-time staff positions, (FTE), assigned by each agency (County, State, and Federal), the technical qualifications of each staff position assigned, activities to be conducted by the assigned position, and the financial resources to be committed.

C. DNR will:

1. Assign an agency representative and actively participate in the County LCC's annual interagency work planning session.

2. Use this work planning process, in conjunction with the DNR work planning process, to make staff commitments toward implementation of NR 151 workload for the upcoming year.

3. Identify site specific projects determined by the agency to be priorities, for onsite farm evaluations, cost-share funding, issuing notification letters under NR 151.09 and NR 151.095, and enforcement action when appropriate.

III. Component 3: Conduct Information and Education Activities

A. The parties agree:

1. That a structured information and educational program is a critical component of an agricultural nonpoint pollution control program.

2. An effective program will:

   a. Educate landowners about the Wisconsin agricultural performance standards and prohibitions, applicable conservation practices, and cost-share grant opportunities.
   b. Promote implementation of conservation practices necessary to meet performance standards and prohibitions.

c. Inform landowners about procedures and agency roles to be used statewide and locally for ensuring compliance with the performance standards and prohibitions.
d. Establish expectations for compliance and consequences for non-compliance.
e. Define target audiences, educational messages for each target audience, methods and activities to deliver the educational message to each target audience, anticipated unit costs for each activity, a proposed regional or statewide budget and a proposed implementation schedule.

B. Chippewa County will:

1. Provide structured input into the development of a state-wide and regional information and education program to be designed by DNR to support and augment NR151 implementation efforts.

2. Before August 1, 2004, using funding allocated through the Duncan Creek Priority Watershed Project, develop a local information and education plan to support NR 151 implementation as outlined in this agreement.

3. Within the limits of State funding allocated, implement information and education activities as scheduled through the County's LCC's annual work plan and financed through the County budget process.

C. DNR will:

1. Develop a statewide information and education program, activity schedule and budget to support state and county efforts to implement NR 151.

2. Work with University of Wisconsin-Extension and DATCP to identify and develop information and education materials and activities needed on a statewide basis, and to make the materials accessible to Chippewa County for use and dissemination.

3. Provide input into the planning of the Chippewa County information and education program.

4. *Participate in work planning for the Lower Chippewa Basin educator to assure that time is allocated to information and education activities (planning, materials development, dissemination) needed to implement NR 151 in Chippewa County. Before January 1, 2005, develop a structured work plan for a regional information and education project.*

5. Assist Chippewa County and the basin educator, where possible, with implementation of the I&E program.

IV. Component 4a: Determine Current Compliance through Records Inventory

A. The parties agree:

1. Many crop and livestock producers in Chippewa County, working independently or through public agencies, have adopted conservation practices as part of routine operations.

2. Since 1990, a significant public investment has been made (through the WI Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Abatement Program, the WI Soil and Water Resource Management Program, and the Chippewa County Land Conservation Program) to assist owners of croplands and livestock facilities to install best management practices to control agricultural nonpoint source pollution.

3. As a result of this conservation work, there are many croplands and livestock facilities that fully or partially comply with the agricultural performance standards and prohibitions.

4. Sections NR151.09(3)(b) and NR 151.095(4)(b) require existing cropland practices and livestock facilities that achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions to remain in compliance regardless of public cost share.

5. Sections NR 151.09(3)(d) and NR 151.095(4)(d) require new cropland practices and livestock facilities to comply with performance standards and prohibitions regardless of cost share.

6. To establish a baseline for program implementation, it is in the public's interest that documentation be made of the location of cropland practices and livestock facilities that were in compliance as of October 1, 2002, and to inform the landowners, in writing, of the compliance determination and the requirements to maintain compliance.

7. To date, there has been no effort to conduct a systematic review of public records to document the location of cropland practices and livestock facilities that were in existence as of the effective date of the rule, or to determine their compliance status.

8. Without an effort to review public records and determine compliance, cropland owners and livestock operators will not be aware of their current compliance status or their obligations to meet or maintain the agricultural nonpoint performance standards and prohibitions, either with or without cost share.

9. State cost-share agreements, subject to contractual obligations of active operation and maintenance plans on or after October 1, 2002, can be used to document the extent of current compliance achieved through previous public investments.

10. Chippewa County will use the tax parcel as the basic geographic unit for evaluating and reporting compliance. Where a tax parcel contains more than one livestock facility or cropland practice, the evaluation and reporting system will contain information to distinguish between facilities and practices based on whether they are new, existing, in compliance and out of compliance.

B. Chippewa County will:

1. Before July 1, 2004, use State-funded priority watershed staff to compile a list of current State cost-share agreements, subject to contractual obligations of an active operation and maintenance plan in effect on or after October 1, 2002.

2. Before July 1, 2005 use State funded priority watershed staff to review these state cost share agreements and associated records to determine:

   a. The status of contract completion, including: the installation of conservation practices; required operation and maintenance periods; the implementation of associated operation and maintenance plans.
   b. The date of the last site visit conducted to verify or confirm compliance with terms of existing conservation contracts.

3. From the records review, make a preliminary determination as to the location of cropland practices and livestock facilities that were clearly in compliance with all performance standards and prohibitions applicable to the parcel.

4. From the records review, identify the location of parcels and operations that have records that are inconclusive and warrant an on-site evaluation to determine compliance under Component 4b.

   Note: The County will evaluate whole tax parcels, as maintained on the Chippewa County Real Property Tax Listing, to determine the extent of compliance with each agricultural nonpoint performance standard and prohibition which may apply to that parcel.

5. Document results of the compliance determination on standardized evaluation forms and compliance status report formats developed by the County.

C. DNR will:

1. Review Chippewa County records evaluation forms and compliance status report forms for consistency with status determination and notification requirements under NR 151.09 and NR 151.095.

2. Provide information to Chippewa County from the DNR CAOS database as it pertains to any Duncan Creek Priority Watershed and targeted runoff management project cost-share contracts.

3. With regard to large scale livestock operations permitted under chapter NR 243:

   a. Compile records of existing WPDES permits for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO) and evaluate these records to determine compliance with NR 151 agricultural performance standards and prohibitions. (Note: As of March 31, 2004 DNR has issued WPDES permits to Jenio-Turkey Store and Five Star Dairy)
   b. When coverage applies, incorporate into WPDES permits standards that equal or exceed the requirements of NR151. (Note: The WPDES permit does not cover cropped fields where manure is not applied)

c. Follow the compliance strategy and provide the County with copies of inspection check sheets and inspection letters sent to the facility. (Note: This strategy calls for two inspections every five years.)
d. Provide the County with copies of portions of the WPDES permit application that describe a facility's manure storage, animal yards, and locations.
e. Provide the County with copies of the manure management plan and its amendments that describe field locations, restrictions, manure application rates, and verification that fields meet "T".

Note: The manure management prohibitions are contained in the permit, nutrient management through the manure management plan requires meeting N&P recommendation of UW Ext., meeting "T" is shown by 590 farm plan or some other approved equivalent, clean water diversions are met with the "zero" discharge up to the 25 year storm. Manure storage is met with requirement of NRCS standard and review of plans before construction and required monitoring by operator.

Component 4b: Determine Compliance through On-Site Evaluation

A. The parties agree:

1. On-site evaluations are often necessary to document current resource conditions and current management practices, as a basis for determining compliance.

2. The accuracy of on-site evaluations will be enhanced if formal evaluation procedures and protocol are established, and standardized evaluation forms are adopted.

3. Greater consistency in conducting on-site evaluations can be achieved if a structured training program is established to educate staff about the standards, evaluation procedures, and requirements for program documentation.

4. The protocol and process for responding to public animal waste complaints, registered under NR243, has been previously established and is routinely administered through the cooperation of the DNR and the LCC (DNR/DATCP MOU, 1987).

5. New or expanding livestock facilities subject to regulations under NR 243 or the Chippewa County Manure Storage Ordinance should be evaluated for compliance with performance standards and prohibitions. The evaluation should be conducted prior to issuance of the state or county permits.

B. Chippewa County will:

1. Conduct on-site evaluations for whole tax parcels, as maintained on the Chippewa County Real Property Tax Listing, to determine the extent of compliance with each agricultural nonpoint performance standard and prohibition which may apply to that parcel.

2. Before December 31, 2005, as part of the Duncan Creek Priority Watershed close-out schedule, conduct on-site evaluations to complete a baseline inventory of compliance for all cost-share agreement holders.

3. Beginning June 1, 2004, within the limits of staff funding allocated by the State, systematically conduct onsite compliance evaluations for livestock facilities and cropping practices that meet any of the following criteria:

   a. Apply for State cost-share funds, administered by Chippewa County
   b. Request on-site evaluations through the Chippewa County Voluntary Farm Evaluation and Certification Program
   c. Seek permits issued through the Chippewa County Animal Waste Storage Ordinance.
   d. Are subject to a public complaint, submitted to the County or DNR .

4. Beginning June 1, 2004, ((date) NR243 M.O.U. protocol) systematically respond to public complaints, which allege that there is violation of state agricultural nonpoint performance standards and prohibitions, or which allege that there is an agricultural nonpoint discharge that may have an impact on waters of the state.

5. Within limits of State funding, attempt to conduct and document a minimum of 10-15 on-site livestock evaluations per year, and a minimum of 30-300 onsite cropland tax parcel evaluations per year.

6. Consult with DNR concerning non-routine evaluations, including evaluations of livestock facilities that are expanding and require DNR WPDES or county permits.

C. DNR will:

1. As part of the County LCC's annual work planning process have the opportunity to provide:

   a. The location of livestock facilities and cropland parcels where, if standards are not implemented, there is a high potential for nonpoint discharge which may result in a significant impact to waters of the state.
   b. Correspondence to the County requesting that an onsite evaluation be conducted, and a report be generated, to determine and to document the extent of current compliance.

2. Provide a structured training framework and training opportunities to educate DNR and County staff about the agricultural performance standards and prohibitions, procedures for making compliance determinations, and policy aspects of program administration.

3. Assist in developing and administering training about the use of management practices to achieve and maintain compliance with performance standards and prohibitions.

4. Assist in the identification of environmental models, site review checklists, and other assessment tools used to evaluate compliance. Assist in providing training.

5. Develop and provide standardized example evaluation forms and a companion electronic form/software application.

6. Provide assistance to the county in making status determinations for high priority or potentially controversial situations, such as those that may require notification (See Attachment A, Letter Types C and D), lead to enforcement actions or may potentially be handled by the DNR under NR 243.

7. Establish and implement a quality assurance program to establish and maintain a predefined standard of administrative performance.

8. Beginning June 1, 2004, (using 1987 NR243 M.O.U. protocol) systematically respond to public complaints registered under NR243, which allege that there is violation of state agricultural nonpoint performance standards and prohibitions, or which allege that there is an agricultural nonpoint discharge that may have an impact on waters of the state.

9. Consult with Chippewa County concerning non-routine evaluations, including evaluations of livestock facilities that are expanding and require DNR WPDES or county permits.

V. Component 5: Prepare Report and Notify Landowners of Compliance Status

A. The parties agree:

1. To be valid, the results of a record review and/or on-site compliance evaluation must be documented and be based upon confirmed facts.

2. A standardized report format will allow for the systematic collection and reporting of evaluation results and will provide consistency through time.

3. A local process, independent of a formal administrative appeal under chapter 227, Wis. Stats., can be used to provide for a structured review of any local decision pertaining to an initial finding of compliance or other decision involving the interpretation of NR 151 or ATCP 50.

4. Farm evaluation forms, compliance status reports and associated correspondence are public records that should be retained by a custodial agency.

5. The compliance status report is a document that can be used to inform the landowner about the compliance status of his/her operation, seek confirmation of information used to determine current compliance, and, if necessary, resolve disagreements regarding compliance status.

6. The information included in a compliance status report provides important baseline information needed to determine and to secure and allocate funding and technical assistance to address on-farm conservation needs.

7. A geographic data base and record keeping system is necessary to provide ready access to compliance reports completed over time.
Note: The record-keeping system is the basis for a detailed accounting of the compliance history for each parcel evaluated. Information required for each tax parcel includes: location; receiving water; status (new; existing; in compliance; not in compliance) for each performance standard and prohibition applicable to the parcel; cost-share requirements; cost-share availability; notification history; compliance deadline; best management practice application & certification history; compliance history.

8. Mapping can be used to show the cumulative location of cropland parcels and livestock facilities that have been evaluated, and the associated compliance status of these lands and facilities.

B. Chippewa County will:

1. Establish a local process to provide for reconsideration of local administrative decisions regarding findings of compliance as established in a compliance report. The LCC will be the administrative body that reconsiders decisions made by County staff in implementing NR 151.

2. Prepare a compliance status report to document the results of each record review and on-site evaluation conducted for a livestock facility or cropping practice. The compliance status report will include the following information:

   a. Parcel status (new versus existing)
   b. The current compliance status of individual tax parcels with reference to each of the performance standards and prohibitions.
   c. Corrective measure options and rough cost estimates to comply with each of the performance standards and prohibitions for which a parcel is not in compliance.
   d. Status of eligibility (costs eligible) for public cost sharing.
   e. Grant funding sources and technical assistance available from Federal, State, and local sources, and third party service providers.
   f. An explanation of conditions that apply if public cost share funds are used.
   g. Signature lines indicating landowner agreement or disagreement with report findings.
   h. The purpose of the report, the implications for achieving and maintaining compliance.
   i. Process and procedures to discuss evaluation results with county and or state.
   j. If appropriate, a copy of performance standards and prohibitions and technical design standards.

3. Provide a copy of the compliance status report and review it with each landowner to explain the content of the report and procedures available to contest the findings or request a reevaluation. In doing so, the County will use the administrative process outlined in the flowchart included in Appendix A. This includes preparing, signing and delivering to landowners Letter Types A and B from Appendix A.

4. In circumstances where the facts and findings of the compliance status report are not agreed to by the landowner, gather additional information and/or provide the landowner with written procedures and a timeframe to pursue reconsideration of local decisions.

5. In circumstances where livestock facilities or cropping practices are not in compliance, assess the relative pollution threat associated with the noncompliance and make a determination regarding the allocation of staff and financial resources under Section 6 of this agreement.

6. Keep and maintain public records, as the custodial authority, following requirements of the Wisconsin Open Records Law.

7. Develop and maintain a geographically-based recordkeeping system and database to record the location where farm evaluations have been conducted and where compliance status reports have been issued. At a minimum, the database will contain the following information:

   a. Location of parcel(s) evaluated as included in the compliance status report, recorded by Town, Range, Section and ¼ ¼ section.
   b. Watershed where parcel is located
   c. Owner of land at time of notification.
   d. Date of compliance report.
   e. Date compliance report mailed to landowner.
   f. End date for landowner request of status report appeal or reconsideration.
   g. Date of request for reconsideration of compliance report (if submitted).
   h. Date letter mailed to landowner.

8. Upon completion of the process, record the compliance status of each livestock facility and cropping practice on the Chippewa County Track Index. The public documents to be formally recorded will be restricted to the following:

   a. Public cost-share and stipulation agreements.
   b. Letters of compliance issued to document that all standards and prohibitions specified under NR151 are met (Status Letter B).
   c. Letters of compliance issued to document that select standards and prohibitions specified on a cost-share or stipulation agreement are met (Status Letter E).

9. Develop and maintain a GIS web-based index map showing:

   a. The location of all tax parcels where compliance reports have been issued.
   b. The locations where letters (Letter Type A, B) have been sent.
   c. The date of the last revision.
   d. The compliance status of the parcel.

10. Upon completion of the administrative process, issue and record a letter of compliance for each livestock facility and cropping practice, referenced to the appropriate tax parcel through the Chippewa County Track Index.

C. DNR will:

1. Co-sign Letter Types A and B in cases where it concurs with the County's findings.

2. Provide support to Chippewa County in explaining compliance determinations that DNR assisted in developing.

VIa. <u>Component 6A: Secure Funding and Technical Assistance</u>

A. The parties agree:

1. Previous commitments for cost-share funding have been made through cost-share agreements signed under the Duncan Creek Priority Watershed Project.

2. Section 281.16(3), Wis. Stats., and sections NR151.09(3)(c), and NR151.095(4)(d) prohibit the State or municipalities from requiring that "existing" practices and facilities , which were not in compliance with the agricultural performance standards and prohibitions on the effective date of the rule, to come into compliance through State regulation or local ordinance unless public cost share funds are provided for eligible costs.

3. NR151.09(3) and NR151.095(4) identify compliance requirements for owners and operators of cropland practices and livestock facilities based on whether the practices and facilities determined to be "existing" or "new", and whether cost sharing is required and made available to the landowner or operator.

4. NR151 defines cost share availability requirements for funding administered by DNR under 281.65, Stats. ATCP 50 defines cost-share availability from any other source. These requirements must be clearly understood to ensure that proper determinations of cost-share availability, are made by DNR and County staff.

5. Cost-share funds to pursue compliance are now available from a combination of public and private non-profit grant sources, including: the Duncan Creek Priority Watershed Project, the DATCP Soil and Water Management Program (SWRM), the DNR Targeted Runoff Management Program (TRM), USDA cost-share and land set-aside programs and nonprofit organizations.

6. Developing cost-share funding proposals and grant contracts from single or multiple grant sources, requires significant knowledge of multiple grant programs, administrative rules, and contracting requirements.

B. Chippewa County will:

1. In circumstances where a cost share contract in the Duncan Creek Priority Watershed has not been fully implemented and where nonpoint performance standards and prohibitions are currently met, offer the producer the option of pursuing the contract, as previously agreed to, or the option of amending the contract to remove conservation practices which are not necessary to achieve compliance. The County will remove practices only if consistent with the priority watershed plan.

   Note: The option for removing contracted procedures will not be extended to "critical sites", previously identified by DNR as necessary to meet watershed plan pollution reduction goals.

2. Through its fiscal policy and grants management strategy, reserve a portion of state cost-share funds available through the DATCP Land and Water grants program for applicants that participate in the Chippewa County Voluntary Farm Evaluation and Certification Program. These funds will be allocated where:

   a. Croplands or livestock facilities that have not met the agricultural nonpoint standards and prohibitions since their effective dates; or

b. Agricultural nonpoint standards are now met and where additional conservation practices will achieve significant public water quality benefits, including circumstances where:
   i. the pollutant source has no applicable standard, or where
   ii. the existing nonpoint standards are not adequate to meet the State water quality standards or management objective for the water body.

3. Through its fiscal policy and grants management strategy, reserve a portion of state cost-share funding through the DATCP Land and Water grants program for cropland practices and livestock facilities that choose to not voluntarily come into compliance with standards and prohibitions, as determined through an evaluation conducted in response to a public complaint or a request submitted by DNR.

4. Within the limits of State staffing grants, apply for additional cost-share funds available through the DNR TRM grant program to provide offers of cost-share to achieve compliance with NR 151.

5. Convey to the responsible USDA agencies (NRCS and FSA) the County's preference to prioritize and allocate a portion of Federal cost share funds to applicants that participate in the Chippewa County Voluntary Farm Evaluation Program that do not, as yet, fully meet the State's agricultural nonpoint performance standards and prohibitions.

6. Within the limits of State staffing grants, pursue new sources of local, state and federal funds for applicants that participate in the Chippewa County Voluntary Farm Evaluation Program if required to implement performance standards and prohibitions.

7. Evaluate the availability of County staff to implement NR151.09 and NR151.095, and allocate effort based upon the availability of State staffing grants and/or direct reimbursement provided by DNR and/or DATCP for the purpose of implementing agricultural performance standards and prohibitions.

8. Evaluate and allocate County staff toward implementation of NR151.09 and NR151.095, based upon the availability of State staffing grants and/or direct reimbursement provided by DNR and/or DATCP for the explicit purpose of implementing agricultural performance standards and prohibitions through NR151.09 and NR151.095.

9. Within the limits of State staffing grants, make staffing commitments necessary to support the installation of conservation practices.

C. DNR will:

1. Assist Chippewa County in determining what constitutes an adequate offer of cost sharing under s. 281.65, Stats and chapters NR 153 and NR 154.

2. Establish procedures with DATCP to confirm availability of cost-share funding from sources other than s. 281.65.

VIb. Component 6B: Option to Issue Non-Voluntary NR151 Notice of Cost-Share

A. Parties Agree:

1. In nearly all circumstances, landowners will be willing and able to implement conservation practices on a voluntary basis as necessary to comply with performance standards and prohibitions. In some instances, a landowner may not be willing to do so.

2. Chapter NR 151.09 and NR 151.095 set forth notification requirements that must be met before DNR can initiate enforcement action under Ch. 281, Stats., for non-compliance with performance standards and prohibitions. This includes provision of a notification to the landowner at the time that cost sharing is made available, or in cases when cost share is not required, when the compliance achievement period starts.

3. Notification requirements and cost-share availability requirements vary depending upon the legal authority that is used to enforce the standards and the source of funding. These requirements are documented in Appendix A.

4. Developing and issuing notices of cost sharing under the non-voluntary NR151 option is a joint responsibility of Chippewa County and DNR.

B. Chippewa County will:

1. Within limits of State staffing grants, and with input from DNR regional staff, prepare draft landowner notifications under NR 151.09 (5-6) and NR 151.095 (6-7) using DNR templates (See Letter Types C and D, Appendix A).

   Note: This includes situations where an existing cost share contract in the Duncan Creek Priority Watershed has not been implemented to meet nonpoint performance standards and prohibitions and where DNR and County staff determine the site is a high priority for issuing the notice.

2. Provide draft notices to DNR regional staff for completion and DNR signature.

C. DNR will:

1. Sign and issue notices (Appendix A, Letter Types C & D) to landowners under NR 151.09 and NR 151.095.

VII. Component 7. Administer Funding and Technical Assistance/Re-evaluate Parcel

A. The parties agree:

1. If public cost share funds are offered to install conservation practices, through either the voluntary or non-voluntary option, a cost share agreement must be developed and public funds must be accounted for.

2. Cost-share agreements have historically been developed by professional staff who have a working knowledge of administrative rules, contracting procedures, agronomy and agricultural engineering.

3. A "farm conservation planning process" has historically been used to:

   a. Compile physical information which describes the production potential and limitations of agricultural land.
   b. Document current management practices which are being used to manage the crop and livestock production.
   c. Inform and educate landowners of conservation practices which are available to meet conservation objectives.
   d. Document the location and scheduled implementation of conservation practices as a basis for cost share contract development.

4. A site evaluation and engineering process has historically been used to:

   a. Inventory and evaluate sources of agricultural runoff and nonpoint pollution.
   b. Identify management options and best management practices to control runoff.
   c. Prepare cost estimates of the available management options as a basis for decision making and contracting.
   d. Survey and design the selected management system.
   e. Layout and supervise the construction of the runoff system.
   f. Through post construction inspections, verify that the runoff system was constructed according to the design.

5. The successful completion of the conservation planning, contracting, and engineering process requires a broad range of skills and services in the fields of agronomy, engineering, and public administration.

6. The DNR, DATCP, and County have, through the Wisconsin Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Abatement Program and the Soil and Water Management Program, recruited, supported, and maintained a technical delivery staff with proven expertise in administering a nonpoint pollution abatement program for the purpose of meeting agricultural performance standards and prohibitions.

B. The County will:

1. Within the limits of state staffing grants, establish and administer a budget and accounting system to receive and disperse state funds administered by the County on behalf of the State.

2. Within the limits of state staffing grants, employ or contract professional staff for the purpose of developing and administrating cost share contracts on behalf of state and federal agencies.

When administering state or local cost-share agreements, the agreement will stipulate (or will be accompanied by a separate stipulation agreement) that the affected cropland practices and livestock facilities will maintain or be brought into compliance with applicable performance standards and prohibitions, as enumerated in the compliance status report. These cost-share documents will be recorded:

The status of each cost-share agreement will be maintained as part of the geographic database and record keeping system described in Section V.B.6.

3. Within the limits of state staffing grants, employ or contract a certified agronomist or conservation planner, for the purpose of providing conservation planning services to landowners, or for the purpose of reviewing the adequacy of conservation plans prepared by private service providers or federal agency staff.

4. Within the limits of state staff grants, employ or contract a licensed engineer, for the purpose of providing engineering design services, assuring construction oversight and evaluating and certifying installation of conservation practices to meet the agricultural performance standards and prohibitions, or for the purpose of reviewing the adequacy of engineering designs, and evaluating and certifying installation of conservation practices through review of "as-built" surveys provided by third party service providers (private sector or USDA conservation delivery system).

5. In circumstances where conservation planning or engineering services are provided to the landowner as a reimbursable expense under the DNR TRM Program or USDA cost share programs account for conservation planning and engineering expenses and bill the landowner at a standardized hourly rate upon completion of the contracted practice.

6. Upon completion of best management practices implemented through the cost share agreement, conduct an onsite evaluation of the operation to document compliance with the agricultural nonpoint performance standards and prohibitions.

7. Provide to DNR a draft letter of satisfaction to be issued to the landowner (See Letter Type E, Appendix A). Record this compliance following procedures in Section IV and V of this agreement.

8. Within the limits of state staffing grants, conduct ongoing compliance monitoring through Operation and Management (O&M Plan) support.

C. The DNR will:

1. Provide direct reimbursement to the County for engineering services performed to design and install best management practices through the TRM grant program.

2. With DATCP, seek to secure sources of funding to reimburse the County for its administrative and technical services.

3. Within the limits of available funding, conduct program reviews to verify that cost share funding and conservation services have been administered in accordance with appropriate state administrative rules.

4. Sign and mail satisfaction letters to landowners.

VIII. Component 8: Enforcement

A. The parties agree:

1. DNR and Chippewa County will use voluntary means, to the extent practical, to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions, but may use enforcement when necessary to meet requirements of ch. 281, Stats., and NR151.

2. Each party has independent authority to enforce standards and reserves the right to exercise that authority without permission of the other.

3. To be effective, the public and affected landowners must perceive enforcement as a necessary option, pursued jointly by the parties, after voluntary measures to achieve compliance have failed.

4. Chippewa County has authority to enforce the performance standards and prohibitions under s. 281.16, Stats., but has chosen not to do so at this time.

5. DNR has authority to enforce performance standards and prohibitions through a number of statutory options. These include, but are not limited to:
   a. Referral by DNR to the Wisconsin Department of Justice to seek relief under s. 281.98, Wis. Stats.,
   b. Use of enforcement procedures under NR 243 and s. 283.89, Stats., to obtain compliance with performance standards and prohibitions or to resolve a water quality problem.
   c. Use of other state laws, including citation authority under s. 29.601, Wis. Stats.

6. To be effective, enforcement procedures must be well coordinated between DNR and Chippewa County, and must be supported by both parties.

7. NR 151.09 and NR 151.095 establish the procedures that must be followed as pre-requisites to enforcement when DNR funds are used or when DNR pursues enforcement under s. 281.98, Wis. Stats.

8. The start of formal enforcement procedures are recognized to begin with the issuance of a Notice of Violation. Grounds for issuing a Notice of Violation letter is non-compliance by the landowner or operator with the notice issued under NR 151.09(5), NR 151.09(6), NR 151.095(6), or NR 151.095(7) and Component 6 of this agreement.

B. Chippewa County Will:

1. Support DNR's lead role in enforcement.

2. Identify cases where landowners do not follow the requirements of their noncompliance notices and provide this information to the DNR.

3. Participate in DNR enforcement conferences.

4. Provide background information to DNR needed for WPDES permits or to develop referral packages to the Wisconsin Department of Justice.

5. Provide testimony, documents or other technical support for enforcement cases.

6. In circumstances where the County has issued permits or is pursuing legal actions under other authority, ensure that appropriate information concerning those permits or enforcement activity is transmitted to DNR.

C. DNR will:

1. Take the lead role in initiating enforcement action, including issuing notices of violation.

2. Ensure that appropriate information concerning enforcement activity by the Department is transmitted to the County.

3. Schedule and conduct enforcement conferences if appropriate.

4. If a point source discharge exists, issue a WPDES permit or take enforcement action under NR 243 and ch. 283, Stats., if consistent with regional and statewide permitting priorities.

5. Determine compliance with permits if consistent with regional and statewide compliance activities.

6. Prepare referral packages to Attorney General's Office if non-compliance continues and referral is approved by the DNR Secretary's Office.

IX. Component 9. Ongoing Compliance Monitoring

A. The parties agree:

1. NR151.09(3)(b) and NR151.095(4)(b) require that existing cropland practices and livestock facilities, which are in compliance on or after October 1, 2002, remain in compliance without the offer of cost share.

2. Ongoing agricultural operations are dynamic in nature and continually change in response to market forces, changes in technology, and changes in land ownership.

3. Periodic evaluations are of direct value to current owners and operators, as they make routine business decisions which affect their agricultural operation, including those related to capital investments, land rental, and land sales.

4. Routine compliance monitoring is of direct value to the general public as a way to verify that compliance is maintained..

B. Chippewa County will:

1. For those operations that have received a letter indicating compliance (Appendix A, Letter Type A, B or E), implement a system of routine compliance monitoring. The extent of monitoring will be directly proportional to the amount of State funding allocated specifically to support this effort.

2. Under the monitoring system:

   a. Conduct an annual reporting and self-certification program for operations that have an active State cost share contract subject to a 10 year Operation and Maintenance Plan.
   b. Conduct an annual educational mailing in association with the annual property tax billing for operations that are in compliance, but no longer subject to provisions of an active operation and maintenance plan.

3. Assume a lead role in responding to public complaints following protocol for compliant response, procedures for site evaluation, and determinations as established in Sections 4 and 5 of this agreement.

X. Component 10: Annual Reporting

A. The parties agree:

1. Annual reports can be used track progress toward implementing the NR151 agricultural nonpoint performance standards and prohibitions.

2. The information contained in an annual report must be systematically collected and be readily available from the County's record-keeping system.

3. DNR will work with DATCP to collect information which can be compiled into an annual State-wide report to document the status of program implementation.

4. To assure that the appropriate information is gathered, the State agencies must define, in advance, what information each agency intends to request in order to monitor the status of program implementation, and the extent to which the standards have been applied

B. Chippewa County will:

1. By April 15 of each year, summarize and report to DNR information that summarizes the general compliance status of livestock facilities and cropland in the County. Information will be conveyed on reporting forms provided by DNR.

   Note: Starting in 2005, NR 151 performance standards/prohibitions reporting form will be combined with LWRM reporting form.

2. The report will be augmented by a map that will show the cumulative location of cropland parcels and livestock operations which have been evaluated, and the associated compliance status of these lands and operations.

C. DNR will:

1. Develop an annual reporting form by which Counties will report the extent of confirmed compliance and the remaining workload to complete site evaluations to determine compliance.

   Note: Information in the annual report is anticipated to include the following, summarized by county, watershed and performance standard/prohibition: total number of fields and facilities (estimate); portion of total that has been assessed (estimate); number of fields and facilities assessed (actual); number of assessed fields and facilities that are in compliance (actual); portion of assessed fields and facilities that are in compliance (actual).

2. Provide the form electronically to the County at least 2 months prior to the deadline for conveyance to DNR

3. Compile the County data from the report into a state-wide report to be presented to the Land and Water Conservation Board, DNR Board, Agricultural Board, Wisconsin Legislature, and other interested parties.

   Note: DNR intends to develop this report jointly with DATCP.

Signatures

_____ _____
Dan Masterpole, County Conservationist — date
Chippewa County Land Conservation Department

_____ _____
Chair — date
Chippewa County Land Conservation Committee

_____ _____
John Paddock, Lower Chippewa Basin Leader — date
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

_____ _____
Russ Rasmussen, Runoff Management Section Chief — date
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Appendix 5

Chippewa County Soil and Water Conservation Standards, 6/25/04

Chippewa County Soil and Water Conservation Standards

SECTION I. Authority, Purpose and Applicability.

This policy and these standards are established by the Chippewa County Land Conservation Committee (LCC) pursuant to s. 92.07, 92.104, s. 92.105, 92.14, Wis. Stats., ATCP 50.16, Wis. Adm. Code, and related guidelines adopted by the Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Board under s. 92.105(2), Wis. Stats.

The policy establishes the local soil and water conservation standards to be administered in conjunction with State agricultural nonpoint pollution control standards and prohibitions established under Wis. Stats. 281, NR151, and ATCP 50, Wis. Adm. Codes.

These standards will be implemented by the LCC under s. 92.14, Wis. Stats., and ATCP 50.10, Wis. Adm. Code. Conformance with these standards and procedures will be necessary for landowners to:

A. Establish and maintain eligibility for farmland preservation tax credits under sections and Subchapter IX of Chapter 71, and ss. 92.104 and 92.105, Wis. Stats.

B. Receive technical assistance or cost-share funding administered by the LCC under s. 92.14, 281.16(5) or 281.65, Wis. Stats, and ATCP 50.10.

These standards shall be systematically applied in the following local program applications:

1. Farmland preservation agreements which are applied for after the formal approval and adoption of these standards by the Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Board and Chippewa County.

   Note: Farmland Preservation agreements applied for prior to the approval and adoption shall be allowed to meet soil and water conservation requirements previously established under s. 91.13(8)(d), Wis. Stats., and adopted June 11, 1986.

2. Applications for State farmland preservation tax credits on land located in a district zoned exclusive agricultural use.

3. State and County funded cost-share agreements, entered between the County and individual landowners under s. 92.14, Wis. Stats., after adoption of the Chippewa County Land and Water Resource Management Plan by the Wisconsin Land and Water Board and the Chippewa County Board.

4. Other circumstances, which are defined through separate County Board resolution or ordinance, adopted after approval of these standards.

SECTION II. Definitions.

A. "Committee" means the Chippewa County Land Conservation Committee.

B. "Cropland" means land used for the growing and harvesting of grains, legumes, grasses, fruits or vegetables; including land used for such purposes that may occasionally be used for livestock pasture.

C. "Department" means the Chippewa County Land Conservation Department.

D. "Ephemeral gully erosion" means a classification of erosion distinct from sheet and rill erosion, and from classic gully erosion which is caused by runoff in natural drainageways and which results in recurrent erosion channels of a size which can be obliterated through normal tillage operations.

E. "Farmland" means lands used for any agricultural uses defined in s. 91.01(1), Wis. Stats., including beekeeping; commercial feedlots; dairying; egg production; floriculture; fish or fur farming; forest and game management; grazing; livestock raising; orchards; plant greenhouses and nurseries; poultry raising, raising of grain, grass, mint and seed crops; raising of fruits; nuts and berries; sod farming; placing land in federal programs in return for payments in kind; and vegetable raising.

F. "Participant" means a landowner who owns land that is subject to a farmland preservation agreement or is included on a zoning certificate under the provisions of s. 71.59(1), Wis. Stats.

G. "Landowner" means any of the following:
-A person who owns a parcel of land, or
-a person who rents, controls, or uses a parcel of land for agricultural purposes.

H. "RUSLE 2" means the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation - Revision 2, a mathematical formula used to estimate or predict average annual soil erosion rates due to sheet and rill erosion caused by rainstorms on specified land areas.

I. "Technical Guide" means the Wisconsin edition of the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service Technical Guide.

J. "T-Value" means 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. T-Values of soils are specified in Sections I and II of the Technical Guide.

K. "Wetland" means land that has a predominance of hydric soils and that is inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances does support, a prevalence of hydrophtic vegetation typically adopted for life in saturated conditions.

L. "Wind Erosion Equation" means the mathematical formula for estimating or predicting average annual soil erosion rates due to wind erosion, as described in Section I of the Technical Guide.

SECTION III. County Soil and Water Standard(s).

The following soil and water conservation standards are established pursuant to s. 92.07 and 92.105, Wis. Stats. The standards to be implemented are those required under ATCP 50.04(1), (2) and (3), Wis. Admin. Code, and those included in parts A and B of this section.

A. Manage land to achieve compliance with agricultural nonpoint pollution performance standards and prohibitions as established in Wis. Stats. 281, and ATCP 50.04 and NR151, Wis. Adm. Code, according to a schedule of compliance established by the committee.

Explanatory Note [1]: With regard to sheet, rill, and wind erosion control as referenced in 50.04(2) and NR151.02, soil erosion on cropland will be managed to achieve and maintain a soil erosion rate equal to, or less than, the "tolerable" (T) rate on individual fields and management areas. Soil erosion rates shall be determined for each soil type and cropland management area through use of the mathematical formula titled: Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE 2), or if applicable, a documented wind erosion equation.

In planning and managing cropping systems using RUSLE 2, all areas of concentrated flow identified on the Chippewa County Soil Survey, located within the managed crop area, shall be managed to prevent channelized rill and ephemeral gully erosion from concentrated runoff by:

1. Installing a constructed waterway system, or
2. Establishing and maintaining a protective sod cover, or
3. Maintaining a permanent cover of crop residue sufficient to demonstrate that channelized rills will not form, or
4. Implementing other performance based measures sufficient to demonstrate that channelized rills will not form.

This erosion standard shall be applied in all cases when RUSLE 2, or an affiliated model using RUSLE 2 outputs, is used to:

1. Estimate rates of soil erosion, sediment delivery, or phosphorus delivery, for the purpose of administering a state agricultural performance standard or prohibition, or
2. Plan a cropping system or a nutrient or pest management system used to meet a state agricultural performance standard or prohibition.

Explanatory Note [2]: With regard to nutrient management plans referenced in 50.04(3), the nutrient management plans will be reviewed and verified based upon plan specifications established in the Technical Guide and the requirements of ATCP 50.04(3)(a-g).

B. Conduct agricultural activities without draining, filling, flooding, or otherwise altering the hydrology of mapped wetlands. This standard shall apply to all wetlands meeting defined criteria established in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual. This standard shall be administered in conjunction with the general regulations of Section 3.0 through 7.0 of the Chippewa County Shoreland Zoning Ordinance, the provisions of Chapters 30 and 31 of the Wisconsin Statutes, and other state and federal law when applicable.

Agricultural activities allowed under this standard are those which are conducted without filling, flooding, excavating, dredging, ditching, tiling, or otherwise draining wetlands including:

1. All cropland activities, including the growing and harvesting of grains, legumes, grasses, fruits or vegetables which can be periodically supported in dry years.
2. The pasturing of livestock.
3. Silviculture practices including the planting, thinning, and harvesting of timber.
4. Harvesting of wild crops including marsh hay, wild rice, berries, tree fruits, and seeds in a manner that is not injurious to the natural reproductives of such crops.
5. All other agricultural activities supporting "Farmland" as defined in Section IID.

Explanatory Note[3]: With regard to wetland standards, referenced in Section IIIB, these standards do not apply to road construction or maintenance activities conducted by State, County, or Town highway authorities in the public road right of way.

SECTION IV. Schedule of Compliance.

The soil and water conservation standards in NR151, ATCP 50.04, and Section III of these standards shall be achieved and maintained according to a schedule of compliance established by the committee.

A. With respect to the agricultural nonpoint pollution performance standards and prohibitions of Section IIIA, the committee may use a schedule of compliance to schedule technical services and cost-share funding to assist the landowner to achieve compliance. In setting the length of the schedule, the committee shall consider:

1. The physical properties and nature of the landscape.
2. The extent of current compliance.
3. The on and offsite environmental impacts of noncompliance.
4. The availability of public funding and technical service from public agencies.
5. The financial and technical limitations of the County.

If adequate, progress is made in pursuing compliance through the schedule. Landowners will have up to five (5) years to achieve full compliance with the standards.

B. With respect to standards for wetlands management enumerated in Section IIIB:

1. The standard shall go into effect at the time the applicant files an application for a farmland preservation agreement, first requests an exclusive agricultural zoning certificate, or signs a State or local cost-share agreement.

2. The standard shall remain in effect for the contractual period of the farmland preservation commitment, or for the contractual period of a State or local cost-share or service agreement.

SECTION V. Variances.

A. The committee may authorize a variance from the schedule of compliance when, upon a showing by the landowner, unnecessary hardship would result from meeting the schedule of compliance. The grant of a variance for unnecessary hardship must be based on findings by the committee that:

1. The schedule of compliance, by itself, would preclude a reasonable return from the land in question.

2. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances and not to the general conditions of the area which may reflect the unreasonableness of the schedule of compliance itself; and

3. The conditions authorized by the variance will not have significant off-site impacts.

All requests for variances shall be submitted by the applicant on forms provided by the County and shall be accompanied by written documentation which is adequate to support an objective analysis and finding of fact.

B. With respect to variances from the schedule of compliance to achieve the agricultural nonpoint pollution performance standards and prohibitions, the unavailability of cost-sharing funds to install needed practices, by itself, will not be sufficient ground for the committee to grant a variance. The availability of cost-sharing funds may be considered in determining reasonable return under Section V. A. However, a variance will not be granted to allow time for the implementation of an expensive conservation practice when a less expensive practice would allow the landowner to meet the standard schedule of compliance.

C. With respect to the standard for wetland management, the committee may grant a variance for:

1. The periodic maintenance or repair of agriculture drainage systems only to the extent necessary to maintain the level of drainage required to continue existing agricultural use of the site or adjacent fields and only where permissible under Section 30.20 of Wis. Statutes and Section 9.33 of the Chippewa County Shoreland Zoning Ordinance.

2. Operational activities in support of existing cultural cranberry bogs, including flooding, dike and dam repair, and drainage system maintenance.

3. The construction and maintenance of roads which are necessary to conduct agricultural and silvicultural activities provided that:

   a. The road cannot, as a practical matter, be located outside the wetland;

   b. The road is designed and constructed to minimize the adverse impact upon the natural functions of the wetland;

   c. The road is designed and constructed with the minimum cross-sectional area practical to serve the intended use;

   d. Road construction activities are carried out in the immediate area of the roadbed only; and

   e. Any filling, flooding, draining, dredging, ditching, tiling, and excavating must be necessary for the construction or maintenance of the road.

4. The construction or maintenance of nonresidential buildings, provided that:

   a. The building cannot, as a practical matter, be located outside the wetland.

   b. Such building is not used for human habitation and does not exceed 500 square feet in floor area; and

   c. Only limited excavating and filling necessary to provide structural support for the building is allowed.

5. Other activities which would not have a significant adverse impact on the physical characteristics of the wetland.

A variance from the standard for wetland management shall not be granted if the proposed activity may result in a significant adverse impact on any of the following:

   a. Storm and flood water storage capacity.

   b. Maintenance of dry season stream flow, the discharge of groundwater to a wetland, the recharge of groundwater from a wetland to another area, or the flow of groundwater through a wetland.

   c. Filtering or storage of sediments, nutrients, heavy metals, or organic compounds that would otherwise drain into navigable waters.

   d. Shoreline protection against soil erosion.

   e. Fish spawning, breeding, nursery, or feeding grounds.

   f. Wildlife habitat; or

   g. Areas of special recreational, scenic or scientific interest, including scarce wetland types.

SECTION VI. Administration.

This policy shall be administered by the Chippewa County Land Conservation Department, under the direction of the Land Conservation Committee. The County Conservationist will be responsible for the daily administration of these standards and procedures. Technical assistance may also be provided by available staff of other designated state or federal agencies.

A. Onsite Evaluation.

The department will conduct an onsite evaluation to document which standards apply to each parcel or livestock facility and the extent of current compliance.

The administrative process that will be used is defined in the document titled: Implementation Strategy for NR151 Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions, (2/5/03).

For participants who are subject to or who are out of compliance with the standards, the committee shall establish a schedule of compliance.

1. When screening for compliance with the agricultural performance standards under Section III, the land cover and cropping practices applied to fields during the preceding five year period, or full crop rotation, will be used to calculate the current rates of soil erosion.

2. When administering the wetland management standard established in Section IIIB:

   a. The aerial extent and boundaries of wetlands shall be documented in the participant's case file. This shall include an assessment of Wisconsin Inventory Type, soil type, hydrologic regime, and current land use.

   b. The existence and condition of artificial drainage systems within, or adjacent, the wetland area shall be documented. This shall include the location, design, and maintenance of the drainage system and an assessment of the system's condition and efficiency.

   Where an apparent discrepancy exists between a wetland boundary shown on either the Wisconsin Wetland Inventory Maps or USDA wetland inventory maps, and actual field conditions. An onsite investigation shall be conducted to review the accuracy of mapped wetland boundaries.

   If the investigation shows that the wetland area was incorrectly mapped or that the wetland boundaries had been altered through natural or artificial means, the department shall inform the custodial agencies of the inconsistency and a map amendment.

B. Compliance.

1. Certification. Landowners subject to the County Soil and Water standards under Section I shall certify in writing each year that they are in compliance with the soil and water conservation standards required in Section III. For participants

with a schedule of compliance, the landowners shall certify that the annual progress to achieve required standards has or has not been accomplished. Certification may be made by mail or in person to the Chippewa County Land Conservation Department on forms provided by the committee. Certification must be made by October 31 of each year.

2. Spot Checking. The committee will systematically verify compliance with the required soil and water conservation standards at least once every four years. This determination will be made through a combination of field review and examination of aerial photos or slides.

3. Notice of Noncompliance. The committee will issue a notice of noncompliance to any landowner who does not comply with the standards in Section III, or meet conditions of a schedule of compliance under Section IV., or comply with an existing farm conservation plan.

A field inspection of the farm operation will be requested prior to issuance of the notice.

The notice will be issued in circumstances where a landowner fails to:

a. Participate in the certification process by providing information or certifying compliance with the standards.

b. Permit access for a reasonable inspection to verify compliance.

At a minimum, the notice will:

i. Disclose the nature of the violation and the timeframe for resolving the violation.
ii. Inform the landowner of administrative procedures that will be used to verify information and, if necessary, seek compliance.
iii. Inform the landowner of procedures which may be used to contest the notice.
iv. If applicable, inform the landowner that they may not claim farmland preservation tax credits until the violation is resolved.

In circumstances where the notice applies to a Farmland Preservation agreement, or exclusive agricultural zoning district tax credit claim, the "notice of noncompliance" will be forwarded to the appropriate zoning authority and the Wisconsin Department of Revenue. Landowners issued a "notice of noncompliance" under such circumstances will not be allowed to claim farmland preservation tax credits unless the "notice of noncompliance" is subsequently canceled by the committee under s. 92.104(4) or s. 92.105(5), Wis. Stats.

In circumstances where the committee issues the "notice of noncompliance" to suspend the landowners eligibility for farmland preservation tax credits, the committee may do so without offering public cost share.

4. Hearing. Prior to issuing a "notice of noncompliance" the committee will notify the affected landowner by registered mail that the committee is considering issuing the notice of noncompliance. The affected landowner will be given an opportunity at a regular committee meeting to present reasons why the notice of noncompliance should not be issued. The committee will provide at least 10 days notice to the landowner prior to the committee meeting at which the landowner should appear.

5. Cancellation of Notice of Noncompliance. If a landowner, who has been issued a "notice of noncompliance", subsequently complies with the required soil and water conservation standard(s) the committee will cancel the notice of noncompliance.

   The cancellation of the "notice of noncompliance" must be based on a request from the affected landowner and a field inspection of the farm operation. Notice of the cancellation of the notice of noncompliance will be given to the appropriate zoning authority, and the Wisconsin Department of Revenue.

SECTION VII. Annual Report.

By April 15 of each year, the committee will prepare and file with DATCP an annual report of the status of administering this policy. The report will include the number and location of parcels evaluated, the number and location of parcels complying with standards, the number and location of parcels at various stages of schedules of compliance, the type, number, and location of variances granted, and the number and location of "notices of noncompliance" issued.

At a minimum, this report shall document the activities completed during the previous year and to meet requirements of ATCP 50.18, Wis. Admin. Code.

SECTION VIII. Amendments.

This policy may be amended following a public hearing held by the committee for which a Class 2 notice shall be published. All amendments shall be consistent with the Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Board Guidelines for Soil and Water Conservation Requirements in the Farmland Preservation Program.

Appendix 6

Amendment to Chippewa County Operational Agreement Between DNR, Chippewa County Land Conservation Department, and Chippewa County Zoning Department for Stormwater Plan Review and Associated Engineering Services in Chippewa County.

LCD 2/20/02

AMENDMENT TO CHIPPEWA COUNTY OPERATIONAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN DNR, CHIPPEWA COUNTY LAND CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT, AND CHIPEWA COUNTY ZONING DEPARTMENT FOR STORMWATER PLAN REVIEW AND ASSOCIATED ENGINEERING SERVICES IN CHIPPEWA COUNTY

This is an amendment to the current operational agreement which has developed between the Chippewa County Land Conservation Committee and cooperating State and Federal resource conservation agencies.

The amendment has been drafted to clarify the responsibilities and commitment of the Chippewa County Land Conservation Department (LCD), the Chippewa County Zoning Department (ZD), and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR), as necessary to implement the requirements for designed construction site erosion control in Chippewa County.

The Department of Natural Resources and Chippewa County propose to enter into this agreement to establish a cooperative approach for review of designed erosion control and stormwater management plans for construction site erosion control. In addition, these services can be extended to other areas of DNR authority that specifically require the development and review of erosion control and stormwater management plans.

The following findings have led the Department of Natural Resources and Chippewa County to develop this agreement.

The DNR and the County acknowledge:

1. DNR is the lead agency for the administration and implementation of Administrative Rule NR216, as it relates to stormwater management and construction site erosion control.

2. The Chippewa County Zoning Department is the lead agency for receiving and approving land division proposals, administering the grading provisions of the County Shoreland Zoning Ordinance, and administering the Construction Site Erosion Control provisions of the Uniform Dwelling Code for one and two unit residential developments.

3. State Administrative Rule NR216 now requires developers to obtain stormwater discharge permits. This requirement has created a significant State agency workload associated with stormwater plan review. Anticipated changes in Federal and State requirements for erosion control and stormwater management permitting will add to the existing workload for plan review under NR216.

4. The Chippewa County LCD employs qualified staff with engineering expertise, which could be applied to assist in NR216 activities.

5. Chippewa County and the DNR Lower Chippewa River Basin Team share common goals and objectives as they pertain to the management of resources in Chippewa County

6. The Department of Natural Resources and Chippewa County have an existing operational agreement that encourages interagency cooperation to pursue common resource management objectives.

7. To optimize use of available staff and program funding, it is in the mutual interest of Chippewa County and DNR to clarify stormwater management and construction site erosion control responsibilities, and to make commitments to assist in its implementation through this amendment to the Chippewa County Operational Agreement.

The DNR and the County agree:

1. DNR and Chippewa County will share notice of any planned land disturbing activities that fall under the authority of the Department's NR216 requirements. These notices would include potential land disturbing activities associated with proposed subdivision plats and other related development proposals.

2. Preliminary plat proposals and successive Certified Survey Maps received by the Chippewa County Zoning Department will be copied and forwarded through certified mail to DNR for review and comment.

3. DNR will evaluate the preliminary plat and make a determination of the department's jurisdiction. DNR will inform the Chippewa County ZD and LCD of each jurisdictional decision. In circumstances where the State jurisdiction applies, DNR will provide copies of required plans to the Chippewa County LCD.

   Upon notice of a project, the LCD will immediately determine whether the County has available engineering staff capable to conduct the review. If it is determined that the County can not conduct the review, the County LCD will inform the DNR in writing within 48 hours.

4. Chippewa County LCD agrees to provide engineering level assistance for reviews of erosion control and stormwater management plans developed in the DNR NR216 program or requirements for River Regulation Permits.

   The LCD will review the plans using both State standards and specifications for stormwater management, erosion control, and water quality; and County standards and specifications. State BMP specifications are contained in NR104, NR103, NR102, NR216, NR151, the Wisconsin Construction Site Handbook, and Volume 1 and 2 of the Wisconsin Stormwater Manual. County standards and specifications are contained in documents titled County Stormwater Standards (dated Oct 25, 2001).

5. Chippewa County LCD will draft a Plan Review Report and forward this report to DNR and the County Zoning Department within 30 days of receipt of plans. The County *Plan Review (Report)* will address: 1. adequacy of the plans to describe the Stormwater proposal, and 2. adequacy of the proposed stormwater measures to meet the State and County standards and specifications.

6. DNR and Chippewa County LCD will cooperatively utilize site visits and inspections to help determine compliance with permitting requirements for erosion control and stormwater management practices. Site visits may be conducted during the following phases of the project: plan review, inspection of construction progress, and inspection of erosion control activities.

7. The Chippewa County LCD will develop a *Final Review of Construction (Report)* after completion of construction and final site reviews. This report will: 1. review adequacy of construction documentation provided by the landowner's engineer, and 2. document and verify installation of required practices and facilities. A copy of this report will be forwarded to the DNR and County Zoning Department.

8. The Chippewa County LCD will delegate responsibility for plan review, site visits, and construction inspection to qualified engineering staff, funded through County levy, and through a State grant allocated through the Duncan Creek Clean Water Project. Chippewa County and DNR will explore alternative grant funding sources as they become available.

9. Any party may terminated this amendment by giving 30 days prior written notice to the other parties.

Signatures

John Paddock, Wisconsin DNR — 3/6/02 date

Doug Clary, Zoning Administrator
Chippewa County Zoning Department — 3/4/02 date

Dan Masterpole, County Conservationist
Chippewa County Land Conservation Department — 2/21/02 date

Rev 20 feb2002

Appendix 7

Format for Annual Interagency Soil & Water Conservation Work Plan

DATE

RECOMMENDED FORMAT TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT ANNUAL INTERAGENCY SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION WORK PLAN
(With Example of 2019 Program)

Target Audience	Purpose	Educational Message	Delivery Mechanism	Lead & Support Agencies	Date	Method for Evaluation
General Public						
Rural Landowners						
Agricultural Producers						
Youth						
Elected Officials						