



WSNetworkNews

May 1, 2001

Click to jump to news on these WSN priority issues:

- [Arrowhead-Weston Transmission Line](#)
- [DNR Independence](#)
- [Factory Farming](#)
- [Groundwater Protection](#)
- [Mercury Reduction](#)
- [Metallic Mining](#)
- [Public Intervenor Office Restoration](#)
- [Shoreland/Wetland Protection](#)

Arrowhead-Weston Transmission Line

Xcel Energy stockholders vote on cutting ties to Manitoba Hydro

One of the United States' largest power utilities rejected a shareholder bid yesterday to cut ties with Manitoba Hydro over its treatment of the Cross Lake Cree. But lobbyists for the Pimicikamak Cree Nation say the nine per cent of Xcel Energy shareholders who supported them represent a solid first step in turning international opinion.

"It's a major accomplishment," Chief John Miswagon said yesterday after Xcel's annual meeting at the Minneapolis Convention Centre, attended by about 1,800 shareholders.

SOURCE: Winnipeg Free Press, April 26, 2001

SOUL to bring line alternatives to attention of utility stockholders

We are planning to try to inform the stockholders of the utilities about the lack of need for this line. Specifically that the utilities are claiming that this line will cost around 175 million dollars to build when in actuality it will cost much more.

SOURCE: Logan Edinger, Save Our Unique Lands (SOUL) edinger@centurytel.net

DNR Independence

DNR split provision expected to slip into state budget

Looks like 1995 all over again. According to a conversation I had with Assembly John Gard's staff, Republicans plan on slipping an amendment into the budget that will split the DNR into two separate agencies. He said there would be one hearing on this possibly in May and the budget should be complete by June.

If I were new to Wisconsin government, I would assume this has no chance in passing, but this is similar to how they got rid of the Intervener and Secretary appointment. There was no citizen's support for that either, yet it passed and has been impossible to change back.

It may be that the split needs to be done. I haven't seen the evidence so far, but if it is necessary, it should be done with a lot more discussion than one hearing statewide. It should take more than a few weeks to fundamentally change the structure of the DNR.

SOURCE: Jim Wise, ECCOLA, ecowise@newnorth.net (715) 453-6015

WWA against DNR split

Two years ago, there was a series of public hearings on splitting the DNR into two agencies — one for hunting/angling interests, the other for regulatory tasks. This proposal has raised its ugly head again — this time as a probable budget item proposed by Rep. John Gard (R-Peshtigo). He apparently is gearing up for an announcement on Monday.

WWA went on record two years ago as being **OPPOSED** to a split of the DNR, for many reasons. This increases costs, increases complexity and duplicity, decreases efficiency, and loses the connection between resource regulation and resource management. It sets us back 35 years to when there were two agencies.

We'll send more details as we hear on this important issue.

Wisconsin Wetlands Association
222 S. Hamilton, Suite #1
Madison, WI 53703
(608) 250-9971
fax (608) 256-4562

(Visit the WSN's web site to learn more about why a DNR split is not a good idea.)

Factory Farming

Family Farm Protection Act vote likely this week

This week Senator Brian Burke will introduce an amendment to the state budget that would secure \$9.3 million dollars for protection of family farms and the environment. The following members of the Joint Finance committee need your call today:

WI Assembly

89 - Representative John Gard	608-266-2343
55 - Representative Dean Kaufert	608-266-5719
50 - Representative Sheryl Albers	608-266-8531
98 - Representative Marc Duff	608-266-1190
94 - Representative Michael Huebsch	608-266-0631
37 - Representative David Ward	608-266-3790

WI Senate

8 - Senator Alberta Darling	608-266-5830
14 - Senator Robert Welch	608-266-0751

Tell them the Family Farm Protection Act Budget Amendment will help to:

- Level the playing field so small to moderate sized family farms — the majority of Wisconsin farms — can be economically viable,
- Ensure adequate environmental protection and healthy rural communities,
- Invest in a future for Wisconsin family farms including low interest loans, low-cost strategies for modernization and expansion, and
- Encourage the development of new agricultural enterprises, new products, and an aggressive marketing effort for Wisconsin-grown products.

There may be a vote on the amendment as early as **Thursday, May 3**, so please do not delay.

Please call me at (608) 256-1250, Ext. 13 and let me know if you will endorse the Family Farm Protection Act budget amendment as described in the memo from the Legislative Fiscal Bureau.

SOURCE: Sam Gieryn
Citizen Action Family Farm Stewardship Campaign Coordinator
(608) 256-1250 ext. 13
sgieryn@wi-citizenaction.org
1202 Williamson Street, Suite B, Madison, WI 53703

(NOTE: E-mail the WSN at wsn@chorus.net for a copy of the six-page memo from the Legislative Fiscal Bureau describing the fiscal provisions of the FFPA.)

Calumet continues review of large dairy operation

Calumet County officials continue to review comments from 350 residents concerning a new 3,000-dairy cow operation to be built by Kenn Buelow in the Town of Rantoul, according to the April 15 Appleton *Post-Crescent*. Comments center on four areas of concern: groundwater, land spreading of manure, property devaluation, and nuisances from such an operation. Matt Glewen, a UW-Extension agent based in Calumet County, said it was too early to tell what ordinances, if any, the county might pass to regulate such a large operation.

SOURCE: WDNR's "Basin Briefs," April 18, 2001

Dairy panel discusses large farm regulation

Milk production costs on a 2,000 cow dairy are about the same in California as in Wisconsin, said a dairy producer at a panel April 19 at the Wisconsin Cheese Industry Conference.

So, what hurdles do large scale dairies face in Wisconsin? Panel members, including the owners or managers of four large-scale Wisconsin dairies, looked at other factors affecting the dairy business in Wisconsin.

"I feel the biggest limitation to growth in Wisconsin are local ordinance controls," said Dan Monson, Brodhead, who manages the 1,800-cow Spring Grove Dairy.

Decisions on where to locate new businesses should be taken out of the hands of people at the township and county level, Mr. Monson said. Decision-making should be regionalized, he said.

SOURCE: *The Country Today*

EPA extends CAFO regulation comment deadline until this summer

Giving into pressure from the agriculture industry and some in Congress, on March 27 EPA extended the comment period on the Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) rule for another 75 days. The new deadline for comments is July 27. EPA will then issue a notice of data availability, adding another 45 days of public comment to receive additional data. The new deadline for comments is **July 30**.

Under the terms of a judicial consent decree between the Agency and NRDC, the final rule must be signed by December 15, 2002, so EPA cannot on its own delay the final rule. However, the sentiment on Capitol Hill recently is turning hostile to the CAFO regulations, and there may be a legislative effort to weaken or block a CAFO rule.

SOURCE: Clean Water Network

Group offers heads up on farm bill reauthorization

The next farm bill re-authorization is slated to occur in 2002, though a great deal of work is currently going on behind the scenes. This bill will have tremendous impact on family farmers, consumers and the environment. It's time we put aside our differences and join efforts in demanding safe food that sustains our farm families and replenishes and heals our biodiversity, water, and land. Future generations will thank us proudly.

TELL CONGRESS THE NEXT FARM BILL MUST...

Increase Prices For Farmers:

Current farm policy is controlled by corporate agribusiness who advance food "surplus" as a way to keep their costs down. Currently farmers "prices" are so low they are below their cost of production. The next farm bill must create mechanisms for slowing this environmentally and economically wasteful surplus and restore prices farmers receive.

Create Stewardship incentives for farmers:

With historically low prices farmers are forced to farm every inch of land hoping to squeeze a profit. The next farm bill must authorize AND FUND additional farm bill entitlements which offer real stewardship incentives for farmers to protect our land, water and wildlife.

Restore Competitive Markets:

Corporate agribusiness controls prices by controlling markets via captive supplies and price fixing. It's time for Teddy Roosevelt's "big stick." The next farm bill should bust up corporate strongholds and adequately enforce anti-trust statutes.

Equalize Subsidies for Organic and Sustainable Methods:

Huge sums of tax dollars (est. \$76 Billion - 1998) currently subsidize unsustainable chemically intensive, highly concentrated food production. Meanwhile, an embarrassingly small amount (est. \$100 Million - 1990) supports organic, sustainable or community based food production. The effects of this on water, wildlife and food safety are devastating. The next farm bill should, at least, level this playing field.

SOURCE: familyfarmer.org

Groundwater Protection

Groups hold water taste test on Earth Day

A blind water taste test between Perrier, municipal water, and private well water was performed on Earth Day at Rock Springs by Concerned Citizens of Newport (CCN) and Waterkeepers of Wisconsin (WOW) with the following results:

15 had “no preference”
16 chose Perrier Ice Mountain water
27 chose Wisconsin Dells municipal water
42 chose private well water

SOURCE: Carol Zimmermann, Concerned Citizens of Newport

Furbish clarifies misleading Perrier statement in *USA Today* story

When a story by Tom Vanden Brook appeared in the in the April 18, 2001, *USA Today*, Mary Jane Schudlach — one of the Wisconsin people quoted in the story — thought something was wrong.

Schudlach read the following in the story, “Perrier says it is being unfairly labeled a water guzzler. In Wisconsin, the company says, its take would be three to four times less than what farmers pump for irrigation from the same site.”

That didn’t fit with what Schudlach remembered, so she contacted the WDNR’s William Furbish, who responded with the following:

“Assume a dry year for irrigation and that the irrigation system would be operated 24 times at 1,000 gallons per minute for the year. Each irrigation application would last between 12 and 24 hours. Assume also that Perrier would pump at between 350 and 500 gallons per minute on a year around basis.

“Perrier would pump approximately 6 to 10 times the amount of water in a year that an irrigation system would pump. I have consistently used this comparison in past conversations. Thank you.”

SOURCE: Correspondence between Mary Jane Schudlach and William B. Furbish, Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater, Private Water Systems Section, PO Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921 fiw@dnr.state.wi.us; Phone (608)266-9264

(Contact the WSN at wsn@chorus.net for a copy of the *USA Today* story.)

Mercury Reduction

Badger mercury landfill approved despite local opposition

Despite more than 300 letters and postcards and standing-room-only attendance at the WDNR’s January 23 public meeting, the burial of mercury-laced sediments at the Badger Army Ammunition Plant has been approved. The 8-acre landfill will be located inside Badger in the Township of Sumpter.

CSWAB received word this week that the WDNR has approved the Army's requested low hazard exemption. The April 6 letter exempts the Army from meeting even minimum design and construction criteria normally required for hazardous waste landfills.

Unlike other hazardous waste landfills, the new landfill will have a permeable soil cover instead of an engineered cap. The WDNR maintains that the amount of settling expected as the sediment dewatered and decomposes would cause a problem with a cap. However, without an engineered cap, rainwater and melting snow will continue to migrate through the buried sediments, carrying low levels of contaminants away from the site.

As a result, conditions of the WDNR approval stipulate that if future monitoring shows that an environmental problem exists at the site or adjacent wetlands, the Department will require remediation and or removal of the entire landfill to a monitored landfill elsewhere on the Badger property. CSWAB maintains the mercury-contaminated sediments should be placed in a fully regulated landfill now rather than risk a failure in the future when it may be impractical or cost-prohibitive to move the materials.

As a result of this decision, CSWAB's board has approved hiring a soil scientist to review the Army's conclusions about the long-term integrity of the burial site.

SOURCE: Laura Olah, Executive Director
Citizens for Safe Water Around Badger
E12629 Weigand's Bay South
Merrimac, WI 53561
(608) 643-3124
Fax (608) 643-0005 alt fax (608) 643-2682
olah@speagle.com

WDNR to highlight mercury reduction in story series

A four-part series "Mercury in Wisconsin's Environment" will be featured in each issue of the *DNR News and Outdoor Report* from April 24 through May 15, 2001. The series will provide information about mercury in the environment and how mercury can be controlled. More information about mercury is on the DNR's new mercury web page. State newspapers often pick up these DNR stories, so look for them in your local papers:

- Part 1 — Overview of the mercury issue and control efforts under way or proposed plus facts about mercury, its sources and its impacts on human health and the environment.
- Part 2 — A closer look at successful pilot efforts to reduce or eliminate mercury from schools, medical offices, businesses, farms and homes in a number of Wisconsin communities.
- Part 3 — A summary of mercury research findings in Wisconsin lakes, fish and wildlife.
- Part 4 — Background on a proposed DNR rule that would require utilities and other large coal-burning facilities in Wisconsin — the biggest sources of mercury in the environment — to reduce the amount of mercury they emit into the air. At its May 22-23, 2001, monthly meeting, the Natural Resources Board will be asked to authorize public hearings on this rule.

SOURCE: WDNR

Home mercury test available...but expensive

Researchers have developed a simple — though still rather expensive — way to test fish for the presence of mercury that is found at levels of concern. A recent study found that 10 percent of women and children surveyed had unhealthy amounts of mercury in their systems, believed from eating certain types of fish or fish that was contaminated. Currently, fish processors test only a percentage of the fish they handle, according to Kim D. Janda, a chemistry professor at the Scripps Research Institute who helped develop the test.

For more information, go to www.worldcatch.com.

Metallic Mining

Senate Bill to ban cyanide in mining introduced

Wisconsin environmental and conservation groups today applauded the introduction of a bill banning the use of cyanide in mining. Senate Bill 160 was introduced April 30 in the State Senate by Sen. Russ Decker (D-Schofield).

“Cyanide is an incredibly toxic chemical, especially for fish,” said Tom Wilson from the Wisconsin Stewardship Network. “Many rivers in the U.S. and around the world have been poisoned by cyanide from mine sites and transportation of cyanide to mines. Wisconsin cannot take that chance, especially when the Crandon mine is proposed near the headwaters of the Wolf River.”

“We appreciate Sen. Decker’s work on behalf of SB 160 and his continued efforts to safeguard Wisconsin’s environment from unsafe mining practices,” said Dave Blouin, vice chairman of the state Sierra Club. “SB 160 clearly has strong statewide support; the conservation congress voted more than 10 to 1 in favor of the cyanide ban for mining at its April hearings. The Rusk and Langlade County boards and a number towns and cities have already voted to support the ban. More than 11,000 residents have signed petitions supporting the cyanide ban.”

SB 160 will be the subject of a public hearing by the Senate Committee on Environmental Resources chaired by state Sen. Jim Baumgart (D-Sheboygan), a cosponsor of the bill. SB 160 and its Assembly companion bill, AB 95, would prohibit the use of cyanide and cyanide compounds in mining for metallic minerals and in processing metallic ore.

Among those supporting the bill is the Forest County Potawatomi Community. The tribe’s reservation is just east of the proposed Crandon mine. Tribal Chairman Harold “Gus” Frank said, “For generations, our people have depended on the waters and fish of Wisconsin. Mining waste or cyanide spills will poison those waters. Water is precious — more precious than copper or gold or mining company profits.”

The Wisconsin Campaign to Ban Cyanide in Mining is urging its supporters to contact their legislators to support both AB 95 and SB 160 and to request public hearings and votes on both bills.

Additional background information on the Wisconsin Campaign to Ban Cyanide in Mining can be found at <http://www.alphacdc.com/treaty/cyanide>.

Other governments and organizations who support the Campaign include:

Menominee Indian Tribe,
Forest County Potawatomi Community,
Rusk County,
Langlade County,
City of Appleton,
City of New London,
City of Milwaukee,
City of Franklin,
Village of Fremont (Waupaca Co.),

Village of Combined Locks (Outagamie Co.),
Town of Ellington (Outagamie Co.),
Town of Wolf River (Langlade Co.),
Town of Nashville (Forest Co.),
Town of Ainsworth (Langlade Co.),
Town of Mukwa (Waupaca Co.),
Town of Poygan (Winnebago Co.),
Town of Winneconne (Winnebago Co.),

Town of Liberty (Outagamie Co.),
Town of Waukechon (Shawano Co.),
Town of Deer Creek (Outagamie Co.),
Town of Westcott (Shawano Co.),
Town of Oshkosh (Winnebago Co.),
United Steelworkers Local 1527,
Wisconsin Conservation Congress,
Wisconsin Trout Unlimited

SOURCE: Dave Blouin, Sierra Club-John Muir Chapter, (608) 233-8455, burroak15@aol.com

Army Corps releases draft scoping document

Recently the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released the Draft Scoping Document, which is a significant step for Corps in the NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) process and the federal regulatory review. The final Scoping Document provides an outline for the federal Environmental Impact Statement.

The Corps is attempting to narrow the scope of their review quite dramatically in the Draft Scoping Document. For example, the Corps does not plan to examine water quality issues Wolf River, located not far downstream.

The link to the Corps web site and the Draft Scoping Document is http://www.mvp.usace.army.mil/project_info/crandon/. Comments were due to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers by April 27, 2001, though some have asked that this date be extended.

SOURCE: John Koss, jnkoss@newnorth.net

Bush Administration is attempting to roll back mining regulations

In the March 23rd Federal Register, the Bush Administration proposed to rollback the current BLM hard rock mining regulations. These rollbacks will affect mining regulations for mines in Wisconsin and across the country. These regulations are crucial to environmental protection for at least three reasons:

(1) They establish environmental performance standards that protect ground and surface water. As of last year, when the old rules were still in effect, EPA estimated 40% of the headwaters of all

western watersheds were polluted by mining. In total, the federal government estimates that 12,000 miles of Americas rivers and streams have been polluted by the mining industry;

(2) They force the mining industry to clean up its own environmental messes. As of last year, under the old rules, American taxpayers were potentially liable for \$1 billion in environmental cleanup costs at currently operating mines; and

(3) They require land managers to deny mine proposals that would cause “substantial irreparable harm” to environmental or cultural resources. Under the old rule, land managers refused to deny mine proposals, no matter how irresponsible, no matter how badly they threatened public health, the environment, or places of cultural significance.

This proposed rollback is an arbitrary and illegitimate capitulation to mining industry special interests. The current rule is the product of a four-year rulemaking process — a process which involved thousands of public comments, dozens of public hearings in cities across the west, and four different drafts of the rule. After all that input, after all that time, the Administration wants to wipe the whole rule away after a 45-day comment period ending on May 7th. This rollback is an assault on public participation in policy making and a capitulation to special interests.

The following can be done:

- E-mails or letters are needed for receipt by May 7th to Bureau of Land Management.
- Please forward this alert below to as many others as you can.
- If you are going to a meeting or an event where you could distribute postcards for signing, please let me know this week and I will ship those out to you immediately. Let me know how many you need.

Thanks, your help is greatly appreciated.

SOURCE: Lisa Yee-Litzenberg, National Wildlife Federation, (734) 769-3351, ext. 23; yee@nwf.org

Public Intervenor Office Restoration

Conservation Congress PIO resolutions pass overwhelmingly

The following totals have been recorded from the April 9 Conservation Congress spring hearings on floor resolutions calling for the restoration of the Public Intervenor Office: 11 counties yes, 0 no (actual votes 824 yes to 125 no)

In some counties a resolution calling for *both* DNR independence and PIO restoration were introduced. This resolution also passed by a statewide vote of 1,818 yes to 83 no.

SOURCE: John Welter, Wisconsin Trout Unlimited

Black giving 2001 environmental legislation overview at Madison luncheon

Rep. Spencer Black (D-77) is scheduled to speak at the Capitol Community Citizens' monthly speaker series Monday, June 11, at 11:45. The subject will be 2001 environmental legislation, including restoration of the public intervenor office. Luncheons are held at the Wilson Street Grill, 217 S. Hamilton St., Madison.

For more information, contact Dave Gochberg at (608) 835-2064, or dave@gochber.com.

Shoreland/Wetland Protection

Wetland bill compromise reportedly reached

We have a bill. Should go to the legislature this week and the Gov. will sign. Was hammered out last Friday, April 27. Final version doesn't look bad. They're never perfect.

SOURCE: John Holmes, Wisconsin Conservation Congress

Two large wetlands to be filled in Waukesha County

On April 19 the Army Corps of Engineers issued two letters indicating that they had no jurisdiction over two separate proposed wetland fill activities that would encompass a total of 17 acres in Waukesha County. Barring any other state or local authorization, these wetland areas will be filled.

In recent public communication, various representatives of the development community have suggested that wetland fill projects which have fallen beyond Corps jurisdiction are few, and small in size. As of today, the Corps has issued a total of 22 letters of "non-jurisdiction" for Wisconsin over the past month, or an average of almost "A WETLAND A DAY" lost to development. See www.mvp.usace.army.mil/regulatory/isojd/ for copies of the letters.

In various communications, Governor Scott McCallum has indicated that "under no circumstances will I allow Wisconsin wetlands to be endangered by this [SWANCC Supreme Court] ruling...I will personally ensure Wisconsin wetlands will be aggressively protected during my administration."

It is time for Wisconsin citizens to insist that the Governor and Legislature take prompt action to halt the destruction of additional wetlands in Wisconsin.

SOURCE: Wisconsin Wetlands Association

Conservation Congress wetlands resolution draws big support

Results are in from a campaign to introduce wetland protection resolutions at the April 9 Conservation Congress meetings:

Counties in favor:	57 (18 of which cast unanimous ballots)
Counties opposed:	2
Counties unreported or with no vote:	13

Total: Yes = 3517 (91%) No = 328 (9%)

(Contact the WSN at wsn@chorus.net for a copy of the resolution introduced at many county meetings or for a complete county-by-county vote on the wetlands resolution.)

W3 wetland fill report form attached

Wisconsin Wetlands Watch, W3, is encouraging sportsmen and women and other outdoor advocates to report suspicious wetland fill activities and document the loss of wetlands throughout the state due to lax regulations.

The W3 report form is attached at the end of this issue of *WSNetworkNews*.

Petition asks FERC to keep WPSC from backing out of Marinette agreements

A petition is being circulated asking the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to refuse or conditionally restrict the application by Wisconsin Public Service Corporation (WPSC) to remove lands from officially licensed project areas near several of the dams which it owns and operates in Marinette County, Wisconsin.

The petition says that removal of the lands from the officially licensed project areas will allow WPSC to sell these lands to unspecified entities, agencies and/or developers and that subsequent development will forever destroy the wild shores around Caldron Falls, High Falls, and four other project areas.

For more information, contact the River Alliance of Wisconsin.

Changes to DNR lake grant program broadens participation

Fifty-seven Wisconsin lake associations, districts, municipalities and nonprofit organizations have been awarded state grants totaling more than \$350,000 to fund projects to help their communities study ways to improve areas in and around their lakes.

The awards are the first given out after changes made to the Department of Natural Resources Lake Planning Grants program. The changes, intended to broaden participation, succeeded in pulling in first-time applicants.

“This is the first cycle under our new rules allowing for small-scale grants,” says Carroll Schaal, who coordinates the grant program for the DNR Lakes Partnership. “These changes allow lake management groups beginning the planning process or wanting to do education or just basic lake trend monitoring to better compete for grants. The changes were made to broaden participation in the program, especially by the smaller lakes whose planning needs are less technical and more protection oriented. Apparently that has succeeded since about half of the awards are going to first time applicants.”

For more information on this program contact Carroll Schaal at (608) 261-6423 or visit the DNR website at <http://www.dnr.state.wi.us/org/water/fhp/lakes/lakeplan.htm>.

SOURCE: WDNR

Landscaper trying to reduce shoreline erosion

A Wausau-area landscaper is trying to change the way people landscape their homes, businesses, and waterfront properties, with an emphasis on reducing erosion and preserving water quality, according to an April 16 article in the *Wausau Daily Herald*. Tom Girolamo and Kathy Clarke-Girolamo, owners of Eco-Building & Forestry of Mosinee, have been in business since 1988 and have worked with landowners to create eco-friendly, low-maintenance surroundings. Through their use of such materials as lightweight mats and logs, they are able to keep water from sweeping sediment and nutrients, such as nitrogen and phosphorus, from area streams and lakes.

SOURCE: WDNR “Basin Briefs”

Water law policy conference May 16

2001 Wisconsin Water Law and Policy Conference will be held Wednesday, May 16, 2001, at UW-Stevens Point University Center. The conference is conducted by the UW Law School for continuing education activities for the Law School and UW-Extension. Presenters (on the flyer) include George Meyer, Chuck Hammer of DNR Legal, Ken Johnson of DNR, SCR, Dave Siebert of DNR Bureau of Integrated Science Services, and Russ Rasmussen who will be replaced (probably by Gordon Stevenson) due to another commitment.

“Water use policy and regulation has become a major public agenda item. Wisely regulating water use and water quality is a challenge facing Wisconsin as demands by conflicting recreational, residential, commercial, agricultural and industrial interest are debated.”

Program and registration information at (800) 355-5573 or www.law.wisc.edu/clew/. The Program brochure also publicizes a “new” publication on Water Law “Wisconsin Water Law: A

Guide to Water Rights and Regulations” 2000 Edition, 199 pages, \$15.00. Available from UW-Extension, Item G3622, in CD or book format. Order information at (608) 262-3346 or <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pubs/>.

SOURCE: WDNR “Basin Briefs”

Conservation Congress nonpoint resolution draws broad support

The total vote count for all counties was 1,112 in support and 168 in opposition to a floor resolution calling for support of the state’s proposed nonpoint pollution rules at the April 9 Conservation Congress spring hearings.

Fifteen counties took up the resolution, with 13 supporting and only 2 rejecting by close votes (Price 11-14 and Sauk 12-23).

Thanks to John Holmes, WSN’s representative from the Conservation Congress for helping get these resolutions out to the various counties.

SOURCE: Bill Wenzel, bwenzel@chorus.net

EPA posts ‘best nonpoint resource materials’

The EPA recently drafted a list of what it considers the best nonpoint source materials available for both the public and professionals. Many of these resources are available in electronic format. To view the list visit <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/bestnpsdocs.html#urban>

SOURCE: Clean Water Network via Steve Skavroneck of Citizens for a Better Environment

WSNetworkNews is published twice monthly by the Wisconsin Stewardship Network, a coalition of Wisconsin hunting, fishing, conservation, and environmental groups.

The WSN’s Steering Committee consists of representatives from the following organizations: Citizens for a Better Environment, ECCOLA, Federation of Fly Fishers, Izaak Walton League of America, Lake Superior Greens, Madison Audubon Society, Muskies, Inc., Northern Thunder, Pheasants Forever, River Alliance of Wisconsin, Sierra Club — John Muir Chapter, Wisconsin Association of Lakes, Wisconsin B.A.S.S. Federation, Wisconsin Conser-

vation Congress, Wisconsin Council of Sportfishing Organizations, Wisconsin’s Environmental Decade, and Wisconsin Trout Unlimited.

The WSN’s mission is to build a cooperative network that recaptures and strengthens Wisconsin’s stewardship ethic for the betterment of its people and natural resources.

Contributions to this e-newsletter are welcome. Send news of your group’s activities relating to Wisconsin’s priority issues to State Coordinator Todd Hanson at wsn@chorus.net.

DOCUMENTATION OF OBSERVED WETLAND DISTURBANCE

We need your help. Please join our *W3 Wisconsin Wetland Watch* effort. Our objective is to document both legal and illegal wetland destruction and to help record and publicize these wetland losses. We need to bring this outrage to public attention!

Wisconsin counties, cities and villages are required to establish shoreland-wetland zoning districts which protect all wetlands, or portions of wetlands, that are 5 acres in area or larger and lie within 1000 feet of a navigable water way or within 300 feet of a floodplain of a navigable river or stream. Any drainage, dredging, filling or flooding of a protected wetland is generally prohibited by law.

Name of Property Owner: _____*

Legal Description of Property*: County: _____ Town _____ Section _____

*Contact the Register of Deeds in county where the wetland is located to obtain this information

Date of your observation: _____

Did you observe the obstruction of a navigable waterway? Yes _____ (Describe below) No _____
(Wis. Stats. Ch. 30-31 require a permit for a structure or activity that would obstruct or divert a navigable waterway, e.g. shoreline modification (riprap, seawalls), dams, bridges, stream straightening, piers, grading, dredging, enclosures)

Are there local zoning ordinances that apply to this property?* Yes _____ (Describe below) No _____
*Contact the county or city zoning authority with jurisdiction over the property for this information.

Your field observations of the alleged wetland disturbance. Please attach photos if available.

Did you observe any of the following (Check all that apply)

Drainage___ Dredging___ Filling___ Flooding___ Other _____ (Describe what you observed below)

What is your best estimate of the acreage of the wetland in question _____

Estimate the acreage portion of the wetland area impacted by the disturbance _____

What is the name of the river or stream closest to the wetland _____

What is the approximate distance (in miles or feet) between river/stream and wetland _____

Return this form to: *Midwest Environmental Advocates*
122 State St. -- Suite 200
Madison, WI 53703