

**Data Compilation from MS4's in Reach 64**

Potential Water Quality Trading Opportunities Between MS4s (As Allowed by Yahara WINS IGA-Section 14 a.)  
 8/6/2020 (DRAFT) Note: Data subject to confirmation by WDNR  
 Strand Associates, Inc.

#	MS4	Data Source (Modeling by consultant XX, or in-house, etc.)	WinSLAMM Version	Modeling Concurrence/Approval by WDNR Date	Modeling Results Approved by Yahara WINS Date	TP Leaf Credit	TP Leaf Credit Amount (lb) in Reach 64	Reach 64										Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (%)	Rock River TMDL Required TSS Reduction (%)	Yahara WINS Baseline TSS Reduction (%)	TSS Reduction Excess or Gap For Meeting Yahara WINS Baseline (%)	TSS Reduction Excess or Gap For Meeting Yahara WINS Baseline (lbs)	TP							Reduction Excess or Gap For Meeting Yahara WINS Baseline	Comments
								Permitted/ Modeled Watershed Area (acres)	Annual No Controls TSS Load (lb)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load (lb)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (lbs)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (%)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (lbs)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (%)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (lbs)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (%)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (lbs)						Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (%)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (lbs)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (%)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (lbs)	Annual Existing Conditions TSS Load Reduction (%)				
1	Deforest, Village of	Vierbicher						2,610	844,717	416,051	428,666	50.7%	73.0%	40.0%	10.7%	90,780	2,412	1,399	1,013.2	42.0%	61.0%	27.0%	15.0%	362	From Sarah Church (Vierbicher): results without streambank stabilization credit						
2	Waunakee, Village of	Strand Associates, Inc.		Yes	Yes				727,372	349,966	377,406	51.9%	73.0%	40.0%	11.9%	86,457	2,363.3	1,384.9	978.4	41.4%	61.0%	27.0%	14.4%	340							
3	Westport, Town of	Strand Associates, Inc.		Yes	Yes				194,756	59,699	135,057	69.3%	73.0%	40.0%	29.3%	57,155	636.6	216.2	420.4	66.0%	61.0%	27.0%	39.0%	249							
4	Sun Prairie, City of	MSA	SLAMM 10.2	9/29/16 per WDNR				1,746	389,600	196,600	193,000	49.5%	73.0%	40.0%	9.5%	37,160	1468	935	533	36.3%	61.0%	27.0%	9.3%	137	from Eric Thompson (MSA). WDNR for Reach 64 has a slightly different TSS % reduction of 49.1% but same TP % reduction of 36.3%.						
5	Bristol, Town of	Nahn and Associates											73.0%	40.0%					29.3%	61.0%	27.0%	2.3%		Not a MAMSWAP Community. On 7/14/20, Chuck Nahn indicated he sent WinSLAMM modeling to WDNR for review on 2/12/20 but has not heard back from WDNR on approval.							
6	Burke, Town of	AECOM	WinSLAMM 10.2.1	6/23/2017	8/16/2017	NO		1,211	362,000	154,000	208,000	57.5%	73.0%	40.0%	17.5%	63,200	1,097	434	663	60.4%	61.0%	27.0%	33.4%	367	from Rick Eilertson (AECOM)						
7	Windsor, Town of	Baxter Woodman											73.0%	40.0%					No Info	61.0%	27.0%	No Info			No TP Information Submitted to WDNR						
8	Middleton, City of	MSA	WinSLAMM 10.2.1	11/7/2016		acknowledged receipt on 9/7/17	Yes	5.4	1,181	288,800	179,400	109,400	37.9%	73.0%	40.0%		969.3	722.4	246.9	25.5%	61.0%	27.0%	-1.5%	-15	from Eric Thompson (MSA)						
9	Middleton, Town of	Vierbicher	WinSLAMM 10.3.1	10/17/2017				847.7	139,678	36,282	103,396	74.0%	73.0%	40.0%	34.0%	47,525	688.8	213.6	475.2	69.0%	61.0%	27.0%	42.0%	289	From Sarah Church (Vierbicher)						
10	Maple Bluff, Village of	Nahn and Associates	WinSLAMM 10.2.1	Feb. 2020	Submitted, Pending	Yes	included in #s	295.7	40,927	27,988	12,939	31.6%	73.0%	40.0%	-8.4%	-3,432	184.8	135.8	49.0	26.5%	61.0%	27.0%	-0.5%	-0.9	Includes TP Leaf Credit approved by WDNR on 2/19/20						
11	Shorewood Hills, Village of	MSA (2007) per Town and Country 2017 Modeling Post-Construction Stormwater Management and	WinSLAMM 9.2.5	2007				401	122,200	101,539	20,661	16.9%	73.0%	40.0%	-23.1%	-28,219	311.4	275.9	35.5	11.4%	61.0%	27.0%	-15.6%	-48.6	from Tom DeBeest (Town and Country). The TP information is based on a 40%TSS/27% TP ration with TP prorated on this ratio as TP wasn't modeled in WinSLAMM.						
12	Madison, City of	Stormwater Management and		Yes	???			26,667	7,171,294	5,222,789	1,948,505	27.2%	73.0%	40.0%	-12.8%	-920,013	23,238	18,514	4,725	20.3%	61.0%	27.0%	-6.7%	-1,550							
	Lake Mendota							6,455	1,815,636	1,318,174	497,462	27.4%				6,101	4,774	1,326	21.7%												
	Lake Monona							4,061	1,343,426	1,010,452	332,974	24.8%				4,094	3,344	751	18.3%												
	Lake Kegonsa							4,681	1,132,010	644,221	487,788	43.1%				3,879	2,722	1,157	29.8%												
	Starkweather Creek							10,178	2,651,707	2,109,473	542,234	20.4%				8,241	7,006	1,235	15.0%												
	Upper Yahara							1,292	228,516	140,469	88,047	38.5%				923	668	256	27.7%												
13	UW-Madison (Campus)	Smith Group	10.3.3?					503	167,600	112,700	54,900	32.8%	73.0%	40.0%	-7.2%	-12,140	565	422	143	25.3%	61.0%	27.0%	-1.7%	-9.6	From Dave Wolmutter (Smith Group)						
13a	UW-Madison (Arboretum)	Strand Associates, Inc.						42	21,465	8,425	13,040	60.7%	73.0%	40.0%		57.8	32.6	25	43.6%	61.0%	27.0%	16.6%	9.6	From Strand 2008 report							
14	Madison, Town of	Nahn and Associates	WinSLAMM 9.2.2	2011	Not participating	NO		668.4	41,542	24,994	16,548	39.8%	73.0%	40.0%	-0.2%	-68	132	95	37	28.4%	61.0%	27.0%	1.4%	1.8	From Chuck Nahn. Town ceases to exist in 2022.						
15	Blooming Grove, Town of	Mead and Hunt						130.2	44,172	29,976	14,196	32.1%	73.0%	40.0%	-7.9%	-3,473	92	74	18	19.6%	61.0%	27.0%	-7.4%	-6.8	from Anne Anderson (Mead and Hunt)						
16	Fitchburg, City of	Claudia Guy						86	23,880	6,900	16,980	71.1%	73.0%	40.0%	31.1%	7,428	65	30	35	54.4%	61.0%	27.0%	27.4%	17.8	24.9 % TP reduction from Eric for entire City. New data on 8/4/20 from Claudia Guy for Lake Wingra (Reach 64 from TMDLanalysis2015.xlsx)						
17	Monona, City of	Strand Associates, Inc./Vierbicher		Yes	Yes	Yes	10.45	882	186,515	139,950	46,565	25.0%	73.0%	40.0%	-15.0%	-28,041	796.5	653.9	142.6	17.9%	61.0%	27.0%	-9.1%	-72	Includes TP Leaf Credit						
	<b>Total</b>								10,766,518	7,067,259	3,699,260	<b>34.4%</b>	<b>73.0%</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>-5.6%</b>	<b>-607,348</b>	35,078	25,537	9,541	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>61.0%</b>	<b>27.0%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>70</b>							

Note: Doesn't include information from Dane County