

Standards Oversight Council  
Meeting Minutes  
February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2002  
DATCP, Room 172

Present: Perry Linquist, Pat Murphy, Gail Puzach, Gordon Stevenson, Ed Odgers,  
Pat Walsh,

Absent: Rebecca Baumann, Paul Daigle, John Ramsden

Guest: Kevin Kirsch (WDNR)

Review Previous Meeting Minutes and Agenda

- The minutes from the December meeting were accepted without change.

General Issues

- Tracy reviewed the activities that she has undertaken since the last meeting.
  - o The SOC website is now up and running
    - Perry suggested that a direct link to the NRCS technical standards should be made more obvious.
      - It was agreed that broad review drafts of technical standards could be put on the web, though with a very prominent 'Draft' watermark. The standard should also be a 'read only' Adobe file.
      - A reference and link should be made to the LCD's contact information for those who would like local information about technical standards (WLWCA site).
  - o A two page SOC ad was included in the WLWCA Thursday Note highlighting the new website and providing an update on the Standard 590 and the county funding issue.
  - o Tracy assisted Bruce Webendorfer in interviewing potential candidates for the 40% UWEX staff position that is intended to aid the SOC in editing companion documents.

SOC Budgeting Issues

- Tracy provided the council with an account of the counties who have contributed to the SOC funding.
  - o The Council discussed ways of encouraging a greater degree of county buy-in.
    - The county funding dollars will be tracked in order to provide a special account of the money at the end of the year. Some suggestions for improving county buy-in and participation:
      - Update the SOC Brochure
      - Highlight the SOC's involvement in the production of companion documents.

- The NRCS could increase the visibility of SOC by inviting it to participate in its listening and training sessions.
- **AR: Tracy** will contact Penny Pohl at Sauk County about setting up a SOC exhibit at the WALCE conference.
- As start new teams, the coordinator should send a request to the counties for information regarding whether or not they have particular needs that SOC might be able to provide such as:
  - o Funding for research – let teams know that there is funding available for books and additional resources if needed
  - o Ask the counties if they are willing to provide staff to aid in the SOC process and if not why?
    - **AR: Tracy** will prepare a draft of this questionnaire.
- The Council discussed the overall SOC funding position with the agencies.
  - o DATCP is currently re-evaluating their short-term allocation process and it is likely that SOC will receive at least a 3.5% cut in the amount that it was promised.
  - o The access to funding from DATCP for the following year is uncertain.
- The possibility of asking The WisDOT to join the SOC as a partner was discussed.
  - o It was decided that for the time being the SOC would concentrate on receiving more work team support.

#### Work Team Update

- Pat Murphy provided an update on the standard 590.
  - The team continues to work on the technical note and some details in the standard still need to be resolved.
  - A ranking scale for the P Index is in the process of being developed.
  - Pat is concerned that the standard may not adequately deal with the management of the applications of nutrients on frozen ground.
  - The standard will need to be completed by the spring.
  - It is likely that the standard will have to be sent out for another broad review.
  - Pat suggested that he would like to release the 590 as an interim standard. The Council agreed that this would be a good idea.
- Perry raised his concern that the standard 590 will be used as a regulation in state code. He believes that the standards for staying in compliance of environmental regulations are usually much lower than the standards for providing public cost-sharing grants for conservation practices. NRCS technical standards have usually been designed for cost-sharing purposes.
  - **Parking Lot:** SOC will need to find the appropriate forum to initiate a discussion regarding the true purpose of the technical standards and performance standards with the three agencies.
  - **Parking Lot:** The Council will need to review the following issues at an upcoming meeting:
    - Provide clear guidelines demarcating the differences between technical standards and regulations.

- Consider who is a qualified team member.
- Establish a protocol for non-team member presence at work team meetings.
  - **AR: Tracy** will post future work team meeting schedules on the SOC website.
- Establish a stronger protocol for team member substitution.
  - Such substitutions must receive approval from the team leader and team members.
  - The Custodian has final approval over work team members.
- SOC is not an authoritarian body and so it is important that the work teams do not feel as if the Council is unduly influencing them.

### Work Plan Update

- A SOC work plan survey will be sent out some time around June.
- The Council reviewed the various requests for SOC to oversee new work teams
- Kevin Kirsch discussed the proposal for the SOC to oversee the revision of the Blue Book (DNR – Wisconsin Construction Site Handbook).
  - A broad array of people were handpicked to participate in two advisory meetings that were convened in order to determine how the Blue Book should be revised, and what kind of work this would entail.
    - It was determined that the entire book needs to be revised because it has been 10 years since it was first published.
    - The revision of this Publication will need to be completed by March 2003 when NR 216 will be released.
  - The advisory committee agreed that they should request at least 2 or 3 SOC work teams.
    1. Sheet and rill erosion control practices.
    2. Gully and channel erosion control practices.
    3. A systems approach to determining percent sediment reduction for use of bmp's, to track compliance with the DNR's 80% reduction performance standard.
- Kevin suggested that at least 15 new standards could be established through these work teams.
- It will be imperative that a solid work plan be developed and the responsibilities for completing various tasks clarified.
- It may be useful to request assistance from the DOT.
- The proposal was generally well received by the council although the third team seemed to be outside of the scope of the SOC process. It was agreed (I think) that the first two teams could address the tasks of the third team if time permits. .
- The DNR will not be mandating the practices, but the performance standard.
- The process of establishing the work teams was discussed along with the initiation of an adequate orientation process.
- Though there may be much interest for people to be on the work teams, it would not be practicable for everyone to be able to participate at that level.

- While the team sizes should remain relatively small, the remaining interested people could be used as advisors to the work teams progress and as reviewers during the initial review period.
- The possibility of DATCP becoming the custodian for a new milking center waste was once again raised.
  - **AR: ED** agreed to coordinate an initial screening team to assess what the parameters for such a team might include.
  - Potential standards include those for: flocculators, wetlands, and bark beds.
  - It is likely that the original Milking Center Waste companion document will need to be revised.
  - These standards are needed so that those implementing these practices can have access to cost share funding.
- Paul Daigle submitted a proposal for the revision of the Fencing Standard based upon the fact that new fencing legislation is being introduced in the state statutes. He also suggested that some substantive problems exist in the standard.
  - The Council determined that it would not be appropriate to revise a standard in order to use it as an administrative tool a regulation in state statutes.
  - The purpose of a fence in the statutes is much narrower than is defined in the fencing standard that serves a broad range of purposes and cost-sharing programs.
  - If there are holes in the technical standard in relation to the management of grazing, that issue should be addressed separately.
- It was determined that the standard Critical Area Planting does not need a revision, but it needs a companion document. This is primarily an information gathering exercise because a lot of research has already been conducted.
  - **AR: Tracy** will talk with Pat Murphy regarding how he can help with this project.
- Though it has been proposed that a standard, or a series of standards, be developed to address the issue of pathogens, the Council did not feel that SOC was the appropriate organization to deal with this public health issue.

### **Action Register**

**Tracy** will contact Penny Pohl at Sauk County about setting up a SOC exhibit at the WALCE conference.

**Tracy** will prepare a draft of this questionnaire.

**Tracy** will post future work team meeting schedules on the SOC website.

**ED** agreed to coordinate an initial screening team to assess what the parameters for such a team might include.

**Tracy** will talk with Pat Murphy regarding how he can help with this project.

### **Parking Lot**

**Parking Lot:** SOC will need to find the appropriate forum to initiate a discussion regarding the true purpose of the technical standards and performance standards with the three agencies.

**Parking Lot:** The Council will need to review issues regarding work team member credentials at an upcoming meeting: