

**Standards Oversight Council**  
Meeting Minutes  
March 12, 2003  
DATCP Headquarters, Room 172 Madison

Present: Rebecca Baumann, Perry Lindquist, Gail Lisse, Pat Murphy, Bruce Webendorfer, Ed Odgers, Mike Murray, Russ Rasmussen  
Absent: Paul Daigle, Robin Shepard

The Dec 18<sup>th</sup> minutes were approved.

SOC Work Plan

The EPA is requesting that the DNR examine the relationship between CAFO regulations and the Nutrient Management (590) standard. This summer the DNR wants to begin work on the project. The task must be completed within a year to satisfy EPA demands. NRCS is planning to reopen the standard and regroup the SOC team once research is compiled. It is expected to occur this summer. SOC will then be able to assist the DNR address potential changes to 590.

- The 590 standard identifies phosphorous use well, but the EPA is asking to strengthen the standards other aspects.
- Some EPA concerns could be dealt with through education or administrative rules. The 590 Tech Note is considered voluntary, however its use may be administratively required by the DNR, possibly through NR 243. The DNR Pink Sheet process for rule changes was explained.
- The national NRCS 590 standard meets EPA requirements. Because the Wisconsin 590 standard is based on the National standard, there is confusion about what the EPA is actually requesting.

**AR: Russ & Pat** discuss and compile issues for the 590 review.

The National NRCS has a requirement of soil loss to T for all cropland. Ideas were talked about at the WI NRCS concerning impacts of this policy in Wisconsin, and how to address the problem. A joint memo was sent to DATCP and DNR explaining the situation.

- The Wisconsin NRCS implementation of the Food and Security Act will impact farming to T. Once T is achieved it must be maintained. Additionally, ephemeral erosion must be controlled.
- There are concerns about open record laws and protections granted to landowners in the farm bill.
- One proposed solution involves inserting language into technical standards stating that farmland must be at T before a practice can be applied. WI NRCS compiled a list of standards this may be applicable to.
  - The impact on cost sharing programs and policy need to be addressed if this alternative is accepted. While some standards have a logical technical link to T, the link to T may not exist in every standard. There is a fear that inserting policy language may tie the standards together with unintended consequences.

- Possibly, the links to T could be put into the considerations section of individual standards.
- SOC agrees that individual teams will need to decide if and how T fits into a standard. There must be a technical, not political reason to include T.
- The NRCS policy on T will be located in the National Policy Planning Procedures Handbook (NPPH).

### Requests for New Standards

A formal SOC requests for technical standard needs should be sent mid-summer. A letter listing the current work plan and active teams, along with a list of existing technical standards will be sent in mid-summer to the agencies, counties, user groups and public.

**AR: Mike** draft a letter for the standard needs survey.

- Vilas County inquired about a review date for Interim Standard 643A, Shoreland Habitat (dated 7/01). NRCS will be reviewing this standard to determine if the team needs to be reformed, or if 643A is ok as it is. One item to examine is consistency with NR 115.

**AR: Mike** solicit 643A team members for comments about how the standard is working and if there is a need to update.

- A proposed Leachate standard (which is on the SOC work plan) was also requested over the past few months. The driving force to have this standard written are the requirements for bunkers and feed storage runoff control. CAFO and CNMP issues also need to be addressed.

NRCS standards:

- NRCS is updating their Pest Management Standard (595)(dated 1/91) to incorporate a resource assessment component. This involves a program titled Weedsoft.
- The three tillage standards (329A, 329B, 344) are all 5 years old and may need revision.
- Prescribed Grazing (528A) is also 5 years old but is working well. It is not expected any updating is necessary.
- There is a demand to update the Forest Stand Improvement and Forest Trails and Landing standards because of EQUIP. The NRCS has slightly modified the national standards for Wisconsin. Effort must be taken to insure that these standards do not conflict with the Forestry BMP Manual.
  - **Parking Lot:** Do forestry personnel need to join SOC when the forestry standards are revised?

**Parking Lot:** Do the agencies need to provide a yearly list of topics for SOC to work on?

### Consultants on SOC Teams

The council has had this discussion with the previous SOC Coordinator. The state phone line could be used as well as teleconferencing (NRCS has facilities) to alleviate travel concerns.

- **AR: Mike** review the old minutes for what conclusions were reached. Forward the team member reimbursement information to the council.

There is a need for one document to contain SOC decisions. Currently many policies are unwritten or located in various places, including the minutes.

**AR: Mike** Create a SOC Policy Manual. Internal and external policies.

### DOT Meeting

The meeting Pat and Mike had with Dan Scudder was discussed. At the time they meet there was uncertainty about potential changes in DOT the administration. Dan is receptive to joining SOC, but it was unclear how a change in the administration will impact DOT's willingness to become a member of SOC. SOC needs to prove its value to DOT before action will be taken on their part. Establishing contacts with technical supervisors and personnel in the districts may help forge a stronger relationship with DOT.

- SOC can demonstrate a benefit for DOT in the following areas: highways in urban setting, assistance with stormwater control, providing access to technical personnel – especially important when considering retirements and staff changes, consistency of standards and issues between agencies - meaning less confusion on DOT road projects.
- There remains an unresolved legal issue between DOT and DNR: liability and the new DNR Interim Sediment Control Water Application of Polymers Standard (1051)

**AR: Mike** Speak with Dan Scudder about changes at DOT & SOC participation.

### Budgets

The value and role of conservation must be reinforced to insure money is appropriated.

- The DNR budget will be livable if the legislature does not alter the governors proposed budget. It is believed SOC contributions will not be affected. Potential changes to GPR Bonding may negatively impact the states ability to implement conservation programs by reducing matching grant money. Dollars for priority watersheds would be reduced, potentially by half, without bonding money.
- The NRCS should be able to provide SOC grant money.

### Blue Book Teams

The Sheet/Rill Team currently has written 8 drafts, including 2 near completion. There remain 8 more potential standards to be developed.

The Channel/Sediment Team has written 6 draft standards. Five standards need to be started.

**AR: Mike** contact UW engineering departments for assistance developing design charts (Channel Erosion Mat Standard).

**AR: Bruce** contact Gary Bubenzer for possible assistance (Blue Book Teams).

- The DNR is planning to post the technical standards on their website. Partially, this is because there is no money in the budget for printing. The UWEX Ag Publications may be able to assist if hard copies are requested.
- The standards can be completed and approved one at a time; it is not necessary to release them all together.
- How to credit erosion control practices is proving difficult for the team. The team's priority is finishing the standards. Crediting practices is a secondary goal, yet something that needs to be thought about. George Foster is working to determine credits (through a grant) using RUSLE II for construction sites.

### Stormwater Infiltration Team

Progress is being made on the standards.

For the DNR teams, the possibility of assistance for writing drafts was discussed. The intent is to help the teams make more progress between meetings, by clarifying the team assignments. It may be possible to delegate responsibilities differently to achieve this goal. Technical writing assistance from outside the team may be beneficial.

### Waste Storage Facility (313) Team

At the first team meeting the topics to address in the revision were outlined. Stacking manure may prove to be a difficult issue to resolve because of the political undertones. Other technical issues, such as the use of digesters, may need to be reviewed as well.

### Milking Center Waste Team

The NRCS is the custodian. The team leader will be decided at the first meeting on April 14th.

### Hydraulically Applied Products Review

A meeting was held in February to determine the parameters of hydraulically applied products and how they should be covered in a standard/s. The mulching standard currently being drafted by the blue book team is touching on issues directly related to hydraulically applied products. The line between what the blue book team is covering and what a new team shall address was defined. When a new SOC team is formed, they will be charged with creating a standard to cover tackifiers and bonded fiber matrices.

### Agency Reports

WALCE: Supplying copies of the SOC Technical Standards Process Accomplishment Report and Work Plan would prove more informative than a separate summary report to WALCE.

**Parking Lot:** It may be beneficial to split the SOC work plan from the accomplishment report.

**AR: Mike** send request to the counties for SOC dues. This includes a reminder for the 2004 budget as well.

NRCS: The Technical Service Provider registration website was activated. Related information about TSP and the impacts on LCD staff was explained. County staff is encouraged to become a TSP.

### Future SOC Meeting Scheduled

Location: DATCP HQ, Room 172

Time: 9:00 – 12:00

Dates: 4/23, 5/29, (6/25, 7/24 rescheduled as one meeting on 7/8), 8/28, 9/25, 10/23, and 11/20

## **Action Register**

**AR: Russ & Pat** discuss and compile issues for the 590 review.

**AR: Mike** draft a letter for the standard needs survey.

**AR: Mike** solicit 643A team members for comments about how the standard is working and if there is a need to update.

**AR: Mike** review the old minutes for what conclusions were reached. Forward the team member reimbursement information to the council.

**AR: Mike** Create a SOC Policy Manual. Internal and external policies.

**AR: Mike** Speak with Dan Scudder about changes at DOT & SOC participation

**AR: Bruce** contact Gary Bubenzer for possible assistance (Blue Book Teams)

**AR: Mike** send request to the counties for SOC dues. This includes a reminder for the 2004 budget as well.

## **Parking Lot**

**Parking Lot:** Do forestry personnel need to join SOC when the forestry standards are revised?

**Parking Lot:** Do the agencies need to provide a yearly list of topics for SOC to work on?

**Parking Lot:** It may be beneficial to split the SOC work plan from the accomplishment report.