Standards Oversight Council (SOC)

Developing effective technical standards that protect Wisconsin's natural resources

131 W. Wilson St., Suite #601, Madison, Wisconsin 53703
(608) 441-2677 || Fax (608) 441-2676 || socwisconsin.org

590 Nutrient Management Standard Team
DRAFT MEETING NOTES

Wednesday June 17, 2015 || 9:00am – 3:00pm || Hancock Ag Research Station

Attendees: Carrie Laboski, Joe Bragger, Matt Zoschke, Tony Smith, Kevin Masarik, Sue Porter, Todd Schaumberg, Sara Walling, Pat Murphy, Laura Chern, Gini Knight.

Updates

- Pat Murphy has been reassigned to the Assistant State Conservationist for Partnerships for NRCS to allow him to focus on completing the 590 revision, assist with the development of agreement with partners, and allow for a more seamless transition to a new State Resource Conservationist.

Criteria V.A. Review

- Clarifications to comments on V.A.1.g, h, & m were discussed and minor revisions were made as needed.
- Comments on V.A.2. were reviewed and the standard language was revised as needed for clarification and to minimize redundancy.
- There is still some concern about the nutrient prohibition setbacks around the various wells. Some prefer to allow less stringent fertilizer application prohibitions.
- The concern was raised that the current standard may not protect R soils outside of spring and fall application periods. Nutrient applications to these shallow to bedrock soils could cause high risk for nutrient loss to fractures and fissures directly to groundwater sources. Should the application rates be reduced year round? The group will review Criteria B and other language to confirm these soils are protected throughout the year. Is this mainly a problem with liquid manures?
- The team discussed concerns about the locally identified areas of concern, which was included to identify critical sites for groundwater protection. Having this language avoids statewide rules, and who is responsible for identifying the features is unclear. There is interest in being more clear about what planners need to identify, which may be beyond their agronomic training. The language was revised slightly, but this topic may not be completely resolved.

Winter Spreading Plan and Winter Runoff Risk Assessment.

A revised Winter Spreading Plan was presented and reviewed. The new plan does not use the SNAPPlus Acute PI or WRE estimate. After several discussions within the team and the software programmer, it was agreed that those two automated estimated were responsive to slope and soil roughness, but they also did not provide a usable risk factor and they would be more work to enter the manure applications in accurately and at the appropriate time. The team also understood that a manual process would still be needed if a more automated process was used. In the future, the team hopes a more appropriate and accurate process for winter manure spreading planning could be identified using the SnapPlus software.

The team discussed the inclusion of a risk factor for the proximity of other spread manure, due to the increased density of manure in a given area. The team was concerned about this factor given that farmers could not control what their neighbors were applying and the difficulty this presents in planning.

The meeting's discussion led to these suggestions:
A Winter Runoff Risk Assessment would include:

- Identifying the following features within each field intended to have winter manure applications:
  - (1) Concentrated flow channels to surface waters
  - (1) C slopes
  - (2) Concentrated flow channels connected to or touching SWQMA
- Fields that have risk features with (1) would be required to have one mitigation practice before application. Fields that have a risk feature with a (2) would be required to have two mitigation practices before winter manure application.

If a Risk Assessment was not conducted, then planners could assume the field had high risk and implement two mitigation practices on all fields intended to have winter manure.

There was more discussion on the mitigation practices, particularly with prohibitions of spreading within 200' or 300' of direct conduits to surface waters or ground waters. Field verification could alter the buffer distance so that it incorporates all contribution areas to the direct conduits. More thinking is needed to decide.

Further questions for NRCS include:

- Are the revisions in the current draft standard sufficient to address winter spreading risk?
- Risk Assessment = Variance only
- Risk Assessment = Maximum of 2 mitigation practices

Next Scheduled Meeting – Early July. Draft agenda items.

- Winter Spreading Plan Review
- Review Criteria V.A.3. & V.B.

Action Items

- Pat will revise the Winter Spreading Plan requirements based on the meeting's discussion.
- Gini will send a Poll out to schedule another meeting in early July.
- Gini and Pat will work to create draft responses for the team to review in hopes of expediting the review.

Timeline

- Early Jul meeting – additional meeting
- Jul 23 – Review Winter Spreading Plan sections & Technical Note; review comments from the rest of standard.
- **2nd Broad Review time frame**: July 31 – August 31
- Sep 9

DATCP	WDNR	NRCS	UWEX	County LCDs	WI Land+Water
Richard Castelnuovo (608) 224-4608	Gretchen Wheat & Mary Anne Lowndes (608) 264-6273	Pat Murphy & John Ramsden (608) 662-4422	Ken Genskow (608) 262-8756	Perry Lindquist (262) 548-7867 & Bruce Olson (608) 785-9867	Jim VandenBrook (608) 441-2677