



Standards Oversight Council (SOC)

Developing effective technical standards that protect Wisconsin's natural resources

121 S. Pinckney Street #420, Madison, Wisconsin 53703
(608) 441-2677 || Fax (608) 441-2676 || socwisconsin.org

NRCS 380 Windbreak-Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation Standard Update Team MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, August 31, 2022 ▲ 1:00pm – 3:30pm ▲

Online meeting

1:00 Welcome & Introduction (Kate, Allan)

Goal: Welcome and review today's meeting objective.

Attendance: Kate Brunner, Allan Braun, Mic Armstrong, Michael Demchik, Matt Wilson, Drew Zelle, Shannon Rohde, Jeremiah Auer, Peter Wisniewski, Eric Hurley

Absences: Roy Diver, Mike Stanek, Tony Johnson

Guests: none

Objective today—Finish the draft!

Notes Review (Kate)

Goal: Review and approve 6/29 and 7/27 draft meeting notes.

Draft notes from June and July meetings were emailed to the team for review.

- 1 open Action Item related to future meeting – Mic and Jeremiah will present on nursery stock and seedlings at a future meeting.
- No other questions or comments to the notes were raised by the team, so Kate will post online as final.

Final Review of Draft Text (Allan, Kate)

Goal: Discuss key topics identified in the team members review of the technical standard.

Finalize revisions for Initial Review, or identify steps prior to release.

Before this meeting Kate sent around the text for review and asked the team to identify the top 1 or 2 things you'd like to change. The team reviews the text while discussing these issues and makes some changes on-screen together. Some key points from this discussion:

- Several on the team noted at the July tour the presence of invasive species. Criteria language added to manage invasive species as part of windbreak renovation.

- Predominant winter wind vs prevailing wind – Team doesn't have a term preference but text will be edited to be consistent. National language also uses both terms with no clear preference.
 - DOT uses an average wind direction of Mid Nov to April 1. See this resource for instructions on determining primary winter wind direction: https://sicop.transportation.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/36/2017/07/NCHRP-20-07147_Controlling-Blowing-Snow-Snow-Fence_Table_2003.pdf
 - The NRCS wind rose resource is also used—see the intro here: <https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/wcc/home/climateSupport/windRoseResources/> . The wind rose data download for WI stations is available here: <https://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/ftpref/downloads/climate/windrose/wisconsin/> This data set uses only 5 main weather stations across the state. The weather station may not represent detailed conditions on the specific field.
 - This Iowa State resource includes WI data and has a lot more detail and customization: https://mesonet.agron.iastate.edu/sites/locate.php?network=WI_ASOS
 - General criteria language added that design will include determination of prevailing wind direction. Procedures for determining prevailing wind will be included in the **guidance document** that Team will be working on next.
- Fire risk – should we include residue management related to fire risk? Species selection could go into this as well. Not a crown fire risk since it's narrow and a windbreak could even act as a fire break. Protecting structures <https://www.nfpa.org/Public-Education/Fire-causes-and-risks/Wildfire/Firewise-USA> . Windbreak design is already 5H away from structure but a consideration will be added related to orientation of windbreaks near structures.
- Odor – Allan spoke to a couple of experts on the topic (Shawn Belt and Paul Patterson) who were referrals from Richard Straight. The odor control is limited and harder to measure and this is not usually a primary purpose, however, it still a purpose for this standard. Having the odor source out of sight can also change perception of odor. Allan already reviewed the current odor-control language with Shawn.
- Select windbreak species tolerant of spray drift—where is this info available?
 - Mike Demchik is aware of research by John Kort from Agri-food Canada but it is not published. We could contact him for research summary.
 - Matt also had contact with Gary Bentrup at National Agroforestry Center and he may be a resource if team would like more input.
 - Some dicamba and windbreak data from University of Missouri: Mitigation of Herbicide Injury with Windbreaks <https://ipm.missouri.edu/MEG/2022/8/windbreaks-MW/>
 - Team will keep this topic in mind during **guidance document** preparation.
- Team discusses that pest management had herbicide use are addressed with reference to CPS 595 and toll WIN-PST. Both are good resources and publicly available (i.e., not just within NRCS).

- Under Considerations for Species Selection there is mention of undesirable pests, though not clear what that means. This was national language that could be clarified. **Guidance document** may address this.
- Delineating field boundaries with a windbreak is peculiar to mention – it is deleted.
- Why are Plans and Specs and O&M after Considerations? It seems like that stuff may be overlooked and could even be mistaken for optional. Ordering of the sections and other formatting are set up as national template and likely not flexible, though **Allan** will look into it.
- Team discussed issue with species that can spread and compete for cropland or other trees. A Consideration is added to avoid more aggressive species.
- Team discusses that in the instructions for expert reviewers, Kate could request they focus to help identify gaps: make sure criteria includes enough information to support a decision.

Break as needed

Initial Reviewer Selection (Kate)

Goal: Identify reviewers for the initial expert review of the revised draft standard.

The Initial Review is by a short list of invited experts only and is usually around 5 to 10 people. Later on, there will be a Broad Review which is the open, public review step.

The team reviews the list of potential Initial Reviewers on screen together and first adds some names, then narrows the list down to 6 Initial Reviewers with a good diversity and combination of expertise. The people who were not selected will still be specifically invited to participate in the Broad Review.

Kate will reach out to the final list of selected Initial Reviewers to confirm they are interested and available for this review. If anyone declines, she'll let Allan know to identify a replacement. We typically give reviewers a 3-week review time, so it will likely extend into early October.

Kate will let the Team know when the document is sent out and who the final confirmed Initial Reviewers are.

Plan of Action (Kate, Allan)

Goal: Review next steps and action items.

Next team meeting is scheduled for Sept 28, 2022. The standard will likely be in the middle of review period so the Sept. meeting will focus on the guidance document.

At the October 26, 2022 meeting the team discussion will then shift focus to discuss comments from the Initial Review, and preparing revised draft for the Broad Review.

Action items:

- **Allan:** make final text updates based on meeting discussions today then send Kate draft to submit to the reviewers.
- **Allan** will discuss with others internally and look into whether sections can be reordered so Plans and Specs and O&M sections come right after Criteria rather than after Considerations.
- **Kate:** reach out to the Initial Reviewers to gauge interest and availability.
- **Kate:** When Allan has the text ready, **Kate** will send out the draft to the Initial Reviewers and inform team of progress.
- **Kate:** finalize 6/29 and 7/27 notes and post online
- **Kate:** prepare today's draft meeting notes for Team review.
- **Kate & Allan:** prepare 9/28 agenda.

3:30 **End** – Meeting concludes at 3:00 pm