



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 || socwisconsin.org

NRCS 590 Nutrient Management Standard Team

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, January 23, 2025 ▲ 9:00am – 2:30pm ▲

Dane County UW Extension, 5201 Fen Oak Drive, Madison, WI 53718 ▲ Drumlin Conference Room ▲

9:00 Welcome (Team)

Goal: Attendance and review the meeting objective.

Attendance: Mike Stanek, Andrew Craig, Cody Caulkins, Morgan Kepler, Sara Walling, Aaron O'Rourke, Christina Anderson, Eric Hurley, Andrea Topper, Dan Smith, Matt Ruark, and Travis Engles.

Announcement: We have an accepted offer for the SOC Manager. Hoping the new SOC Manager, Carl Wepking will start early February.

9:05 Notes Review (Team)

Goal: Action item reports and approve 9/26/24 & 12/3/2024 meeting notes.

Both meeting minutes were approved.

9:20 Review of items from previous meeting (Mike)

- **Contour strip clarifying language (Dan)**
 - Issue in need of clarifying: There are many conservation practices/methods available when winter spreading solids. Language is 25% of the field then waiting 14 days before applying 25% more. Need to clarify "25% of the field" when applying to contouring/buffer strips.
 - Interpretation of "25%" should consider the full defined field, not the individual strip, if the field follows the appropriate practice standard (contouring/buffer strip) definition of alternative erosive/susceptible cropping system.
 - Discussion on the opportunity this provides to producers daily hauling in areas like the Driftless.
 - Discussion on applicability in SNAP+. How to appropriately determine field boundaries, select contours to make up 25% of the field, and ensure the model will work with this method (risk assessment vs nutrient management loading).
 - Opportunity to include conservation practice standards (contouring and buffer strip) key language and links to standards in SNAP+ for planners to reference.
 - Discussion on relevance to "14 days" between spreading events. Is necessary? Mike to consider language around snow events to replace.
 - **ACTION:** Mike will work with SNAP+ team to 1. Ensure 25% can be defined by the full field and not individual strips, perhaps by selecting and grouping strips, 2. This method will work with the model, and 3. Red flags work appropriately.
- **Revised language on PI for TMDL (Aaron & Travis)**
 - National standard includes P risk criteria, TMDLs have lower PI limits to meet water quality goals (P risk areas)

- o Discussion to better understand options for including PI needed to meet TMDLs.
 - Criteria would need leeway for making progress, need to define progress and understand implications for various programs (e.g. FPP).
 - Need to better understand:
 - What is considered progress?
 - Over what timeframe is allowed to make progress and how does this work with other program timelines (e.g. FPP)
 - What happens with change of owner/operator?
 - Need to define “crop rotation”
 - Work with the team to better understand how criteria would work in SNAP+
 - SNAP+ is some changes that may impact PI calculations,
 - Currently uses previous year and two future years for planning
 - Andrew has provided language in previous meetings/discussions – CA will find and discuss with Mike during drafting and bring back to group.
 - Discussion on planning vs implementation – measuring compliance.
 - Ensuring implementation through check-list
 - **ACTION:** Christina to find Andrew’s draft language offered in earlier meetings; review crop rotation definition established in other rules/standards (e.g. conservation crop rotation) and discuss in next meeting
- **Variable rate technology requirements (Mike)**
 - o At small team at NRCS has been drafting guidance and payment scenario for precision ag using GPS guided equipment applied to zones.
 - Defines uses and includes an implementation requirement component doc. Interest to include in Standard.
 - o Questions/discussion: Added note ensuring not to exceed UW Recs.
 - Caution with application of products, applying to P vs N. Applying to lower soil test P, but caution on overapplying N.
 - Do we need guidance on building equations to develop the rate (UW recs baseline, setting parameters) to generate the map?
 - **ACTION:** Mike will Karl if more guidance is needed.
- **Test farm, applicability of 3.5million gal using proposed P risk assessment (Kyle)**
 - o Kyle was unable to attend meeting, but sent test farm information for Mike to share.
 - o Task: Could Kyle reduce by 25% over the rotation? Looks like he was able to make it work out. Kyle created NM Plan, 3.5 mil gal of manure, 945 acres, planned for 25-29, approx. ½ receiving manure, NPK – 11-5-23 liquid (injected). In his strategy of every other year of spreading, equals neg P205 balance.
 - o Discussion looking over field information, confirm the need to define crop rotation.
 - o Hard to have this discussion without Kyle present. Will take a closer look at field output and discuss any further questions at future meeting.

Goal: Discussion to finalize language

Break as needed

12:00 *Lunch, provided*

12:30 **Discussing documentation method options for standard**

Goal: Methods for tracking to support public understanding of standard changes

- o ATCP 50 example. Used excel.
- o Important to include why
- o Agree this is important and will help with outreach
- o Eric has an example from Iowa to use as a template.

1:15 **Silurian dolomite and depth to bedrock restrictions/N targeted areas (Aaron/Cody)**

Goal: Discussion

- o Discussion to ensure we have covered this section.
- o Will reference state standard for [Silurian restrictions](#), DATCP depth to bedrock standard, and associated data layers
- o Other bedrock concerns are already prohibited in other rules
 - Conduits to groundwater definition from NR 243 (fractures, sinkholes...)
 - Setback requirements for wells
- o Discussion on N targeted areas.
 - Draft criteria language from previous meeting (3/14) lays out DNR susceptible areas N restrictions and resources.
 - Mike/Eric will review, incorporate, and come back to the group with any questions.

Break as needed

2:00 **Other topics/issues to discuss:**

- DNR Well compensation areas
 - o This no longer applies and can be removed.
- Locally delineated areas (under nutrient prohibitions for all sites)
 - o Current standard language already refers to abiding by any local ordinances and state rules.
 - o Refer to most accurate map for nutrient application.
 - o Review current standard language to ensure clarity for both state/local rules and delineated areas. Will bring remaining questions back to the group.
- Utilization of SNAP+ for plan development
 - o Discussion about requiring SNAP+ for all plans?
 - Issue: out of state TSPs aligning with WI Plans for NRCS funding.
 - Will review options and draft language to ensure Plain Faith can be accommodated.

2:15 **Review Updated Schedule (Mike)**

Goal: Review remaining steps and milestones.

Meeting Review (Christina/Mike)

Goal: Review Action Items and prepare for the next meeting.

- Mike/Eric/Christina will meet to get through draft standard and come with list of remaining questions, discussion points before next meeting.

2:30 End