

NR 151 Advisory Committee Meeting  
American Family Insurance Building, Madison WI  
January 7, 2008  
9:30am – 12:30am

**In attendance:**

Stevenson, Gordon	WI DNR	Klingberg, Kevan	UW Discovery Farm
Billings, Corinne	WI DNR	Masterpole, Dan	Chippewa County
Parsons, Tim	WI DNR	Calkins, Kurt	Columbia County
Pfender, John	WI DNR	Cleereman, Greg	Marinette County
Kirsch, Kevin	WI DNR	Sebo, Paul	Washington County
*Lueders, Laura	WI DNR	Johnson, Andy	Marathon County
*Bauman, Tom	WI DNR	Crass, David	Representing DBA
*Betz, Carolyn	WI DNR	Zelazny, Julian	WLWCA
*Holden, Carol	WI DNR	Maxted, Jeff	UW – Madison
Cihlar, Sandi	Producer	Calkins, Kurt	Columbia County
Castelnuovo, Richard	DATCP	*Diebel, Matt	UW – Madison
Caneff, Denny	River Alliance	*Ward Good, Laura	UW – Madison
Nowak, Pete	UW Soils	*Fallat, Coreen	DATCP
Koepke, Al	PDPW	*Hoyer, Will	Clean Wisconsin
Zimmerman, Paul	WI Farm Bureau	*Lamb, Jordan	Dewitt, Ross & Stevens
Murphy, Pat	NRCS		

\*Observers – These individuals are not on the Advisory Committee

**I. Review of the December 10, 2007 Meeting Minutes**

- Richard Castelnuovo requested that action items be identified in the subsequent meeting minutes

**II. Discussion of Miscellaneous Proposed Revision to NR 151**

- “NR 151 Revisions: Miscellaneous Proposed Changes to Ag Performance Standards & Prohibitions.ppt” presented by John Pfender and Tom Bauman (download presentation slide online at <http://dnr.wi.gov/runoff/rules/nr151/rulerevision.htm>)
- Slide 5. Margin of Safety. There was discussion of the flexibility of the rule in regards to the margin of safety. Does an emergency clause need to be incorporated? It was stated that NR 151 does not apply to emergency situations. There was discussion of what belongs in the code vs. a technical standard. Operational procedures and design criteria belong in the tech std. This revision is a means for the DNR to be more proactive so it is not necessary to wait for a manure pit to overflow before they may take action. **Action Item: DNR will consider addition of annual precipitation minus evaporation.**
- Slide 9. Nutrient Management. A note was added to clarify that landowners are responsible for accounting for industrial, municipal, and septage within nutrient management plans. NR 214 states that both are responsible. Providers of sludge must know what is in the sludge and producers are responsible to know how spreading will affect P-Index. Committee acknowledged that there is currently a lack of communication b/w the two parties (providers and producers). Need for more training/communication to ensure municipalities/industries take necessary responsibility. **Action Item: TMDL provision needs to be clarified**

- **Committee Members are to send suggestions of discussion topics to [Carol.Holden@wisconsin.gov](mailto:Carol.Holden@wisconsin.gov). Meeting minutes will be distributed w/in two weeks.**

### III. SNAP Plus Demonstration: NRCS 590 discussion.

#### **Presentation**

- “SNAP-PLUS and the Wisconsin P Index.ppt” presented by Laura Ward Good. (download presentation online at <http://dnr.wi.gov/runoff/rules/nr151/rulerevision.htm>)

#### **Discussion:**

- There was concern that SNAP-Plus is too time intensive and tells us what is intuitive. Concern about what counties will be expected to do. It requires a week to input data for one farm and ensure it is correct. This could be done by county, farmer, private sector. This model was formally used as a planning tool, now we are being expected to use it for monitoring and record keeping.
- Counties expressed concern about the inability to get data from NRCS. It is difficult for them to obtain past data to enter into SNAP-Plus from NRCS due to information act. NRCS stated that the counties must go through landowner to obtain it.
- Currently it is not possible to interchange data between SNAP-Plus and RUSLE 2.
- There was discussion regarding accounting period. The producer has a choice of two ways to determine it. They may take into account data from the previous years if it is to their benefit OR they may begin the accounting period the date the rule becomes effective. It was recommendation to not blow whistle on producer first year or two as they are learning. There was concern of how DNR will ensure that producers maintain an average of 6 throughout the accounting period in the first 8 years? There was no committee recommendation on how to do this.
- The question was raised if NR 151 needs a recordkeeping standard? There was no response from the committee.
- There is concern about NRCS 590 and PI = 6 meshing. NRCS currently does not require that planners use SNAP-Plus. They estimated that 60% of them that are cost-shared do (this is inconsistent across state).
- Concern that we are shifting problem as producers begin to continually apply on fields of low risk until their soil test P skyrockets.
- UW is working on simplifying SNAP, adding economic element. Richard Castelnuovo, DATCP, can get workplan for SNAP improvements to committee members upon request.
- Objective of rule revision is to allow producers flexibility on the ground instead of being prescriptive (ie must have 30 foot buffers).
- Comment on the issue of trying to design NPS program of uniformity and equity for an entire state with regions facing diverse challenges. WI Buffer Initiative threw out

this idea. There are 350 county professionals in conservation. Allow them the flexibility to prioritize at the local level, deciding where PI=6 is applicable.

- There was further debate on tillage setbacks. There is opposing opinions that it is currently too wide and too narrow. Also, complaint that there is lack of scientific data to support it.
- DNR should not allow cattle in the stream. There are more effects than just direct deposit of nutrients including degrading of banks and in-stream habitat.

IV. Next Meeting: February 7, 2008 at the WI DNR South Central Regional Office in Fitchburg.