

NR 151 Advisory Committee Meeting
December 10, 2007
1:00pm – 4:00pm

In attendance:

Stevenson, Gordon	WI DNR	Zimmerman, Paul	WI Farm Bureau
Billings, Corinne	WI DNR	Murphy, Pat	NRCS
Parsons, Tim	WI DNR	Klingberg, Kevan	UW Discovery Farm
Pfender, John	WI DNR	Masterpole, Dan	Chippewa County
Kirsch, Kevin	WI DNR	Calkins, Kurt	Columbia County
Lueders, Laura	WI DNR	Cleereman, Greg	Marinette County
Cihlar, Sandi	Producer	Schuster, Bill	Door County
Castelnuovo, Richard	DATCP	Sebo, Paul	Washington County
Caneff, Denny	River Alliance	Maxted, Jeff	UW - Madison
Nowak, Pete	UW Soils	Ward Good, Laura	UW - Madison
Koepke, Al	Producer, PDPW		

Kevin Kirsch, WI DNR, gave a presentation, Revisions to NR151 Agricultural Standards and Synthesis of the WBI into NR151. His handouts and PowerPoint presentation can be found at <http://www.dnr.state.wi.us/runoff/rules/nr151/rulerevision.htm>

Advisory Committee Discussion:

- How much time will be needed to implement
 - Sampling/modeling
 - Landowner contacts
 - Soil test
 - Crop history
 - Manure application
- What is the counties' role in implementing the PI standard?
- How many producers statewide are already in compliance with the PI?
- Nutrient Management planning quality control issues
- Striving for a simple system to implement. This is moving towards a more complicated one (workload issue)
- Getting harder to collect the necessary data from landowners as counties begin to wear black hats
- What is all of this going to mean to the average farmer?
- How can we make this user-friendly to the farmers?
- How can we empower farmers and engage landowners?
- Need the education component
- PI=6 is already in 590. Why do we need a new standard? (DNR response: 590 is a plan, PI=6 is implementation of plan).
- Fear that SNAP will be rejected by farmers if it becomes linked to performance standards.
- When PI=6 developed we had no idea it would be used this way; but research has proved it to be valuable

- Should support PI=6 and see where it goes
- Support state effort to implement NRCS 590 and not just getting plans written
- Need requirement for records to verify implementation of PI
- Kevin needs to present info on accounting period. Rule language is not clear and may need adjustment
- Reconsider exclusion for sludge/septic spreaders (a PI =6)
- 15 foot tillage setback may be CREP eligible
- Will the grant requirement to do full farm compliance make people ineligible for EQIP, etc.?
- If a 15 foot setback was applied to all waterways, how many acres would that be statewide? It will affect different regions of the state differently. South Central Region (little) vs. West Central Region (a lot)
- Clarify in the rule that the 15 foot setback is in addition to the PI=6
- Its time for the PI=6; Setback is a good idea.
- Like the PI=6; like monitoring, like the 15 foot setback. TMDL subject is opening a can of worms.
- PI=6 is already in 590. Strengthen it but not separate standard
- Fears we will lose support for SNAP
- 15 feet is too far to apply everywhere
- Coordinate ATCP 50 with NR 151
- Move PI under nutrient management standard
- Likes the 15 foot setback but it needs to be explained better; need more rules on where the 15' applies (e.g. perennial, intermittent); 15' on pastures?