

May 29, 2012

Voice of the Customer Issues:

Cost:

- Record keeping too time consuming (too many reports required)
- Yield Reduced
- Development of the plan is costly
- Duplicative efforts
- Doesn't allow flexibility

Data management/storage issues:

- Space
- Security

Fairness (non-CAFOs don't have to do it)

"W" soils incorrect

Application rate flexibility

- Critical soil issue
- Economic optimum vs. maximum yield
- Mass balance concept
- Yield research
- Soil survey not linked to productivity
- Rotation planning (# of years going forward)
- Bedrock spreading prohibitions
- Manure may be limited but not fertilizer on same field

DNR:

- Doesn't respond fast enough to field changes.
- Inconsistent interpretation across the state by staff

Ask 5 whys of key Issues:

(1) Record keeping is time consuming

- There are a lot of fields with large farms
- Sometimes there is a duplication of effort
- Farm records and agency forms don't match
- 590/SNAP+ and NR 243 don't match
- EPA regulations require records
 - Groundwater and surface water
 - Daily haul logs
 - Weather records (DATCP has a weather application tool)

Possible fixes:

- Add date and weather to SNAP+
- Already have templates to improve consistency – not all farmers use them
- Could create a hand-held app
- Green Tier approach that would allow review of a record keeping system that is deemed equivalent
- John Deere and CASE could adopt computer programs that are compatible with SNAP+ and the maps that are used in a NMP

(2) Reduces Yield (perception?)

- We are limiting their nutrient inputs so that must reduce yield
- More nutrients is cheap insurance
- With high value crops they want less risk
- UW research doesn't represent their fields
- Believe yield is just based on how green crops are (N)
- If they want to add more than UW recommendations, they have to test their fields and with a lot of acres this is too hard.

Possible fixes:

- UW research needs to test for optimal N with high yield crops (need to pay for
- Revisions by NRCS to 590 will consider adaptive management

(3) Doesn't allow flexibility

- Need to be able to add fields or change plan quickly
- Soil surveys are not accurate about productivity
- Critical soils may be limiting to areas that could receive more
- Research hasn't kept up with new yields
- Five years of planning isn't realistic about what actually happens
- Should be able to use mass balance approach
- "W" soils aren't right

Possible fixes:

- Guidance to allow flexibility under some circumstances.

Voice of Customer Solutions

Easier and faster software

Electronic submittal and access

Everything on restriction maps

Financial assessment of implementation

Record keeping app for daily logs

Permit issuance:

Instead of 5 year rotation can plan for excess land (mass balance)

Annual reports

Instead of looking forward, use past years of record like NR 151

Better communication with DNR staff

More access and visibility

Build a relationship/trust

Don't review all NMPs

Use a certification program

Use a lottery approach (review only a random number)

May 21, 2012

TEAM ANALYSIS

We need to make NMPs faster, cheaper, easier and more reliable.

Used a fish bone analysis for Not Reliable

- Lots of assumptions result in cumulative error (*)
- Using planning tools for regulation (**)
- Environment is always changing (crops, rain) (-)
- Need more standard tools and templates (**)
- All farms are different (-)

(*) Areas where we could affect a change

(-) Areas where we cannot make a change

Used a fish bone analysis for Too Long

- Collecting the data (**)
- Nature of agriculture (-)
- Five year vs. Annual plan (*)
- Communicating changes to plan (single file sharing site) (*)
- Varied regulations among local/state/federal government (1/2*)
- DNR staff levels inadequate (could certify others or increase fees to hire more staff)

TEAM SOLUTIONS

Faster:

- SNAP+ - better manure allocation
- GIS based - connect attributes to field
- Do we always need a five year plan?
- On-line file sharing allows plans to stay current
- Central intake for completeness then one reviewer
- Reissuance tickler from DNR (better communication)

Easier:

- Redo NR 243 checklist (repetitive)
- Get everyone to use the standard narrative
- Use certified reviewers instead of DNR?
- Offer an expedited review for a fee?

More Reliable:

- Better guidance on GP, "W" soils, bedrock, waterways, etc.

