

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resource
Sensitive Areas and Management Practices Workgroup
Monday November 23, 2015, 1-4:30pm
Luxemburg Fairgrounds Expo Center, Luxemburg, WI

Workgroup Members: (Present) Russ Rasmussen, Betsy Doolittle, Kevin Erb, Andrew Craig, Nathan Nyssee, Kevin Masarik, Jeff Polenske, Ryan Debroux, Mick Sagrillo, Lynn Utesch, Dale Konkle (for Bill Schuster), Joe Baeten, Don Niles, Tom Davenport, Davina Bonness, Tressie Kamp (for Sara Geers), Sara Walling (via phone)
(Absent) Sarah Geers, Andy Wallander, Mary Anne Lowndes, Bill Phelps, Kyle Burton, Brad Holtz.

Welcome and Introductions (1:05pm)

Agenda Review

- No comments.

Review October Meeting Notes

- A workgroup member recommended revising the meeting notes to state the nutrient balance calculations for Keweenaw County and subsequent workgroup discussion at October meeting were based on the revised DNR document (distributed at October meeting). The minutes will be revised to reflect this clarification.

December Meeting

- Next meeting is scheduled for December 15, 2015, from 1:00-4:30pm at the Keweenaw County Fair Grounds in Luxemburg. This time and place worked for all workgroup members.

Review of Recommendations

- Discussed workgroup process and ground rules for discussing and selecting recommendations:
 - 14 total workgroup members
 - Each workgroup member can submit recommendations for consideration/discussion
 - Workgroup members with similar occupation (CCA) or agency (DNR, UWEX) must work together and have one 'vote' on recommendations
 - Some workgroup members worked with other members and submitted joint recommendations (e.g., M. Sagrillo, A. Wallander and L. Utesch)
 - 9 out of 14 workgroup members submitted recommendations for review
 - Recommendations with similar focus/content were grouped into common categories for discussion by DNR

- Primary goal for workgroup is to reach consensus or ‘near-consensus’ on submitted recommendations
- Achieving consensus may require workgroup discussion/analysis and may also require amending or combining similar recommendations
- Consensus or near consensus may not be possible for some recommendations
- Definitions for workgroup recommendations:
 - Consensus (all 14 members agree)
 - Near-consensus (1-2 disagree; remaining members agree)
 - Majority opinion (9-11 agree) and Minority opinion (5 or less agree)
- See attached ‘Workgroup Recommended Practices for Sensitive Areas’ documents dated November 23, 2015, and December 15, 2015, for outcome of workgroup discussion.

Break (2:35pm)

Public Comment (2:50pm)

- Bill Iwen
 - Use MSDS (material and safety data sheets) involve OSHA when approving industrial waste applications on fields.
 - State is turning into a nitrate hell.
- Dick Swanson
 - 10% exemption for industrial waste in manure pits.
 - How and why did the state allow/approve this policy?
 - State needs to disclose to landowner what wastes are being applied on their land; track from point of origin to field.
 - Signed land contracts need to be required before manure applications to fields
 - No spreading of liquid manure on 5 feet or less to bedrock; limit volumes, rates and timing on remaining acres with > 5 feet to bedrock.
- Joe Mills
 - Lack of CAFO representation in the workgroup.
 - Workgroup needs to partner with CAFOs on recommendations so they can be adopted/implemented
 - CAFOs are a main cause of the groundwater problem.

Resume Review of Recommendations (314-430pm)

- See attached ‘Workgroup Recommended Practices for Sensitive Areas’ documents dated November 23, 2015, and December 15, 2015, for outcome of workgroup discussion.

Adjourn (4:30pm)