



# Delaware Nutrient Management



## The Delaware Nutrient Management Commission Planning Subcommittee Minutes of the Meeting Held January 10, 2006

### In attendance:

<i>Committee Members Present</i>	<i>Others Present</i>
D. Baker, Planning Chair	S. Hollenbeck
B. Schilling	S. Kepfer
T. Keen	M. Guo
C. Larimore	P. Sample
C. Solberg	M. Davis
E. Lewandowski	J. Manchester
<i>Ex-officios Present</i>	M. Pielmeier
W. Rohrer, Jr.	

*This meeting was properly notified and posted as required by law.*

### Call to Order/Welcome:

Chairman D. Baker called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and thanked everyone for attending.

### Approval of Minutes:

E. Lewandowski motioned to approve the minutes from the October 6, 2005 Planning Subcommittee meeting. Motion seconded by C. Larimore which passed unanimously.

### Discussion and Action Items:

*Review and act on Research and Demonstration Grant Proposals:*

B. Rohrer suggested ranking the top four proposals and justify why the subcommittee has not ranked the remaining. The subcommittee is in receipt of eight proposals over \$255,000. There is just over \$104,000 available in the Research and Demonstration budget.

The Planning Subcommittee reviewed the proposals. E. Lewandowski asked if any of the proposals could be taken off the table due to not meeting the eligibility requirements or address priorities as listed in the Request for Proposal (RFP). C. Solberg clarified by asking if any of the proposals are not referenced in the research priorities and states in his opinion there are two. Discussion of the review follows:

#### **1. Addition of Genesis Calcium, \$24,543.20:**

- This proposal does not fit research the research priorities as listed in the RFP.

CONSENSUS: Based on the evaluation criteria of the RFP, this proposal is not considered. Specifically, it does not fit the research priorities.

**2. Advancing NM in DE, \$28,122**

- The proposal could be classified as the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control's (DNRECs) responsibility. DNREC has Tributary Action Teams for almost every watershed in the state and part of their charge is specific to the proposal.
- The Commission is charged with measuring the effectiveness of BMPs and this proposal does allow for this.
- Mass balancing would qualify some of the goals of the Commission with excess litter, application of litter and how much is produced.
- The concern is the data may already exist. It is noted the data the Commission is utilizing is old.
- C. Solberg thought T. Sims was going to bring forward a new mass balance forward within the next year. B. Rohrer stated that he was trying to do but is trying to secure funding.
- It was suggested to add a timing provision to reduce payment by \$2,000 for each month after October 2006.

CONSENSUS: Will be considered as it fits research priorities as listed in the RFP.

**C. Solberg motioned to accept grant proposal #2. P. Sample seconded the motion. There were four votes in favor, one vote against with one abstention. Therefore, motion carried.**

Discussion ensued in reference to the suggestion made earlier to reduce payment by \$2,000 for each month after October 2006 the data was late. If receipt of data is of a concern, this should be added.

Since the first motion passed, Chairman Baker asked for a motion to modify the first motion. **C. Solberg motioned to add a timing provision to grant proposal #2 as specified by the proposal. M. Davis seconded the motion.**

Discussion ensued if there would be a penalty provision as to what would happen should the data be late. It was noted that this was not included with the RF, therefore, could not. B. Rohrer stated he would address the issue with T. Sims.

With a motion and second on the table, Chairman Baker called for the vote which **passed unanimously**.

**3. Effective Setbacks for Controlling Nutrient Runoff, \$45,265**

- This proposal fits the research priorities as listed in the RFP.
- This research could have direct impact farmers related to land usage and also with discussions with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).
- This is a two-year research project.
- M. Guo provided an explanation of his proposal and answered questions.
- M. Guo stated the research proposal would answer questions concerning the Clean Water Act.
- Concerns were shared in reference to soil types. M. Guo stated there are at least 10 different soil types in a 1-5 acre piece of land. The soil types could be chosen to be typical and representative of Delaware soil.

CONSENSUS: Will be considered as it fits research priorities as listed in the RFP and the research is important in reference to future discussions with USEPA.

**B. Schilling motioned to accept grant proposal #3. P. Sample seconded the motion. There were four votes in favor, one vote against with one abstention. Therefore, motion carried.**

**4. Extending the Benefits of Ag NM, \$37,368**

- For the most part, this proposal does not fit research the research priorities as listed in the RFP.
- The only item in the proposal that could fit is the method of quantifying the effectiveness of Best Management Practices (BMPs).

CONSENSUS: Based on the evaluation criteria of the RFP, this proposal is not considered. Only one part of the proposal fits the research priorities.

**5. Little Assawoman Bay Watershed, \$22,285**

- E. Lewandowski rescued himself from the discussion.
- This proposal would cost the grower in a long run. Model farms will force individuals out of business as they will not be able to do it.
- P. Sample asked what the objective of the proposal is. The following objectives were outlined:
  - The operation is being threatened due to encroachment and the goal is to protect it to keep it as a viable operation.
  - This has been done in the past successfully for another operation.
  - The intention is to monitor actual reductions in nitrogen and phosphorus coming off the operation to the line ditch which runs off the property through implementation of the listed BMPs.
  - Work with the integrators to create the model farm.
- The concern is the level of financial support that it would take to create the perfect farm next to a development is at a higher level of diligence than is expected the rest of farming is expected to reach. A model farm does no advance the research priorities.
- There is not enough background data to do a comparison.

CONSENSUS: Based on the evaluation criteria of the RFP, this proposal is not considered. Specifically, it does not fit the research priorities.

**6. Modeling Stormwater Loads, \$41,734**

- This proposal does not fit research the research priorities as listed in the RFP.
- B. Rohrer stated this proposal pertains more towards stormwater than agriculture.

CONSENSUS: Will not be considered as it does not fit the research priorities.

**7. Poultry Litter as Activated Carbon Sources, \$23,748**

- One area of the proposal fits the research priorities as listed in the RFP as it would provide an alternative for excess litter.
- All other areas do not fit the research priorities as listed in the RFP.
- It is noted this is a long range research project and would be better handled by the Chesapeake Bay Commission.
- M. Guo provided an explanation of his proposal and answered questions.

CONSENSUS: This proposal will be deferred to allow further discussion with M. Guo. The Subcommittee recommends the elimination of #4 from the proposal. This elimination would lower the amount of money being requested under the

proposal. It would also allow the proposal to fit within the research priorities as listed in the RFP.

#### **8. Reduce Phosphorous Loading, \$25,000**

- The concern was raised that additional the funding requested form the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) has not been awarded. Request for funding through a pre-proposal was submitted to the NFWF on November 18, 2005.
- Biological Litter Management (BLM) is a new concept. It has been suggested to table this proposal to allow proper level of scrutiny. Timeline for submission will not allow this.
- The second concern is that PLT is being utilized. PLT is ammonia.
- The proposal could be amended to utilize Alum instead of PLT.

CONSENSUS: This proposal will be deferred until funding from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation has been secured and with a change to use Alum instead.

All research priorities have been addressed with except of priorities 5 and 6. It was suggested to process another round of the Request for Proposals. Discussion ensued concerning soluble phosphorus and determined it may be a while for this to happen as something that was affordable.

#### **P. Sample motioned to reject grant proposals #1, #4, #5 and #6. M. Davis seconded the motion which passed unanimously.**

B. Rohrer will make notification of rejection to all applicants of grant proposals #1, #4, #5 and #6. C. Solberg suggested including the reasons why.

B. Rohrer asked if the approved grants would be presented at the Full Commission meeting this evening.

D. Baker stated yes as they have been approved by the subcommittee.

*Discuss DNMC role during Governor's Conference on Ag:*

B. Rohrer provided an update on the progress on the Governor's Conference on Ag. B. Rohrer reviewed the draft agenda.

Following is a list of individuals who have agreed to speak at the conference:

- Conference Opening: Historical background on the Nutrient Management Law, B. Rohrer
- Presentation on Indicator's and Trends: John Snyder of Watershed Assessment or a staff member
- Measurable Results from Implementing Nutrient Management: Dr. Bill Saylor, University of Delaware
- Phosphorus Balances on the Farm: Dr. Tom Sims or Dr. Greg Binford, University of Delaware
- Alternative Use for Excess Poultry Litter: Perdue AgriRecycle; also asked Allen Family Foods, but has not yet confirmed; broker to discuss data on moved litter (if a broke cannot be identified, S. Hollenbeck or B. Rohrer will present the information)
- Panel Discussion, "*Big Picture for Nutrient Management*":
  - USEPA: Shawn Gardner or Hank Zygmunt
  - DE Water Resources: Kevin Donnelly
  - Industry: Jeff Smith, Delaware Poultry Industry Environmental Committee Chair and Environmental individual for Mountaire
  - Environmental & Conservation organizations: B.Rohrer is looking for feedback as an individual has not been identified. B. Rohrer suggested Sally Kepfer of NRCS, one of the Chesapeake Bay Programs, Commission member.

- DNMC Perspective: The DNMC Chair or Vice-Chair
- Lunch & DE Environmental Stewardship Award
- Prospects for Ag in DE: Governor Minner

The following suggestions were made:

- D. Baker will provide the DNMC perspective
- G. Binford for Phosphorus Balances on the Farm
- E. Lewandowski will identify someone from the Chesapeake Bay Foundation
- S. Kepfer may be able to help with someone
- It was suggested to include a Sussex County Farmer and R.C. Willin was recommended

**Next Meeting**

It will be necessary to schedule a meeting once the additional information has been received in reference to grant proposal #7 and #8.

**Adjournment**

Chairman D. Baker adjourned meeting at 6:15 p.m.

Approved,

David Baker, Chair  
Planning Subcommittee

BRR/mrp