

NYS Soil & Water Conservation Committee
10B Airline Drive, Albany NY 12235 – Telephone (518) 457-3738

STATE COMMITTEE MEETING
June 22, 2004—Albany

Present: D. Hill, G. Proios, B. Aman, J. Dickinson—Voting Members; M. Latham—Assistant Director; J. Ten Eyck, L. Miller, M. Moore, B. Steinmuller—SWCC Staff; J. Rusnica, R. Zimmerman—NYSDAM; L. King—NYSDEC; K. Lewis—NYSCDEA; R. Lewis—NYACD; P. Kaczmarczyk, L. Wilson—NYSDOH; P. R. Churchill—NYSDOS; J. Tauzel—NYFB; S. Machovec—NRCS; D. Fox—Cornell; P. Black—SUNY ESF; K. Sumner—Orange County SWCD.

Call to order

D. Hill called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m.

Review/Approval of Minutes

B. Aman moved to approve the minutes of the May meeting with corrections submitted by G. Proios and L. Miller; seconded by G. Proios. Motion passed; carried.

Correspondence

Letters & Memos

1. Letter to Ron Kaplewicz from Paul Vickery, Chairman, announcing the appointment of David V. Bottar as Executive Director of the Central New York Regional Planning and Development Board. *Letter dated May 13, 2004.*
2. Letter to Ron Kaplewicz from David Haight, New York Field Manager, American Farmland Trust, asking for assistance in developing a new publication tentatively called "Planning for Agriculture in the Empire State". The publication will be a toolkit for planners, extension agents, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, farmers, land trusts and others that work with town governments in New York on planning and agricultural issues. *Letter dated May 25, 2004.*

Reports & News Letters

1. *USDA Wildland Waters*, Spring 2004 Issue.
2. *Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor Annual Report 2003.*
3. *National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council 2003 Annual Report.*
4. *Buffer Notes*, April 2004
5. *Watershed Agricultural Council Strategic Plan 2004-2007.*
6. *What's Cropping Up?* Volume 14, Number 3, May-June, 2004
7. *Local Open Space Planning Guide*, NYS DEC, Dept. of State publication.
8. *Conesus Lake Watershed Management Plan, Executive Summary*, model plan outline by DEC and Dept. of State.
9. *New York State Environmental Excellence Awards*, first annual awards 2004 application brochure.
10. *Susquehanna River Basin Commission New Release*, May 27, 2004
11. *Center for Watershed Protection 2003 Annual Report.*
12. *Waterworks*, New York State Federation of Lake Associations, Inc., May 2004.
13. *Keeping It On The Land*, Volume 6, Number 1, May 2004. Information for the soil erosion and sediment control community in the Great Lakes region.
14. Information packet from DEC regarding information on wet weather discharges.
15. *Bay Journal*, The Chesapeake Bay Newspaper, May 2004
16. *CFA News*, Volume 22, Number 2 – Spring 2004.
17. *Farming, The Journal of Northeast Agriculture*, June 2004

Conferences & Seminars

1. Planning for Green: Hudson Valley Perspectives, July 8-10, 2004, Marist College, Poughkeepsie, NY
2. 15th Annual Nonpoint Source Pollution Conference, "Planning for Water Quality", Fort William Henry Hotel, Lake George, NY, May 25-27, 2004.
3. Construction Contracting for Public Entities In New York, Latham, NY, August 12, 2004
4. Meetings and Events Calendar for NACD through August 2004.
5. Series of NRCS meetings entitled "Watershed Working Lands Summit: Better Water Quality through Better Government Collaboration, June, October and November 2004.

Discussion

After reviewing the letter and request for assistance from American Farmland Trust regarding the development of an agricultural planning publication, M. Latham noted that a discussion about land use planning is on the agenda for the Staff Meeting scheduled for June 24-26.

G. Proios suggested that the Committee look into holding a meeting to discuss and evaluate land use planning in New York State. He suggested that all key State Agencies be involved in this discussion. He noted that a coordinated effort between State agencies may secure additional funding for land use planning activities. He also mentioned that the Department of State's document on Quality Communities needs to be reevaluated because of its lack of reference to agricultural issues. G. Proios volunteered to be a representative for the State Committee if a committee is established to examine land use planning in New York State.

R. Lewis pointed out those ideas are similar to the objectives of CEM. CEM is designed to be a way to coordinate efforts between different State agencies regarding a number of different issues, including farmland protection and land use planning.

Ag Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control Program – B. Steinmuller

STATUS OF ROUNDS I-IX

Of 318 projects, 127 are active, 3 are pending, and 188 are complete. All originally funded Round IX projects are active. There is one pending contract in Round VI, one in Round VII, and one in Round IX.

ROUND X

The EPF grant awards for Round X were announced on March 22, 2004. Through Round X, a total of 31 projects were funded for a grant total of \$6,134,000. Plans of work are being received and contract development is underway.

Round XI

Please note: B. Aman recused himself from Round XI Discussion.

In response to the requests to establish a noncompetitive funding base for AEM, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended that a portion of the annual Environmental Protection Fund (EPF) be dedicated to establish consistent funding for AEM inventories (Tier 1) and assessments (Tier 2). The State Committee endorsed this concept at the April 20th, 2004 meeting. The State Committee requested that the staff develop a proposal in accordance with the TAC's recommendation. The proposal includes the recommendations from the May 17th meeting of the TAC.

B. Steinmuller briefly reviewed the proposal and emphasized that some of the details will continue to be worked out through the program development process.

G. Proios shared his concerns about the TAC's recommendation to dedicate \$600,000 from this year's EPF regardless of the outcome of the agricultural allocation.

J. Ten Eyck responded that a non-competitive funding source for Tier 1 and 2 projects may help determine future needs for planning and implementation and may aid in securing additional funds. He noted that, if left in the competitive pool, some counties may never receive money for assessment due to the structure of the ranking process.

M. Latham mentioned that the \$600,000 figure is strictly for funding Round XI. This amount can be re-evaluated for subsequent rounds.

J. Dickinson moved to accept the proposal and the TAC's recommendations to establish non-competitive funding for AEM inventories (Tier 1) and assessments (Tier 2); seconded by G. Proios. Motion passes; carried.

Please note: B. Aman rejoined the meeting at this time.

Amendment Requests

1. Orange SWCD – Walkkill River Farm Runoff Control – Round X – 34-1

Request 1: Addition of two landowners

Reason 1: One landowner has requested to postpone installation of pesticide containment BMP making funding available for the two additional landowners.

Request 2: Change of BMPs

Reason 2: One landowner has requested to postpone installation of pesticide containment BMP; those funds will be transferred to three farms. The two additional farms (see request 1) propose to install barnyard water management practices to address nutrients and the third landowner (already included in the project) will be adding conservation tillage to address sediment.

Previous amendments: none

B. Steinmuller advised the Committee that Counsel has taken issue with this amendment because the change of BMPs addresses different pollutants. This amendment alters the project from the intent of the proposal for which it was ranked.

K. Sumner, Orange County Soil and Water Conservation District Manager, was present at the meeting to help clarify any questions the Committee had about this amendment request.

Discussion ensued regarding this amendment request.

B. Aman moved to approve the addition of two landowners and the change of BMPs; seconded by J. Dickinson. Motion passed; carried.

Staff Approved Amendments

1. Tompkins SWCD – Salmon Creek Watershed Improvement Project – Round IX – C700731

Request: Change of landowners

Reason: The landowner has sold the farm and animals to the new landowner who will be completing the same BMPs.

Approved by J. Schumacher 6/7/04

2. Tompkins SWCD – Eastern Susquehanna River Basin Management Intensive Grazing Grant – Round VII – C700658

Request: Change of landowners

Reason: landowner was injured on farm accident and is not willing to complete BMPs at this time

Approved by J. Schumacher 5/24/04

3. Yates SWCD – Keuka Lake Watershed AEM Phase II Implementation Grant – Round IX – C700735

Request: Change of landowners

Reason: landowner has passed away

Approved by T. Brace/B. Steinmuller 6/17/04

4. Yates SWCD – Seneca Lake Watershed Tier IV Implementation Grant – Round VIII – C700063

Request: Change of landowners

Reason: landowner may be selling property

Approved by T. Brace/ B. Steinmuller 6/17/04

5. Livingston SWCD – Conesus Lake Watershed Tier II Planning Grant – Round X – 24-1

Request: Change of Landowners

Reason: original landowner is no longer farming
Approved by T. Brace/B. Steinmuller 6/17/04

6. Saratoga SWCD – Fish Creek/Sucker Brook Watershed – Round VII – C700649
Request: time extension from 6/30/04 to 3/31/05
Reason: additional time needed to complete construction activities due to pending EQIP funding
Approved by S. Lanthier 6/18/04
7. Cayuga SWCD – Fall Creek Barnyard Runoff and Nutrient Management System – Round VII – C700055
Request: time extension from 6/30/04 to 11/30/04
Reason: due to wet spring conditions more time is needed to complete barnyard management BMPs
Approved by J. Schumacher 6/22/04
8. Erie County SWCD – Upper Buffalo River Watershed Protection Phase II – Round VI – C700604
Request: change of budget
Reason: \$1,600 from contractual services was moved to BMP implementation to reflect the appropriate line where unused funds were returned.
Approved by T. Brace/B. Steinmuller 6/22/04

AEM Report – Jeff Ten Eyck

A copy of the *AEM Congressional Earmark Spending Proposal for FFY 2004* was distributed to Committee members. The Congressional earmark funds slated for New York State to help bolster the Agricultural Environmental Management (AEM) program, provides a unique opportunity to advance the voluntary program to the benefit of all New Yorkers, now and into the future. The need for permanent dedicated base funding for county/watershed AEM assessments has been the subject of priority resolutions previously passed by the New York Association of Conservation Districts, and the New York State Conservation Districts' Employees Association. Additionally, the above stated need is a critical component of the State's AEM Strategic Plan endorsed by the NYS Soil and Water Conservation Committee.

FY '04 Congressional Earmark --\$ 750,000

\$100,000 for engineering assistance for the AEM Program would remain with New York State USDA-NRCS. NRCS would hire a fulltime person to assist county SWCDs in the design, review and construction of Best Management Practices (BMPs) funded through the State's Agricultural NPS Grant Program and/or EQIP using the AEM framework.

The remaining *\$650,000* will be transferred to the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets via a contract with the Department and the State Committee for use as follows:

\$10,000 to support the AEM website

The State Committee will provide \$10,000 to support the AEM website. The site needs to be expanded and kept current with the latest worksheets, information sheets, references, related program news, and training opportunities to help local programs statewide.

\$30,000 to conduct statewide AEM training

The State Committee will provide \$30,000 for regional and statewide AEM training on the overall program, including requirements of a Strategic Plan and other technical training.

\$100,000 for the development of local AEM Strategic Plans

The State Committee will provide up to \$2,000 per District to develop and/ or update a local AEM Strategy that includes goals, objectives, and chronological tasks.

J. Ten Eyck noted that this will allow all districts to receive funding whether or not they are located in a primary watershed.

G. Proios noted that this will help reward good stewardship practices and will aid the program in prevention as well as remediation.

\$510,000 for the implementation of local AEM Strategic Plans*

The State Committee will provide up to \$10,000 per District to implement AEM Tier I Inventories and/or AEM Tier II Assessments, and/or AEM Tier V Evaluations that are consistent with the locally developed AEM Strategies.

The AEM Steering Committee will be charged by the State Committee to assist with the coordination and development of AEM Strategic Plans and other facets of the AEM program.

All remaining and unused resources will be used for this activity.

Discussion ensued regarding the administration of the program with two separate funding sources. Concerns were expressed that Districts may not be prepared to participate under the new program structure. In response, the point was made that only one non-competitive program will be administered using the two separate funding sources.

B. Aman moved to allow the State Staff to move forward with further developing the plan to utilize the AEM appropriation based upon the above proposal; seconded by G. Proios. Motion Passed; carried.

Conservation Innovation Grant

The grant proposal project abstract, *Protecting Prime Agricultural Soils in Low-Density Development environments*, was distributed to Committee members.

J. Ten Eyck reviewed the project abstract and discussed how the Conservation Innovation Grant is a good fit for addressing land use planning concerns. He acknowledged D. Conable, L. Miller, and R. Kaplewicz for their roles in developing this grant proposal.

Project Objectives

1. To conserve prime soils and other land resources critical to the continuity of farming enterprises in the face of development pressure through a set of single farm assessment and planning techniques, based on the New York State Agricultural Environmental Management (AEM) voluntary, incentive-based participation model.
2. To create and field test a guide for whole farm site planning that protects prime agricultural land and agricultural operations which will be usable in all regions of the United States where farming is threatened by the incursion of dispersed, single family housing unites and commercial construction.

Summary of Work to be Performed

Development of worksheets and a tiered approach to identifying EQIP eligible farms for participating in prime farmland continuity planning; development and possible follow-up design support; development of plans for these farms under SWCD guidance and monitoring; evaluation of the methodology of working with farmers and the adequacy of the guidebook on the basis of project experience.

Discussion ensued regarding the implications of breaking up contiguous farmland and open space areas with tracts of development. The point was made that many issues can arise and need to be considered when bringing the non-farm public into agricultural areas. It was emphasized that this proposal is not intended to promote development, but acknowledges the fact that development will occur whether or not we are prepared for it. There is significant pressure to develop prime agricultural lands because it is easier and more economically rewarding for developers. This proposal seeks to establish assistance for those farmers who may consider or are considering subdivision development and, to

recognize the benefits of protecting prime agricultural lands and instituting agriculturally friendly development plans.

P. Black felt that this proposal should be looked at as one phase, in which the State Committee should be involved, to address the issue that the Commissioner presented regarding land use planning. He mentioned that the Committee should consider becoming a part of a coordinated approach for land use planning, which takes into consideration the complex network of operations and scales of operation. He called attention to the fact that these are issues of sustainability and the State Committee needs be the instrument which brings environmental concerns to the forefront of development and zoning issues.

J. Rusnica concurred and added that most local officials aren't aware of the issues we are now talking about. The vast majority of zoning codes do not address agricultural issues and usage. Hands on training and planning assistance should be provided so they are properly equipped at the local level to address these concerns. Continuing legal education (CLE) regarding the Ag Districts Law should be a consideration.

Discussion continued.

Other Program Updates — Staff

CREP

M. Latham distributed the latest *Record of Referrals and/or Inquiries for CREP*. He mentioned that there was a discussion at the Employees Association meeting regarding these numbers because they may not accurately reflect all of the requests/applications. He wanted the Committee to be aware that more may be coming in and the acreage will continue to grow. CREP contracts are being stalled because of the FSA EAP process.

M. Latham advised the Committee that an additional 30 HUCs have been accepted by National NRCS. A new map reflecting these changes will be distributed as soon as it is published.

M. Latham also mentioned that at the last meeting the CREP steering committee heard a presentation by Michael Brower, SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, regarding the integration of willows as CREP buffers, which could then be harvested as a sustainable/renewable energy source.

The next meeting for the CREP steering committee is scheduled for September 29, 2004 in Tully, NY.

Stormwater

L. Miller reported on the Stormwater subcommittee meeting on June 21, 2004.

Stormwater Positions—Applications for the Region 1 Stormwater Specialist position were in. Suffolk County requires that the new hire must reside in Suffolk County. Suffolk SWCD is working on this as the position will cover Nassau County as well. L. Miller reported that the Chemung and Sullivan SWCDs have both been approached by Civil Service regarding the new positions. At the current time, the Chemung District position will not be required to test as the position is considered temporary. Sullivan District was required to submit a position description and they have been informed the position will require a test regardless of temporary status. An appropriate test will need to be created.

Stormwater Reimbursement Procedure—L. Miller reported that the memo for bi-annual reimbursement has been drafted. Once State rates for District salaries have been updated the memo will be mailed out. There is still some concern that the program is not being used in some regions but the committee will wait to see what is reflected in the District reporting before taking further action. Vouchers and activity reports will be due around the end of July, depending on when the memo is sent out.

Stormwater List-serve or Q&A website—L. Miller discussed some of the concerns that the Counsel's office had regarding the SWCC providing answers on a Q&A website. Some concern was raised regarding answers to questions directly related to the stormwater permits. L. Miller will continue to work to resolve these issues as it is important for Districts to have a support system.

Mini-Grant Suggestions—L. Miller reported that she met with Lois New along with G. Chartier, and L. King to discuss the mini grant suggestions developed by the Stormwater Committee. As a result of this meeting both non-competitive and competitive levels were outlined based on the committee's

recommendations. DEC expressed the need for funding projects that provided tangible and on-the-ground results. Several of the recommended suggestions were accepted and others will be revised and combined as larger projects.

L. Miller will be working with G. Chartier to revise the projects and develop the RFP. DEC would like to aim for an August mailing of the RFP package.

Stormwater Training—L. Miller reported that Don Lake will be providing stormwater training at the Conservation Skills Workshop this fall. The topics will include both those recommended by Don and the additional topics recommended by the committee (which were based on 2004 Stormwater Survey Results).

G. Proios suggested that the Committee utilize New York Farm Bureau and Cornell Cooperative Extension to distribute information to the counties, especially regarding stormwater training.

CEM

R. Lewis distributed and reviewed the *CEM Statewide Implementation EPA Water Quality Cooperative Agreement Funding Proposal*. The goal is to strengthen New York State's County Water Quality Coordinating Committee (CWQCC) partnership to enhance statewide implementation of needed non-point source programs locally. New York has three initiatives that form the basis for potential long term success at addressing non-point source pollution in NY: Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS), Agricultural Environmental Management (AEM), and Community Environmental Management (CEM). The following are the objectives of this funding proposal:

- Test 9 core CEM Worksheets (currently in draft form) and companion Resource Guides with eight CWQCCs in eight regions of New York State to ensure statewide adoption of CEM
- Design, program, post and maintain a CEM webpage on either the NYSSWCC or NYACD's web sites.
- Modification of Environmental assessment worksheets and guide based on field test results.
- Adoption by the NYSSWCC and NPSCC of worksheets and guide for statewide use.
- Conduct four regional training sessions for CWQCCs on CEM tools, new AEM tools, and updating their Water Quality Strategies using a modified WRAPS approach to reinvigorate, refocus, and strengthen CWQCCs statewide.

Two years of funding were requested at a total of \$89K. NYACD has heard the grant will receive funding. R. Zimmerman asked if the amount awarded was known. R. Lewis replied that at least partial funding will be granted, but as of yet, they have not received written confirmation. Further funding for this proposal may have to be through partnerships with other organizations.

CAFO

J. Ten Eyck reported that there are currently 33 Certified Nutrient Management Planners and he reminded the Committee of the impending June 30, 2004 deadline for all medium CAFOs to submit an Appendix B. He distributed L. Telega's final report on the CAFO survey conducted. The results indicate that if given a reasonable amount of additional time, most medium CAFO operations will be able to comply by filing their Appendix B. According to the survey results, the best scenario would have 149 farms completing plans before the deadline, with only 61 not meeting the June 30th deadline. The worst scenario has 107 farms completing plans with 116 farms missing the deadline. 659 farms have submitted an NOI to file an appendix B, but under new regulations horse racetracks may need to be considered as well. DEC has indicated that as long as farms are making an effort to move plans along, they may not be pursued by DEC. DEC has not been forthcoming with their compliance strategy for operations that never submitted an NOI.

Discussion ensued regarding CAFO compliance strategies, and there will be more to come after the filing deadline has passed. Collaboration with DEC will continue in order to provide clear guidance to farmers regarding the CAFO program.

R. Zimmerman mentioned modifications to CAFO Fact Sheet number 3. These changes will continue to clarify issues concerning the definition of a medium CAFO.

Approval of Annual Plans of Work

G. Proios moved to approve the following Annual Plans of Work, seconded by B. Aman. Motion passed; carried.

- Essex
- Schuyler
- Franklin

To date, 43 annual plans of work have been approved.

Other Reports and Comments

B. Steinmuller handed out the County rankings for the 2004 NYS Envirothon and gave a brief description of Envirothon activities.

B. Steinmuller also reported that the development of the Competitive Round XI RFP is on schedule for approval at the July meeting. He has been in consultation with D. Smith from NYSDAM Counsel's Office regarding the Round XI RFP.

J. Dickinson asked if there were any other funding sources, besides crop insurance and loans, which could provide assistance to Washington County agricultural producers for crop damage sustained from the strong winds, heavy rain, and hail that they endured earlier this season. Without it being designated a disaster area, they cannot receive funding from FSA.

R. Zimmerman responded that there is no formal disaster assistance program at the state level. It has been the primary responsibility of the Federal government (FSA) to provide disaster assistance. However, R. Zimmerman informed J. Dickinson that a pattern has been established to request funding through direct outreach to the Congressional delegation. R. Zimmerman offered to assist J. Dickinson with further details.

S. Machovec informed the Committee that EQIP is set to release approximately \$160M for funding at the end of July and may release \$45 Million in additional funding.

NRCS is ready to advertise for the engineering position funded through the AEM earmark once NYSDAM Counsel's office has approved the position announcement.

Lastly he notified the Committee that Don Pettit has accepted a position as assistant state conservationist for programs with the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) in Syracuse. He will provide statewide leadership for conservation programs administered by NRCS and is set to begin work in mid-August.

K. Lewis reminded the Committee of the NYSCDEA Golf Outing to be held on Tuesday, July 20, 2004 in Oneida County.

R. Lewis advised the Committee that NYACD is currently collaborating with Senator Hillary Clinton's staff to examine whether or not New York State is receiving an equitable amount of Farm Bill Conservation funds. R. Lewis alerted the Committee to the fact that Farm Bill Conservation programs increased nationwide by 26% while NY only received modest increases. In regards to EQIP, NYS was number two in the nation for unfunded proposals. National funding increased by 40% but New York's allocation increased by less than 2%. R. Lewis also shared concerns that no watersheds in New York State were allocated Conservation Security Program (CSP) funds. He will continue to update the Committee about this collaboration.

P.R. Churchill, NYS DOS, informed the Committee that R. McNeil, who represented NYS DOS on the State Committee has retired.

J. Tauzel informed the Committee that the 2004 NYS Legislative Session has concluded without a budget in place. The Senate has approved a 6-week temporary spending bill that will cover the state through August 2.

R. Zimmerman handed out Pro-Dairy's May 25, 2004 Dairy Update: *Air Emission Law Enforcement Coming to Dairy Facilities: EPA "Safe Harbor" Consent Agreement Offered*. For the most up to date information on this issue please check the following website: <http://www.ansci.cornell.edu/prodairy/>.

Pro Dairy suggests that dairy producers and organizations need to work together to obtain legal guidance and quickly evaluate the pros and cons of the consent agreement so an informed decision can be made.

R. Zimmerman pointed out that traditionally agriculture was thought to be exempt under the various Clean Air Acts. But in recent years, increasing farm size, air quality concerns in some parts of the country, and lawsuits against livestock industries have prompted EPA to look more closely at emissions from all livestock production facilities. Preliminary estimates suggest that dairies between 200 to 500 cows may be above the reporting threshold for ammonia emission, and those with more than 2,500 cows could need an operating permit. R. Zimmerman informed the Committee that EPA recognizes that there is limited research regarding air emissions from dairy facilities. As a result, EPA has negotiated the following so-called "Safe-Harbor" Consent Agreement with livestock agriculture groups that:

- blocks lawsuits and protects against fines based on violations of the clean air laws;
- levies a one-time "penalty" on producers who sign it. The penalty assessment for CAFOs or AFOs with less than 700 mature milking cows is \$200; for CAFOS of 700 milkers or more the fine is \$500; Operation with more than 7,000 cows will be assessed \$1000;
- can assess each participating dairy farm up to \$2,500 (one-time) per location to support emission-monitoring research.

R. Zimmerman reported that Doug Shelmandine, a well known New York dairy producer, has submitted an open letter encouraging farmers to accept EPA's consent agreement. Discussion ensued regarding the EPA offer.

R. Zimmerman also offered details about the Great Lakes States and Provinces collaboration over the control of the Great Lakes resource usage. The Governors and Ministers of the Great Lakes States/Provinces signed a compact a few years ago regarding usage but are now starting to evaluate the finer points. They are looking at possible regulations and are requesting input. There are a number of issues they are considering, including implementing a consumptive use permit program for the agricultural industry, which may take into consideration both water withdrawals and/or outright diversions from the Great Lakes Region.

G. Proios commented on Long Island's success at the 2004 Envirothon and shared how Long Island Envirothon has formed a 501C3 for establishing funds. By establishing a non-profit any donations to the Envirothon can be considered a tax write off for the donor.

K. Lewis added that the Foundation for the Environmental Education Fund raises money to support the NYS Envirothon.

M. Latham reported that the "Spring Clean Sweep" pesticide collection program was successful and collected 42,000 lbs of unused or unwanted pesticides. The next collection is scheduled for the first week in November in Northern and Central NY. This program is a great way for the agricultural industry to turn in their obsolete and/or unwanted pesticides for at no cost, or commercial golf-courses, schools and other organizations to turn them in at low cost.. He noted that these are fully confidential amnesty programs.

D. Hill commented that NYACD has scheduled their annual meeting the same time as the State Grange Annual meeting. He expressed his hope that NYACD's meeting could possibly be changed to accommodate those who normally attend both. The Grange meeting is scheduled for October 22-26, 2004 and NYACD's meeting is planned for October 24-26, 2004.

Meeting adjourned 2:50

The next meeting date has been scheduled for Thursday, July 22, 2004, in Utica NY.