

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

STATE COMMITTEE MEETING
July 22, 2004—Utica

Present: D. Hill, G. Proios, J. Dickinson—Voting Members; R. Kaplewicz—Executive Director; J. Ten Eyck, L. Miller, M. Moore, B. Steinmuller—SWCC Staff; D. Smith, R. Zimmerman—NYS DAM; G. Chartier—NYS DEC; K. Lewis—NYSCDEA; R. Lewis—NYACD; P. Kaczmarczyk—NYSDOH; R. Churchill—NYSDOS; J. Tausel—NYFB; S. Machovec, P. Webb—NRCS; K. Czymmek—CCE; L. Travis—Yates County SWCD; T. Teletnick—Herkimer County SWCD; J. DeHollander—Oswego County SWCD; J. van der Heide—Oswego County CCE.

Call to Order/Introductions:

D. Hill called the meeting to order at 10:17 a.m.

R. Kaplewicz took the opportunity to introduce L. Travis and announce that he along with R. Lewis will be joining the State Committee Staff. L. Travis will be the new Region 3 AEA, and R. Lewis will be the new AEA serving Region 5.

Review and Approve Minutes:

G. Proios moved to approve the minutes of the June meeting with the correction he presented; seconded by J. Dickinson. Motion passed; carried.

Correspondence:

Letters & Memos

1. Letter to Ron Kaplewicz from George Squires, District Manager, Genesee County SWCD regarding their Annual Seedling Sale review. **Letter dated June 29, 2004.**

Reports & News Letters

1. **NASCA UPDATE – June 2004.**
2. **Water Week** fact sheets from DEC. **May 2004.**
3. **North Central Research Station News – Spring 2004**
4. **Susquehanna Guardian** – A publication of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, **Volume 13, No. 2 – Summer 2004.**
5. **Beware Factory Farms** - A newspaper article from the Syracuse Post Standard regarding CAPO. **Article dated July 1, 2004.**
6. **Community, Food and Agriculture Program News, Cornell University, Volume 12, No. 2, Spring 2004.**

Conferences & Seminars

1. **12th National Nonpoint Source Monitoring Workshop** – Managing Nutrient Inputs and Exports in the Rural Landscape. **September 26-30, 2004. Princess Royale Oceanfront Hotel, Ocean City, Maryland. (www.ctic.purdue.edu/NPSWorkshop/NPSworkshop.html)**

Discussion

Correspondence from Genesee County SWCD regarding the addition of new plant material to their annual seedling and shrub sale was read. R. Kaplewicz stated that he has been contacted and has had recent discussions with the New York State Nurserymen Association (NYSNA) regarding District tree and shrub programs. The NYSNA has some concerns with Districts and annual tree and shrub programs. One recommendation is to develop a policy statement between the SWCC and NYSNA regarding the sale of trees and shrubs by Districts. The current SWCC policy is nearly 20 years old. NYSNA has expressed its interest in collaborating with Districts and the SWCC. R. Kaplewicz has been asked to present at the NYSNA Annual Meeting in January regarding SWCD law and an overview of Districts and their programs. The NYSNA is also looking at strengthening the native plant program in New York State. P. Kaczmarczyk expressed support for strengthening this partnership. K. Lewis mentioned that most Districts are sensitive to competing locally with businesses and pointed out that some areas may not have a nursery to collaborate with. Most individual

NYSNA members concerns are localized. He also felt that some discussion should take place before R. Kaplewicz presents at the NYSNA annual conference.

R. Kaplewicz suggested that the Committee and SWCD's play a critical role in invasive species initiatives as well. The NYS Invasive Species Task Force is currently looking at aquatic and land based invasives, and the SWCC and Districts need to look carefully and critically at what species are being offered. The Committee discussed the need to respond to the request from Genesee County as it may bring forth more issues than just selling additional plant materials at the annual District sales. Committee members stressed that this should not be looked at as a threat to Districts and their programs but as an opportunity to collaborate and coordinate with other organizations. R. Kaplewicz said that he will share the list of species that Genesee County provided to the Executive Director of NYSNA. R. Zimmerman said that a lot of issues and concerns exist now that did not thirty to forty years ago when the District tree programs started and the Committee's shift to focus on invasives is a logical evolution.

G. Proios made the point that the Committee was really discussing three separate issues; the public/private sector issue; the list provided by Genesee County for their request; and the concerns over invasive species. G. Proios went on to say that Genesee County should have their list of plant materials technically reviewed with an expert on ecological balances and considerations. He suggested the SWCC direct them to DEC and other experts in this field. With regards to the public/private sector issue, G. Proios went on to say that making adequate plant material available to farmers at low cost from the Districts complements the completion of BMPS. He suggested that the Committee should receive additional input from the NYS Invasive Species Task Force. R. Kaplewicz said that the several members of the Department are involved with the Invasive Species Task Force and they are currently looking at opportunities to optimize and look critically at how the State is dealing with invasive species. G. Proios suggested forming a sub-committee regarding these issues.

D. Hill suggested that a letter be drafted to Genesee County to answer their request and state that further review is pending.

L. Miller also pointed out that the demand for plant material will continue to grow as new BMP projects are being installed and Districts may look to the Committee for continued guidance. G. Chartier agreed and added that as stream bank restoration programs begin, the need for affordable, established plant materials will continue to increase, and how Districts use these plant materials should also be considered.

The Committee reached a consensus in that there is no objection with regards to Genesee County selling plant materials for wetlands purposes in the annual plant sale, but the District should ensure that invasive plant materials are not being sold. They should also be informed that the Committee will be seeking further guidance on these issues.

Ag Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control Program:

Status of Rounds I-IX

Of 318 projects, 125 are active, 3 are pending, and 190 are complete. 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 reviewed and contract development is continuing.

Round XI

The TAC met on July 13th to discuss and make final recommendations on the Round XI RFP for competitive funding. The TAC determined that the draft satisfies the needed changes and recommend that the State Committee approve the RFP. If the RFP is approved in July it will be released as soon as possible, with proposals due in October.

Amendment Request

1. Saratoga SWCD – Fish Creek/Sucker Brook Watershed – Round VII – C700649
Request: time extension from 3/31/05 to 12/30/05
Reason: more time needed to complete BMPs because farmers are hoping to receive additional EQIP funds to help their overall conservation work.

Note: S. Lanthier recently approved an extension through 3/31/05. S. Lanthier supports the additional 9 month extension and recommends approval.

Previous amendments: 1 time extension

G. Proios moved to approve the time extension; seconded by J. Dickinson. Motion passed; carried.

2. Monroe SWCD – Multi-County Oatka Creek AEM Tier IIIB Planning Project – Round VIII – C700682
Request: to include an additional landowner in the project at no additional cost
Reason: funds remain to add a high priority landowner located in the Oatka Creek watershed.

Previous amendments: 1 time extension and 1 change of landowner

J. Dickinson moved to approve the amendment; seconded by G. Proios. Motion passed; carried.

3. Ontario SWCD – Central Lowlands Ag. Program – Phase II Round IX - C700716
Request 1: change of landowner
Reason 1: landowner has sold operation and the new landowner is not interested
Implementing the project
Request 2: change of BMPs
Reason 2: BMPs were identified as needed through extensive planning on the new farm

Note: T. Brace supports and recommends approval of this amendment

Previous amendments: none

B. Steinmuller noted that he had discussed this amendment with Counsel and recommended that the State Committee adjust their policy regarding amendments that change both landowners and BMPs. Currently the State Staff does not have the authority to approve both on one amendment request, however if these amendments had come separately they would have been able to approve them. D. Smith agreed as it would save the Committee time during the meetings, and allow Staff to act quickly on minor amendments.

D. Hill stated that this topic should be placed on the agenda to discuss at the September Meeting.

G. Proios moved to approve the amendment; seconded by J. Dickinson. Motion passed; carried.

4. Rensselaer SWCD – Tomhannock Watershed Ag NPS Partner II Project – Round V – C700575
Request: time extension from 6/30/04 to 12/31/04
Reason: progress has been slowed due to a wet spring and difficulty in obtaining fencing contractors

Previous amendments: 3 time extensions

Discussion ensued regarding this amendment request. The Committee had previously decided at the September 17, 2003 meeting that the amendment reviewed at that meeting would be the last time extension for this contract.

The Committee reviewed the amendment request along with the current and previous interim reports. It was decided that there had been minimal progress from the last interim report and if another time extension were to be granted the Committee would be setting a poor precedent based on their previous decision and the current status of the project.

L. Miller stated that she had notified the District of the date and the time of the State Committee meeting and advised them that they could attend and provide further information to the Committee regarding this request. She also informed the District that if the amendment request were to be denied, any costs incurred after the June 30, 2004 contract expiration date would be ineligible for state cost-share assistance.

G. Proios moved to deny the time extension on the basis of the Committee's last action taken and the absence of compelling evidence that the project has progressed since the last extension was granted; seconded by J. Dickinson. Motion passed; carried.

Staff Approved Amendments

1. Tompkins SWCD – Eastern Susquehanna River Basin Management Intensive Grazing – Round VII C700658
Request: change of landowners
Reason: original landowner voluntarily withdrew due to lack of time to complete his project
Approved by J. Schumacher 6/29/04
2. Suffolk SWCD – Beaverdam Creek Farm – Round IX C700066
Request: complete additional BMPs at no additional cost
Reason: BMPs are needed and money is left over to complete additional BMPs
Approved by L. Miller/B. Steinmuller 6/30/04
3. Schuyler SWCD – CNMP in Seneca Lake Watershed – Round VII – C700652
Request: time extension from 6/30/04 to 9/30/04
Reason: additional time needed to complete planning activities
Approved by T. Brace/B. Steinmuller 6/29/04
4. Livingston SWCD – Conesus Lake Watershed Farm Planning Grant – Round VII – C700668
Request: time extension from 6/30/04 to 12/31/04
Reason: additional time needed to further review and clarify CNMP billings
Approved by T. Brace/B. Steinmuller 7/12/04
5. Steuben SWCD – Chemung River Basin Grazing – Phase 3 – Round X – 47-1
Request: change of landowners
Reason: number of animal units on original farm has gone below threshold for the project
Approved by T. Brace/B. Steinmuller 7/20/04
6. Broome SWCD – Intensive Rotational Grazing (IRG) Implementation for the Susquehanna River East and Nanticoke Creek Watersheds
Request: change of landowners
Reason: original landowners are unable to complete the project as planned in the time allocated
Approved by J. Schumacher 6/24/04
7. Madison SWCD – Susquehanna River Headwaters Farm Planning and Prioritization Project – Round X 25-2
Request: change of landowners
Reason: original owner no longer interested in completing CNMP
Approved by J. Schumacher 6/24/04
8. Chautauqua SWCD – Conewango Creek Bunk Silo Leachate Management Project – Round X – 6-01
Request: change of landowners
Reason: original landowner declared bankruptcy
Approved by T. Brace/B. Steinmuller 7/9/04
9. Delaware SWCD – Delaware River Stream Corridor Restoration – Round VII – C700628
Request: time extension from 2/28/05 to 10/31/05
Reason: funding from other sources that are required to complete the project is unavailable for the 2004 construction season
Approved by J. Schumacher 7/12/04

Round XI RFP

D. Smith advised the Committee that there has been a change in the way notification of grant proposals are published. The RFP must be placed on the State Register 45 days plus 2 weeks before the proposal deadline.

B. Steinmuller reviewed changes that had been made to the Round XI RFP.

G. Proios suggested that the word "current" be inserted on page 2 of the proposal eligibility so that it now reads; "Applicants requesting State funding to conduct planning projects or for the implementation of eligible BMPs must have completed a *current* AEM Tier 1 inventory and an AEM Tier 2 assessment on all participating farms." K. Lewis expressed concerns about the ambiguity of the word "current," and asked whether Districts or the Committee will determine what is "current." R. Kaplewicz replied that Districts will be submitting proposals relevant to the current operation, and should therefore base their standards on whether or not their Tier 2 is relevant to the current operation. For Round XII, the expectation may be that a current Tier 2 will be no more than three years old. B. Steinmuller said that a statement regarding the standard in terms of a current Tier 2 assessment would be included in the memo that goes to Districts with the RFP.

G. Proios moved to approve the Round XI RFP; seconded by J. Dickinson. Motion passed; carried.

Discussion ensued regarding Item 15a in the RFP, which currently asks "are all farms of CAFO size in compliance with CAFO regulations?"

G. Chartier asked whether or not the Committee should modify its position on this and take into account the huge backlog of CNMP implementation. After much discussion, a consensus was reached and it was decided to change the wording of this item so it asks "do all CAFO farms meet CAFO requirements?"

G. Proios moved to approve the Round XI RFP as proposed with the recent changes; seconded by J. Dickinson. Motion passed; carried.

B. Steinmuller also presented the proposal evaluation instrument for approval. He noted that all changes have been reviewed by Counsel and are appropriate.

K. Lewis asked what the procedure would be if a reviewer is not able to attend the technical evaluation meeting. R. Kaplewicz assured the Committee that every accommodation will be made to get the evaluators at the meeting by coordinating their schedules or possibly holding teleconferences.

J. Dickinson moved to approve the Round XI grant proposal evaluation instrument; seconded by G. Proios. Motion passed; carried.

R. Kaplewicz noted that the Round XI RFP has received all Departmental approvals and commended the staff for their diligence. It is hoped that the RFP could be released earlier than planned.

AEM Report:

A copy of the AEM timeline for 2004-2005 was handed out to Committee members.

R. Kaplewicz discussed the timeline with the Committee and integration of the Federal Earmark. He noted that the approach put forth in the timeline is the staff recommendation for moving the AEM program forward, but noted that ultimately it is up to the Committee to decide the direction of AEM and how it will be administered. He also informed the Committee that the House Agricultural Appropriations Committee has established \$850,000 for AEM in the next federal fiscal year. R. Zimmerman said that although these numbers are still preliminary it shows that the partnership working with Washington is still strong. He also noted that the timeline is fairly aggressive and may run into some obstacles along the way, but is a good testament to the quality of work going on in this growing program. He also conveyed the increasingly important role that the Steering Committee will play in keeping the AEM program moving in the right direction. He mentioned that at the AEM Steering Committee meeting, held in Cortland last week, the Committee engaged in thoughtful discussions and brainstorming regarding the big picture of AEM and approaches to further accelerate the program.

J. Ten Eyck reported that the Steering Committee included representation from organizations not previously included in AEM Steering Committee meetings. These organizations were brought in to invigorate the Steering

Committee and be a source of new information, guidance, and advice with regards to the AEM program. However, the State Committee has the ultimate responsibility for the program.

Discussion ensued regarding the Non-Competitive Grant Program for AEM. R. Zimmerman noted that the submission of the AEM Strategic Plan may serve as the District's application to receive non-competitive funding. J. Ten Eyck reported that the Steering Committee is still open to receiving thoughts and comments regarding the model County AEM Strategic Plan, and the model should be brought forth to the State Committee for approval at the September meeting.

R. Kaplewicz informed the Committee that a statewide AEM Training session has been scheduled for November 16-17, 2004 in Waterloo, NY. Districts and AEM Team participants will attend this training, the logistics of which are still being worked out. He asked for the State Committee's guidance with this activity. G. Proios suggested that information also be presented to District Directors, possibly at the upcoming October meeting. R. Kaplewicz agreed that empowering Directors to be involved would be a positive step and said that the State Staff would be happy to make a presentation at the October meeting. R. Lewis also noted that it may be appropriate to present information at the four-way partnership meeting.

J. Dickinson asked whether the non-competitive award would be through a reimbursement procedure like the competitive grant program. R. Kaplewicz confirmed that the reimbursement procedures would be consistent with the competitive grant program.

Discussion ensued regarding the logistics of the non-competitive grant program. It was noted that a District may not have more than two open contracts at one time, and no time extensions would be issued. Districts may be eligible to receive up to \$20,000 between the EPF and the Federal Earmark and unused portions of that money may be reassigned to implementation projects.

K. Lewis commended the work done to bring the program to where it is now, and said that it should be viewed as a significant achievement for the partnership effort.

Mini-grants—Draft RFP for 2004-2005:

L. Miller reported that two meetings with DEC have been held to discuss the mini grant RFP. At the current time, there are seven levels to this year's mini grants, all with a Phase II Stormwater focus. Many of the suggested ideas from the sub-committee were used, some were combined with others. Further discussion regarding the Level 1 and Level 2 projects needs to take place before release. It is still anticipated that the RFP will be released in early August.

Other Program Updates:

CREP— R. Kaplewicz reported on the CREP forum, which was held in Hershey, PA. The forum was a great showcase of CREP activities across the nation and included representatives from USDA, FSA, various State agencies, and NGOs from across the nation. He noted that most states are actively engaged with NGOs and he sees it necessary to engage those groups in our program in the future.

He met with Chad Chadwell of FSA in regards to determining the eligibility of well-head protection areas outside of the eligible CREP watersheds. FSA has agreed to allow NY to include all well-head protection areas regardless of the HUC it is in.

Members from the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Committee talked about the Farm Bill and spoke seriously about the implications of the federal budget process. Homeland security and homeland defense remains the highest priority with the federal budget. Because of the focus on these two issues, every other program is under intense scrutiny, which may put funding for some Farm Bill programs in jeopardy. This as an opportunity for the Committee to think about its role in justifying and accounting for the monies that come from the federal government. This accountability issue extends beyond the Farm Bill to include Section 319, EPA and other sources of funding that move the State Committee programs forward. As an example, CREP accomplishments are reported by USDA in acres. Is reporting by acres the best way to report and measure success? Is there a better way to build public support for the program? It may be more effective to report how many miles of streambank have been buffered. The Committee needs to be prepared to give the information in a relatable way.

As of the end of June, there were 204 requests for CREP projects, with approximately 1900 eligible acres. There are several other activities ongoing with CREP including the preparation of the CREP brochure, a public display board and finalizing a sample CREP conservation plan for use in New York. E. Svenson is expected to return in September.

Stormwater —

Conservation Skills Workshop – a stormwater track has been added to the Conservation Skills Workshop. This will be hands on training with daily comprehension exams. Although the CPESC exam will not be offered during the training, it is expected that participants will be ready for the exam after completing the full week of training.

SU Stormwater Training – The SU Stormwater Training was designed for the private sector stormwater professional, although many District staff have been taking the courses. This coming year, the courses will be offered through SUNY ESF rather than Syracuse University. The sub-committee believes that this is a better fit with the courses and may provide a 25% reduction in course costs.

Other training opportunities – The sub-committee discussed the many other training opportunities that D. Lake provides each year. DEC provides all of the training materials for these classes. Most classes for specific groups (i.e. DOT) also reserve seating for other groups such as SWCDs to attend. These courses are listed on the DEC stormwater website. In addition, many courses are added by request throughout the year.

Stormwater Cadre – The sub-committee discussed the new stormwater cadre that is being formed. The main responsibility of this group will be to provide local training to municipalities. It may be possible that once the cadre is established and is meeting the local training need, that they may be able to assist with some technical training. Some of the Stormwater Specialists have already been assisting in this capacity. It was suggested that all of the stormwater specialists attend the Conservation Skills Workshop.

Meeting outcomes:

1. *Stormwater sub-committee should develop a training calendar to post all upcoming training opportunities in one location.*
2. *Through the NYSCDEA and NYSSWCC newsletters, all District and SWCC staff should be encouraged to post training opportunities on the calendar, regardless of location.*

Special Item – A question was posed from Madison Co. SWCD regarding district involvement in construction site inspections for the private sector. Several Districts have been approached by the private sector to provide this service. The Stormwater Sub-committee will seek legal opinion on liability and legality of District involvement with the private sector in this capacity.

Updates – G. Proios announced that the Region 1 Stormwater Specialist has been selected. Dave Gaspar from Nassau SWCD will be taking the position and will start in a couple of weeks.

The letter requesting stormwater reimbursement vouchers from Districts has been sent. The deadline for vouchering for the Jan – June period will be August 13th.

Stormwater List-serve – L. Miller has heard from a few districts that a stormwater list-serve would be preferred over a Q&A web page. She has looked into developing this and it could be done free through Yahoo. G. Proios would like to first try the list-serve with the sub-committee members and the stormwater specialists.

Potential Stormwater funding in State Budget – a lengthy discussion took place regarding the additional reimbursement funding to Districts in the proposed State Budget. This year's funding, if approved in the state budget, is for capacity building and will be equally divided among all Districts. Discussion continued regarding the need to provide additional documentation for SWCD stormwater needs and services provided to build a case for future funding. Districts show far more reimbursable money spent than the additional funding would warrant and feels that additional tracking of stormwater activities is not necessary. The sub-committee offered to help provide any additional information if it is requested.

CAFO Status Report—

J. Ten Eyck reported that of the 120 CNMPs that had not been received as of the June 30th deadline, 70 are in the process of completion through the certification process.

Currently there are 34 Certified CNMP Planners; 25 Planners who are actively planning; 30 Conditionally Certified Planners, 18 of which have submitted plans for review; 13 Conditionally Certified Planners have had at least one plan accepted.

P. Kaczmarczyk asked if there was any particular area within the State that was lacking planners. J. Ten Eyck replied that the State is well covered, but if any, the Mohawk Valley and the Eastern part of the State could take advantage of more planners.

R. Kaplewicz noted that the CNMP Planning Specialist position will soon be advertised. Part of their responsibility will be to monitor the quality of the plans that certified planners are preparing.

J. Ten Eyck noted that the New CAFO permits are now available and will be sent out to producers. He distributed a handout which highlighted the difference between the renewed and original CAFO permit in New York State. The new permit requires an annual review and producers will be required to submit a CAFO compliance status report, which will need to be signed by the Certified Planner. This will help promote a long term relationship between the farmer and the planner. K. Lewis asked if the farmers were aware of this change. J. Ten Eyck replied that it has been publicized. K. Lewis suggested that it might be beneficial for the SWCC and SWCD's to inform producers of this requirement. An information piece could be disseminated to Districts for their newsletters. K. Czymmek suggested that an article be placed in Pro-Dairy and other publications. Further funding may be needed to support the relationship between the farmers and planners.

R. Zimmerman gave credit to J. Ten Eyck's hard work on the CAFO worksheet to help determine whether an operation is an AFO or a CAFO. He commended the open process this program has had and acknowledged DEC for continuing to be reasonable in regards to this enforcement program. He said that overall compliance is another aspect in the long term strategy in regard to the general permit. Legislation was passed in the Senate and Assembly and has been sent to the Governor for his signature. If passed, it will require the development of a compliance effort and procedures which will deal with situations where there may be a complaint or other water quality contravention. R. Zimmerman reported that A. Eaton of DEC has drafted a document that would be completed by farmers in the event of an occurrence which impacts water quality on their farm.

Other Reports and Comments:

1. John DeHollander, from the Oswego County SWCD and Jan van der Heide, Oswego County Cornell Cooperative Extension (CCE) presented information to the Committee about a grant they, along with other partners, received for commercial flower bulb production on marginal muck soils in Oswego County. This project will develop a new use for the marginal muck soils of New York State, by adapting existing machinery, buildings and equipment of onion farms for the production of ornamental flower bulbs on a commercial scale.

Existing wetlands legislation prohibits the clearing of new muck land, which means that growers cannot compensate for the loss of productive soils by clearing new muck for agricultural production. Over time, the importance of the onion industry to the economy of New York State will decrease accordingly.

The project calls for the bulbs to be sold and marketed through the Soil and Water Conservation Districts' annual plant material sale. They anticipate approximately 10,000 tulip bulbs and 1,000 ornamental onion bulbs to be sold through this pilot marketing program in collaboration with the SWCD in Oswego County and in up to ten additional SWCDs in Central New York.

Discussion ensued regarding commercial bulb production in New York State. The question was asked whether or not District Law allows the SWCD's to sell ornamental plants in their annual sale. This issue will need further examination and discussion with the Committee. Committee members felt that this should be looked at as a transitional period in terms of State and District policy as it relates to agricultural enterprise and enhancement.

2. G. Proios distributed a letter from NYACD President, Joseph Gregela to Susan Henry, Dean of Cornell's College of Ag and Life Sciences, and Helene Dillard, Director Cornell Cooperative Extension. The letter and attached resolution asked that CALS, CCE and the SWCDs work more closely together to provide education and outreach in regards to the principles of AEM and stormwater runoff. The letter also suggests holding a yearly meeting to address these and other issues.

It was suggested that a meeting between CALS, CCE and SWCC coincide with the November State Committee meeting.

G. Proios also suggested a possible intern project that would put together a manual or handbook with a listing of all agricultural resources in New York State which would then be provided to the local legislatures in the State.

4. K. Czymbek informed the Committee that Pro-Dairy is attempting to contact Sierra Club's Atlantic Chapter Chair, Yvonne Tasker-Rothenberg, regarding her editorial that was published in the Syracuse Post Standard. The goal would be to invite her to have a dialog with the partnership regarding agricultural environmental issues.

K. Czymbek also reported that the EPA might give dairy producers more time to consider the proposed "Safe Harbor" Consent Agreement. If agreed to by producers, this agreement would block lawsuits and protect against fines based on violations of the clean air laws; levy 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; EPA can assess each participating dairy farm up to \$2,500 (one-time) per location to support emission-monitoring research.

5. D. Smith distributed a copy of a sample resolution which Districts would be able to utilize for their Ag. NPS Grant proposals. The sample resolution will be distributed with the RFP and Districts may choose to use it if they wish, but it will serve as a reminder that a resolution needs to be included with their proposal.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

The next meeting date has been scheduled for Tuesday, September 14, 2004 at the Delaware County SWCD.