

DRAFT

NYS Soil & Water Conservation Committee

10 B Airline Drive, Albany, NY 12235 – Telephone (518) 457-3738

STATE COMMITTEE MEETING

February 21, 2006

Department of Agriculture and Markets

Present: G. Proios, D. Hill, J. Dickinson, Voting Members; R. Kaplewicz, Director; M. Latham, Assistant Director; R. Zimmerman, D. Smith, J. Rusnica, C. Cuddeback, Ag. and Markets; B. Steinmuller, J. Ten Eyck, R. Lewis, L. Travis, C. Frasier, G. Albrecht, B. Brower, R. Rausch, SWCC; G. Lee, S. Machovec, NRCS; A. Barber, NYSCDEA; P. Black, SUNY-ESF; L. King, R. Draper, J. Lendrum, DEC; D. Grantham, CALS; J. Tauzel, NYFB; J. Green, DOS.

Call to Order:

Introductions made.

Review and Approval of Minutes

G. Proios moved to approve the January minutes as presented; seconded by J. Dickinson. Motion passed; carried.

Correspondence

Letters & Memos

1. Letter to Marilyn Stephenson, USDA, NRCS, from Marinus Rovers, Clinton County Soil and Water Conservation District regarding earthen, non-engineered ag. waste storages on dairy farms. **Letter dated January 20, 2006.**
2. Letter to Ron Kaplewicz from Jim Hotaling, Cayuga County SWCD regarding funding for a Regional Digester under Round XII. **Letter dated February 2, 2006.**
3. Letter to Ron Kaplewicz from Elizabeth Corron Dribusch, New York Farm Bureau regarding a normally organized Farm Bureau in Putnam County. **Letter dated February 9, 2006.**

Reports & Newsletters

1. Hamilton County Lakes Report, A Statistical Analysis of Water Quality Trends 1993-2003.
2. **National Agricultural Statistics Service: Agricultural News:** USDA Survey to Measure 2006 Crop Acreages; New York Strawberry and Blueberry Production; New York Egg Production in December; New York Fruit Production; **Corrected** 2005 New York Field Crop Summary; New York Cattle Inventory Unchanged; Goat Inventory Increases; New York Sheep Inventory; Value of New York Vegetables; New York Farm Numbers; January Prices Mixed; New York Livestock Operations; December Milk Production
3. Central New York Regional Planning & Development Board's 2005 Annual Report
4. Onondaga County SWCD 2006 Tree & Shrub Seedling Sale Order Form
5. NYACD January 2006 Newsletter
6. 2006 Financial & Technical Assistance Guide to Programs for Rural Community Water & Sewer Infrastructure Development & Water Quality Management
7. **Bay Journal** – January 2006
8. 2005-2006 College Report from the College of Veterinary Medicine – **Cornell University**
9. **Keeping It On The Land**, Vol. 7, Number 4, December 2005; a publication of the Great Lakes Commission
10. **CDEA News** – February 2006
11. **US Dept. of Agriculture** – Agricultural Research February 2006
12. **The Upper Delaware – Winter 2005-2006**
13. **CFA News** – Vol. 24, No. 1 – Winter 2006
14. **Nuggets & Nibbles** – from the Cornell Local Roads Program – Winter 2006

Conferences & Seminars

1. **Stormwater Conference and Tradeshow** – March 30, 2006, RIT Inn and Conference Center, Rochester, NY; Inquiries: tstevenson@monroecounty.gov

DRAFT

R. Kaplewicz read the letter from Dutch Rovers, Chairman of the Clinton County SWCD, to Marilyn Stephenson, Area 4 Conservationist for USDA-NRCS, dated January 20, 2006 regarding the issue of earthen, non-engineered agricultural waste storages on dairy farms. D. Rovers explains in his letter that there are a sizable number of these storage structures which were built at a time when the regulatory climate was much less stringent than at present. The letter states that the USDA-NRCS has always been the lead agency in designing and supervising the construction of storage structures. D. Rovers, on behalf of the Clinton County SWCD, is of the opinion that "there is no one in a better position to examine those [structures] currently in use, and determine whether they are safe to use or not". The letter expressed doubt that private engineers who may have never built a storage structure would be willing to assess their soundness. "If they were, the cost may be prohibitive." The letter requests that M. Stephenson share the Clinton County SWCD's concerns with her colleagues, and consider the implications of not assisting.

S. Machovec explained to the Committee that workload prohibits NRCS from being able to conduct evaluations of undesigned storages. Private sector involvement may be the only way to meet this need.

A. Barber asked if NRCS can be a part of the evaluation process to perhaps determine a level of risk, but not fulfill the entire requirement. S. Machovec responded that conducting a risk assessment is a good idea.

R. Kaplewicz asked if P. Wright, NRCS, State Engineer, could convene a group to develop a plan on how to deal with this issue.

R. Kaplewicz read a letter from Jim Hotaling, Cayuga County SWCD Executive Director, to R. Kaplewicz, NYSSWCC Director, dated February 2, 2006 regarding the District's regional digester project. J. Hotaling requested a status of the Round XIII discussions as they relate to broadening the Agricultural NPS Grant Program's policies to accommodate projects like the regional digester.

R. Kaplewicz and B. Steinmuller noted that the expedited timeframe to develop the Round XIII RFP did not allow the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) enough time to fully discuss the implications of opening the program to projects of this scope.

D. Smith advised the Committee that there are issues beyond that of the definition of "agricultural land". The program is designed to assist NYS farmers in abating and controlling NPS pollution originating from their agricultural land. This project goes beyond what the program is capable of funding. The District, not the contributing farmers, will own and operate the digester, and the County will be the recipient of the financial benefits. There are other permit issues involved with moving manure and other solid wastes to and from the digester.

A. Barber told the Committee that the District needs to be made aware of the other issues besides ownership of the land.

G. Proios asked that if the Committee agrees that this project is an innovative way to handle agricultural waste, why do we come up with obstacles. In response, G. Proios was advised that the ruling on this project is consistent with existing program laws and policies as established by the Committee.

Proios explained that this project would be a perfect pilot if the Committee can deal with the ownership and waste stream issues. If we can resolve those issues, the Committee should let it go through as a pilot.

R. Kaplewicz noted that opening the program to publicly owned projects would be an enormous change to current and established objectives and goals.

The State Committee will draft a letter to J. Hotaling explaining the additional barriers to Agricultural NPS funding for this type of project.

DRAFT

R. Kaplewicz read a February 9, 2006 the letter from Elizabeth Corron Dribusch, General Counsel for the NYS Farm Bureau to R. Kaplewicz. M. Latham asked whether there is a formally organized Farm Bureau in Putnam County. The letter advised that Putnam County does not have its own, separately-incorporated County Farm Bureau. However, Putnam County is served by the Dutchess County Farm Bureau. The Dutchess County Farm Bureau may be in a position to appoint an eligible, qualified and active Farm Bureau member candidate from Putnam County to the Putnam County SWCD Board. The absence of an official county Farm Bureau in Putnam County, however, does create problems with the appointment process. R. Kaplewicz and J. Rusnica have discussed this letter with Ms. Dribusch directly.

J. Tauzel thanked the Committee for following up on this issue.

Ag Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control Program – B. Steinmuller

STATUS OF ROUNDS I-XI

Of 380 projects, 133 are active, 17 are pending, and 230 are complete.

Round XII

The press release for Round XII awards has been drafted and the Department is waiting for the Governor's office to release awards. It appears there will be approximately \$5.3 million available for the 31 projects in ranked order. Immediately following the announcement, plan of work materials will be sent to the successful Districts.

Round XIII

J. Dickinson abstained from the Round XIII discussion.

The Technical Advisory Committee met on February 6th to discuss the Round XIII Request for Proposals (RFP). The TAC reviewed the timeline for the Round XIII release which includes time for the State Committee to review the Questions and Answers document before it is posted on the Department's website. The TAC supported this review by the State Committee. However, it was noted that this can pose a disadvantage to Districts who rely on a more timely response to their questions. This modification would prevent the State Committee Staff from addressing questions that come in after the State Committee meeting.

The Committee agreed that concluding the Q&A a week early could put Districts at a disadvantage. The Committee requested that the program coordinator communicate with the Committee what questions came in and what decisions have been made. B. Steinmuller will send out an email to the Committee when the Q&A is updated and posted on the web.

The suggestions from the Statewide Managers' Forum were discussed at the TAC meeting. The TAC looked at items that could be addressed in this short timeframe to release the Round XIII RFP. The TAC addressed omitting or consolidating application questions to streamline the process. Consensus was reached on omitting or consolidating questions that were identified as redundant or not needed to assess the merits of the application. The following questions were removed:

Part B – General Project Information:

3. Project Locations and zip codes (including cities, towns, or villages) – The townships are identified on the Project SW-1 Form, List of Landowners.

Part F – Specific Project Information:

11. What are the deliverables for this project? – This information is noted both on the Project SW-3 Form, BMP Implementation List, and in the Project Narrative.

14. For planning projects involving AEM III, Please list below the number of farms and the average cost per farm for planning: This financial information can be provided through the Project SW-2 Budget Form.

DRAFT

The TAC also consolidated certain questions to shorten the application where ever possible. The TAC also decided to add the CAFO Permit number, if applicable, on the SW-1 Form.

The TAC discussed the Checklist for Completeness in terms of what should constitute a critical flaw. The TAC was in agreement that the listed required attachments all support the reviewer's ability to properly assess the proposal using the rating criteria. After considerable discussion, the TAC identified three options that may still provide enough of an incentive for the applicants to submit complete proposals. The TAC did not reach a consensus on the following options:

Option 1 – The required information in the RFP should not be changed. The responsibility should remain with the applicant to submit complete proposals. Failure to provide the required information constitutes an incomplete proposal and the application will not be considered for funding.

Option 2 – Sufficient points are deducted from the score for any missing attachments. The TAC could not decide on how many points constitute a sufficient penalty. The TAC also discussed how the penalty points would be assessed. Should it be 5 or greater points off the top for any missing documents or should it be a point assessed for each missing document? It would also be communicated to the applicant that missing information may result in a lower score given by the proposal reviewers in addition to the penalty. The TAC could not resolve these issues at the meeting.

Option 3 – Applications with missing information will be flagged but still forwarded to the reviewers and ranked if possible. If the proposal reviewers could not properly evaluate the proposal as a result of the missing information than the final determination of eligibility would be made by the State Committee. It was noted that Reviewers from different agencies have different perspectives and a missing item that may not be as critical to one reviewer could be more critical to another. It was suggested that this option places the question of completeness and ultimately eligibility in the hands of the Reviewers because it would be their recommendation that the State Committee considers.

The TAC identified other items that should remain a critical flaw regardless of what option is pursued. The Screening Tool for Agricultural Waste Storages, the District Board resolution, and the Application Form are examples of required items that should not be considered under Options 2, 3.

D. Smith advised the TAC that the State Committee does have the authority to grant exemptions to requirements if the request or appeal is asked in advance of the proposal submission deadline. This can be done formally through the Q&A process or outside of that process as long as the decision is made before the deadline. It was noted that this flexibility does not establish an appeals process to decisions of eligibility after proposals are due.

Discussion ensued regarding the critical flaw issue. R. Zimmerman noted that the Agricultural NPS Grant Program has an excellent track record.

D. Hill explained that maintaining the critical flaw policy as it already stands, or Option 1 noted above is the only appropriate course of action for Round XIII. The Committee agreed.

The TAC also discussed establishing a total point threshold. Funding would be cut-off to a proposal that scored below that threshold. The TAC identified a small number of proposals under Round XII that had deficiencies across many of the items on the Proposal Rating Sheet. The TAC agreed that these proposals should not be awarded in the event that the appropriation could extend beyond their position on the ranked list. However, the argument was noted that all eligible projects should be considered for funding if funds are available. The State Committee could work with the applicants to develop a stronger project. After discussion, the TAC made the recommendation to assign a total point threshold.

The Committee supported the concept of assigning a point threshold and asked B. Steinmuller to devise a proposal to assign this point. B. Steinmuller told the Committee that he will work on this and bring a recommendation to the next State Committee meeting.

DRAFT

The TAC also heard a recommendation from the CREP Steering Committee via R. Lewis that the Steering Committee felt a half a point per reviewer would not be enough to encourage more participation in the Ag. NPS Grant program. They felt a half a point wouldn't seem significant to most districts to make the effort to apply since the grant program normally takes at least a year between RFP and contract and usually the time frame is not advantageous to when buffers are normally installed. Round 13 will be the exception and thus this round is when we should be encouraging CREP applications. In fact in most cases the additional points won't affect whether a CREP project was funded or not. Instead, offering a full point provides a statement that CREP is a State priority. The Steering Committee thought a full point per reviewer would send a strong message that the State supports the installation of more buffers to protect and enhance water quality and drinking water supplies.

The TAC considered the CREP Steering Committee's request but felt that the preference point should remain at .5 point per reviewer. It was agreed that the Grant Program should be encouraging CREP applications but the TAC decided that a .5 point or 3.5 total points for CREP or Conservation Buffers proves that it is a State Priority. In addition to the preference points, CREP is noted as a priority under other categories in the Proposal Rating Sheet. The TAC noted that proposals that included match from CREP and other Federal sources have received higher points and funding through the Ag NPS Grant Program.

The TAC reviewed other items such as the barriers to funding regional digesters, additional feedback from the Managers' Forum, and additional items for the Proposal Rating Sheet. The TAC is committed to fully discussing these items in the future. However, these issues were tabled in the interest of developing the Round XIII RFP to meet the release deadline of April 14th.

The issue of evaluating undesigned manure storage structures was raised. It was noted that these evaluations will come to a great financial cost to the regulated CAFOs. J. Ten Eyck asked the State Committee if it would consider providing cost-share assistance for this activity through the Ag. NPS Grant Program. B. Steinmuller asked if it would be considered a planning or implementation activity. It was explained that it could be considered an implementation project. The State Committee asked J. Ten Eyck if he could include the practice in the Agricultural BMP Catalogue. J. Ten Eyck will draft the practice into the catalogue.

The Committee supported the cost-sharing of evaluations of undesigned manure storage systems through the Ag. NPS Grant Program.

Amendments for State Committee Consideration

1. Columbia SWCD – BMP Implementation on 4 CAFO Farms – Round IX – C700708

Request: change of landowners

Reason: the original farm is relocating and for sale. The new farm was identified by the District as a priority through the AEM process and the proximity to an unnamed tributary of the Hudson River.

Previous amendments: 1 time extension

Note: Lauren Miller, Region 6 Water Quality Specialist, is not supportive of the change due to animal number decrease and the horse farm is not a CAFO. The original contract called for BMP Implementation on 4 CAFO farms.

L. Sager was present to discuss the merits of the request and answer the Committee's questions.

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

DRAFT

2. Montgomery SWCD – Otsquago Creek BMP Implementation – Round VII – C700640

Request: time extension from 3/31/05 to 3/31/07

Reason: additional time needed to complete implementation projects due to landowner's financial constraints. Landowner is now committed to finishing the project.

Previous amendments: 2 time extensions, 1 landowner change

Note: The start date of this contract was 2/28/00. A contract term longer than 5 years is only permitted by the Office of the State Comptroller under extenuating circumstances. Rich Lewis, Region 5 Associate Environmental Analyst, recommends approval.

J. Dickinson moved to approve the no-cost time extension; seconded by G. Proios, with the stipulation that this will be the last extension granted. Motion passed; carried.

Staff Approved Amendments

1. Broome SWCD – Short Duration Grazing Implementation for the Eastern Susquehanna River Basin in Broome, Tioga, and Chenango Counties – Round X – C700742

Request: change of BMPs

Reason: the practices of short duration grazing will remain, however, one farm is changing from the component of permanent vegetative cover to an animal trail and walkway. Another is changing from animal trail and walkway to an alternate water supply

Approved by J. Schumacher 1/27/06

2. Monroe SWCD – Genesee River Basin Implementation Project – Round XI – 26-1

Request: change of landowners

Reason: one of the original landowners voluntarily withdrew from grant, new landowner identified as a priority because it is also a CAFO and CNMP addresses the same need

Approved by L. Travis 12/12/05

CALS Strategic Vision – D. Grantham

D. Grantham gave a presentation on the Cornell University College of Agriculture and Life Science (CALS) strategic vision. D. Grantham gave a brief history of CALS. Her presentation went on to explain the missions of the different programs including Land Grant, Social Sciences, Environmental Sciences, and New Life Sciences. D. Grantham told the Committee that CALS is working to make research knowledge more accessible by connecting campus/county research and Extension through better integration and services for constituents.

G. Proios noted that CALS reporting should be sent to the SWCC so that it can appear in the State Committee minutes.

D. Hill thanked D. Grantham for taking time out of her busy schedule to report to the Committee.

CAFO Update – J. Ten Eyck

J. Ten Eyck distributed a CAFO Program Update. The CAFO General Permit GP-04-02 Current Numbers as of February 15, 2006:

- ◆ 146 Permitted Large Facilities
 - All have certified CNMPs
 - 144 have submitted Annual Compliance Reports
 - 2 new facilities

- ◆ 468 Permitted Medium Facilities
 - 437 have certified CNMPs
 - 14 have overdue CNMPs
 - 16 require certification in the future

DRAFT

- o 8 overdue 2004 Annual Compliance Reports
- o Some may be dropping out, filing NOTs

The report explained that the DEC is committed to increasing outreach efforts including Farmer/CNMP planner meetings and PE training. A series of informational meetings regarding the approaching CAFO deadlines will be held throughout the state starting on March 21st, 2006. Trainings for PEs on CAFO issues are being planned for May.

J. Ten Eyck told the Committee that a CNMP Certification Training Session will be offered again at the March Water Quality Symposium. As of now 21 participants are signed up, which include mostly District and NRCS employees, 3 private sector individuals, and 1 DEC employee. Ten Eyck explained that there are other continuing education classes being offered at the Symposium including training on undesigned manure storages, CAFO update, P Index, conservation tillage, and planning and implementation failures.

G. Proios asked if the State Education Department is aware of the Professional Engineer needs in terms of the CAFO Permit. J. Ten Eyck believes that P. Wright has acquired CEUs from the State Education Department.

J. Ten Eyck gave a CNMP Specialist Report. He reported that B. Brower and G. Albrecht are preparing for the CNMP Training session at the March Symposium. They have conducted a review of a CNMP submitted by a third party planner. The quality assurance checklist has been revised. They have updated the list of conditionally/certified planners. They are reviewing the EFARM documentation requirements, revising and updating the sample CNMP for the training session, working with DEC on updating the CAFO inspection form, and conducted an informal survey on the number of undesigned earthen manure storages on CAFOs. The survey indicated approximately 300 undesigned storages on permitted CAFOs. Brower and Albrecht conducted another survey that concluded that of 586 CAFO facilities, 87% have been included on an Ag NPS Grant or EQIP application. 79% of those have received funding. This does not represent full compliance on those 79% that have received funding.

Discussion ensued regarding undesigned manure storages structures. DEC stated that they are considering extending the large CAFO deadline for structural practices only to July 31, 2007. The deadline for evaluation of undesigned manure storages would not be extended.

AEM Committee Reports

AEM Steering Committee

J. Ten Eyck discussed the issue of petroleum bulk storage tanks on farms. He explained that pressure from the EPA will most likely cause an increase in petroleum bulk storage inspections in New York State. These inspections may include farms that have registered tanks of greater than 1,100 gallons. Ten Eyck explained that the AEM Technical Committee together with the DEC is reviewing the AEM Tier 2 Worksheet that deals with petroleum storage to emphasize compliance with the bulk storage permit. Ten Eyck also expressed the need to get the word out to farms that have registered bulk storage tanks regarding the need to register and comply with the terms of the permit.

J. Tauzel told the Committee that an article has been published in Grass Roots and an email to New York Farm Bureau members alerting them of a rising potential for CAFO inspections.

J. Ten Eyck distributed a proposal for AEM Base Year 2 Funding. J. Ten Eyck advised the Committee to treat this proposal more as a concept. There may be legal and contract issues to work out before the proposal can be approved.

The 2006 Year 2 AEM Base Program proposal provides a flexible program to address local priority agricultural environmental issues on priority farms with emphasis placed on Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO) and the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). Additional funding beyond the Base program will be provided to Counties that have demonstrated outstanding performance during the 2005 Year 1 Base Program to address additional components of their AEM Strategic Plans.

DRAFT

The proposal included conducting the noncompetitive Base Program in the same format as the 2005 program with up to \$20,000 available per SWCD to implement components of their AEM Strategic Plan addressing priority issues in priority watersheds. Contracts will be deliverable based with set payments for completion of contracted tasks.

The proposal also included additions to the Base Program deliverables that place a special emphasis on addressing CAFO needs and taking advantage of CREP funding.

Counties will be given through March 2006 to update their AEM Strategic Plan. Year 2 of the program is scheduled to begin on May 7, 2006.

R. Zimmerman noted that Year 2 of the program focuses on capacity building to bolster the District's ability to deliver services.

J. Ten Eyck told the Committee that it is important that the Committee agrees on the direction of Year 2 of the Base Program so that the details can be worked in time for the second year contracts to be executed.

G. Proios asked if the proposal diverges from the original intent of the AEM Base Program. J. Ten Eyck responded that the message will not change. The Base Program's goal of bringing new farms into AEM will still be addressed in Year 2.

The State Committee agreed to the concept of the 2006 AEM Year 2 Base Program proposal.

AEM Technical Committee

Ten Eyck explained that the Technical Committee is working on various AEM Tier 2 worksheets including Petroleum Product Storage, Farmland Continuity, Fruits and Vegetables, Sustainable Viticulture. The Technical Committee is also improving the Greenhouse Worksheets and looking at the compatibility of the core worksheets with NRCS Conservation Security Program (CSP).

Outreach

J. Ten Eyck distributed an AEM Outreach Report. The report highlighted a series of Media Training Sessions to be held in March and April. The sessions will provide basic training for AEM partners to handle press calls and interviews, provide key messages and speaking points so everyone is giving the same AEM message statewide and identify key individuals willing to take on a more active role as part of an AEM Media Network. A general Media Training Session is also planned for the Water Quality Symposium. Please see B. Silvestri for dates and locations.

CREP Update – R. Lewis

R. Lewis gave an update on the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). He distributed a report on conservation buffer practices implemented as of 12/31/05. Lewis noted that CP29, Marginal Pastureland Wildlife Habitat Buffer, practice can now be completed without planting trees. He expects to see an increase in enrollment as a result. R. Lewis advised the Committee that he and the SWCC staff is working on a series of maps that will show the Agricultural NPS Grant Program match from Round X and XI. R. Lewis explained that CREP training that focused on how to use AEM and CREP as complementary programs was conducted in the past month.

319 Report – R. Kaplewicz and M. Latham

R. Kaplewicz advised the Committee that he, R. Zimmerman, M. Latham, and M. Scott (Assistant Director, Fiscal Management) will be meeting with Bureau Directors from the DEC on March 1st to discuss the state of 319 funds and program priorities. R. Kaplewicz noted that the ability to administer SWCC and SWCD programs will be greatly decreased if 319 funded positions are not filled. R. Draper followed up by stating that the DEC needs to look forward despite of a serious decrease in 319 funding. He explained the need to identify the most critical programs and the resources needed to deliver those programs.

DRAFT

R. Kaplewicz noted, as an example, that the 319 program is a major reason why the CAFO program in NYS has accomplished what it has. Limiting 319 funding makes it difficult on all of us. The integrity of water quality programs is on the line.

Other Reports - All

USDA-NRCS

G. Lee acting State Conservationist reported that the new State Conservationist will start on April 17th. Lee advised the Committee that CSP sign ups are ongoing in the Oak Orchard Creek Watershed. Lee told the Committee that the President's Budget includes a \$130 million cut across all Farm Bill programs. The budget also eliminates the 2006 (FY 2007) Congressional Earmark. This may result in the downsizing of NRCS employees by 1500 nationwide.

EFARM

C. Frasier gave a status report on the EFARM program. He advised the Committee that the SWCC staff met with staff from the Environmental Facility Corporation (EFC) to review the procedure for reimbursement of CNMP update costs.

SWCD Annual Reports

The following SWCD Annual Reports were approved:

- ◆ Albany
- ◆ Chautauqua
- ◆ Cayuga

Draft Policy on Sale of Tree and Shrubs

R. Kaplewicz handed out a draft policy statement regarding District Tree and Shrub programs. G. Proios asked how many Districts are selling items that may be impacted by the Draft Policy. This information is not known.

NYACD

G. Proios updated the Committee on the efforts underway by NYACD. Legislative Days will be held on March 6th and 7th. NYACD will be focusing on communicating one need to the NYS Legislature. That need is increased reimbursement for Districts.

G. Proios also advised the Committee that the NYS Department of Transportation recently completed a Stormwater Management Practices Study. The study focused on manufactured stormwater management practices, including water quality inlets and catch basin inserts. The goals of the study were to provide the following three products:

- ◆ A literature review evaluating various stormwater runoff treatment systems and technologies
- ◆ Laboratory tests of catch basin insert technologies and field tests of catch basin inserts and water quality inlets
- ◆ A generic protocol for evaluating treatment systems to be used in future projects

NYSCDEA

A. Barber invited all of the State Committee voting members to the Water Quality Symposium Banquet on Thursday evening, March 9th. A. Barber also offered a reaction to the discussions regarding the Districts ability to address the CAFO needs. Barber noted that the AEM program has been developed as a voluntary, incentive based approach to agricultural environmental issues. CAFOs represent 2% - 10% of the agricultural community in Cortland County. Barber explained that AEM does a good job focusing on the environmental impacts related to agriculture and she expressed the importance of not leaving the non CAFO community behind. We need to continue to look at AEM from a bigger perspective.

NYS DEC

L. King advised the Committee that the Hydrologic Habitat Modification (HHM) Committee is conducting informal forums on Barrier Mitigation.

DRAFT

Envirothon

B. Steinmuller advised the Committee that the 2006 NYS Envirothon will be held on May 24th and 25th at SUNY Oswego. The current issue topic is Water Stewardship in a Changing Climate. The Envirothon Committee has approved the oral presentation question and the written tests are being drafted. B. Steinmuller distributed raffle tickets to raise money for the NYS Envirothon.

NYS DOS

J. Green told the Committee that the NYS DOS has released RFPs for Quality Communities projects, and the Shared Municipalities Services Incentives Awards.

Managers' Forum

L. Travis reported on the statewide Managers' Forum that was held on January 24th and 25th. He advised the Committee that a lot of good feedback was shared by the participants. The next challenge is how to build that feedback into the delivery of programs.

NYS Department of Agriculture and Markets – March Road Tour

R. Zimmerman told the Committee that the Department will be conducting a series of workshops on NYS agricultural issues in March. Zimmerman noted that the AEM message will be incorporated into the opening remarks of each session.

NYSERDA – Innovations in Agriculture

R. Rausch advised the Committee that NYSERDA will be conducting informational meetings on the Innovations in Agriculture program on March 29th and 30th in Syracuse.

Maple Weekend

D. Hill told the Committee that the NYS Maple Weekend will be held on March 18th and 19th.

Next Meeting – March 21, 2006 in Utica.

Meeting adjourned 4:00 p.m.