

**CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE for the
GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT (GEIS) on ANIMAL AGRICULTURE
Meeting Notes**

**May 8, 9 & 10, 2001
Holiday Inn, Arden Hills**

CAC members or alternates in attendance: George Raab, Mara Krinke, Galen Lisell, Helen Palmer, Ken Albrecht, Pat Bloomgren, Larry Schultz, Fraser Hart, Mark Schultz, Harold Stanislawski, Pat Henderson, Pat Wulff (for Tom Dunnwald), Dave Preisler, Myron Just, Kent Sulem, Tina Rosenstein, Jim Ische, Jim Sullivan, Kris Sigford, Andy Otness (for Helen Palmer), Troy Gilchrist, Jeanne Scharf, Tom Dunnwald, and Andy Steensma

Not represented: Gary Allen, Ed Hegland, Chris Radatz

EQB Staff: George Johnson, Gregg Downing, Angela M^cGovern

Facilitator: Virginia Pierce, Charlie Peterson, Department of Administration
Audience: In Audience: Paul Burns, Matt Drewitz, Paul Toren, Mike Sullivan,
Ken Nimmer, an environmental consultant from Impact Planning

Please note that these minutes are only an extract and summary of the discussion, which took place over three full days. These minutes do NOT include every remark made by every person. The minutes try to capture some of the major ideas. An audiotape of the entire meeting is available to any interested party to review. I apologize if anyone feels I am misquoting him or her or taking portions of their remarks out of context. A complete transcript of every word would be many times longer than these minutes. I take full responsibility for my editorial license. Remember, twenty people can talk faster than one can type.

Welcome, overview, and introductions The meeting came to order at 8:15 a.m.

The meeting opened with remarks by George Johnson. He informed the CAC members of the contents of the mailing sent and pointed out additional materials at their place. He made a number of general announcements. Gary Allen will not be able to attend this meeting. Pat Wulff joined CAC, meeting for the first time as alternate for Tom Dunnwald. Mr. Johnson introduced himself and asked the CAC members to make brief introductions for the benefit of the new member. He made introductory remarks on the ongoing policy development process. Occasionally CAC members with special knowledge or expertise will be tapped to look at earlier versions of policy to help with revision. Several CAC members have offered extra time to help formulate initial

policies. Due to the limited time available in CAC meetings, an attempt is made to bring members documents that have been reviewed and hopefully improved during the revision process. All policies will be reexamined by CAC prior to finalization

The Legislature is considering budget requests including the EQB requested money for completion of the animal agriculture generic environmental impact statement project. We are waiting for conference committee reports to hear if CAC gets funded to complete their work by December 2001. The LMIC GIS funding has been extended to June 30, 2002. This should give LMIC sufficient time to do the detailed spatial analysis needed (make the maps from the feedlot inventory/census data collected over the last two years) A special CAC GEIS GIS task force has been meeting to guide this analysis.

Ms. Pierce went over CAC ground-rules and our procedures for reaching consensus on policy recommendations. She indicated that we need to be courteous and work to listen and respect other people's ideas. We will be dealing with some controversial topics this time, likely to elicit strong individual opinions. The recommendations we are going to try and get through this meeting are the areas of: Water Quality, Land Use, Soils and Manure, Role of Government and Animal Welfare.

Mr. Johnson gave CAC a brief update on the current budget situation. He pointed out the difficulty of uncertainty with the fiscal year end at the Legislature. There are a number of initiatives related to feedlots, the property tax reform, reductions in state agency funding and other controversial topics being considered by the elected officials. In a budget year there are always last minute games within games within games that complicate what goes on at the Capitol. In spite of these complications, it is important for the CAC to try and accomplish as much as possible by June 30, 2001. All the TWP's are contracted and will be completed with current funding. What would suffer if the requested funding was not granted, is the policy recommendations, the GEIS documents and public participation.

Final TWP's will be posted on the Feedlot link of Minnesota Planning's home page at (<http://www.mnplan.state.mn.us/eqb/geis/2000/proposals.html>) (exactly as written by the contractors) with a disclaimer indicating that these documents are produced for the GEIS but do not necessarily represent the policy or opinions of the CAC or EQB. This media allows the maximum number of Minnesota's citizens to access the information as they desire at minimal cost. CAC meeting minutes, the entire Literature Summary and other supporting data and internet links can be found at this location.

Ms. Krinke asked for clarification on exactly what CAC/EQB would produce if the additional funding were not provided. Mr. Johnson explained that all TWP's would be completed, the policy recommendations agreed to by CAC would be included and whatever draft GEIS text that could be crafted. One possible approach would be to take the summaries of all the TWP's and the policy recommendations of CAC and combine these into a draft GEIS. Mr. Johnson said, he would much prefer to allow CAC more time to deliberate on policies, carefully edit and construct the GEIS sections by combining the relevant sections of the TWP's and Literature Summaries and finally take the draft document out for review in a series of public meetings around the State. On the

basis of public response to the draft a final GEIS could be prepared and presented to the EQB. Board for final action. This is the approach that is planned if the requested money is granted by the Legislature.

Mr. Johnson told the group about a one-day seminar on animal handling and humane slaughter he attended in Cannon Falls. The featured speaker was Dr. Temple Grandin from Colorado. Dr. Grandin was a reviewer on the Feedlot Literature Summary and is an international expert on animal welfare issues. There was a facility tour and slaughter demonstration. Mr. Johnson found the talk to be very practical. He also mentioned that in the most recent Fedex package, the CAC received the Animal Welfare TWP from Marlene Halverson.

Helen Palmer, Tom Dunnwald and Ms. Halverson attended the Temple Grandin meeting on the humane treatment of animals. Ms. Grandin presented economic reasons to treat animals humanely. She was very practical and realistic person, known for her inventions of cattle chutes and squeezeboxes, devices which help keep animals still for sorting and vaccinations. She has reengineered many facilities. Her approach involves the behavioral psychology and works with natural instincts of the animal.

Mr. Johnson asked all CAC members if anyone had any news for the group. Ms. Palmer gave her observations on the Temple Grandin meeting. Ms. Grandin has designed about one third of the slaughterhouses in the USA. She has been on the McDonald's task force to evaluate animal welfare. Dr. Grandin suggested that a good test of any animal handling technique is to gather a dozen people at random from the airport or bus station and ask them what they think of the technique. She is particularly concerned at the poor treatment of poultry in battery cages. She advocates minimum decent standards for animal treatment.

Ms. Henderson had also talked to Dr. Grandin and was very impressed with her. She also informed us that the League of Woman Voters has taken a formal position against the excessive use of antibiotics in animal feed. This raises the specter of these emerging issues that are gradually becoming part of the common consciousness. There will always be new issues emerging in animal agriculture. Mr. Lisell mentioned his conversation on the plane with an international salesman on the foot and mouth disease in England. Mr. Albrecht mentioned the need for integrating the Land Use and Role of Government recommendations. He advised us to try and anticipate the changes coming in the future. Mr. Lisell mentioned the importance of evaluating the relationships between energy and agriculture.

Social and Community Impacts draft TWP

Dr. Cornelia Flora, Dr. Wynne Wright and Dr. Kathy Kramer arrived to make their initial presentation on the Social and Community draft TWP. Dr. Flora works for the Northcentral Center for Regional Development, an organization that includes the twelve north central states, so she has been able to take a regional perspective on Minnesota's

situation. Dr. Flora expressed her strong bias in favor of maintaining vital rural communities. She classified four kinds of capital available to develop rural communities:

1. Human capital - skills, knowledge, leadership of local people
2. Social capital – relationships, communication, responsibility, trust
3. Financial Capital – Land, labor, money, resources
4. Environmental Capital - air, water, soil, plant and animal communities

She has found that a healthy environment needs to have a balance among these kinds of capital. If you pay too much attention to any category of capital the other types tend to be degraded. The key challenge is trying to find the perfect balance

Dr. Wright began to identify the areas she focused on. The overwhelming lesson to be learned here in the Social and Community area is the incredible rapidity with which this change has come onto the rural areas. Hundreds of years of tradition are being overturned in a couple of decades. Change is coming on with unprecedented speed; change is coming from new directions. Fundamentally livestock is crucial to life in rural Minnesota. It is an extremely important part of the state and farm economy. Livestock is essential to the viability of a sustainable food production system.

The TWP team selected six study counties with four major species represented. Pennington/Clearwater were beef counties. Morrison/Stearns were poultry counties. Goodhue was the dairy county. Rock was the swine county. The most important indicator of a person's level of interest in livestock was their relationship to animal agriculture. Changes in animal agriculture include a decrease in the number of farms Statewide, herd size has increased. Swine farms show very significant concentration. The number of farms decreased 53% but the herd size grew 205% between 1987 and 1997. What's going on in Minnesota swine operations is very similar to trends in the rest of the Midwest, North Carolina, and Oklahoma. Poultry farms show increasing convergence. The number of farms has decreased by 38% in the ten-year period of analysis, but herd size at the remaining farms has dramatically increased.

Farms are becoming much more specialized and reliant on high technology and energy to maximize production. Genomics of plants and animals is becoming a major public health concern and also offers a potential for dramatic improvements in yields and nutrition. Increasingly vertical integration is occurring and more animal production is becoming contracted to large firms that dictate exactly how the animals are raised. While this arrangement does reduce financial risk to the farmer somewhat, it also lessens their personal control over their business operations, leading to a sense of diminished empowerment.

One of the things that makes farming more and more difficult these days is that the community of farmers is declining. Fewer and fewer people actually farm, so there is less community support and compassion for the farmer's struggles. The network of farmers is becoming thinner and thinner. Dr. Kathy Kramer discussed her work on identifying the characteristics of farms and farmers. The number of farms and farmers

has decreased in Minnesota and across the nation. The number of people who list their principle occupation as full-time farmer decreases every year for the last two decades. In Minnesota less than one percent of our population are full-time farmers.

Dr. Wright discussed the focus groups and the individual interviews conducted to gauge public sentiment to the changes in animal agriculture. Visible changes include seeing farms vacant during the day. Many farmers need to take off farm employment to earn their living expenses. Farming is increasingly becoming a part-time evening morning and weekend occupation. Farmers are working more hours, often in the dark to do their farm chores on top of their 40 hour a week job. Fewer animals are visible in pasture as confinement structures become the norm. Farm structures are becoming much larger. Fences are disappearing as livestock becomes grain-fed, not pastured. Abandoned farmsteads are becoming more common especially in south and west Minnesota. Increasing non-farm rural residents, not familiar with normal farm operations change the dynamics of rural communities, and the average age of farmers increases as many young people choose to avoid farming as an occupation.

Farmers have been the cornerstone of rural communities for centuries. Now they are becoming increasingly irrelevant and impotent. New rural residents are much more concerned with environmental amenities and less tolerant of nuisances or impacts from farming operations. Dr. Wright heard rural people complaining about dirt or mud on the road. While this may seem a trivial observation, laughed off by most farmers, it indicates the expectations of new rural residents for “farming without any mess.” Recreation and aesthetics are much more important to new rural residents. Many came to the country for clean air, clean water and the idyllic landscape.

There is a great deal of fear or uncertainty in farmers. They were afraid of corporations making them slaves or serfs as vertical integration seems inevitable. The philosophy is often repeated “you must get big or get out.” Declines in 4H participation and decreasing interest in county fairs indicate that farming is seen as archaic and an untenable lifestyle for young people. Many farmers feel they are losing ability to control their own life. There is an increasing social and economic gap developing between small farmers and those who choose to expand their operations. Small farmers feel like inferiors or second class citizens. For current farmers there is a perceived lack of opportunities and limited access to markets unless you contract to a large agri-products corporation.

Dr. Kremer discussed the media analysis the team did of articles in local newspapers. The visibility of animal agriculture has shown an overall decrease in the number of news items but an increase in the number of editorials and letters to the editors. This indicates that the level of public dialogue is getting larger. She also went through the Social and Community TWP team’s initial policy recommendations. First, citizens need to understand that livestock agriculture is an important part of Minnesota economy. Second, producers need to be more aware of and sensitive the environmental concerns of their neighbors. Third, we need to find ways to expand livestock production that preserve and protect our environmental resources of rural Minnesota. We need to enhance cooperation between the environmental regulators at the federal, state and local level.

We need to develop more programs to help small and medium producers to comply with environmental regulations. Create opportunities for increased public dialogue and participation in planning of future livestock developments. Increase market access for small and medium producers.

Ms. Palmer was concerned with the severity of the problem and the sense of abject disempowerment of many in the rural community. Mr. Lisell was impressed with the fact that this team did go out in the field and actually talked to real people about their problems. Mr. Stanislawski was concerned that the presentation portrayed the rural communities as victims of change. He wanted to have more stress on the positive aspects of the changes and opportunities. He pointed out that the EAW process does give citizens a great deal of input into the planning and regulation of livestock facilities. Dr. Flora indicated that the team was reporting back what they heard from people in the field. They did not hear about optimism for future opportunities from the people they interviewed. Mr. Stanislawski indicated his concern that the issue of food processing was not adequately addressed. He pointed out some of his observations of the dynamics of several areas with which he was familiar. Dr. Wright indicated that it was possible that the interviews may have selected for persons who had a grievance or bias. She pointed out that the persons she talked to do not have much positive feedback to offer.

Ms. Henderson felt the Social policy recommendations were weak. She was hoping for some examples of where these ideas might have worked elsewhere. Her feeling was that the team's media analysis of St. Cloud's papers were not the same as her experience after regularly reading those papers for her professional work. Dr. Kremer explained her sample methodology and the basis of her findings. Mr. Albrecht wondered if they looked at the clustering of articles or form letters as a fraction of the letter volume. He also pointed out the development of the invisible new infrastructure that has evolved to service modern animal agriculture, like custom manure spreaders, contract soil samplers and veterinarians. Even though Minnesota has laws preventing corporate farming, many people perceive modern industrialized farming in Minnesota as "corporate farming". Dr. Flora stated that she would have preferred making statistical comparisons, but CAC directed her to do more case studies, so that is what her team did.

Mr. Preisler wondered about getting in more detail on draft Social policy recommendations number 4 and 6. He was particularly interested in hearing about any real life situations where these general ideas were tested and the results obtained. He observed that if you overlaid the map of density of swine operations in the USA with the location of processing facilities, you would discover a universal relationship. Everything is shrinking down to get production closer and closer to processing capacity. This is true in all industries to a large degree. Dr. Flora observed that while the common wisdom is that supply brings processing plants, what she has seen is that processing plants also bring supply. In cases where a plant was built in a region with few animals, the farmers changed their operations to start producing what the processor was looking for. In her experience the processor comes first, not the production.

Sociologists have observed that many of the trends of larger society show a lag effect in agriculture. Agriculture tends to be very conservative and resistant to change for a longer time. Ms. Bloomgren compared the Role of Government TWP data to observations of the Social TWP teams on citizen participation. Ms. Rosenstein discussed the social changes she had seen in Nicollet County in relationship. Mr. Hart questioned Dr. Flora's observations on the relationship between production and processing based on his knowledge of Seaborg farms in Oklahoma. He further opined on the sociological importance of immigrant populations in processing plants. He stated that one of the most critical issues is the prejudice in rural areas to immigrants who come into to work in processing plants. This issue is missed by focusing exclusively on livestock production. He observed that the underlying racism is a far more significant issue in negative reactions to livestock operations Minnesota and other parts of the USA than many people are willing to recognize. Mr. Hart took issue with the fact that the University of Minnesota was neglecting its need for employing more rural sociologists to deal with these problems.

Ms. Henderson raised the issue of the "bully factor" in American agriculture. She was struck by this increasing fear factor in rural residents. In her interviews, Dr. Wright said there were many cases in her interviews, where people reached a point that they seemed genuinely afraid to speak further on an issue. It was like there was a line they were afraid to cross, as if, if they told too much of the truth they perceived it would somehow come back to hurt them. Dr. Wright said that while a large part of this reaction may be the uncertainty and fear of modern life, farmers seem to have even more of this fear than urban residents, as if there was some additional burden on them besides everything that everyone else has to deal with. Mr. Johnson concurred with Ms. Henderson. He pointed out that as he delved into all the issues and the interrelationships, he came to believe that we possibly needed a TWP on the psychological or emotional aspects of animal agriculture on rural residents.

Mr. Stanislawski encouraged the Social team to look into the dairy processing plant in Zumbrota in Goodhue County. He offered to introduce Dr. Flora to the manager of this flagship processing plant in the county they have chosen to focus their study of dairy production. Dr. Flora said one of the greatest frustrations they heard about from people was that they perceived no one was listening to them. Government officials and bureaucrats need to respond to people or they feel that they have no control over the changing situation.

After lunch CAC identified the initial issues. There was a copy of a handout listing the preliminary policy recommendations presented by the Social TWP team. Ms. Krinke thought the concept of citizen voice was key. The issues of government response and personal empowerment were also important. She was also concerned about access to markets, the links between producers and processing facilities that are community supported. Ms. Palmer felt we needed to make information more available, to educate people about alternatives. We have to offer programs to encourage young people into farming.

Mr. Sulem felt public education was important, especially the gap between perception and reality. The public needs to know what the decision-making framework is and is not. There is a widespread misunderstanding as to the role and impact of neighbor complaints. Just because a person speaks up, that isn't the sole or even most important aspect of the decision making process.

Ms. Palmer recommended using state resources selectively. Encourage small to mid size farm because it means more independence for more people (more people on the land that are interested in the land). Ms. Rosenstein said the state could go broke trying to subsidize farming lifestyles. We should limit discussion to funding to fulfill environmental stewardship compliance. Ms. Palmer thought we should use the economics section to talk about what is currently being subsidized and the perception that government favors big operations. Mr. Lisell says, "Don't use economics as yardstick for support of different types of farming." Mr. Just stated that the social conditions of a rural community id reflective of the economic reality of production and consumption patterns. Ms. Wulff suggested some sort of registration and certification for farmers similar to what she went through in nursing. She said farming is not a lifestyle, it is a business and farmers are responsible to maintain environmental quality. She expects farmers to act like professionals. Mr. Steensma said the fundamental question is "What type of social structure do we really want in rural areas?" Mr. Larry Schultz was concerned that there was not enough emphasis on the problems of small and midsize farmers, especially regarding access to markets.

Mr. Preisler said that if you look at alternatives, too much time is spent trying to fix the system we have and not enough on how people can operate outside the system. He recommended looking at Manitoba's recent GEIS-like document. They are going to try to move forward on two tracks in animal agriculture at the same time. One to maximize lower cost world market segments for larger producers. The other for specialty niche markets at higher cost for the smaller producers. By going both ways at once they can let farmers choose the best of all markets for them to pursue. Mr. Preisler did not deny that animal agriculture is consolidating, but he said so is every other major business segment and many industries are much more concentrated than animal agriculture.

Ms. Wulff was concerned about the recommendation # 3 to increase budgets for state agencies. She felt that these decisions should be made at local level. Mr. Lisell disagreed with this. He felt that if you don't have state agencies to back up local levels, you don't have the back bone or the money to counter some of the problems. Mr. Larry Schultz was hoping that Social TWP has more concrete recommendations in the final TWP. Mr. Just though that in their interviews there was a real 'victim' issue. Most of their recommendations cite that. People perceive a real confrontation with animal agriculture. How can we help people deal with change? What we are seeing now is a 21st century version of the same conflicts that have always been part of American culture.

Ms. Bloomgren expressed her concern with the quality of the Social draft TWP. There were with misspelled words and wrong words used (here not hear). It didn't really get to policy at all. Mr. Stanislawski said Social TWP falls far short of his expectations. It fails

to address so many things. He was particularly distressed that there is no discussion of the social implications of livestock processing. Mr. Downing reminded the CAC that workplan specifically did not include the processing component.

Mr. Hart was concerned that there was no discussion of the vast percentage of people who don't care about these issues. All they want is high quality food, real cheap. He said there is nobody left in rural MN to care. Mr. Hart has done a detailed examination of the 2000 census results. Rural depopulation is emptying out large parts of the state. He said we have a basic ideological split in CAC – should we save the small farm or do we leave them die out? Should we subsidize small farms or subsidize large farms, or both, or neither?

Mr. Preisler directed the group to look at page 13, in the middle of second paragraph – non-farming community doesn't care about a feedlot unless it smells. This is true, most people don't care at all unless it smells or directly effects their personal income. In his opinion the Social TWP report is pretty shallow.

Policy recommendations - Water

Mr. Johnson introduced the topic of water quality policy recommendations reminding CAC of the many aspects of water quality policy and all the groups, agencies and levels of government involved. We would probably need to revisit this topic several times before the end. On the basis of Dr. Mulla's presentation on the Water Quality TWP and suggestions from Kris Sigford additional proposed recommendations were appended onto the end of those CAC had already seen. Policy development is a process of continuous improvement and revision until final agreement or a total impasse is reached by CAC. Ms. Bloomgren from MDH and Mr. Jim Sullivan from MPCA have been a great deal of assistance in developing and reviewing early versions of suggested water quality policy.

Mr. Charlie Peterson took over the facilitation of the process. He reminded the CAC of the ground-rules we use and the process we will follow. He referred everyone to the ladder of inference model posted on the wall in guiding our process. He asked CAC to use a dot exercise to rank those you agreed with (green), those you opposed (red) and those which needed discussion or further refinement (black). While CAC groaned about the dots exercise, it does help us focus on the order of item discussion.

CAC proceeded with a lively discussion of all the new draft water quality policy recommendations. Ms. Rosenstein brought up the issue advocated by Dr. Mulla of the need for doing paired watershed studies to evaluate the effectiveness of best management practices (BMP's). Ms. Rosenstein believed that there would be some federal funding available to do these paired watershed studies. Ms. Krinke supported the paired watershed studies and pointed out that the Land Stewardship project was involved in similar studies, whose results would be available soon. Ms. Wulff pointed out that the regulatory limit of 10 animal units in shoreland was not protective enough. She was concerned that even a couple of animals can damage a shoreland area severely.

Ms. Sigford said that she supported the revision of the FLEVAL model and also implementing the use of the modified tool. Ms. Rosenstein expressed her extreme frustration with the implementation of manure management plans. These plans are causing farmers more problems than any other provision of the new rules. Mr. Sullivan suggested the best way to evaluate land application is a paired watershed study. To require FLEVAL to include land application sites would substantially increase the complexity and workload on feedlot regulators.

CAC debated the policy suggesting that we support the increase in cost-share funding available to farmers needing to upgrade facilities to meet environmental standards. The group was referred to the February 2001 Minnesota Department of Agriculture. Ms. Sigford and Mr. Stanislawski offered their insights and observations on the rationale and need for this policy. Mr. Stanislawski asked for a friendly amendment to the recommendation specifically endorsing the Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP) as part of the cost-share package. This amendment was accepted by the motion maker, Ms. Sigford. Ms. Wulff asked if the practices we were endorsing had been evaluated and approved. Mr. Johnson pointed out our reliance on the technical expertise of the University of Minnesota, Board of Soil and Water Resources and Minnesota Department of Agriculture in these matters. Mr. Matt Drewitz from MDA provided a number of paper copies of this report for the CAC. The CAC did reach unanimous consensus on the item supporting increased cost-share funding.

The CAC discussed at length the water quality recommendation to develop regulatory standards for suspect chemicals. They approved this recommendation unanimously. One of the draft recommendations discussed the need for centralized collection and publishing of water quality data from local, state, federal and non-governmental associations. It also sought continuous improvement in the quality and quantity of data. Ms. Wulff asked if CAC had discussed the issue of funding water quality data collection. Mr. Johnson explained that the whole issue of funding would be dealt with as a meta-issue at a later time. Mr. Albrecht pointed out the need for a clearinghouse to receive, review and publish all data that met standards of sampling and analysis quality. Ms. Sigford reminded the CAC of all the private individuals and non-profit groups which are collecting high quality monitoring data. Mr. Stanislawski stated that he wanted to be sure that all data collection was done under the auspices and to the level of quality of governmental organizations. He was concerned that many groups might collect and contribute questionable data without rigorous quality control. CAC was able to get unanimous consensus on water policy recommendation # 13. They also agreed to recommendation # 15 unanimously.

On the second day CAC began with introductory remarks by Mr. Johnson. He regretted that due to the CAC meeting he could not attend the lecture given by the Dali Lama. The tickets were \$ 50 each and had to be purchased almost one year in advance. Mr. Johnson's wife and teenage son and his two friends did attend the lecture and were delighted. The Dali Lama had a wonderful message of compassion and consensus.

Mr. Johnson gave his impressions of the previous day's activities. Due to the budget uncertainties, we are trying to push the policy process as quickly as possible. There seemed to be some level of general dissatisfaction among CAC members about the Social and Community draft TWP. Mr. Johnson reminded the group that with the limited budget it is not possible to cover every topic in the depth that people often desire. It is fair to say that all of our TWP's could be considerably improved if more money is available. We are trying to get the maximum amount of information and best possible value for our money in many complex areas. It is inevitable that some people will not be satisfied with our findings or request that additional study be done in certain key areas. In particular, the lack of information on livestock processing is a concern to the group.

Policy discussion is an extremely difficult but important area for CAC. There is more debate and discussion on policies than had originally been anticipated. Mr. Stanislawski objected to the opinions Mr. Johnson expressed. He felt that Social TWP report was extremely deficient. Mr. Lisell acknowledged the problems with the Social report but was pleased with other aspects. Ms. Rosenstein asked how could we be sure to continually update the TWP documents with new and pertinent information.

Jean Coleman and Carol Seersland made a presentation on the revised Land Use TWP. Ms. Coleman went over the major changes in the document and maps in the draft document. One major item of discussion by the CAC was over the definition of a "farm". Ms. Coleman chose to rely on the definition used by the Agricultural Census, which is that a "farm" is any agricultural enterprise that generates over \$ 10,000 per year income from the sale of agricultural commodities. This has been an accepted definition for many years intended to exclude those entities that are clearly hobby farms from enumeration. These days it would be very difficult for most individuals or families to live on this amount of income, but there are no widely used replacement criteria available.

The issue of farm tenure was clarified by Ms. Coleman. There was quite a bit of discussion over what constitutes a full-time farmer. Mr. Albrecht commented on his observations on the long term historical trends in farm ownership. Ms. Coleman modified the maps and certain sections of the document to incorporate the CAC comments on the draft TWP. Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Coleman for her thoughts on the draft policy recommendation for tiered agricultural zoning. She was familiar with cases of this practice being used to a limited extent in parts of Minnesota and elsewhere in the USA. Her observation was that while the concept of tiered agricultural zoning was logical, there is insufficient history of the practice to make many conclusions at this point. Mr. Larry Schultz wondered if there had been negative impact on property values from the practice.

The question of loss of property values came up again. Ms. Coleman said the effect is extremely localized and she has no additional knowledge beyond the Taft study from the University of Minnesota. She said that on some occasions persons will be paid a fee or easement to compensate them for a perceived loss in the value of their property.

Ms. Coleman gave a number of examples on how land use controls had been used effectively in other parts of the USA. She offered to stay around to answer additional questions during the CAC Land Use policy discussion.

Mr. Troy Gilchrist and Mr. Kent Sulem had helped with the preliminary policies in Land Use. Mr. Gilchrist agreed to help facilitate the discussion of the draft policies by the CAC. The first recommendation concerned upgrading the quality and utility of odor complaint information. Mr. Gilchrist advised the group of the need to be cognizant of the requirements of the Data Privacy Act in dealing with any complaint information. The issue of timely notification of facilities came up. A complaint is most useful if it can be used in real time to make adjustments to the operation and incorporating current weather information. A producer should have a fair chance to know about the complaint and make adjustments and correct the problem.

On the basis of an informal poll of CAC members, they wished to discuss all of the draft policy recommendations in the Land Use topic. Mr. Raab wondered about the ability of townships to impose their own more restrictive regulations on feedlots. When the recommendation to enhance the level of public education on feedlot issues, Ms. Coleman pointed out that there was a unique opportunity to accomplish this now concurrent with the implementation of the new feedlot rules. The creation of special conflict management teams was considered by CAC. There seemed to be general support of the concept after a number of clarifying questions. Mr. Gilchrist explained each of the draft policy recommendations and provided his perspective on each suggestion.

Mr. Stanislawski commented on the problem of anonymous complaints. He said that he felt people needed to take responsibility for their complaints. Mr. Johnson pointed out that while there are spurious complaints there is also a real concern of retribution by some persons for their making complaints. Mr. Gilchrist advised the group that they are legally bound by the requirements of the Data Privacy Act in handling complaints. Mr. Dunnwald suggested that this item needs to be stated for those not familiar with the law. He also suggested that anonymous complaints be handled differently than those where the name is given. Mr. Larry Schultz wondered if the location of the complaint would provide useful information if the name of the complainant was withheld. There was an extended discussion by CAC on the use and limitations of complaint information.

The next recommendation was for the formation of feedlot conflict management teams for the use of and at the direction of local units of government. After discussion and clarification CAC was able to give unanimous consensus on this item. Policy # 3 concerning planning and zoning efforts directed at animal agriculture at the local level. Mr. Stanislawski was concerned over the possibility of townships exerting too much power to set arbitrary standards. He felt that zoning was best handled at the county level. Mr. Preisler pointed out some of the technical difficulties in dealing with adjoining townships with different zoning standards. He pointed out that there are many examples of facilities being built near county or township boundaries, which often generates conflict. Ms. Coleman encouraged strong coordination between local units of

government to overcome this problem. Her experience has been there are townships, which will act in counties that won't. The trend is that after the township initiates action the county tends to go along later.

Recommendation # 7 in Land Use encourage the exploration and evaluation of innovative land use techniques including agricultural tiered zoning, agricultural preservation districts, setbacks based on OFFSET, notification of residents of possible nuisance conditions, purchase and transfer development rights, buffer zones, promoting livestock friendly zones and relocation of feedlots in environmentally sensitive zones. CAC members engaged in detailed discussion of these various provisions. There was CAC discussion that recommendations # 9 (air quality easements) and # 10 (buyout and/or relocation of homes or facilities for insoluble odor problems) also belonged in this list. Ms. Scharf wanted to explore the concept of relocating homeowners near feedlot facilities. She did not support the concept of establishing a fund to buyout homes due to the uncertainty of determining whether there was a real environmental or health problem or just a perceptual problem. Each sub-item of policy # 7 was debated and discussed in turn. Ms. Rosenstein gave her perspective on the normal practices of land use control as practiced in Nicollet County. There was considerable discussion of the concept of air quality or odor easements. The CAC voted to delete this item as listed in policy # 9.

Ms. Coleman pointed out that besides the jurisdictional conflicts between townships and counties, there is an additional complication. Many cities exercise a zoning or land use control that extends some distance outside their municipal boundary. This level of governance can also control feedlots and nuisance conditions that may be generated during facility operations. CAC voted to unanimously approve policy # 13 and to delete policies # 10 and # 11. CAC agreed to delete Land Use policy # 8 regarding information exchange. Policy # 5 was placed on hold due to inadequate time left to discuss.

The Soils TWP team returned to update CAC on progress with the report and the Phosphorus Index. Dr.'s Paul Bloom, Neil Hansen, John Moncreif and David Mulla were present. The University of Minnesota Soils Department is taking the lead in our state on a national project sponsored by USDA and NRCS to evaluate Phosphorus fertilization throughout the United States. The CAC GEIS provided start-up funds for this P Index of Minnesota. The University has provided matching funds from a number of sources to complete two additional years of research and field validation. As a result of this time frame the P Index report which goes into the GEIS will be an interim product.

Dr. Moncrief began the presentation. Minnesota has a great deal of environmental and soil phosphorus index. The literature review of phosphorus indexes shows several states have already developed different P indexes. The University scientists are using lab tests and field trials to establish soil critical P levels. Each soil is like an individual entity and reacts slightly different to varying Phosphorus concentrations. Climate differences in eastern and western Minnesota causes a gradation in how the soils react to applied Phosphorus. Evaluation of the field scale index is underway at several experiment stations. The regional scale index is also being researched by Dr. Mulla. NRCS is going to do some Minnesota field verification tests in summer and fall 2001.

The soil critical P level is determined by a laboratory characterization of 120 soil samples from across the state. Simulated rainfall studies are conducted on the soil samples to find out how much of the applied P will run off. A factor to account for snowmelt run-off is being developed to account for Minnesota climate conditions. Open surface tile inlets are an important factor and are being incorporated into the P Index. The regional P Index is being used in several test watersheds with good statistical co-relations to measured monitoring data. Tillage practices are very important in determining how much run-off occurs, especially in the snow melt period. Chisel plowing seems to offer the most conservation of P in response to rainfall and snow melt events.

As P index went up the P loss in rainfall goes down in test soils. Manure seems to hold P in the soil matrix more effectively than chemical fertilizer. Dr. Moncreif described the Phosphorus research program in considerable detail to the CAC. A number of members asked technical questions on the work. Ms. Sigford wondered if their research had looked at pathogens in manure. Dr. Moncreif said no, this study focused on Phosphorus chemistry and transformation in the soil-water cropping ecosystem. When the Soil team had finished their presentation, Mr. Johnson explained that the Soils and Manure TWP was different from the other documents. These topics were covered very thoroughly in the Literature Summary section on Soils. There has not been a great deal of dramatically new innovative research in this area. The Soils TWP revisited the major issues briefly, but its primary focus was on the Phosphorus index. The P index like most agricultural research is a long-term effort that will not be completed prior to the document deadline.

The P index is a case where Minnesota is doing groundbreaking work on a national or international problem in response to a federal mandate to examine phosphorus issues. Ms. Henderson asked about the economic values of manure land application in crop management and erosion control. Dr. Bloom and Dr. Moncrief indicated that while manure definitely offers advantages beyond its fertility, such as improving soil structure and water infiltration, these secondary benefits were much more difficult to quantify economically. Mr. Just asked for some clarification on several aspects of Dr. Mulla's regional Phosphorus index. Dr. Hansen explained how field data was collected and interpreted to reach his conclusions. The Soils team explained how the P index was only one tool used to evaluate the appropriate management of any cropping system. Mr. Dunnwald asked about the relationship between soil erosion and phosphorus losses. Dr. Moncreif explained the differences between soluble and particulate phosphorus. Mr. Lisell asked about winter application of manure and what the risk of P loss was from this practice. Dr. Moncreif said that winter application especially on sloping soils is generally not a good method. This presents a major problem for facilities with inadequate manure storage. These operations must haul manure daily, even in the winter. Ms. Henderson wondered if the P index would be designed to be easy for farmers and manure applicators to use. Andy Otness from the League of Women Voters joined the group in the afternoon, since Helen Palmer could not present.

After the Soils presentation and a brief break, CAC went back to the Water Quality policies that had not been completed. First of all, we talked about Water Quality policy # 26, which came from Ms. Krinke and Ms. Rosenstein supporting the concept of paired watershed studies. Mr. Johnson asked Dr. Mulla to elaborate and clarify the logic behind this recommendation. Dr. Mulla explained the methodology of using paired watershed studies to evaluate the effect of best management practices by limiting the variance to single measurable differences. Ms. Sigford asked how data from these studies could be applied to the regional level.

Dr. Neil Hansen did his doctoral work on paired watershed studies. He would be bringing this study and expertise to bear on the P index question. Mr. Preisler indicated that it was extremely important to account for the effects of commercial fertilizers in our calculations. It is not possible to adequately control nutrient management and phosphorus pollution unless manure and chemical fertilizers are considered together. Mr. Dunnwald asked for clarification on whether these recommendations were CAC's final attempt or would they be allowed to revisit items once they have heard everything. Mr. Dunnwald said there was nothing that he agreed to that he would not agree with, but he felt there were many things not yet said, that he would like to see addressed. Mr. Johnson answered that if there was money to continue, he would plan to go back through every recommendation for final consideration after CAC had gone through everything. Ms. Rosenstein said it was important to revisit the meta-issues after all the TWP's were completed and members had a chance to think through all topics and the inter-relationships.

Ms. Sigford felt that the paired watershed study recommendation was too vague. She was hoping for more specificity in exactly what should be studied and which BMP's should be evaluated. Ms. Rosenstein talked about the practical value of the University of Minnesota field studies of BMP's and Phosphorus use. Mr. Albrecht commented that some of the policy recommendations were so generic as to be almost meaningless to the Legislature. CAC was able to reach unanimous consensus on policy # 26 of Water Quality. Mr. Hart cautioned the group against excessive detail in the recommendations. CAC approved water quality policy recommendation # 21. Mr. Dunnwald was concerned that we are not following any logical order in policy making. He felt that we need to prioritize and group clusters of similar recommendations together. Time spent organizing the policies would enable CAC to go through these more quickly. Policy # 17 was deleted by consensus of the CAC.

Work continued on policies for Water Quality, Role of Government and Animal Welfare. Mr. Gilchrist pointed out that there were people not present who were vitally interested in the policy area. Mr. Albrecht pointed out that it was not possible for us to wait until everyone was there. Ms. Scharf reiterated her support for the idea to proceed with CAC's work with whoever had shown up at the meeting. Mr. Stanislawski provided some alternate language for Water Quality policy # 1. He also provided some information on an agricultural product environmental assurance program used in Michigan. Ms. Bloomgren asked if this program included land application.

Mr. Stanislawski stated that it was comprehensive and did include that component. CAC reached unanimous consensus on this item. Mr. Mark Schultz did not vote against the item but he cautioned the group that some of his colleagues in Michigan had noted some implementation and operational problems with this program. Ms. Rosenstein talked about some of the problems associated with different levels of county feedlot inventories. How this information is collected and interpreted. Policy # 12 in Water Quality was given unanimous consensus.

Ms. Henderson indicated that she had a long conversation with Dr. Mulla about the issue of animal density limits for proper manure management. He said that no one is currently monitoring the aggregate effect of the cumulative impacts of long term manure application. Ms. Henderson submitted draft language and supporting information to Ms. McGovern. Discussion was stopped to allow the Role of Government team to present their final TWP.

Sharon Decker, Lee Paddock and Barb Freese came back to address the comments on their draft presentation and help with the initial policy discussion. Ms. Decker introduced the group and summarized the recent legal precedents in feedlot regulation. They examined regulatory programs in eight other US states to evaluate trends. Decker's team suggested a number of ways the generic EIS on Animal Agriculture could be used to improve environmental review and the feedlot permit program. Mr. Paddock advocated the notion of identifying a limited number of priority issues, focus enforcement efforts and evaluate progress towards achieving identified goals. He also discussed the concept of the Integrated Compliance Management System in detail. Essentially this approach involves identifying the problem and the range of options to achieve solution. Then picking out the tools to be used in combination to solve the problem in an integrated fashion. In the Role of Government Final TWP report, Decker's team identified many of the tools available and made some suggestions on how to use these in particular situations. These included: public education, stewardship programs, financial and technical assistance programs, manure management programs or exchanges, self-audits and certification programs, focused inspection and targeted enforcement, and creative new ideas as new problems arise. In Mr. Paddock's opinion, CAC needed to suggest a follow-up mechanism to update the GEIS and implement the policy recommendations.

Mr. Paddock also commented on the need to increase public participation in feedlot permitting and enforcement issues. Changes in the MPCA permit rules will ensure that very few facilities will now have to go through public review. An informal mechanism needs to be developed to keep the general public involved in the dialogue on siting and permit conditions for new or expanding feedlots. One example he cited was a farmer-lender mediation process that was developed some years ago when crop prices fell dramatically. He suggested a number of good neighbor program approaches, where large facilities pledge to work with neighbors to maximize the common good.

Ms. Freese discussed the legal implications of the right to farm legislation which limits the rights of citizens to sue farms for nuisance conditions except in cases of the most egregious violations. This seems to be very contradictory with the broad provisions in

the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act, which includes blanket exclusion for the actions of farming operations. Ms. Palmer observed that the Social TWP team had presented a sense of severe hopelessness with the current farming environment. She strongly supported Mr. Paddock's recommendation to increase the level of citizen involvement in feedlot permitting and regulation. Mr. Paddock cited the recent accomplishments of citizen groups in the Minnesota River Valley in minimizing pollution problems. Ms. Freese also reminded CAC that many counties, local governments and non-governmental units have made progress in stimulating public involvement on environmental issues.

Ms. Henderson posed the question that many groups felt that public participation was time-consuming and interfered with the normal processes of commerce. She stated while this was not her opinion, she had heard these remarks often enough to be concerned about the public perception of citizen empowerment. Mr. Paddock said that based on his experience the earlier these dialogues were had, the easier and less costly dealing with the problem would be. According to Ms. Decker, many of the county staff she talked to said that the EAW process actually helped the process. It got information out there early and short-circuited the controversies that might have exploded later.

Mr. Stanislawski raised the key concerns about the conflict of social justice issues and problems of environmental quality. The Minnesota farmer needs to have assurance that if they follow all the appropriate laws they will be permitted to conduct their business. The uncertainty of ever-escalating environmental requirements and unknown costs are making it very difficult for farmers to reinvest in their business with any confidence. Ms. Sigford said that she sees the inevitable trend towards less and less public involvement. Ms. Palmer was pleased that the Role of Government report actually mentioned and made a recommendation regarding sustainable agriculture. Mr. Mark Schultz commented that the fact that the MPCA was not doing enough on animal agriculture was demonstrated by the two court-ordered EIS's for large feedlots. In both of these cases, the facility met all the standards to receive a feedlot permit, including completion of an EAW. Mr. Mark Schultz felt that the government needs to listen more closely to the needs of the smaller farmer. Mr. Dunnwald asked about the problems of poor information availability for feedlots. Mr. Paddock advocated a unified information database for all feedlots.

The policy process on Role of Government began with the dot prioritizing exercise. CAC debated the problems with collecting confidential or private information on individual feedlot operations and then making this data available to the general public. Ms. Henderson and Mr. Dunnwald stated that it might be easier to do the policy discussion if we grouped items together into similar classes. There was considerable discussion about differences in definitions of data privacy. Mr. Mike Sullivan addressed CAC and provided the EQB perspective. He explained the history of the issue as he saw it. EQB has been dealing with the problems of trying to interpret limited permit and inventory data. Mr. Mark Schultz explained some of the difficulties he had encountered in working with the Legislature. Mr. Hart disagreed with Mr. Sullivan over the privacy issue. He pointed out that the invasion of privacy is inevitable in our modern society.

Ms. Henderson stated that many undelegated counties often do not report data because of producer privacy concerns, if more data is requested or required, we risk the further subsuming of data. Feedlot information currently is a mess and extremely unusable to the general public. Mr. Paddock explained that his intention was to identify specific environmental problems and then go about solving these. In order to do this effectively you need to monitor baseline conditions and illustrate changes over time.

SOCIAL COMMUNITY — KEY ISSUES

Group brainstorm

Resources

- Recommendation number three look at resources for better local planning and decisions
- Recommendation number three – need state agencies and resources to help and support local agencies

Small and mid-sized producers

- Recommendation number four – limit to fulfilling environmental stewardship and compliance
- Recommendation number four – encourage small- to mid-sized farms – encourage more people with vested interest in the land

Marketing

- Access to markets
- Recommendation number six – alternative markets for small producers

Alternatives

- Educate people on alternatives to “Get big or get out”
- Too much time trying to fix the system we have and not enough on how to operate outside the system; we need policies for both
- Perception that government favors big operations
- Economics isn't the yardstick for support of different types of farming
- What is the responsibility of Minnesota for small- and medium-sized farms?
- What agriculture structures do we really want?

Citizen voice and education

- Citizen voice – government responsiveness; empowerment
- Citizen voice for community support of processing facilities
- Educate people on alternatives to “Get big or get out”
- Perceptions of animal agriculture may not match reality – educate the public
- Educate on the process – input doesn’t mean you get what you want

Additional issues

- Sociality of rural community is reflective of the economic reality
- Separate farming as lifestyle from farming as business or profession
- Make suggestions that focus on building a better future (be positive)
- How to help people deal with change (vs. being victims)
- Programs to encourage young people to farm
- TWP doesn’t address policy or impact of processing

CAC DISCUSSION ON ANIMAL WELFARE OPTIONS

- Specialized production – encourage, support, and facilitate the marketing for meat that meets animal welfare standards; ways to exploit these markets
- How to determine who pays for cost of certification relating to animal welfare standards
- Develop certification programs that guarantee basic animal welfare standards
- Any state certification program should include animal welfare as a category
- Producers should be encouraged to phase out production systems that do not meet animal welfare standards

PARKING LOT

From air quality recommendations

- One-stop shop for producers regarding permitting, etc.; role of government
- Role of government – operational practices, setbacks distances, and odor levels (air quality recommendation and orange sheet)
- Discussion on funding requests for recommendations and areas for further research
- Cumulative impacts of air, water and other environmental, public health, economic, and social effects
- Make a greater effort to inform the public regarding feedlot issues and public education
- The need to continuously or periodically update GEIS information in light of new issues emerging

From human health recommendations

- State, federal, and international transboundary issues – environment, economic, social
- Role of government

Additional parking lot issues

- Who is a full-time farmer? (Consider social and economic aspects)
- Recommendation of a level two or level three inventory
- Sustainability

Parking lot issues from meeting on May 8-10, 2001

- We should have fewer, more effective processes
- Impact of processing plants on the community
- Energy costs and impacts from agriculture
- Environmental outcome (define and discuss)
- Professional certification and education of farmers
- Dual track in agricultural commodities – large low-cost and small high-cost
- Should we subsidize small family farms, large industrial operations, both or neither?
- Privacy of data collected on feedlots, etc.

Mr. Jim Sullivan said the social impacts of agricultural processors on rural populations has not been fully investigated. An effort should be made to evaluate the social and economic impact of agricultural/community processors on the rural community.

Pat H: Provide increased funding to the U of M for rural sociologists to deal with livestock production/processing and social issues.

Develop proactive, inter-agency, intervention methods in communities facing livestock/social issues.

Institute conflict mitigation training for county and township officers through local government entities.

Initial Soils and Manure policy recommendations

Pat H.

Mandate alternatives such as gravel inlets or grass buffers for new surface inlets and provide transition to alternatives for existing surface tile inlets.

Discourage winter manure application where transport risk to surface water is high.

Emphasize the infiltration effect of manure application at appropriate agronomic rates to reduce annual run-off.

4:45 Summary/Check-in

5:00 Meeting Adjourned