On September 15, the Wisconsin Department of Ag, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) forwarded to the Governor’s office an initial proposal to include regulation of liquid manure applicators in the next state budget.

The initial proposal would require both training and testing for anyone who applies liquid manure (>88% water). Farms with WPDES permits and commercial manure applicators would be included in the first round, with farms between 300 and 999 Animal Units in the second and those 299 and under in the final round.

The PNAAW board has met several times since the proposal was released, and also met with representatives from DATCP, expressing several concerns with the proposal. DATCP has agreed to work with the board as this process evolves, and to take into account concerns expressed by professional applicators. Concerns expressed include, but are not limited to:

- Cost of the program
- Ability to have certified individuals supervise uncertified new employees (probationary period)
- Flexibility
- Requirements vs. similar programs (septic, etc)

The association will keep you informed as we learn more. Concerns or questions can be directed to any PNAAW board member.

One of the reasons given to license all liquid manure applicators is the frequency and environmental impact of manure spills and runoff incidents. Currently, there is no statewide summary of manure incidents, and the information available is somewhat lacking in detail.

The Association has begun to collect data on incidents over the past 5 years. As we get into the slower season in winter, you may receive a call asking for information on any incidents you have had, or farmer incidents you are aware of. The more accurate and complete the data, the better the final product will be.

Questions can be directed to Kevin Erb at 920-391-4652.
**Statewide Set of Manure Setback Maps**

A number of federal, state and local agencies have created a one-stop website for farmers and applicators to download copies of manure spreading restriction maps. You can find a link to the website on the PNAAW website:  [www.wimanuremgt.org/resources/handbook.cfm](http://www.wimanuremgt.org/resources/handbook.cfm). You can print what you need or save copies of each map to your hard drive for easy access.

Of note:
- You do not need any mapping software—they are in Adobe Acrobat format
- Each section (square mile) is a whole page.
- Special restrictions (WPDES permit requirements) ARE NOT INCLUDED—you will need to review each farm’s permits for any additional setbacks.

For those who are more technically advanced, you can download the GeoPDF toolbar and custom 590 Geostamps programs (free) from the site. These tools will allow you to:
  - measure distances, acreage
  - add text (field names, farm names, application information)
  - add field boundaries
  - add/subtract layers (soils, setbacks, etc)

These tools will be demonstrated in detail at the annual meeting in January.

---

**Safety Insight**

Last spring, a safety supervisor at one of the paper mills in Green Bay asked each foreman to sign a commitment to drive no faster than the speed limit for the next 4 weeks. At the next monthly meeting, he asked them to summarize how easy or hard it was to obey the speed limit. Almost all said it seemed impossible, as they felt pressure (from themselves, passengers in the car and other drivers) to go faster.

“Your crew feels the same way” he responded. It’s hard to follow all of the safety guidelines when you think you’re holding up others or slowing production. Yet the pressure to go faster, to cut corners, stretch a few more hours out before maintenance, often leads to a greater loss than if the procedures were followed.

Food for thought…
Due Process represents a set of procedures carried out in accordance with established rules and principles. The underlying intent of due process is to make sure employees are treated fairly. A number of court cases and decisions by labor arbitrators have established a set of principles, summarized here, that organizations should follow to provide due process for employees.

1. Employees have a right to know what is expected of them and what will happen if they fail to meet expectations. It would be unfair to expel a college basketball player for allowing a team booster to give him gifts, for example, if the player didn't know it was wrong. Similarly, a production employee should not be punished for failing to clean a machine if she is not aware that the machine needs cleaning. Effective discipline requires that organizations communicate clear expectations for acceptable behavior.

2. Discipline must be based on facts. A college would not fire a football coach for providing money to recruits without gathering facts about what actually happened. Reducing a steel worker's pay for being consistently late to work is also improper unless evidence shows that he has actually been late a specific number of times. Disciplinary actions should be carried out only after a careful investigation of the facts and circumstances. Fair investigations involve obtaining testimonial evidence from witnesses and those involved. Documents and physical evidence can also provide key details to either support or refute allegations against employees.

3. Employees should also have a right to present their side of the story. A football player who is accused of punching a teammate should not be disciplined until he is allowed to describe his actions and the circumstances that led to those actions. In the same way, a sales representative accused of falsifying expense reports must be given a chance to explain his financial records. Employees should also have the right to appeal decisions. Providing the opportunity for another person to evaluate the facts of the case and the decision of the supervisor is important for ensuring fair and consistent treatment.

4. Any punishment should be consistent with the nurture of the offense. A track team runner who is late for a meeting should not be removed from the team. Neither should an employee who becomes angry with a single customer be fired. In addition, the procedures used to investigate the alleged offense and the nature of the punishment should be consistent with common practices in the organization. Disciplining an individual for doing something that is routinely done by others who go unpunished can be evidence of discrimination against the person receiving the discipline.