

AAPFCO Meeting - Slow Release Committee Minutes (DRAFT)

February 20, 2018 – Savannah, GA

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review and Approval

Approval of Last Meetings Minutes/Report

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 am by James Bartos, Chair. Patty Lucas made a motion to approve the agenda and Ametra Berry seconded. Motion carried and the agenda was approved. Sharon Webb made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 2017 meeting and Patty Lucas seconded. Motion carried and minutes were approved.

Old Business

Update/Status on Soil and Accelerated Methods

Bill Hall provided a method update on the soil and accelerated lab methods. He said he has retired from Mosaic so things should move forward a little faster now. The document resources are available and the equipment could be borrowed. The samples are scheduled to go out around April and invitation letters will be sent soon. There are two methods in the study: ambient soil and accelerated lab. If anyone is interested in participating, please see Bill Hall. The accelerated method is more difficult to set up; the ambient soil requires 180 days. Results are anticipated by this time next year. The method has been approved as First Action through AOAC and is on a timeline. Output is series of % released over time. Topic to address in the future: How would this relate to a state running this?

Discussion: James Bartos asked, in addition to extraction equipment on the list, what other lab instrumentation would you need? Bill Hall indicated whatever equipment you would use for NPK. Combustion Nitrogen is ok but a lot of water (some work better than others). Kjeldahl works great. P&K (if on ICP), would need matrix match of weak citric acid.

New Business

Expanded Advisor Panel

- *Update committee on Advisor membership*
 - *Observer proposal*
- *What is current status*
- *Topics: 15% Rule (i.e. Rule 3)*
- *Define "Slow" time period and relationship to EE*

An update on the Advisory Panel was given. Members include Dr. James Robbins, University of Arkansas Extension Service, Dr. Jerry Sartain, University of FL, Soil and Water Science Department and new members Dr. Max Schlossberg, Penn State University, Dr. Kelly Nelson, University of Missouri (Turf/Ag), Dr. Bobby Golden, Mississippi State University and Dr. Beth Guertal, Auburn University.

Discussion of format of meetings: Plan is to have a couple of observers (TFI). Jim Skillen requested to have horticultural, lawn and garden participate; use as conduit. Bill Hall still involved since beginning. The committee would be the 6 professors (academia), James Bartos, Jim Skillen, TFI (Ed Thomas) and Bill Hall. Conference calls will be held. A question was asked regarding whether there were any concerns with the plan? Purpose of advisory panel, Brian Birrenkott, Scotts Miracle Gro. Two-fold purpose: One, look at 15% Rule – Information/history, etc. and two, what do we mean by slow? What is slow that would meet our definition? Information will come back to us to discuss, then move to Uniform Bills, and to have science-based decision making. Other thoughts? Brian Birrenkott asked if they are going to start with 15% rule and then move on the “slow” issue? Priority. Sandy Simon, Harrells said to look at page 46, Uniform Bills agenda. Recommended talking about this in preparation for next meeting; not sure where it came from. James Bartos asked about a 10-10-10 (for example): Is it 1.5% for N or $1.5\%+1.5\%+1.5\%=4.5\%$; This may not be related to this group. Does anybody else know? No answers.

Overview of 15% study: See Excel spreadsheet for cost statement. The post doc is well suited for this project. The cost would include \$15,833 + other costs/university overhead. The scope of work would include a literature review of information and an evaluation of the quality/applicability of the information. James Bartos indicated that it is not limited to a particular nutrient (primarily N) and not any specific crop. Bill Hall asked how big is the net, US, International? James Bartos said we want a lot of information. The post doc is not restrained in any way. Will have advisors/observers. Jim Skillen asked what is the timeframe on coming up with 40K? Response was within the year. The post doc is to write peer reviewed publication and present at next year’s meeting. The \$40K was discussed in closed session and supported by attendees (states in support). There could be other funding sources.

Discussion: Fred Carney, Harrells said he wondered if there is anything to be found? 15% may have come up in a group like this...13, 15, 17, etc. James Bartos is hoping we have defensible data and said AAPFCO is the point source on this. We require industry to pay for peer reviewed; AAPFCO should too. Nick Young indicated that all states represented voted unanimously. This will be discussed in Board meeting. Idea to get \$1-\$2K here and there. James Bartos said that AAPFCO is to cover with contributions earmarked. AAPFCO should be major contributor. Bill Hall said to build in funds for experts to be here in addition to post doc for resource info, etc. Plan is to publish in Soil Science Society of America Journal or comparable. Jim Skillen shared that in working with 3-4 universities, you may avoid overhead by making lump sum gift. Also discussed was to have quarterly conference calls and the value of observers.

Literature review/study for 15% rule: Brian Birrenkott said you need a really clear statement of work. Literature review to access what is out there. Put guidelines, when to stop; overhead can be negotiable; have benchmarks. He asked would Jim Skillen and Ed Thomas provide input on scope of work? Funding is for this project. James Bartos to serve as conduit. James Bartos asked is this is fairly clear? Any additions/suggestions? Will know where we are going in 6 months.

What is “slow” – tackle simultaneously? Goal is to have one or more of advisors here to debate. James Bartos asked board if we needed a motion. No, it’s already on agenda.

New Control Release Term

- *Elaborate on “specified” or specific conditions*
- *How do we want to communicate/incorporate?*

Regarding new control release term, do we need to elaborate on “specified” or specific conditions? Open up for discussion. Bill Hall said there are 2 options, leave it up to producer/seller to determine (may get 40-50 different). An alternative is to use ambient conditions as specified. This limits things; in a good way everyone on same field, level playing field and repeatable/reproducible; could be bad, maybe you only want to sell product in south FL, for example, etc. (limit regional product). James Bartos said, this is a question for those that have products. Eric Johnson, Chemical Dynamics said reason restricted was to provide for innovation, not restricted; need to define, set up conditions to define. James Bartos said need to set up criteria? Sandy Simon agreed with Bill Hall but from a labeling perspective, having a specified release information (to give to regulators); up to manufacturer to determine conditions; to put in every condition would result in a large label. Prepares something for specific users, supplemental label or release protocol for their given area. James Bartos said to look at info that state regulators need. Jim Skillen clarified this is only for controlled release. Slow release is ok as is. James Bartos said is it temp/time, etc. Jim Skillen said for organic, slow release, its ok. James Bartos said if you can specify product conditions, predictable and reliable under x conditions. Brian Birrenkott said we can handle in SUIP (appropriate to target use). Needs to be determined by product, relevant to customer. For example, for heavy metals you can view website on label. Is this supportable? Nick Young, CA asked is it substantiated? And said that CA would ask for data to meet claim. Questions included what level, control official and/or consumer? Is everybody providing same info? What/should we go into SUIP? Sounds like a working group is around the bend. If asked, what are those specified conditions? Nice thing as control official, if not there yet, can push back to slow release. This is initial discussion to tackle down road. SUIP is next step?

Ed Thomas from TFI gave comments on student proposal. Would like sound scientific founded number – why 15%, does it go up/down? Would like literature to support decision making. If need to change in future, have studies to support. Different for different crops, etc. Hopeful literature search will provide science, then policy decisions can be made. James Bartos mentioned the 4 Rs. Jim Skillen said members are interested in moving forward. If question of 15%, want to go forward as based on science. Bill Hall said what happens if science based shows its 75%? Just think about it.

Canada representative asked question on N focus, what about P/K and micronutrients? Nick Young said this was discussed in closed session, thought NPK was most applicable. Wasn't limited but researcher may be limited (scope). Brian Birrenkott said goes back to scope, recommend focus on N. Start there. See if we can get a reduced cost for just nitrogen (SR, rates of application); Don't spend a lot of time on P/K. As Nick suggested, main focus is NPK; if when looking at N, if you see P/K, etc. Sandy Simon said 15 states regulate N/P; Chesapeake and FL; SR content of N. Nick Young said focus on N; can make recommendation from committee to primarily focus on N.

James Bartos asked for motion to limit students work primarily to N; Have open to P/K and micro as well. Focus on N but if P/K/other show up, document for future. Sharon Webb made a motion for the work to be directed to NPK primarily with any other info found as a bonus. Cast the net and if student sees other secondaries/micronutrients, include them. Patty Lucas seconded.

Discussion: Fred Carney did some research on it. James Bartos said need to narrow scope but include years of work (Fred Carney's) with specific product. Rank with other info.

Vote: All in favor; motion carries.

Start going over references to SR/CR/EE in AAPFCO OP

- *Motions? Action Items?*

Use remaining time to look at items not covered in summit. See question 9, question to control officials. From Objective 4. Given results, good to address what is slow. If it primarily releases within a year, need to define if? Rule 3 is more than just 15% rule. Look over Rule 3, strike product names (see edits). SUIP 30 – Is this where we put our specified conditions?

Homework* - Look at Rule 3, SUIP 30 and Policy Statement

Where do stabilizers fit? Last thing has to do with overall policy statement OP#70, p164. Changes to slow release and stabilized to enhanced efficiency. Opportunity to look at. Sandy Simon said on conference calls we discussed stabilizers; good to take into account; is there info to support? Bill Hall said regarding stabilizers to direct researcher not to look at stabilizers. Book just says slow release in several places but is that what we want? Need to update language and intent.

James Bartos asked if there were any last minute comments? Bill Hall said that if interested in participating in study or fund independent lab, etc., let him know.

Public Comment/Input/Issues

Committee Member's Comments and Issues

Next Steps, Assignments & Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Adjourn

Sharon Webb made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Ametra Berry. Motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 9:31 am.

Note: James failed to distribute a sign in sheet, so the number of attendees and affiliation was not collected.