

Ag BMP TAC Animal Waste Subcommittee

September 26, 2022

Augusta County Government Center, Verona

10:00 a.m.

Voting Members Present:

Amanda Pennington, Chair, DCR
Allen Jackson, Blue Ridge SWCD
Philip David, DEQ
Elizabeth Dellinger, VACDE
Megen Dalton, Shenandoah Valley SWCD
Mark Campbell, VA Farm Bureau (proxy for Zach Jacobs)
John Kaylor, Headwaters SWCD
Eric Paulson, VA Dairymen's Association
Steve Escobar, VA Horse Council
Nick Livesay, Lord Fairfax SWCD
Kevin Dunn, Peter Francisco SWCD

Non voting members present:

Josh Walker, Shenandoah Valley SWCD
Ben Chester, DCR
Chris Hamilton, NRCS

Amanda opened the meeting with a summary of the follow-up on several items from the last meeting related to matrix item 1A [*The Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board directs the Animal Waste Subcommittee (Subcommittee) of the AgBMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to review and examine the water quality impacts of livestock manure, specifically the differences between the impact of poultry litter and livestock manures. The Subcommittee shall review the existing WP-4 standards and specifications, in addition to the Animal Waste Control Facility Needs Determination Worksheet for Livestock Waste Storage Facilities (Worksheet) provided by the Shenandoah Valley Soil and Water Conservation District, to determine the most appropriate method to evaluate the impacts of the manure. The Subcommittee shall provide their recommendation, including the standard and specification and the method used to evaluate the impacts, to the full AgBMP TAC for review and approval; the Subcommittee shall also make a recommendation on whether the revised specification and standard should be implemented during FY2023. The action and recommendation taken by the AgBMP TAC shall be presented to the Board at their December meeting*]:

- Ben reviewed his process for adding poultry options to the Risk Assessment tool. He explained that there are lots of conversion calculations set up in the background that need to be checked before the spreadsheet goes into use.
 - Discussion of the appropriate time period to capture in the tool. The risk assessment tool and sizing worksheet have different purposes so looking at different timeframes on each of them makes sense. The risk assessment would use 365 days in confinement for poultry while sizing would be for 120-180 days.

- What should the new tool be called? Suggestions of 'Resource Concerns Assessment', 'WP-4 Risk Assessment'. Also to remove "Heavy Use Area" from the title.
- Kevin moved to accept the revised worksheet, Nick seconded and the motion passed unanimously.
- Review and editing of the questions in the first part of the form to apply to waste storage only and add poultry data sources.
- Jason revised the WP-4 spec to incorporate the new risk assessment tool.
- Amanda favors keeping the poultry dry-stack needs determination worksheet as a tool but not a requirement. Megen requested to change the name because it does not include all information needed for sizing. The needs determination sheet title was revised to "Optional Animal Waste Control Facility Data Collection Worksheet" and a note was added that cost-share/tax credit are not authorized for operations that do not currently have a way to collect manure.
- Steve moved to accept the changes to the WP-4, Kevin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Discussion related to matrix item 4A [*Include the following NRCS Practice Standards into one or more of VACS specifications: 360 Waste Storage Facility Closure, 521 Pond Sealing or Lining - Geomembrane or Geosynthetic Clay Liner, 520 Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil Treatment, and 522 Pond Sealing or Lining, Concrete. The 360 Practice is used to properly demolish an existing waste storage facility, typically liquid manure pits or lagoons. The three others are options to line an existing leaking manure pit/lagoon based on the best way to line or seal them depending on environmental and soil conditions.*]:

- Elizabeth revised the WP-8 spec based on the discussion from the last meeting, but in the process of doing so felt that it doesn't work well for the scenario of closing a pit and continuing to use the barn/other facilities for a pack barn or replacing earthen pit with concrete.
- The subcommittee needs more information about Bay model credits, liability issues, and information from DEQ to continue discussion in the future on a potential cost-share practice.
- If this suggestion is attempting to address a DEQ programmatic issue through VACS, could DEQ look at giving loans based on NRCS participation/eligibility? Phil explained that for DEQ loan program purposes the NRCS standard just has to be included in a VACS spec, the practice doesn't have to be signed up through VACS.
- Amanda pointed out that NRCS may not be following some aspects of VACS specs even when the NRCS standard is included in the spec.
- The other standards included in this suggestion (besides 360) are not applicable under WP-8.
- Discussion of adding NRCS 360 to the WP-8 without further edits for now, with the understanding that if additional information becomes available the option of a cost-share practice may be revisited.
- Kevin moved to add NRCS 360 to the existing WP-8, Allen seconded. 10 in favor, 1 abstention. Motion passed.

Break for lunch

Continued review and development of the risk assessment tool instruction document (matrix item 1A):

- Discussion of definitions for the water feature terms in section A1. Questions/discussion about wetland determinations and implications.

- Discussion related to Section B, Concentrated Flow. Concern with being able to identify the presence of a transport feature under different conditions or times of year. Multiple site visits and close inspection may be necessary. Discussion of definitions for swale, grassed waterway, and gully.
- When the instruction document draft is complete Amanda will send it out for everyone to review and provide feedback.
- Discussion of what “within a TMDL watershed based on the 303d Impaired Waters List” means for vulnerable water feature and receiving feature. Within a TMDL watershed? On the 303(d) list? A stream may be listed without a TMDL. Would it be helpful to have a TMDL map layer available in Tracking?
- The Risk Assessment does not reference the most recent version of the Environmental Sensitivity Index (2014).
- Soils for evaluation are soils at the location being evaluated. Elizabeth says soils evaluation does not take karst into consideration.