

Program Year 2020 Agricultural BMP TAC
Animal Waste Subcommittee
11-6-18 Meeting Summary
10:00 am – 3:00 pm
Shenandoah Valley SWCD Office
Harrisonburg, VA

- Voting subcommittee members present:
 - Megen Dalton-Shenandoah Valley SWCD
 - Hobey Bauhan-Virginia Poultry Federation
 - Eric Paulson-VA State Dairymen
 - Sam Turban-Lord Fairfax SWCD
 - Rick Shiflet-Headwaters SWCD Board Member
 - Darrell Marshall-VDACS
 - Kevin Dunn-Peter Francisco SWCD Board Member
 - Amanda Pennington-DCR-Chair
- Non voting members present:
 - Ben Chester
- Public, non committee members, present:
 - Josh Walker
 - Jason Wilfong
- Review of 10-18-18 TAC meeting
 - TAC voted to table matrix items 2A, 3A, 11A, 13A, 19A, and 20A. This aligns with the subcommittee's recommendations.
 - Matrix items 1A and 9A were voted by the subcommittee to be advanced to the Soil and Water Board for approval, and this was supported by the TAC, but revised specifications need to be provided to the TAC for an official vote.
- Review new matrix suggestions
 - 1A
 - Start looking at if we can get extra credit in the Bay Model for not land applying since using freezers
 - Email to Victor Clark to remember about the poultry taskforce-Action Item-Amanda
 - Talk to DCR policy about how to add something into the spec to make sure all future vendors go to the taskforce. The biosecurity section in the manual may be a better place for it. Action Item-Amanda
 - 14A
 - Subcommittee discussion questioned if this needs to be moved to programmatic subcommittee because the definition of participant would need to be changed and that is outside of the scope of this subcommittee.
 - Further discussion, the subcommittee agreed that if the participant meets the definition of under the current program, and the operation meets the definition

of agricultural operation, they are already covered by the cost share program. This would be an expansion of the program.

- VOTE-SC voted unanimous to table. You can already get the practices if it is an ag operation, but currently, participant does not cover recreational horses, therefore, a change would be needed to the definition of participant if the program were to be expanded to cover recreational horses.
- Review of progress summary and action items
 - Making sure everyone understands their assignments and when they are due.
- Review and discuss revised WP-4B specification (matrix item 8A)
 - Cannot include this with the specification for Dairy cattle as the management of beef is so different from dairy, would makes more sense to revise the WP-4 specification instead. This would keep WP-4B for dairy operations only.
 - The beef cattle are only confined in the winter months, not year round like dairy
 - The beef pack facility would need a lot of management. The subcommittee feels that providing a feeding facility, even if it is confined, would be better for water quality than continuing to feed the cattle outside in small lots. There should be some type of agreement that would require the landowner to use the facility for feeding to make sure we are eliminating the water quality issue.
 - The bed pack is important from a management side, they need to know how much bedding they are going to need.
 - Presented basic idea of what needed to go in the spec for subcommittee feedback
 - Will continue to work on the specification to discuss at the November 29 meeting.
- Begin discussions on outstanding matrix items, as time permits
 - 12A
 - The intention is duplicative of the project the poultry federation has with DCR litter transport program.
 - How do we pay on something we can't really track?
 - The issue of tracking needs to be fixed, DEQ doesn't do yearly inspections anymore.
 - Not a TAC issue, needs to be worked out between the state agencies.
 - Not within the scope of the TAC.
 - Where would the resources come from to track the transport?
 - There is a program already in place that does this (DEQ/Poultry Federation), the subcommittee could table it based on that.
 - VOTE-unanimous to table
 - 15A
 - Ability to install diversions and grassed waterways are included in practices, like the WP-4 and WP-4B
 - SL5, Diversion, is also an available practice that can be used independently to address stormwater issues
 - WQ12, Roof Runoff Management System, can also be used to retrofit existing farm buildings with gutters to address stormwater issues
 - Rain gardens are not appropriate for farms, they require a high level of maintenance

- VOTE-unanimous to table
 - 21A
 - The issue is more with cost sharing on littersheds in the first place, not so much the timing of the request
 - Seems to be more of a programmatic issue as it is related to the resource concern existing
 - Proposed changes to WP-4 specification to address:
 - Strike-vii. Enlargements cannot receive additional cost-share for WP-4 unless the original cost-shared WP-4 practice has been in place for 10 years per location.
 - Add must address all manure for current operation
 - Revise to remove the work “not” viii. For waste storage facilities that will not store manure produced on the operation where the facility is to be located. End user facilities are not authorized. Change to say not authorized for manure produced elsewhere
 - Revise to say *Shall- District should consider all existing animal waste storage facilities on the same property when sizing a new manure storage facility. The District should determine on a case by case basis whether any existing manure storage facilities (cost shared or non-cost shared) are adequate for continued manure storage. Existing storage deemed adequate shall be deducted from the total storage need calculation to determine the amount of additional storage eligible for cost share.*
 - Amanda will make changes and bring to next subcommittee meeting
 - Not adding to cover littersheds for future expansion
 - 17A-
 - Current model allows for 15 year credit for animal waste
 - NRCS contract is 15 years
 - Change it to 15 WP-4, WP-4B, WP-4C
 - VOTE to change, unanimous
 - Amanda will change the spec and bring it to the next subcommittee meeting
 - NOTE-voting members present for this vote:
 - Megen Dalton
 - Eric Poulson
 - Sam Truban
 - Rick Shiflet
 - Darrell Marshall
 - Kevin Dunn
 - Amanda Pennington
 - Hobe Bauhan absent for this vote, but subcommittee still had quorum
 - 22A-
 - Seems that if a lined waterway is needed for roof runoff, there is not an adequate outlet and other methods should be considered.

- If the area is so eroded that a lined waterway is needed, should be a separate practice
 - Megen to find out specific example since this was recommended by her staff
 - 23A
 - Work into WP-4 spec, two options
 - 100% confinement
 - Just a covered feeding pad
 - Discussed putting language in the spec that they are checked yearly, District can decide when “the district is encouraged to ensure these practices are being managed appropriately”
 - Tiered approach to checking on this
 - Kevin to talk to Charlie Wootton of the stream protection subcommittee about how the SL9 will be checked as they are considering a similar approach
 - Must have something to discuss for the December meeting, will discuss further at the next November meeting and have a spec to review language by December
 - 37P
 - Not a TAC issue, an engineering issue.
 - Already have NRCS standard drawings that DCR engineers can issue
 - 100% consensus to table
 - NOTE-voting members present for this vote:
 - Megen Dalton
 - Eric Poulson
 - Sam Truban
 - Rick Shiflet
 - Darrell Marshall
 - Kevin Dunn
 - Amanda Pennington
 - Hobe Bauhan absent for this vote, but subcommittee still had quorum
 - Continued discussions on caps, with Jason Wilfong and Josh Walker (non committee members) input during the public comment period as this was their suggestion
 - Floating caps to be recognized in your secondary considerations.
 - Amanda to pull numbers from tracking program to see the ratio of these projects hitting the cap