

## Ag BMP TAC Animal Waste Subcommittee

September 15, 2022

Department of Forestry, Charlottesville

10:00 am

### Voting Members in Attendance:

Amanda Pennington, Chair-DCR  
Allen Jackson, Blue Ridge SWCD  
Elizabeth Dellinger, VACDE  
Eric Paulson, VA Dairymen's Association  
John Kaylor, Headwaters SWCD  
Kevin Dunn, Peter Francisco SWCD  
Megen Dalton, Shenandoah Valley, SWCD  
Nick Livesay, Lord Fairfax SWCD  
Lars Bolton, DEQ, Proxy for Phil Davis  
Steve Escobar, VA Horse Council  
Zach Jacobs, VA Farm Bureau

### Non Voting Members Present:

Sara Bottenfield, DCR  
Ben Chester, DCR  
Jason Wilfong, DCR  
Josh Walker, Shenandoah Valley SWCD  
Hobey Bauhan, VA Poultry Federation

Amanda opened the meeting, established quorum, reviewed agenda, and gave a brief recap of actions from the last meeting and matrix items.

*Continued discussion of 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]:*

- Instruction document to be developed and approved by TAC and included in manual.

- Decided to keep risk assessment for all WP-4s with slight modifications to loading table. Adding a line to the table should be based on defensible rationale. Ben researched cutoff numbers, higher loading... depends on many factors. EPA CAFO has pre-defined sizes that could be used as baseline? S/M/L categories, numbers are large because they are nationwide.
- John observed that most operations are expected to qualify already, so would just adding poultry as an animal type be sufficient? Points could be reconfigured since the last step is only 5 points?
- Elizabeth made a motion to update the score of 75 to 80 and 80 to 100 in the existing table. Zach second. Passed unanimously.

Continued discussion of 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.*]:

- Chris looked at NRCS records but it's hard to get meaningful cost information because a detailed breakdown is not available from their database. Less than 20 planned or installed over 17 year. Details could be found in practice files. SVSWCD has done at least one, also Culpeper. Doesn't rank by itself, done with other practices.
- Currently no Bay model credit. Megen will ask Bay model animal waste working group if they have evaluated the practice.
- Could it be wrapped into WP-8? DEQ would like it in the manual to qualify for their loan program, but without cost share they are so expensive they likely won't get done. The DEQ loan program is not required to use VACS specifications, can use NRCS or potentially their own, but want to be consistent with other water quality programs.
- Lots of old hog lagoons in eastern part of state. John says 1 person has asked about a closure in his 27 years. Eric hears from dairy producers who want to close pits.
- Allen- it sounds like we don't have enough information to make an informed decision. Elizabeth suggested including closures in the WP-8 to help with DEQ eligibility while gathering more information for a potential new spec.
- Lars made a motion to add to WP-8. Allen seconded. One abstain, all others in favor.
- John pointed out that there are requirements in code related to closure of manure pits and suggests looking into this as well as reaching out to other states' SWCDs and getting more detailed cost information from completed NRCS practices, if possible.
- Amanda says these closures would need P.E. design.
- Elizabeth will review WP-8 spec and bring suggested new language to the next meeting.
- There was a question as to whether WP-8 requires abandonment of *all* old facilities.

Return to item 1A:

- Review of Amanda's draft instruction document – to be used for “regular” risk assessment. Will risk assessment for manure storage be different? Amanda will revise risk assessment with WP-4 to remove references to feeding, etc.

- Will the WP-4 assessment still ask if they have a way to collect manure? Or add it to WP-4 spec? Or both? Requirement that a hardened feeding area exists, leave space for description of it on form.
- Cow/calf weight is by pair.

Break for lunch 11:40-12:30

Resume review of draft instruction document (item 1A):

- Establish limits for slope and distance for reasonable alternative feeding site? For most areas of the state distance will be the main consideration. There will always be exceptions and instructions allow for that. If an alternative site(s) is/are available, they need to be evaluated using the Risk Assessment to determine if risk would be reduced by using them.