

Program Year 2020 Agricultural BMP TAC
Animal Waste Subcommittee
11-29-18 Meeting Agenda
10:00 am – 3:00 pm
Shenandoah Valley SWCD Office
Harrisonburg, VA

Voting members present:

Amanda Pennington, DCR-Chair

Megen Dalton, Shenandoah Valley SWCD

Hobey Bahaun, Virginia Poultry Federation -note Hobey Bahaun was not present for the entire meeting. Votes that occurred during his absence are noted below, the subcommittee still had quorum in his absence.

Sam Truban, Lord Fairfax SWCD

Josh Walker, Headwaters SWCD-proxy for Rick Shiflet, Headwaters SWCD Board Member

Darrell Marshall, Peter Francisco SWCD Board Member

Kevin Dunn, Peter Francisco SWCD Board Member

Eric Paulson, VA State Dairymen

Non voting member present:

Ben Chester

Public attendance:

Richard Fitzgerald, nutrient management specialist who currently works part time for NRCS, was present for discussions concerning manure injection to provide information about the process to the subcommittee.

The subcommittee had quorum for the entire meeting.

- Matrix Item 8A-Revise WP-4 to include pack barns for beef cattle
 - The subcommittee reviewed and discussed a draft proposed new specification, WP-4L, that would allow “pack barns” for beef cattle as well as allow confined feeding facilities to be cost shared on.
 - The new specification would include two options, 100% confinement or pasture management with seasonal feeding facility
 - SC reviewed and discussed the document, will discuss further next meeting
 - Discussed separating the two options, one specification for 100% confinement and revise WP4 to be more clear concerning the intended use of the feeding facility, potentially to include pasture management
 - **Hobey Bahaun not present for this discussion**

- Other WP-4 Revisions
 - Matrix Item 17A, increase lifespan to 15 years
 - SC voted unanimously to increase the lifespan of WP-4, WP-4B and WP-4C to 15 years
 - Matrix Item 21A, allow littersheds for expansions, note, the SC feel this should not be for future expansions, only for operations who have added chicken houses and they are in production. SC recommendation:
 - 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.
 - VOTE-unanimous
 - Matrix Item 23A, limit animal feeding facilities to a certain animal unit per acres served
 - Part of the issue in addressing matrix item 8A
- Changes to WP-4B Specification
 - Matrix Item 9A, addition of NRCS standards 642-Water Well, 533-Pumping Plant and 578-Stream Crossing
 - Matrix Item 17A, increase lifespan to 15 years
 - Add Dairy in the title and description and purpose
 - Hobey Bahaun not present for discussion or vote
 - VOTE all in favor of revised spec
- Changes to WP-4C Specification
 - Matrix Item 1A, allow mortality freezers
 - Work on the language about considering the “least cost, technically feasible” to make it more certain
 - Changed to “cost share payment and tax credit shall be based on the least cost technically feasible option”.
 - **Hobey Bahaun not present for discussion or vote**
 - VOTE in favor of revised spec, unanimous
 - Matrix Item 17A, increase lifespan to 15 years
- Matrix Item 22A, include lined waterways in the NRCS standards
 - Megen to get more information from staff
- Matrix Item 18A, manure injection
 - Richard Fitzgerald, nutrient management specialist who currently works part time for NRCS was present for discussions
 - Mr. Fitzgerald informed the SC that the method of injection, whether it be by use of a dragline or no dragline, doesn’t matter as long as it is injected, therefore it would make sense for the cost share rate to be the same as long as the manure is injected
 - If a cap is placed on this, it could mean that the farmer only gets paid for part of the farm
 - Commercial places that do this are expensive, for many operations, the end result of emptying the manure pit is often most important, so they don’t want to spend a lot of money on getting rid of the manure.
 - Manure injection doubles the recovered nitrogen vs spreading so less N runoff and less N application later required for production

- Richard provided an example of a farmer that did manure injection and then did not have to sidedress his corn at all by keeping the nitrogen in the soil vs runoff
- The subcommittee discussed payment rates, maybe pay a lower rate and have no cap to cover the entire farm
- There is a lot of capital cost up front
- The incentive needs to be at or near the operating cost so the farmer will put up the capital cost
- Crops are doing better because the N is staying where they put it rather than running off
- Subcommittee is generally in support of manure injection, just trying to decide what the rate should be
- MD pays between \$45 and \$55 per acre, but they have a special grant
- NRCS controls the cost with a cap
- Josh Walker to ask James Davis Martin what credit we get in the bay model
- Josh Walker to draft a new spec for it and bring to the next meeting
- Matrix Items 4A, 5A, 6A, and 7A-caps
 - The subcommittee discussed that we could propose the option for projects that exceed the cap to apply for a variance, similar to the DEQ TMDL program, because if the cap is raised, a small district could spend all of their allotment on one project.
 - The SC discussed including the variance procedure and how/where that would go.
 - The SC proposed no cap on the variance. Would need to draft a variance procedure and it would only apply to only WP4s
 - Kevin Dunn to draft procedure, including who should be on the variance committee.
 - The SC also discussed raising the cap for WP-4, WP-4B, and potentially WP-4L (new specification the SC is working on, details provided above) since each district can set participant caps to avoid spending all cost share on one project.
 - VOTE to raise cap to \$100,000 for WP4, 4B and 4L. Note- all members except Kevin Dunn voted in favor. The SC had quorum and the voted passed at greater than 80%.
 - Ben Chester to ask James Martin to run logi report statewide for WP4 and WP4B that shows the actual cost for completed practices going back 3 years.
- Matrix item 4A-addressed with the raised cap and variance process.
- Matrix item 5A-VOTE unanimous to table as it is addressed with the higher cap
- Matrix item-6A-VOTE unanimous to table. Projects needing additional funding will be addressed with the raised cap and variance process. It will be too complicated to attempt to apply species specific caps.
- Matrix item 7A-addressed with the raised cap and variance process.
- Matrix item 16A-This suggestion is too broad and most suggestions don't apply to animal waste. Additionally, there is already have loafing lot management practice. VOTE-100% to table