TRC Conference Call Meeting Notes

October 26, 2015

Attending

Area I: Lorie Baldwin, Sue Ailstock
Area II: Greg Wichelns, Emily Nelson
Area III: Charlie Lively, Stacie Heflin, Jim Tate, Sharon Conner, Tri-County/City staff, 3 Northern Neck staff, Leslie Anne Hinton
Area IV: Big Walker staff
Area V: Dave Sandman and Jonathon Woodridge
Area VI: Eastern Shore staff, Peanut staff
DCR: Amy Walker, Mark Hollberg, Jim Echols, Barbara McGarry, Scott Ambler,
Others:

- Announcement-
  November conference call will be on regular date of 4th Monday; November 23
  December 2015 meeting has been cancelled

- Acreage reported on SWCD Reimbursement Reports-
  Barbara McGarry reported that she was pleased to receive quarterly SWCD Reimbursement Reports in a timely manner. She noted that there we problems on a few that were the result of acres included on the reimbursement report not matching the actual acres in the RMP itself. This problem could arise from at least 2 different scenarios…the plan developer had an error in the number of acres included in the narrative portion of the plan and the District used the acreage number reported in the narrative; or, when a revision was submitted, the acreage number was corrected and the District reported on the acreage included in the initial plan. It was suggested that the person completing the Reimbursement report refer to the acres included in the plan's land unit summary; either on the land units tab or in the land units section of the RMP report attachment. The module does not produce a viewable acreage value for the entire plan, but displays acreage values by field. Barbara can view a report which does summarize whole plan acreage values. Prior to the next Reimbursement Report due date, she can provide Districts with a list of these summarized acreage values so that the District may use these values, or may use it as a "check" to the values that they found in the plans.

- Upcoming TRC Training-

- DCR has offered several TRC/module-user trainings recently. These are intended for new staff, staff unable to participate in the earlier trainings, or those who would like a refresher. A final session for the fall will be offered this coming Thursday, October 29, at Wytheville Community College following Conservation Planning Module Training. Anyone who wishes to attend should contact Stacy Horton about registration.

- RMP Development Contracts-
  Regarding the current '15 plan development contracts, all plans have been submitted; however many are still in the development or review phases, awaiting either an initial review or a revision review. Although regulations allow the SWCD 90 days for an initial review and 45 days for a revision review, DCR encourages Districts to review plans as quickly as possible as we have a large number of farmers awaiting plan approval.

  A Notice of Intent to Award for the '16 RMP development contracts has been posted. $120,000 was available in the CB Watershed, $100,000 was available Outside CB Watershed. 2 applicants applied in each watershed. Demand in CB exceeded available funds and plan developers will have to prioritize which plans on their submitted workload will be completed. If additional funds become available, current applicants may increase their workload. This contract will be effective November 1, 2015 – June 30, 1016. Demand did not meet available funds for OCB; applicants have been allowed to increase their requests for OCB. This contract will be effective January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016.

- TRC Review of submitted RUSLE2 worksheets-
  A question has arisen as to how in depth RUSLE2 worksheets should be reviewed. Scott reported that he is aware that some TRCs have gone in-depth enough to request the MOSES data. Ultimately, the answer is that it depends on what the TRC is comfortable with.
  Jim Tate added that in reviewing RUSLE2 worksheets; comparing the District's calculations to the plan developers calculations, the results were not similar. At that point, the District realized that they were using an older RUSLE2 template. When they began to use a new template, the calculations were much more in-line.

  Next Step for Plans in Implementation Phase-
  As plans have been approved, there have been questions about the next step – some Districts have received phone calls from the plan owner/operator indicating that they are ready for certification. The workflow establishes that, following plan approval, the plan developer must conduct an onsite implementation inspection. Following a "passing" inspection being entered into the module, the TRC will make on onsite certification inspection. Following a "passing" certification inspection being entered

into the module, the Board will request DCR to issue a Certificate of Implementation. TRCs were encouraged to read more in the "Implementation Phase" section of the RMP Module User Manual.

RMP staff will be meeting with the most prominent plan developer in the near future to discuss how implementation inspections will fit into their schedule of plan revisions and beginning new plans in the '16 contracts.

Questions and Comments from the TRC:

Question: Will the TRC receive an e-mail notice from the RMP Module when a plan has been resubmitted?
Response: Yes.

Question: How should a District deal with a nutrient management plan that has expired before the point of plan certification and a new NMP has been submitted?
Response: Verification would be done on a plan that is current at the time of review. Verification is to be done by whomever the TRC has delegated to do the verification inspection.

Question: How does the plan developer submit a new NMP when the plan is in the implementation phase?
Response: RMP plan developers can attach documents to plans in the module at any time.

Comment: Some submitted NM plans include more land units than the RMP, but do not include a glossary to direct the TRC to the appropriate pages in the NMP. RMP staff suggested that this comment should be made to the plan developers from the TRC.

Comment: Attachment file sizes are so large that they cannot be opened on WIFI in a TRC meeting. It was suggested to download the files in advance of the meeting.

Comment: Many attached files have the default file name of MapExport, making it difficult to identify the correct file. It was suggested that TRCs may make a comment about file names, and that DCR would bring this up with the RMP developers submitting plans.

Comment: It is difficult to identify the revised or modified file attachments. It was suggested that having plan developers indicate something like "revision 1" in the file name would be helpful.