

TRC Conference Call Meeting Notes

July 27, 2015

Attending

Area I: Megan Mauk

Area II: Claire Hilsen, Willie Woode

Area III: Jim Tate, Keith Burgess, Carl Thiel-Goin, Three Rivers staff, Brandon D., Charlie Lively, John Allen, Etta Lucas, Sharon Conner

Area IV:

Area V: Robert E. Lee, Tricia Mays

Area VI: Megen Terrien

DCR: Barbara McGarry, Scott Ambler, Stephanie Martin, Blair Gordon Jim Echols. Amy Walker, Roland Owens

Others:

FYI

- Link to RUSLE guidelines
http://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/VA/ERO_VA_Erosion_Resources_Index.pdf

RMP staff reminded plan reviewers about the Virginia NRCS Erosion Resources Index. This index is a list and description of official Virginia NRCS guidance documents on erosion and utilization of RUSLE2. Review of these, particularly instructions for LS determinations could be helpful when reviewing the work of a plan developer.

- Word version of FOIA certification of closed meeting (attachment)
FOIA guidance provided to SWCDs in May provided a sample certificate of closed meeting. Following a request to have this section available in Word format, this has been provided as an attachment and will be made available on the RMP website under the header "Resources for SWCDs".

Discussion

- Cover crop and split N practices in an RMP

According to RMP staff, there have been questions about cover crop practices. In an RMP, when a cover crop is required to meet T in RUSLE2, RUSLE2 does not require that the cover crop meet the specs of a cost-shared cover crop. The RMP

team is considering ways to indicate that a cover crop was implemented to meet T.

RMP staff also spoke about the NM-3C practice, Split application of N is sometimes required in the NMP because the planned area contains environmentally sensitive soils. There have been questions about the use of this practice within an RMP, when the planned area receives commercial fertilizer. Although the practice is named “Split Application of Nitrogen on Corn using Pre-Sidedress Nitrate Test to Determine Need for Sidedress Nitrogen when Organic Nitrogen Sources Have Been Previously Applied”, it can be used without PSNT and for inorganic sources. This practice can be used if split application of N on corn is required by NMP.

- Documentation of historic buffers and description of water features

Regarding buffers, there has been confusion about existing buffers between an RMP area and a water body. The FR-3 practice is appropriate to be used when a buffer is to be created. In the case of a functioning, but historic buffer, the buffer doesn’t qualify to be labeled as an FR-3 practice which establishes a “new” buffer. In the case of the existing buffer, credit for the buffer is already included in the Bay model. This situation will be corrected in the module. Roland describes the enhancement. Worldview is working to create the functionality for a planner to digitize features as shapes that are associated with a plan instead of associated with a particular BMP. The enhancements will allow the planner to designate the existing historic buffer and to also draw perennial streams. This will be done quickly; likely next 3 weeks or so.

Question: In meantime, if approving plans, how do we show existing buffers.

Response: Print a plan, draw in buffers, scan, and attach to plan.

Roundtable

- Comments from TRCs who have reviewed plans

Hanover-Caroline SWCD TRC reviewed a good plan with TRC first and then reviewed others with TRC to see what was missing. Met for 4 hours and reviewed 12 plans. Staff had reviewed details

John Marshall SWCD TRC met for 3 hours and reviewed 7 plans. Staff had reviewed prior. It took longer to review the first few, but became quicker as staff became familiar with the format. There was concern about amount of paper. Some TRCs responded that they used a projector and screen in the TRC meeting instead of paper copies. This TRC wanted to have paper copies for particular expert members of the TRC.

James River SWCD used a projector. Staff conducted a completeness review prior to the TRC meeting. They reviewed 4 plans in 1 hour.

There was expressed concern about necessary maps not being submitted. DCR mentioned a map error in the module. Some users receive a drawing error message when opening the attached maps. Roland and WorldView are researching other pdf readers to see if there is one to recommend. If continually having problems, let Roland know and he can help find a short-term solution.

DCR is hearing from several TRCs questions about assessments. The DCR template is not a required format. The format can be determined by the developer. The module verifies that an assessment is attached and should document that a field visit was done by the plan developer, but

A participant suggested that the best plan he has reviewed includes the DCR-template assessment form.

It was suggested that TRC staff may consider documentation of time associated with RMP workload. Documentation of time is not required, but could be helpful in working with future annual budget templates.

- Other questions/comments

A plan writer suggested detailed comments from reviewers. One TRC staff discussed that he did not limit comments to those in the module, but sends an e-mail with an attachment. DCR suggested that such an attachment could be attached into the module.

Regarding soil maps. a TRC is having issue with a plan developer stating that the map is "on file in the NMP". The TRC wants all maps attached. DCR made reference to prior discussion about NMPs; what is required to be submitted. This SWCD is still receiving NMPs including more than acreage included in the RMP.