State Technical Committee Meeting
May 17, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.
DGIF Headquarters Board Room

A G E N D A

10:00 – 10:10	Welcome and Opening Remarks	NRCS – Jack Bricker
10:10 – 10:30	DGIF & NRCS: Highlights of a formal 7-year partnership for Virginia's Wildlife	DGIF – Marc Puckett NRCS – Jeff Jones
10:30 – 11:15	Water-quality monitoring in the USDA and USGS Showcase Watersheds 2010-2013: a focus on results from Smith Creek and Difficult Run	USGS - Ken Hyer and Jimmy Webber
11:15 – 11:30	Habitat and water quality benefits of streambank stabilization and cost effectiveness	Brian Wagner of Ecosystem Services LLC TU – Seth Coffman
11:30 – 12:15	Virginia's first Cooperative Weed Management Area	Rod Walker, Blue Ridge PRISM
12:15 – 1:00	LUNCH	
1:00 – 1:15	Farm Manure-to-Energy Initiative	VT – John Ignosh Sustainable Chesapeake – Kristen Hughes
1:15 – 1:45	Agricultural Conservation Easements	NRCS – Diane Dunaway
	Conservation Innovation Grants	NRCS – Blaine Delaney
	Regional Conservation Partnership Program	NRCS – Blaine Delaney NRCS – Patrick Vincent
	Environmental Quality Incentive Program Conservation Stewardship Program	NRCS – Patrick Vincent
1:45 – 2:00	Agency Updates	All

++++++++++++++++++++++++

Next Meeting – TBA

State Technical Committee Meeting

Tuesday, May 17, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.

Department of Game and Inland Fisheries Headquarters Board Room

Those in attendance were:

Jack Bricker, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
David Whitehurst, Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF)
Marc Puckett, DGIF
Jay Howell, DGIF
David Bryan, NRCS/DGIF
Lorien Koontz, NRCS/DGIF
Doug Moyer, US Geological Service (USGS)
Jimmy Webber, USGS
Wilmer Stoneman, Virginia Farm Bureau (VFB)
Todd Groh, Virginia Department of Forestry (VDOF)
Dean Cumbia, VDOF
Kirsten Hughes Evans, Sustainable Chesapeake
John Ignosh, Virginia Cooperative Extension (VCE)
Emily Horsley, Farm Service Agency (FSA)
Betsy Bowles, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Seth Coffman, Trout Unlimited (TU)
Gary Moore, Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR)
Kenneth Carter, Virginia Assoc. of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (VASWCD)
Rod Walker, Blue Ridge Partnership for Regional Invasive Species Management (PRISM)
Maggie Walker, Blue Ridge PRISM
Patricia Stansbury, Virginia Association of Biological Farming (VABF)
Matt Kowalski, Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF)
Brian Wagner, Ecosystem Services
Rick Myers, DCR — Division of Natural Heritage
Philip Davis, NRCS
Blaine, Delaney, NRCS
Julie Hawkins, NRCS
Jeff Jones, NRCS
Patrick Vincent, NRCS
Chad Wentz, NRCS
Ron Wood, NRCS
Kathleen Anderson, NRCS (Recorder)

Julie Hawkins, NRCS Assistant State Conservationist for Programs, welcomed everyone to the meeting, and expressed how good it is to be here today at the new DGIF headquarters. The building is phenomenal, with a state of the art computer system in the meeting room.

Each attendee introduced him/herself.

Jack Bricker, State Conservationist of NRCS, opened the meeting. He commented on the 20 days of rain that the area has received. He mentioned that there are a lot of great things featured on the meeting's

agenda. There is to be a 45 minute lunch period, followed by Agency updates. In the next months, we will be seeing a lot of changes, with a new president and a new administration. There most likely will be a new NRCS chief, a new Secretary of Agriculture, a new Farm Bill, and new opportunities. There will be a new way to do conservation planning, to reinvigorate the planning process, and a need to have a renewed interest in conservation planning. We will require two plans per year for certified planners. We will have the same standards for partner organizations. We may want to hold off, as HQ national level changes at national level. We expect to start, October 1, our new standard of 200 acres of cropland and pastureland.

David Whitehurst, Director of Bureau of Wildlife Resources with the Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, gave a welcome, appreciating the work that everyone contributes. He said "thank you" to NRCS for the work that it does. He mentioned that the role that NRCS plays throughout the nation is invaluable--golden warbler project, quail, and is also on the staff of the National Landscape Conservation committee (LCC), and the Appalachian Mountains LCC. The Appalachian Mountains LCC is a 15 state joint venture, with integrated activities addressing that area's unique environmental needs. Mr. Whitehurst also reminded us that next month DGIF will be 100 years old.

Marc Puckett of DGIF passed around a report. He expressed thanks to the senior staff. Various members have been on the team from for two to six years. We have a relationship that is better than ever, having the biologists working in the NRCS offices. There had been a gap before, between the conservationists and the biologists. There is now a better relationship than we ever had. The district biologists can focus on the private lands program, the habitat, the land, and their message, maximizing the number of acres on the ground. They help with the burden of the numbers. There have been 2763 site visits over a two year period, covering 327,000 acres. But there is also the human element—more than just the number of acres, etc., but rather the partnerships, such as with DCR and DOF. And, partnerships beget more partnerships. Having a liaison in the offices has a part in this. The downside is that we worry about losing such good people. We would love to have them stay with us. But, Kentucky has the best 20 year partnership with NRCS, with 17 private lands biologists.

Jeff Jones, NRCS State Biologist, affirmed the above concepts. He would like to move forward with the partnerships, to bear fruit, and that long term agreements would be great to continue, to maintain these quality people.

David Bryan, Private Lands Biologist in Hanover, has had five great years. The synergy has been great—what we have accomplished with different agencies working together, more so than just the organizations working by themselves. We have gained much. The PLBs in the state have had a great relationship with USDA and with the non-profit organizations, too, such as with The Virginia Extension and Piedmont Environmental Council. Between all these agencies, there is an additive effect, resulting in stability in the last few years. There had been high turnover. But, over the last years, we have had the same team stay in place. The groups know who their Private Lands Biologists are! Private landowners that have a forested lands easement can update to a forest stewardship plan site visit, where forest and wildlife can overlap. There are a variety of interesting experiences for a PLB. Yesterday, on a beautiful sunny day, he had gone to Orange County for an activity at a private school, where there was wildlife habitat for songbirds. There was also a pollinator project to inspire the kids in their environmental aspirations. A PLB meeting can focus on an array of topics--team building, issues, technical issues, studies on quail, or whatever the focus of interest is on.

Julie expressed gratitude to have this partnership with the Private Lands Biologists.

Jimmy Webber, hydrologist for the US Geological Service, Virginia Water Science Center, presented information on several watersheds that his group is studying. The USGS Non-tidal Monitoring program web site discusses this in great detail. This extensive study has been ongoing for several years, with seven co-authors. There are different water quality issues in different parts of the state and in the smaller watersheds that make up the Chesapeake Bay watershed. We want to combine conservation practices with water quality, to have best management practices in the target watershed, using effective monitoring. Then, we want to apply these lessons throughout the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. We need to understand the nutrient loads (especially nitrogen and phosphorus), the sediment loads in the non-tidal network and to look, over time, to see how these change, and then seek trend estimates. Samples are taken on a regular basis at many monitoring stations. There are 117 non-tidal network monitoring stations. Weighted Regressions on Time, Discharge, and Season (WRTDS) modelling techniques are employed, resulting in important information on nutrient and sediment. There is a lot of variation due to stream flow. And, during storms, nitrogen is diluted. With all this information, we can then see patterns throughout the entire Chesapeake Bay Watershed. Yields are ranked as low, med, and high levels of nitrogen in the watersheds. The observations show three assessments: improving, no change, or degrading. Of nitrogen per acre, the loads and trends from 2005 through 2014 were compiled.

There are many questions that are raised is this study. Why are things changing or moving in a certain direction? How are these watersheds responding? What are the trends? We moved into small locations to see what is working and what is not working.

Where is the nitrogen coming from? What are the sources of the nitrogen? Nitrogen can come from forest soils, artificial fertilizer (farm and non-farm), septic systems, manure, and even from the atmosphere. Are the concentrations increasing? Why? How fast do these changes happen? What is the age of the water going out of the springs, known as "lag time"? Some water is five years old in one area, and some is thirty years old in another area.

The areas mentioned today were Smith Creek (agricultural activity of cattle and poultry/forested mountain ridge), Difficult Run (urban Fairfax County), and Upper Chester, Maryland (row crops/artificial fertilizers). A wealth of information has been collected, in addition to total nitrogen (TN as mg/L) and total phosphorus (TP as mg/L)--acidity/alkalinity of the water, temperature of the water, stream flow plus load concentration. There are similarities in the areas, but variables, too—headwater springs, limestone, karst, sinkholes, shale, sources of the regional groundwater, salinity and different hydrologic events.

For example, in Fairfax County's Difficult Run, there are many impervious surfaces, pavement, and much road salting. Three main areas in the county that have these conditions are Tysons Corner, Fairfax City, and Reston. The water flows out on the watersheds and into the Potomac River. There are high concentrations of nitrate. What is the source? There is a high number of septic systems per square mile. The more septic systems that are in existence per square mile, the higher the nitrate concentrations are. This creates some interesting correlations. Could fertilizer be causing this, as there is more lawn space? There is a dilution during storms. No, it was not fertilizer that increased the nitrogen. Septic systems were the culprit in these observations. We can see how nitrogen increased due to the density of the septic systems in a given area. These systems are overloaded, but there are no septic system failures. The septic systems were just not designed to be so close together. What defines a failure of a septic

system? No county is doing a great job of preventing overflows. But in this case, in the Fairfax area, there is no failure, it is that there are just too many of the septic systems.

In summary, we have a commitment to the observation and monitoring involved with this water quality project. Finding the levels of nutrients and sediment that are produced in each area, will ultimately effect what flows into the Chesapeake Bay.

Next, **Brian Wagner of Ecosystems Services**, and **Seth Coffman of Trout Unlimited** presented the work that they are doing with cold water streams, stream restorations, water quality, and riparian buffers.

Seth Coffman and Trout Unlimited have been working on the Shenandoah, the upper James, Green River, and the Potomac drainage are of West Virginia. They completed 18 stream restoration and riparian buffer improvement projects since 2010.

Two areas from Rockingham County were discussed. In Beaver Creek, cattle were fenced out of the stream, and rotational grazing was added. The stream was eventually restored to a meandering pattern over three years. Water temperature improved, brook trout came back, and invertebrate numbers were up. Also, spring fed Mossy Creek was restored to have a stable bank slope, reducing sediment and allowing vegetation to grow. In Clarke County, Spout Run had an improved habitat and stream bank stabilization. A very informative video was shown on this restoration.

Brian Wagner said Ecosystems Services partners with other agencies, such as Trout Unlimited, the Nature Conservancy, and various universities. NRCS is a technical service provider.

A large percentage (60-70%) of the pollution load to our local watersheds is from stream bank erosion and stream degradation. Bennett Run, in the headwaters of the north fork of the Shenandoah, was assessed five miles in the watershed, showing improvement with has reduced Total Nitrogen (TN), Total Phosphorus (TP) and Total Suspended Solids (TSS).

Other projects were the Arey Farm (to establish a nutrient bank) and the Maury River projects (to repair bank erosion). A watercourse needs to have a healthy stream bank, stability, with a whole farm approach, or else the land will erode into the stream, losing acres. Vegetation is also very important in renewing a stream. The cost of restoration, such as bank grading and meandering, can vary depending on what technique is used. Ecosystems Services has been working with NRCS for several years. Also, districts cans team with local governments. There are opportunities right in one's back yard. Each project is different, depending what the history of the area is. Some areas have a history of mill ponds, and so legacy sediments are a concern. What is the goal? There needs to be a happy medium. The fish must be happy and the farmer must be happy. A good indication of success is if the brook trout are moving in.

The next presenter was **Rod Walker of Blue Ridge PRISM** (Partnership for Regional Invasive Species Management). This is a local group of a national organization known as Cooperative Weed Management Area (CWMA), which deals with the problem of invasive species. Rod is a landowner in western Albemarle County. He started working with invasive species that were on his property. One plant that was especially troubling was Oriental Bittersweet. It produces very dense vegetation, with a very thick vining stalk that chokes out native trees and pulls them down by its weight. It can overtake a wooded area, by obliterating the sunlight. Rod began to tackle this problem by talking to personnel at the

Shenandoah Park. A problem with invasive species is that they are very attractive in appearance to homeowners!

Many landowners struggle with invasive species, which are great threats to the forest canopy, meadows and farm fields. There are over 90 invasive species in Virginia. Some of them are: Ailanthus, kudzu, multi-flora rose, Japanese honeysuckle, garlic mustard, Chinese privet, and wavy leaf grass.

Defend the borders of your land! Try to get your neighbors to do this and fight the invasion! Forming a CWMA chapter will give you strength in numbers.

Virginia has one area of CWMA, encompassing several million acres in counties in the area of the Shenandoah Park. There are ten counties as a target area in that part of the state. New York has eight areas. More land areas are covered by CWMA in the western United States, such as almost all of California. Here in the east, there usually are many small landowners working together to combat the weed infestations. Out west, there are fewer, but bigger, landowners.

Different groups are working together against invasive plant species. Some of them are Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), United States Forest Service (USFS), Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs), Virginia Cooperative Extension (VCE), Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR), Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC), the Nature Conservancy, Virginia Department of Forestry (VDOF), and private landowners.

Some of the key programs of CWMA include: Area Stewards Program (grass roots), General Landowners Program, Education and Outreach (thirst for knowledge in the landowner community), Early Detection and Rapid Response. Area Stewards act as coaches. An Area Steward can help if someone needs a person who can visit and walk a property with the landowner. Also, there are Landowner Kits to inform a person who is new to CWMA. A kit can have factsheets, species-specific information, further reading list, and case studies. There are lists of where a landowner can get help, professional assistance, or herbicides. The information can address diverse issues such as using generic pesticides, to what is the best time of the year to attack these weeds.

He mentioned some related topics regarding this subject. The noxious weed laws from the 1970s need to be changed, as the wording had inadvertently protected the destructive species. Also, stop the importation of these plants from coming into the state!!

Mr. Walker is involved with NRCS' RCPP program. The state pool for Virginia is $894,000 over 5 years, with financial assistance to landowners in the 10 county area. Three year contracts can be made with the landowners.

LUNCH

There were two Farm Manure-to-Energy Initiative presentations.

Kristen Hughes of Sustainable Chesapeake discussed a gasifier/combustion system/bio-burner for poultry litter. This would make a good replacement fertilizer. But, it is very dusty, and so some farmers would like it to be pelletized. There is not an established market for this just yet. There are many challenges with this, such as particulate matter, start-up cost, operation and maintenance is much higher than for propane. Ash markets not established.

John Ignosh of Virginia Tech (Virginia Cooperative Extension) discussed a pilot test regarding biomass poultry litter manure to energy. What type of permit will be needed for this? Virginia DEQ says this is below the permit threshold, and it is being reviewed. There are differences throughout the bay states (Chesapeake Bay Watershed). Vendors and farmers want the units to burn as cleanly as possible. We need good testing for the size of particulate matter.

What are some other factors to determinate if this will work for someone's farm? It could cost anywhere from $100,000 to a million dollars. Should a farmer consider a poultry litter to energy unit? The farmer needs to consider his/her nutrient management plan, time constraints, and farm finances. It is almost like a maze to figure out what is the best choice to make.

AGENCY UPDATES

Natural Resources Conservation Service

Easements—Diane Dunaway's team is hoping to close three easements in CY 2016. There is one WRE funded, in Washington County, and 1 ALE funded, in Lancaster County, out of 12 applications. *(See handout entitled "Land Conservation Easements.")*

Conservation Innovation Grants (CIG)—Blaine Delaney, program manager for Conservation Innovation Grants (CIG), explained that this program is for those who have been successful with other programs, and who want to improve even further. They want to implement/adopt Best Management Practices that are included in the CIG programs. An example of this is using a diverse mix of cover crops, such as a mixture of 3-12 species of cover crops. CIG will stimulate the development of the new conservation practices or the adoption of these around the state. There is a national program and the local program. The award had been $1 million, but now is $2 million. There will be no pre-proposals this year, only just proposals. Proposals are due June 24. *(See handout entitled "Virginia Conservation Innovation Grants.")*

Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)—Blaine continued to explain that there are 5 RCPP projects in existence at this time. Three are from 2015 (Virginia DOF, Maryland Department of Agriculture, and National Fish and Wildlife Foundation) and two newer ones for 2016, Blue Ridge PRISM *[see above for details on this organization]* and Shenandoah National Park Trust, and The Nature Conservancy's Upper Clinch-Powell Project in Virginia and Tennessee.

There are three funding pools—National, State, and Critical Conservation Area (which is the Chesapeake Bay Watershed here in Virginia). Full proposals are due Sept 19. So, we have not yet seen the list of who has applied. It is not a grant program *(See handouts entitled "Regional Conservation Partnership Program" and "RCPP Contracts/Application Status.")*

Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)—Patrick Vincent, Program Specialist, reviewed the state's EQIP budget. Over $18 million has been allocated, almost $3 million in contracts has been approved, $14 million has been preapproved, and over $1 million is remaining. *(See handout entitled "EQIP Budget Allocation Sheet – 5/17/2016.")*

Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)—Some of the contracts are expiring, and there will be a chance to renew.

Farm Service Agency—Chad Wentz reported on CREP for Emily Horsley: There is a slow decline in riparian buffers being implemented. What are the obstacles to getting these implemented? Since 2009,

under 1000 acres have been enrolled in Virginia. We made some changes in the CREP programs, and now 3000 acres are enrolled, with 700 contracts. Also, lot of expirations of contracts are coming up, and we need to see if they want to re-enroll the CREP acres.

Department of Conservation and Recreation—Gary Moore: There is double the cost share 1.2 million in state funds to CREP. DCR has been hiring IT support staff. There is a conservation trainer in the works, as well as a new dam safety engineer, and a new conservation engineer. The General Assembly provided 62 Million in BMP cost share to address the 100% cost share payment for the SL-6 practice backlog.

Department of Forestry/NRCS Liaison—Todd Groh: Ed Zimmer is the new chief of operations. The General Assembly has encouraged planting pine back in the state 1 to 1 match. Fire season has been tough in southwest Virginia, until the rain began recently. DGIF and DOF are to collaborate together. Four longleaf pines were planted in downtown Richmond by the first lady, Dorothy McAuliffe.

Chesapeake Bay Foundation—Matt Kowalski: There is good news—cleaner water, and crab numbers are up.

Julie thanked everyone for coming, and is looking forward seeing everyone at the next meeting.

USDA NRCS
United States Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service

Land Conservation Easements

ACEP, FRPP, GRP, WRP
Report to State Technical Committee, Virginia
May 16, 2016 Meeting

Easement Highlights in FY-2016

- NRCS ranked applications and selected the highest ranking ones. We are able to fund 1 WRE (Washington County) and 1 ALE (Lancaster County):
  - ALE Allocation - $1,767,455
  - WRE Allocation - $404,352
  - Currently performing title searches, environmental database searches, NRCS Internal Controls checklists, etc. in advance of obligating agreements.
- In FY2016, NRCS received 12 ACEP applications (7 WRE, 5 ALE), totaling requests for 1,893 acres in land conservation.
- Expect to close 3 easements in CY2016.
- Annual monitoring for FY16 is ongoing and will be finished by August 1st.

FY-2016 Summary Report to the Virginia United Land Trusts (VaULT)

- NRCS holds 71 permanent easements totaling 3,639 acres (more than half of which is restored wetland.)
- NRCS provided matching funds to partner organizations across VA to hold an additional 52 permanent easements protecting 9,894 acres of farmland with the FRPP program, now the ALE program.
- We are currently in the process of acquiring or funding 13 new easements that will protect a new 2,992 acres with the new Farm Bill's ACEP program. Six of these are from FY15 and 2 are from FY16.

Program	Number of Easements	Acreage of Easement
FRPP	52	9,894.11
GRP	18	1,425.08
WRP	53	2,214.00

Submitted for Diane D. Dunaway, Easement Specialist, Program Manager for ACEP-ALE, ACEP-WRE, FRPP, WRP, GRP, Diane.Dunaway@va.usda.gov, (804) 287-1634.

Virginia Conservation Innovation Grants (CIG) History

YEAR	# of CIG Awards	CIG Funds Awarded
FY 2015	**0**	$0.00
FY 2014	**3**	$224,923
FY 2013	**7**	**$406,641**
FY 2012	**3**	$164,415
FY 2011	**6**	$248,704
FY 2010	**2**	$143,054
	21 projects	**$1,187,737**

- The purpose of CIG is to ***stimulate the development and adoption of innovative conservation approaches and technologies***, while leveraging the Federal investment in environmental enhancement and protection in conjunction with agricultural production.
- CIG projects are expected to lead to the transfer of conservation technologies, management systems, and innovative approaches into NRCS policy, technical manuals, guides, and references, or to the private sector.
- CIG is used to apply or demonstrate previously proven technology. It is a vehicle to stimulate development and adoption of conservation approaches or technologies that have been studied sufficiently to indicate a high likelihood of success, and that are candidates for eventual technology transfer or institutionalization.
- CIG funds projects that target innovative on-the-ground conservation, including ***pilot projects and field demonstrations***.
- Each state may use up to **5%** of their EQIP allocation for the state CIG Program each year. We have generally stayed below the 2% level in Virginia. With the unexpected, large decrease in Virginia's EQIP funding in FY2015, we did not offer a 2015 CIG Program.

NATIONAL FY2016 CIG Program

- NRCS no longer uses a two-phase process of pre-proposals and full proposals from applicants selected from the 1st round of competition (pre-proposals)
  - Proposals were due on May 10, 2016
- $20 million available
  - Maximum award is now **$2 million** (it used to be $1 million)
- **Two key changes to CIG Program in 2014 Farm Bill**
  - **On-farm conservation research is now allowed**
  - **No "cash match" requirement, matching funds can be up to 100% in-kind. Applicant still needs to provide at least 50% of total project costs.**

STATE FY2016 CIG Program

- $150,000 available
- **Proposals are due June 24, 2016**
- Maximum state award is $75,000
- This CIG Announcement is posted on:
  - Grants.gov
  - Virginia NRCS Website

TOPICS

- **Alternative Establishment – Warm Season Grasses**
  - Demonstrate alternative establishment techniques for livestock producers to successfully establish native warm season grasses economically, to decrease establishment time, to minimize vegetative competition, and to maintain use of the field(s) during establishment. **(Jeff Jones – NRCS Technical Contact)**

- **Fescue Toxicosis Education and Outreach**
  - Demonstrate the conversion of toxic endophyte fescue to novel endophyte fescue and manage the grazing livestock in comparative production systems (novel to toxic) to document and report the difference in livestock performance and natural resource impact on farms. **(J.B. Daniel – NRCS Technical Contact)**

- **Innovation in Virginia Cropping Systems (Rotations, Cover Crops, Soil Compaction Management, etc.)** Priority area is eastern Virginia and especially southeastern Virginia.
  - Investigate/demonstrate/educate about innovative strategies for increasing implementation of one or more VA NRCS soil health management principles *(keep soil covered, minimize soil disturbance, maximize living roots and energize with diversity)* on Virginia cropland. This includes alternative harvested or non-harvested *(i.e., cover)* crops and integrated soil management strategies including controlled traffic. **(Chris Lawrence – NRCS Technical Contact)**

- **Intersection of Weed Science with Cover Cropping & other Cropland Conservation Practices**
  - Investigate/demonstrate/educate about innovative issues at the interface of weed science and cropland conservation practices. Examples of associated topics include the use of cover crops, crop rotation, crop residue management, and other conservation strategies to help control herbicide-resistant and other weeds. Examples also include mitigating the impact of herbicide residues on cover crops establishment and the potential for cover crops to become weed problems. **(Chris Lawrence – NRCS Technical Contact)**

NOTE: You will find final reports and some fact sheets of the completed projects on the CIG page of the Virginia NRCS website!

Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)

There are 5 RCPP Projects in Virginia: **5.17.2016**

- ✓ Three 2015 RCPP Agreements
- ✓ Two "new" , 2016 RCPP Agreements to be signed SOON

2015 Agreements

68-33A7-15-001 - Virginia Department of Forestry (State Funding Pool) ***Forests - Fundamental for Conservation in Virginia***

Total EQIP Financial Assistance (FA) = **$940,000**
Total RCPP Award = $1.3 million (includes EQIP TA for VDOF & for NRCS)

CAP 106 Forest Management Plans; Site Preparation (490, 394 & 338); Tree Establishment (612 & 391); Forest Stand Improvement (666); and Critical Area Protection (342).

68-3B19-15-020 - Maryland Department of Agriculture (CCA Funding Pool)

(Maryland NRCS - Lead State) VA Partners: DCR, CBF & DOF - ***Accelerating Chesapeake Bay Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs)***

Total EQIP FA = **$1,450,000**
Total RCPP Award *(Virginia portion)* = $2,119,102 (includes EQIP TA for the Virginia Partners & for NRCS)

The purpose of this program is to protect water quality by fencing livestock from surface water features in selected TMDL, Bay watersheds. DCR, CBF, DOF and NRCS have partnered to provide livestock producers an additional funding opportunity to install creek and cross fencing, alternative water systems and to establish or protect existing forested buffers.

68-2D37-15-763 - National Fish & Wildlife Foundation (CCA Funding Pool)
(Pennsylvania NRCS - Lead State) VA Partners: TU, SVSWCD, etc. - ***Comprehensive Watershed Conservation in Dairy and Livestock Landscapes of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed;*** Trout Unlimited is the LEAD Virginia Partner

Total EQIP FA = **$992,000**
Total RCPP Award *(Virginia portion)* = $1.4 million (includes EQIP TA for the Virginia Partners & for NRCS)

- Three Rockingham County sub-watersheds are being targeted
  - Dry Fork (within the Smith Creek Showcase Watershed)
  - Linville Creek
  - Long Meadow-North Fork Shenandoah River
- Focus Conservation Efforts on:
  - Livestock Exclusion, Forested Riparian Buffer Establishment and Improve Manure Management

2016 Agreements (not signed yet)

68-33A7-16-001 – The Nature Conservancy (National Funding Pool) **(Virginia NRCS - Lead State) VA Partners: TNC & SWCDs - *Upper Clinch-Powell Watershed Partnership***

Total EQIP Financial Assistance (FA) = **$3,400,000**
Total RCPP Award = $4,568,235 (includes EQIP TA for TNC & for NRCS)

Implement conservation practices, such as livestock exclusion, to improve water quality to protect endangered and threatened species of mussels and fishes in targeted sections of the Clinch-Powell Watershed in Northeast Tennessee and Southwest Virginia.

68-33A7-16-002 – Shenandoah National Park Trust (State Funding Pool) ***Blue Ridge PRISM Landowner Programs Expansion;*** Blue Ridge PRISM is the LEAD Virginia Partner

Total EQIP Financial Assistance (FA) = **$643,915**
Total RCPP Award = $894,000 (includes EQIP TA for SNPT & for NRCS)

This project will target eleven nonnative, invasive plants in a 10-county area bordering the Shenandoah National Park: Albemarle, Augusta, Clarke, Greene, Madison, Nelson, Page, Rappahannock, Rockingham and Warren. The 11 targeted invasive plants are Ailanthus (Tree of Heaven), Autumn Olive, Chinese Privet, Garlic Mustard, Japanese Honeysuckle, Japanese Stiltgrass, Kudzu, Mile-a-Minute Vine, Multiflora Rose, Oriental Bittersweet and Wavy Leaf Basketgrass.

FY17 RCPP Agreements (ROUND #2)

- Full Proposals are due by September 19, 2016.
- We have NOT yet received the full list of this year's pre-proposals.

RCPP Contracts / Applications Status Report 5.16.16

RCPP Project	Account Name / Project Title	Allocated	Contracts	Contract Approval	Preapproved Applications	Preapproved Amount	Funds Remaining
	Virginia	$3,382,000.00	167	$1,200,181.32	26	$688,499.26	$1,493,319.42
DCR	Accelerating Chesapeake Bay Watershed Implementati	$1,450,000.00	9	$224,777.00	6	$81,604.97	$1,143,618.03
NFWF	Comprehensive Watershed Conservation in Dairy and	$992,000.00	1	$146,756.00	7	$508,621.04	$336,622.96
DOF	Forests-Fundamental for Conservation in Virginia	$940,000.00	157	$828,648.32	13	$98,273.25	$13,078.43
	Total	$3,382,000.00	167	$1,200,181.32	26	$688,499.26	$1,493,319.42

EQIP Budget Allocation Sheet - 5/17/2016

Fund Code	Account Name	Allocated	Contracts	Contract Approval	Preapproved Applications	Preapproved Amount	Funds Remaining	Eligible Applications Remaining	Estimated Cost
76F 51	**Virginia**	**$18,644,508.00**	**105**	**$2,899,017.15**	**300**	**$14,384,515.42**	**$1,360,975.43**	736	$29,204,510.00
76F 51 AQ	**Aquaculture**	$116,251.00	4	$54,551.00	3	$61,700.00	$0.00	30	$275,136.62
76F 51 BC	**Beginning Farmer - Cropland**	$302,799.91	1	$1,017.00	5	$301,782.91	$0.00	13	$368,254.85
76F 51 BF	**Beginning Farmer - Livestock**	$543,500.00	0	$0.00	3	$543,500.00	$0.00	56	$3,045,577.91
76F 51 CA	**CAPS-Conservation Activity Plans**	$61,115.90	6	$20,329.00	15	$40,786.90	$0.00	64	$183,712.71
76F 51 CC	**Cropland - Christiansburg**	$20,875.00	1	$20,875.00	0	$0.00	$0.00	3	$9,668.61
76F 51 CF	**Cropland - Farmville**	$241,535.08	0	$0.00	5	$241,535.08	$0.00	6	$107,517.81
76F 51 CH	**Cropland - Harrisonburg**	$565,523.38	5	$430,921.00	2	$134,602.38	$0.00	22	$990,661.43
76F 51 CS	**Cropland - Smithfield**	$819,000.00	2	$175,462.00	9	$636,982.43	$6,555.57	67	$2,255,517.49
76F 51 EC	**FY16 On-Farm Energy CAP**	$89,515.00	4	$11,565.00	29	$69,726.46	$8,223.54	0	$0.00
76F 51 2	**FY16 Organic Certified**	$65,790.00	2	$45,752.00	1	$20,000.00	$38.00	1	$3,019.58
76F 51 3	**FY16 Organic Transition**	$55,568.00	3	$43,631.00	2	$11,414.34	$522.66	5	$71,500.00
76F 51 GW	**Golden Winged-Warbler**	$44,761.00	1	$7,669.00	4	$30,676.00	$6,416.00	0	$0.00
76F 51 HT	**High Tunnel Systems**	$102,472.09	8	$41,968.00	10	$60,504.09	$0.00	30	$150,842.17
76F 51 AC	**Livestock - Christiansburg**	$2,644,451.82	9	$704,317.00	12	$1,936,950.09	$3,184.73	77	$4,639,688.54
76F 51 LF	**Livestock - Farmville**	$1,635,284.44	0	$0.00	14	$1,634,963.01	$321.43	97	$5,119,314.39
76F 51 LH	**Livestock - Harrisonburg**	$4,036,490.20	5	$445,343.00	40	$3,489,814.08	$101,333.12	51	$2,428,984.45
76F 51 LS	**Livestock - Smithfield**	$0.00	0	$0.00	0	$0.00	$0.00	3	$178,717.51
76F 51 LP	**Long Leaf Pine Initiative**	$178,611.00	3	$83,281.00	4	$89,584.81	$5,745.19	3	$4,554.20
76F 51 FM	**NWQI - Fifteen Mile Creek**	$230,589.00	1	$84,143.00	0	$0.00	$146,446.00	1	$0.00
76F 51 MR	**NWQI - Smith Creek - Mountain Run**	$230,588.00	0	$0.00	0	$0.00	$230,588.00	1	$0.00
76F 51 WB	**NWQI - Smith Creek - War Branch**	$230,588.00	0	$0.00	0	$0.00	$230,588.00	1	$0.00
76F 51 SC	**Socially Disadvantaged - Cropland**	$268,890.26	2	$101,856.00	3	$167,034.26	$0.00	8	$244,654.50
76F 51 SD	**Socially Disadvantaged - Livestock**	$408,640.07	1	$58,133.00	4	$350,507.07	$0.00	14	$936,959.67
76F 51 FC	**StrikeForce - Cropland**	$477,852.72	2	$36,998.00	6	$440,854.72	$0.00	64	$2,225,858.29
76F 51 SS	**StrikeForce - High Tunnel Systems**	$343,464.88	17	$165,922.00	17	$171,264.91	$6,277.97	20	$187,554.92
76F 51 SF	**StrikeForce - Livestock**	$1,258,109.00	1	$123,500.00	6	$1,134,609.00	$0.00	87	$5,487,978.00
76F 51 S2	**StrikeForce 2 - Cropland**	$522,956.93	1	$6,663.00	6	$516,293.93	$0.00	3	$125,721.43
76F 51 TS	**StrikeForce 2 - High Tunnel Systems**	$486,513.62	3	$28,320.00	33	$325,768.00	$132,425.62	0	$0.00
76F 51 SL	**StrikeForce 2 - Livestock**	$1,538,129.45	0	$0.00	12	$1,538,129.45	$0.00	0	$0.00
76F 51 HM	**Wildlife - Habitat Maintenance**	$146,895.73	4	$26,458.00	14	$120,437.73	$0.00	4	$20,310.92
76F 51 HC	**Wildlife - Wildlife Habitat Creation**	$504,040.76	19	$169,599.00	41	$315,093.77	$19,347.99	2	$3,618.00
76F 51 17093	**FY16 CIG State Component**	$150,000.00	0	$0.00	0	$0.00	$150,000.00	0	$0.00
76F 51 17425	**FY16 EQIP Reserve**	$323,705.76	0	$10,744.15	0	$0.00	$312,961.61	0	$0.00
	Total	**$18,644,508.00**	**105**	**$2,899,017.15**	**300**	**$14,384,515.42**	**$1,360,975.43**	**736**	**$29,204,510.00**

Conservation Stewardship Program

CSP FY16 General Sign-up - 95 applications

CSP FY17 Renewals - 89 applicatons