

**State Technical Committee Minutes**  
**Richmond, Virginia**  
**September 28, 2010**

*Attendance:* Wade Biddix (NRCS), Chad Wentz (NRCS), Mary Elfner (Audubon), Diane Dunaway (NRCS), Libby Norris (CBF), Dale Gardner (WaterStewardship), Dave Slack (VDOP), Wade Thomason (VT), Kevin Schmidt (VDACS), Jeremy Stone (NRCS), Mark Schonbeck (VABF), Barry Harris (NRCS), Emily Horsley (FSA), Pat Paul (NRCS), Ron Wood (NRCS), Dan Solomon (NRCS), Maribeth Pettigrew (NRCS).

**Wade Biddix (NRCS – ASTC [Programs])**, welcomed group and opened meeting at 10:05 a.m. Introductions were made around the room. Wade encouraged all to pick handouts up from the front table.

**Emily Horsley (FSA) – CREP – Handout**; directed group to note enrollment progress. They are very close to enrollment goals in Southern Rivers. Still working on Chesapeake Bay goals, specifically quality habitat and longleaf pine. There has been some talk about modifying the Culpeper basin to make it a bit more attractive. Wade asked about extending the Southern Rivers deadline since they are close to enrollment goals. Emily said that it will depend, based on next year's budget. Right now, they plan on continuing through the rest of the fiscal year because the state isn't sure they can meet their CREP obligations as it is. Per Emily, "We still have acres available".

**Wade** began the **NRCS** report, pointing out that there are lots of handouts, including progress summary sheets. He reviewed the Farm Bill handout first. "As you can see, with 98% of funds obligated, we had a very good year." Then reviewed the other handout with report criteria. "We expect it to go up even more in 2011." Comments or questions? He explained that was just an overview of the programs NRCS has been operating.

**Barry Harris (NRCS) – Easement Programs – reviewed handout:**

FRPP - Question re: 4 new ones that are still open – in Montgomery, Essex, Clark and Spotsylvania. VA Outdoor Foundation & Clark County are cooperating agencies. Essex and Montgomery easements are with VOF. GRP – We went back to headquarters and received additional funding for this program. Had a backlog of 6 applications – those six will be rolled over into FY11 and re-ranked to see if they are eligible for funding. WRP funds now obligated on 131 acres. There wasn't time to move those other four through the system. Amount of money needed has not yet been determined. A site visit needs to be made.

Barry was asked for information re: how many acres are currently under easements? There was a question about not spending all of the money allocated. Barry stated: "We knew we would not be able to use it, so sent it back to headquarters so someone else could use it". Due diligence required because of environmental hazard; all that preliminary work needs to be done, and it was just not possible to get it done. In WRP, the most acres that have ever been allotted nationwide were done – the program is growing nationwide.

When you start looking at the totals, over the years, it is adding up. Over 10,000 acres have been allotted in Virginia on easements. Wade noted that Barry is moving on to another assignment and thanked him for the leadership he's provided in these programs over the past few years. FRPP easements are monitored by the other entities, and they come up with their own monitoring forms – but NRCS monitors the other programs on an annual basis. ACES people cannot work on wetlands projects. Permanent staff must be assigned to those projects.

Barry noted that all easements have been entered into the NEST database. Nat'l is expecting to use remote sensing to monitor them. We have tried to establish a footprint digitally so they can be monitored. We will be focusing on monitoring more than we have in the past. We'd be interested in talking to any non-profit organization among our partners who'd be willing to handle some of this workload.

**Dan Solomon (NRCS)** – Since the Farm Bill overall report was covered, the more detailed spreadsheet wasn't done for today's meeting as it typically is. Within EQIP and CBWI, there are funds to be allocated to specific projects, so if there is a watershed that has special needs/special qualities, we do have monies. TU has been involved in one already; Libby Norris with CB has been involved in one. New information will be available shortly that will give directions on how to ask for some of this funding. Dan suggested that maybe Audubon would be interested, and Mary responded that she would be. Dan pointed out that there are several different avenues to pursue. The money is there and we welcome anyone who wants to work with us.

Reviewed handout re: backlogs – carrying unfunded programs over. The amount is quite high. The CBWI amount has grown. With Partners' help, the program has become more popular, so there is more of a backlog. What will happen with the backlog? Applicants in database will receive a letter to ask if they'd like to continue to be considered, and they are given the opportunity to enhance their application. This will all be looked at for FY11 allocations. There are no points awarded because these applications are backlogged, which typically would be applications of a lower priority.

Ron pointed out reports that were already on other sheets – summaries.

Wade asked everyone to look at the handout that projects Program Schedule for FY-11. We'll be going out to the four areas during October as noted, and will roll out the new programs. We have to quickly transition to a new year. We are going to try to have one deadline to all programs – the only exception will be CSP – because we haven't been told yet when the deadline for it will be. Will try to have most of the deadlines before the holidays – 1<sup>st</sup> quarter. Application date is being split from ranking date. Having them together has caused problems in the past.

NRCS may only fund the highest priorities during the first ranking period. There will be a second deadline with rankings for applications that are due later. With midterm elections, we still may not even know funding for several months. We can begin, but we won't know how much money we have.

Mark asked about whether all the program deadlines would be posted on the website so anyone could access the information. The answer is yes. Of course, headquarters may have new programs we have to incorporate, but we're not waiting to see what they're doing to get started. December 17<sup>th</sup> is the new deadline for applications. **(This has been changed now to January 14, 2011).** It's been determined that this way of setting it up will work best.

CIG and CCPI publications expected by October 1st. Have not seen anything yet, but we are anticipating by end of week and are hoping that we will have more monies to spread around. Specifically - manure injection issues – that is something we'd like to consider. We had some very good proposals last year. There are some innovative and creative ideas out there. There aren't a lot of funds, but we do want to encourage some new ideas to be developed. We cannot announce a state CIG until national announces theirs. Thought we should continue unless there are major objections. Libby was curious as to how much other states around us were allocated. 2010 was the first year VA offered state CIG. **(Wade checked on the State CIG offerings from other Bay States. Did not hear from WV, but NY has \$250,000 annually, PA has \$300,000 annually, MD and DE do not offer it.)** Requests nationally were very competitive. There was a national CIG for Longleaf pine. The lead state for that is NC.

That's all for program changes unless committee members have questions or comments. As soon as we get national info, we will get it out to you. NRCS is not depending on Headquarters meeting their Oct 1st deadline. Last year, it didn't come out until April. However, we are certainly aiming for having it come out earlier in the fiscal year this year. Have tried to fund prior year projects and get additional funding. It will be interesting to see if we get funds for already established programs earlier. We don't have to wait for National for the continued ones. These projects are for 2-3 years. This money has to be given to EQIP eligible applicants – has to be private land. Perhaps there are projects that need funding – we are open. Lots of creative thoughts; want

to encourage applications. Some good proposals came in - one on composting, but it was on public land, so we couldn't do it. Emphasis has been placed on larger scale or cutting edge projects – things that are on that transition between research and application tend to be looked at favorably. Have been in partnership with other states, TN, KY, NC. Also with other agencies. Question about whether there seems to be a leaning toward multiple state or multiple agency partnerships. Definitely seems to be looking for new ideas within CIG. CCPI – watershed issues. We don't fund the actual technical assistant part. Partnerships provide the technical assistance and solicit participants and then bring them to NRCS for funding.

**Wade Thomason (VT)** – 2010 CIG grant is a focus on cover crop - rate methods, species. Need to see what's working on the ground. Project already started last month. Trying to look at what works best in the system – why farmers should do it for their own bottom lines as well as for the greater good. Idea of crop rotation. Looking for promotion – sales of concepts. Lot of producers out there who are very innovative already. Looking at implementing what some farmers are already doing – more widespread. It's not being quantified adequately – VT's role is to assist with quantifying.

**NRCS** - Jeremy will be lead on FRP; Diane will be lead on GRP and WRP. Diane stated they are hoping to do twice as much. Focus will be to try to increase participation on all three programs. Diane wanted to look at the ranking sheets. Didn't hand out because they've been handed out in the past. Ranking for GRP. Barry had asked for input. Only change on GRP was to add geographical area rate cap (GARC) so that ranking could be tied in. Same addition was made to WRP. Other minor changes on WRP were the notation that it was native wet woodlands and notation of native habitat. Noted participation in easement subcommittee meeting. Basically keeping this same process, just with a little tweaking.

Mary Elfner w/Audubon was wondering if this acreage was something Audubon might be able to look at as something they could be involved with – they might be able to have some effect. Barry noted that there is a bonus point added for some early successional wildlife. Could probably be applied to warm season grasses and other things. Sounds like a good fit – could complement both programs.

Wade noted: GRP – expecting increase in sign up. A lot of farmers are interested. We are doing an assessment right now to assess GARC – due in mid-November. Have a private analysis being done.

**Jeremy Stone (NRCS)** - Referred to FRPP ranking worksheet handout. Bold type indicates changes. He has made some minor changes to the way questions were asked so they are focused on nat'l criteria for 2008 Farm Bill. Jeremy noted that Kevin Schmitt and his staff gave a lot of input on giving a more equitable point distribution. Cultural resource consideration was given an expanded definition. Funding of Easement areas have been broken out in more detail. Easement length is no longer a factor since term easements are no longer eligible. In question 6, only proximity to military installations was noted previously. Now there is emphasis on other things. Question 8 is new entirely. Question 10 is broken down more in terms of closing issues. Wade noted that Easements tend to take a long time, so one of the goals is to tighten up the closing into a shorter period of time. Kevin wanted to thank everyone for considering their suggestions. He also wondered about changes that might happen with next interim Farm Bill – we don't really have an answer now, but we will check and keep updated. Wade noted they looked like good changes and said they'd move forward unless there were objections.

**Barry Harris (NRCS)** - Pulled out Easement Programs Report and reviewed. This is the regular report he normally gives to the STC.

**Dan Solomon (NRCS)** - Good news: there have not been a lot of new changes. Agreement that the changes made for this year are working, so basically will keep in place. There are a few tweaks. There is a screening worksheet. We are going to develop a program handbook for the field. Everything needed will be in one place. Each practice will have the bullets for that practice. There will be more emphasis on conservation planning in the ranking process. NRCS wants field people working prior to plan proposals. There should be an emphasis

on good plans addressing resource concerns. That will add more points to ranking. One of the things we ran into this year that was a problem is that things were divided by land use (or farmer type) i.e. grazing and waste use were separate. For instance, someone came in with a feedlot but also had issues with grazing lands; this year, grazing and waste use will be combined for landowners that have both on one farm. There will still be separate pools, but if both are applicable, they'll be able to combine them. There are a lot of administrative costs for us that can be avoided if we can just have one contract per operator.

Poultry houses – wind-rowing – we tried this year. There were a lot of concerns about ammonia emissions. One of our mandates is air quality, so we are dropping wind-rowing.

A new pilot project will be in stream projects. We've taken a look at small watersheds where conservation practices are in place in the uplands, but there are still issues within stream beds. So NRCS will try to incorporate work with stream banks as a small pilot. Game and fish and wildlife have other issues besides livestock inclusion, i.e. caving in of stream banks or threatened species. We don't have a lot of engineering expertise in these areas. U.S. Fish and Wildlife will bring in some of their resources for engineering, so we can see if NRCS can fund but get them to help. There will be name changes for some practices.

Special funding pool to be established for Smith Creek only – because it is the showcase watershed for the Chesapeake Bay. Clientele in this watershed are very conservative and have specific needs. Have been competing with a different culture and so the competition hasn't gotten Smith Creeks projects funded, so Smith Creek will have a special funding pool.

Libby requested that FSA work with CB to try to adjust some of the barriers that have been getting in the way of funding Smith Creek projects.

Solid Waste Separators – run off – making a new standard – also with herbaceous, etc. Some other things are being added to the organic initiative.

VIMS and shellfish growers asked to be added to EQIP so those on the ocean side could take advantage of some of the benefits that CB is providing. It was discussed, but right now, it won't be added to EQIP – it is too hard to justify at this point. Right now we are working with oyster and clam farmers in the Bay Watershed to clean their cages so waste doesn't go back into the bay. We feel like we need to learn more about this industry before this project is expanded to become part of EQIP.

The water wells cap increased to \$6000. The payment rate didn't change, but the cap changed. Emily said that CREP had their cap increased as well for providing alternative water supplies to keep cows out of the creeks. It's not a huge increase, but it will allow some more farmers to participate. Some concern about use of wells – it was clarified that the use is limited to watering livestock.

**Ron Wood (NRCS)** - Reviewed handout. Talked about analysis of this year's results. High tunnels "rocked". They will be included in next year's offerings. Emphasis in WHIP – clarification on emphasis: importance of plan. Question and clarification re: scalping. Established that it should not cause loss of topsoil. Comments re: using mulcher for creating new wildlife habitat.

Wade summarized. These are the main changes. We think we have a pretty good set of program offerings. For the coming Fiscal Year, we will probably have more money from CBWI. We expect to propose that we basically keep this plan in place for the rest of the current Farm Bill.

**Pat Paul (NRCS)** - (handout) - There is a lot of activity going on out there with programs. A lot of assistance is available financially. The biggest problem we have is how to get the information out to the farmers. Having an early start this year will help and have us doing more outreach. But our most effective outreach is through

our partners. Would like to talk about bringing together some of the activities – to set up a process where we could try to provide more opportunities.

### ***Showed video on Fencing Livestock out of Streams***

Libby pointed out the video had just come out. Background: At Smith Creek meeting, Pat met a gentleman from The Downstream Project – George Patterson (and George Ohrstrom) – committed to using visual arts to reach out with media. He was talking about having just completed a video on trying to reach landowners in a new way. They didn't have a script; they just went out and talked to people and captured – they have a “teaser”, but can go more in depth. They have resources listed and facts that are downloadable on the website. The project was done as a package. Pat pointed out that she felt it was very effective outreach. We're now trying to work on some projects like this to use on a variety of issues.

Pat says part of the problem is that there just isn't time to have meetings where we are there and people show up. Farmers who are impressed with ideas say “I wish my brother was here...” This would be a way to get the info out and reach more people.

Distribution methods: Mark commented that he'd like to see the film shown in every Farm Bureau meeting. It is available on YouTube – once it gets out into social media, it will spread.

Question re: if having an outreach subcommittee would allow us to have a focal point for getting materials together and send them out “virally”? Mary Elfner said Audubon would be willing to participate on a subcommittee.

Wade said we need to take it and saturate it out there – that could be a benefit of a working group here so that the jargon could be broken down and ideas presented in simple language. He pointed out that we're all part of this effort – this film wasn't just about one program; it was about a lot of different programs. It's not program or agency driven – language was simple; it's going to appeal to different things – different triggers – Libby was thinking she'd like to assess all the triggers mentioned in that film – It really impressed her as to different triggers that get people to do thing. Video currently available on YouTube, and also on cd. You can go onto the website and download much more detailed information on the general ideas presented in the video. It's focused on one issue, and it's all linked. Then people can easily follow up on the issues they are interested in. For instance, a five minute video just on the advantage of conservation easements could be done.

We are going to continue working, Pat says. Wade pointed out that it's an obvious win-win. Who are the best people to contact to talk about an issue? Answer: Outreach committee can point out who the experts/resources are.

Pat asked committee to send her their top three issues. We'd like to get started quickly. Pat gave her e-mail: [pat.paul@va.usda.gov](mailto:pat.paul@va.usda.gov)

Libby Norris noted that YouTube has all sorts of creative things produced by farmers on nutrients etc. Said she'd send Pat the links.

### **Agency Updates:**

**Chad Wentz (NRCS)** – A number of new conservation practice standards are set to be posted on the Federal Register; he will send notifications to the committee. That should be done in the next couple of weeks. The only other new funding opportunity this year is that CB states will be offering manure storage for farmers who don't have livestock on farms. The idea is to try to redistribute. It will primarily affect litter transport – the end user rather than the producer. It will be a new FY11 program. They've asked for recommendations from each of the Bay states and are going to try to do criteria for all states, not individually.

**Mary Elfner (Audubon)** – Trying, with Emily, to get reduced minimal acreage requirement, because that factor has limited sign up participation. She remarked that a lot of things mentioned today gave her ideas for new applications.

**Libby Norris (CBF)** – The 3<sup>rd</sup> technician for Smith Creek should be hired soon. There is plenty of work to do. The TMDL person in Rockingham County reported that he's met with all but 2 of the farmers along that watershed, and all but 4 are fenced. He is working closely with Fred Garst of NRCS, and they are trying to get everything monitored. A lot of fencing went in without cost-share. That is exciting. Re: Farmers to Bay trip - there were 17 participants – a completely mixed group, including people from state agencies, poultry, dairy, etc. There is a new grant from NFWF to run a whole community approach on nutrient reduction on Eastern Shore. They will purchase 3 greenseeker systems. New technology will be used and offered. They are working with various partners; it's a multi-year grant. Kristen in CB office is working on this project. Libby will be out of the office most of November, but if there is a need to contact her, office will know how to get her.

**Dale Gardner (Water Stewardship)** – Water Stewardship is driving a lot of farmers to NRCS programs. It's their feeling that requiring plans for participants to qualify is a good thing.

**Dave Slack (VDOF)** – They have concluded an herbicide application program statewide. There are a lot of concerns about drought and fires; they are hoping this will slow things down. A question came up re: if EQIP money has arrived or if it is still pending? Answer: No budget yet, but applications can be submitted before funding is issued because it is a continuous application program. No one should be turned away.

**Kevin Schmidt (VDACS)** - FY2011 - State matching funds only \$100,000 statewide. Hoping for an increase for 2012, but right now it is just the same. Seems like the state is finding some money; maybe some will be found for farmlands. Have started a project working with VA Outdoor Foundation and VA Farm Bureau. VA Outdoor Foundation is looking for language changes to try to satisfy IRS requirements, etc.

**Mark Schonbeck (VABF)** – announced that the Nat'l center for Appropriate Tech. and VA Association for Biological Funding are involved in looking at standards and making recommendations to make programs more accessible to organic farmers. Work will get started Oct. 1<sup>st</sup>. There is a Southern Sustainable Working Group Conference planned for Chattanooga. Information will be posted soon on their website. VA Biological Farmer Association meeting will be held in February in Danville. Info for that will also be posted on the website.

**Barry Harris (NRCS)** expressed his appreciation for the opportunity of working with the people on the committee. He's not leaving NRCS, but his responsibilities are changing, so he will no longer be on STC.

**Emily Horsley (FSA)** – Results: 3000 acres of general CRP accepted in VA – this was competitive. Almost all offers made in VA were accepted. They will all be approved by end of month. About half were re-enrollments from general sign-ups, so the program was fairly successful.

Wade asked for any other comments; then pointed out a change in the regular schedule for the **next meeting**: it has been moved to the 5<sup>th</sup> Tuesday, **November 30<sup>th</sup>**, (instead of the 4<sup>th</sup>) because of the holiday week. It will be at 10 a.m. as usual.

Meeting was closed at 12:28 p.m.

State Technical Committee  
Agenda

September 28, 2010 - 10:00 a.m.  
Richmond NRCS State Office  
1606 Santa Rosa Road, Ste. 209

Welcome and Introductions	Group
Conservation Reserve Program (CRP & CREP)	Emily Horsley Gary Moore
FY-10 Farm Bill Progress Summary Easement Programs (WRP, FRPP, GRP) EQIP, CBWI, CSP WHIP	Wade Biddix Barry Harris Dan Solomon Ron Wood
FY-11 Schedule	Wade Biddix
FY-11 Proposed Program Changes CIG WRP, GRP FRPP EQIP, CBWI, CSP WHIP	Wade Biddix Diane Dunaway Jeremy Stone Dan Solomon Ron Wood
Outreach Activities Establish Subcommittee	Pat Paul
Agency Updates	All



*Next Meeting – November 30, 2010*

**Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program  
Sign-up Progress**

As of 9/28/10

<b>Chesapeake Bay -</b>	1,727 contracts approved <b>15,913.5 acres</b> <i>AVAILABLE ACRES: 9,086.5</i> <i>Current Allocation: 25,000</i>
<b>Southern Rivers -</b>	2,183 contracts approved <b>13,014.0 acres</b> <i>AVAILABLE ACRES: 1,986.0</i> <i>Current Allocation: 15,000</i>
<b>CP-33 - Habitat Buffer For Upland Birds</b>	226 contracts approved <b>1,633.3 acres</b> <i>AVAILABLE ACRES: 866.7</i> <i>Current Allocation: 2,500</i>
<b>CP-36 Longleaf Pines</b>	18 contracts approved 303.8 acres <i>AVAILABLE ACRES: 3,446.2</i> <i>Current Allocation: 3,750</i>
<b>SAFE</b>	
<i>Culpeper Basin Bird Habitat Restoration CP-38A – (Forested Riparian Areas) CP-38E – (Native Grass Areas)</i>	<i>AVAILABLE ACRES: 1000</i>
<i>CP-38C Restoration and Management of Eastern Shore Migratory Bird Tree/Shrub Habitat</i>	<i>AVAILABLE ACRES: 500</i>
<i>CP-38C Statewide Tree Planting</i>	<i>AVAILABLE ACRES: 1,800</i>
<i>CP-38D Longleaf Pine</i>	8 contracts approved 202.0 acres <i>AVAILABLE ACRES: 798.0</i> <i>Current Allocation: 1,000</i>

## FY-10 Farm Bill Programs

Fund	Allocation	Obligated	Unobligated	# of Contracts	% Obligated
WHIP	\$667,777.00	\$654,617.29	\$13,159.71	87	98.03%
EQIP	\$11,315,043.05	\$11,265,450.87	\$49,592.18	357	99.56%
CSP	\$3,571,008.00	\$3,313,041.00	\$257,967.00	270	92.78%
CBWI	\$10,129,087.00	\$10,060,955.93	\$68,131.07	267	99.33%
	<b>\$25,682,915.05</b>	<b>\$25,294,065.09</b>	<b>\$388,849.96</b>	<b>981</b>	<b>98.49%</b>

Note: CSP Includes 1st and 2nd Sign-up Periods

Date: September 28, 2010

Glossary

Region	State	Applications Received	Estimated Cost Requested	Application Acres	Contracts Obligated	Obligation Amount	Contracted Acres	Contracted Percent
CBWP 2008		843	\$24,763,171.46	114,013.35	504	\$15,588,474.04	81,652.65	59.7866%
2009		293	\$6,560,952.55	54,978.60	237	\$5,502,790.31	46,867.60	80.8877%
2010		550	\$18,202,218.91	59,034.75	267	\$10,085,683.73	34,785.05	48.5455%
EQIP 2008		1,785	\$46,094,977.73	154,650.88	677	\$21,170,470.84	64,267.14	37.9277%
2009		816	\$21,533,734.61	84,476.49	322	\$9,905,545.13	30,924.10	39.4611%
2010		969	\$24,561,243.12	70,174.39	355	\$11,264,925.71	33,343.04	36.6366%
WHIP 2008		247	\$1,773,629.93	12,922.67	173	\$1,287,664.43	9,572.84	70.04%
2009		132	\$1,046,466.21	7,461.98	89	\$635,807.29	5,151.80	67.4244%
2010		115	\$727,163.72	5,460.69	84	\$651,857.14	4,421.04	73.0433%
		2,875	\$72,631,779.12	281,586.90	1,354	\$38,046,609.31	155,492.63	47.0966%

**FY-2010  
Year End  
Easement Programs Summary Reports**

**FRPP**

Allocation - **\$1,587,170**

Applications – **Four new agreements for a total of 888 acres**

Funds Obligated - **\$1,175,430**

Funds Unobligated - **\$411,740**

Backlog of applications or requests and amount requested - **0**

Contracts or Agreements - **Four new agreements \$1,175,430 for a total of 888 acres**

Easements Closed - **Three closing on 413 acres for a total of \$877,986**

**GRP**

Allocation - **\$634,720**

Applications – **15**

Funds Obligated - **\$1,937,920**

Funds Unobligated - **\$0**

Backlog of applications - **Six and amount needed - \$988,829**

Contracts or Agreements - **Eight new easements for \$2,052,393 on 607.5 acres**

Rental Contracts - **One rental contract on 16.4 Acres @ 10/ac for 10 years**

Easements Closed - **One on 57.68 acres for a total \$220,345.24**

**WRP**

Allocation - **\$4,622,569**

Applications – **Three**

Funds Obligated - **\$371,720 on**

Funds Unobligated - **\$4,090,622 sent back to NHQ**

Backlog of applications or requests - **Four and amount needed - N/A**

Contracts or Agreements - **Two new contracts on 131 acres**

Easements Closed - **Three closing on 58.7 acres for a total \$215,848.38**

Restoration Completed - **49 acres for a total of \$60,700**

## UNFUNDED BACKLOG EQIP CBWI

<b>EQIP Backlog</b>	<b>\$5,280,000</b>
Cropland	\$1,255,000
Beginning Farmer	\$1,125,000
Socially Disadvantaged	\$809,000
Groundwater Conservation	\$548,000
Seasonal High Tunnel Hoop Houses	\$460,000
Pasture	\$439,000
Forestry	\$336,000
Livestock in Confinement	\$308,000

<b>CBWI Backlog</b>	<b>\$5,007,000</b>
Animals in Confinement	\$2,571,000
Cropland	\$861,000
CCPI Shenandoah Valley	\$763,000
Pasture	\$594,000
New Farmer	\$218,000

**FY-11 Farm Bill Program Schedule**  
(As of September 28, 2010)

**Schedule**

**Staff Training Sessions for Program Roll-out**

- October 12 – Harrisonburg
- October 14 – Smithfield
- October 19 – Farmville
- October 21 - Christiansburg

**FY-11 Program Dates**

- 1<sup>st</sup> Application Deadline: December 17, 2010
- 1<sup>st</sup> Ranking Deadlines:
  - CSP Ranking Date: December 31, 2010
  - Forestry Ranking Date: January 14, 2011
  - Orchard Ranking Date: January 14, 2011
  - Ranking Date for All Others: February 18, 2011
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Application Deadline: February 18, 2011
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Ranking Date: March 4, 2011

## **CIG and CCPI Timelines for 2011**

October 1

- Publish National CIG (including Chesapeake Bay)
- States notify NHQ they are offering State CIG. States can announce CIG after National publication
- NHQ issues RFP for CCPI (including Chesapeake Bay)

November 15

- National CIG pre-proposals due
- RFPs are due for CCPI

December 1

- CIG pre-proposals are selected for full proposals
- RFP awards are selected and announced for CCPI

January 14 - CIG full proposals are due for national

February 1 - Announcement of Awards for CIG

February 15 - RFP awards to partners for CCPI

May 1 - Deadline to complete all agreements with partners for CCPI

**VIRGINIA 2010 FARM & RANCH LAND PROTECTION PROGRAM (FRPP)  
RANKING WORKSHEET**

Entity \_\_\_\_\_

Landowner Name \_\_\_\_\_ County \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Tax ID # \_\_\_\_\_

Cong. Dist \_\_\_\_\_ FIP Code \_\_\_\_\_

FSA Farm #(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Tract #(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Field #(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Size of Land Offer: \_\_\_\_\_ acres

Is the Adjusted Gross Income (AGI) of the applicant > \$1 million?  Yes  No

Does the landowner/operator meet the Conservation Compliance Requirements?  Yes  No

Parcel is eligible<sup>1</sup>:  Yes  No Reason why ineligible: \_\_\_\_\_

**1) Percent of prime, unique, and important farmland in the parcel to be protected:**

≤ 25%	0 points
26-50%	10 points
51-75%	15 points
> 75%	25 points

Score: 25 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**2) Cultural Resource consideration:**

Is the site listed on the National Register of Historic Places, formally determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, or listed on the State or Tribal Register of Historic Places and will an easement protect this site from development?

Yes (15 points)  No (0 points)

Score: 15 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**3) Agricultural Use:**

Percent of cropland, pastureland, grassland, and rangeland in the parcel to be protected.

≤ 25%	0 points
26-50%	3 points
51-75%	6 points
> 75%	10 points

Score: 10 \_\_\_\_\_ points

Score: 10 \_\_\_\_\_ points

D. Population density (population per square mile) as documented by the most recent United States Census

County \_\_\_\_\_ State

< State 0 points

≥ State 5 points

Score: 5 \_\_\_\_\_ points

### 6) Significance

A. Proximity of the parcel to other protected land, including military installations, land owned in fee title by the United States or a State or local government, or by an entity whose purpose is to protect agricultural use and related conservation values, or **land that is already subject to an easement or deed restriction that limits the conversion of the land to nonagricultural use.**

Adjacent (5 points)       Not Adjacent (0 points)

Score: 5 \_\_\_\_\_ points

B. Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and infrastructure?

Yes (5 points)       No (0 points)

Score: 5 \_\_\_\_\_ points

### 7) Threat to Development

Is the tract covered under agricultural zoning or designated agricultural use in a comprehensive plan?

Designated or zoned agricultural use 15 points

Not Designated or zoned agricultural 0 points

Score: 15 \_\_\_\_\_ points

8) **Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to encourage farm viability for future generations:**

Yes (10 points)       No (0 points)

Score: 10 \_\_\_\_\_ points

### 9) Additional Considerations

A. Does the easement protect wetlands or other sensitive habitat?

Yes (2 points)       No (0 points)

Score: 2 \_\_\_\_\_ points

B. Geographic Region Location

**Virginia State Technical Committee  
Easement Programs Report  
September 28, 2010**

---

**FRPP:**

**Upcoming Closing:**

Entity: Virginia Outdoors Foundation  
Location: Washington County  
Size: 200 acres  
Amount:\$500,000

Entity: Virginia Outdoors Foundation  
Location: Augusta County  
Size: 113 acres  
Amount:\$113,000

**GRP:**

NRCS has obligated funding eight GRP applications within the following Counties:

*Cumberland County*, one contract on 99.0acres

*Halifax County*, three contracts for 184 acres

*King George County*, one contract for 99.9 acres

*Page County*, one contract for 80 acres

*Southampton County*, one contract for 40 acres

*Spotsylvania County*, one contract for 97 acres

**Upcoming GRP Closings:**

Location: King George County

Size: 95.3 acres

Amount:\$268,468.27

Permanent Easement

**WRP:**

**WRP Closings:**

Location: Bedford County

Size: 11 acres

Amount:\$41,027.67

Permanent Easement

**Restoration:**

Location: Southampton County

Size: 20 acres

Location: Frederick County

Size: 4.3 acres

**Upcoming WRP Closings:**

Location: Fluvanna County

Size: 12 acres

Amount:\$20,475

30-year Easement

Location: Fauquier County

Size: 31.33 acres

**VIRGINIA 2010 FARM & RANCH LAND PROTECTION PROGRAM (FRPP)  
RANKING WORKSHEET**

Entity \_\_\_\_\_

Landowner Name \_\_\_\_\_ County \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Tax ID # \_\_\_\_\_

Cong. Dist \_\_\_\_\_ FIP Code \_\_\_\_\_

FSA Farm #(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Tract #(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Field #(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Size of Land Offer: \_\_\_\_\_ acres

Is the Adjusted Gross Income (AGI) of the applicant > \$1 million?  Yes  No

Does the landowner/operator meet the Conservation Compliance Requirements?  Yes  No

Parcel is eligible<sup>1</sup>:  Yes  No Reason why ineligible: \_\_\_\_\_

**1) Percent of prime, unique, and important farmland in the parcel to be protected:**

- |        |           |
|--------|-----------|
| ≤ 25%  | 0 points  |
| 26-50% | 10 points |
| 51-75% | 15 points |
| > 75%  | 25 points |

Score: 25 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**2) Cultural Resource consideration:**

Is the site listed on the National Register of Historic Places, formally determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, or listed on the State or Tribal Register of Historic Places and will an easement protect this site from development?

- Yes (15 points)  No (0 points)

Score: 15 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**3) Agricultural Use:**

Percent of cropland, pastureland, grassland, and rangeland in the parcel to be protected.

- |        |           |
|--------|-----------|
| ≤ 25%  | 0 points  |
| 26-50% | 3 points  |
| 51-75% | 6 points  |
| > 75%  | 10 points |

Score: 10 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**4) Funding of Easement**

**A. USDA Funds**

Requesting 50% USDA Funding	0 points
Requesting 40-49% USDA Funding	2 points
Requesting 30-39% USDA Funding	3 points
Requesting 20-29% USDA Funding	4 points
Requesting <20% USDA Funding	5 points

**B. Other Sources**

Landowner donation or multiple (>1) entities contributing funds to the purchase. 5 points

Score: 10 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**5) County Data:**

**A. Ratio of the total acres of land in the parcel to be protected to the average farm size in the county according to the most recent USDA Census of Agriculture.**

County \_\_\_\_\_ Average Farm Size \_\_\_\_\_

< 1:1	0 points
1.5:1	5 points
2:1	11 points

Score: 11 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**B. Decrease in the percentage of acreage of farm and ranch land in the county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture.**

County \_\_\_\_\_

0-5%	0 points
5-10%	3 points
10-15%	6 points
15-20%	10 points

Score: 10 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**C. Percent of population growth in the County as documented by the United States Census.**

County: \_\_\_\_\_

0-5%	0 points
5-10%	3 points
10-15%	6 points
15-20%	10 points

Score: 10 \_\_\_\_\_ points

D. Population density (population per square mile) as documented by the most recent United States Census

County \_\_\_\_\_ State

< State 0 points

≥ State 5 points

Score: 5 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**6) Significance**

A. Proximity of the parcel to other protected land, including military installations, land owned in fee title by the United States or a State or local government, or by an entity whose purpose is to protect agricultural use and related conservation values, or **land that is already subject to an easement or deed restriction that limits the conversion of the land to nonagricultural use.**

Adjacent (5 points)       Not Adjacent (0 points)

Score: 5 \_\_\_\_\_ points

B. Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and infrastructure?

Yes (5 points)       No (0 points)

Score: 5 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**7) Threat to Development**

Is the tract covered under agricultural zoning or designated agricultural use in a comprehensive plan?

Designated or zoned agricultural use 15 points

Not Designated or zoned agricultural 0 points

Score: 15 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**8) Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to encourage farm viability for future generations:**

Yes (10 points)       No (0 points)

Score: 10 \_\_\_\_\_ points

**9) Additional Considerations**

A. Does the easement protect wetlands or other sensitive habitat?

Yes (2 points)       No (0 points)

Score: 2 \_\_\_\_\_ points

B. Geographic Region Location

Chesapeake Bay            3 points  
Southern Rivers            0 points

Score: 3                    \_\_\_\_\_ points

C. Are there any significant local social, economic or cultural considerations that make this tract unique?

Yes (2 points)             No (0 points)

Score: 2                    \_\_\_\_\_ points

**10) Performance of the entity including but not limited to, managing and enforcing easements, closing efficiency and monitoring.**

A) Closing within:

< 0-12 months	5 points
13-18 months	3 points
19+ months	0 points

B) Monitoring:

Once a year or more            10 points

Score: 15                    \_\_\_\_\_ points

**TOTAL POINTS**

points

\_\_\_\_\_  
FRPP Program Manager            Date

**SCREENING WORKSHEET**  
**Chesapeake Bay Watershed Initiative – CBWI**  
**For applications within the Chesapeake Bay only**

Applicant Name: \_\_\_\_\_ County: \_\_\_\_\_

Application Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Field Office: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Eligibility**

1. NRCS-CPA-1200 Complete Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
2. Applicant has provided proof of control of the land Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
3. Applicant is currently actively farming and there is a resource concern on the offered acres - Brief Description: \_\_\_\_\_
- 

4. Applicant is eligible in Protracts for current year – has FSA farm and tract number and meets AGI requirements and has an AD-1026 on file with no violations Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**If all questions above are “Yes” move application to “Eligible” and assign a “Priority” below and in ProTracts**

**Priority Determination (High, Medium, Low)**

**High Priority**

The application will result in the implementation of one or more priority practices and the application is in a CBWI priority watershed

(Or)

The application will result in the implementation of 3 or more priority practices and is not in a priority watershed

**Medium Priority**

The application is located in a priority watershed with no priority practices

(Or)

The application will result in the implementation of a priority practice and is not in a CBWI priority watershed

**Low Priority – Do not score with Protracts ranking tool until notified to do so**  
The application will not result in the implementation of any priority practice and is not within a CBWI priority watershed

## **FY11 Organic Initiative and WHIP Summary of Changes**

### **Organic Initiative:**

No major changes for FY11;

- 484 Mulching
  - Adding a payment scenario to switch from plastic mulch to straw mulch;
- 590 Nutrient Management payment scenarios:
  - This would pay for record keeping software;
  - Nutrient analysis;

### **WHIP** (all WHIP practices are for non-farmed/production areas)

No major changes for FY11;

- 314 Brush Management – added
- 315 Herbaceous Weed Control- added
- 643 Restoration and Management of Declining Habitats (Long Leaf Pine)
  - Adding sub-soiling scenario for cropland (conversion to long leaf pine)
  - Adding a scalping scenario
- 647 Early Successional Habitat Development
  - Use of a forestry mulcher