

TRC Conference Webinar Meeting Notes

August 22, 2016

Attending

Area I:

Area II:

Area III: Keith Burgess, Brandon Dillistin, Jim Tate,

Area IV:

Area V: Dave Sandman, Jonathon Wooldridge, Glenn Chappell

Area VI: Cole Charnock,

DCR: Barbara McGarry, Scott Ambler, Roland Owens, Angie Ball

New RMP Program Update Bulletin

The August 2016 RMP Program Update Bulletin was e-mailed to District Administrative staff on Friday as an attachment to an RMP Program Update memo. Hard copies are being mailed today to District Chairpersons. A copy was included in the invite to this webinar and posted on the RMP Program and TRC website.

Of the information in the bulletin, much of the information is not new to those who participate in monthly TRC calls as several topics have been discussed at previous TRC conference calls or at annual cost-share program training.

Revised RMP Program FAQ document/COIA changes

An updated FAQ document was made available in the same manner as the Program Update Bulletin. In the updated version dated August 2016, outdated material has been removed, questions and responses condensed, re-written for clarity, and additional material added. The most significant change is the change to any question and response which may fall under consideration of the Conflict of Interest Act. Changes to the act make us aware of many situations that could be a conflict that were not previously considered a conflict. There were many questions in the FAQ regarding a District staff person, Board member, TRC member, or Board affiliate serving as a plan writer. Responses had been written from the perspective of RMP regulations. In light of the expanded conflict potential, responses have been revised. Each conflict determination is very situationally dependent, so DCR is not advising whether any particular situation is a conflict. Regarding any District staff person, Board member, TRC member, or Board affiliate serving as a plan writer, the responses now all indicate that the plan writer should consult with an attorney.

Next Steps: Moving an RMP from Implementation to Certification

Roland demonstrated in the module the actions to be taken by an RMP developer and a TRC module user when moving a plan from the Implementation to the Certification phase. He demonstrated how an RMP developer will conduct an onsite inspection and add an Implementation Inspection in the module which includes inspection of BMPs and schedule items. He demonstrated the SWCD role of changing the practice status of all included complete BMPs to a complete status. The SWCD will conduct an onsite inspection, complete and attach an Implementation Inspection Form, and then also add an Implementation Inspection in the module. If no deficiencies are found, the plan moves to the Certification phase.

NM verification

Nutrient Management Plan implementation is required for RMP certification. EPA has approved an NMP implementation verification process in which NM plan writers verify implementation. DCR has an NMP verification form which will be posted on the RMP website. As these forms are completed, they should be attached to the RMP. TRCs should still be looking at NMPs in the review process, but SWCDs are not responsible for NMP implementation verification. RMP developers were just made aware of the verification form at a training last month.

There was a question about an NMP which has expired before the RMP participant receives certification. At the time of certification, the participant must have a current NMP attached to the RMP. Certification requires that the NMP remain current. At this point there is nothing in place to trigger an SWCD to check an RMP for a current NMP, besides the 3-year compliance inspections. This process should be easier when the NutMan is integrated with the RMP module.

Questions/Comments