

TRC Conference Call Meeting Notes

June 27, 2017

1 RMP Carryovers

For those who have RMP-1 practices, it is necessary for the practice instance status to be “carryover” for funding to remain guaranteed for this instance. For most RMP-1 and RMP-2 practices, the statuses have already been changed to “carryover” but there are some in the module that are either “funding availability confirmed” or “approved”. If the status remains the same, the practice is not completed by the end of the program year, and the participant requests an RMP-1 in FY’18, the application is subject to the new RMP-1 and RMP-2 funding scenario for FY’18.

2 RMP Implementation and Development Funding for FY’18

Draft documents relating to RMP-1 and RMP-2 funding for FY’18 were discussed, including an RMP Implementation and Development Funding concept narrative, an RMP-1 Development Interest Form, and an RMP Development Interest Ranking Worksheet.

According to the draft, the RMP set-aside balance will be carried over into FY’18, with an emphasis on RMP-2. Only RMP-2 practices will be considered until December 31, at which point, RMP-1s may be considered from the set-aside.

This year, Districts will have the option to conduct an RMP Development Sign-up Period. Those District who opt to offer a sign-up period will have the option to accept RMP Development Interest Forms, which will be ranked and submitted to DCR. Ranked participants will then be either directed to any remaining set-aside or to be included in a potential workload list for upcoming RMP Development grants, beginning in July 2018. Additionally, Districts may continue to fund RMP-1 or RMP-2 applications with their individual VACS allocations.

RMP staff request comments on these documents on or before this Friday. These documents will be reviewed by the DCR on Monday, July 10 for finalization.

3 Proposed VACS practices in RMPs

With FY’18 VACS sign-up beginning, there may be applications for VACS practices already included as a proposed VACS practice within an RMP. Roland will schedule a webinar for the next TRC conference meeting date, in which he will demonstrate how to move a proposed VACS practice in an RMP into the module for VACS funding consideration. He will also create and explain a LOGI report which will allow District staff to see easily access a list of BMPs included in an RMP.

4 Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) Update

The SAG has met twice; once in May and once in June. The presentation from the June meeting and a revised RMP workflow were attached to this meeting announcement. Although the SAG has made no decisions, there has been consensus that a survey should be conducted to study RMP

Implementation and Certification.

The final SAG report is due October 1. A draft report will be presented to the SAG in September.

The September SAG meeting date has not yet been determined.

5 Questions and Comments

When conducting a site inspection, if a landowner who is not the RMP participant asks District staff about the purpose of the inspection, how should District staff respond?

District staff may not disclose that the purpose of the inspection is related to an RMP, as that information is protected. DCR has advised the District staff may respond with “the purpose of this site visit is to inspect conservation practices on behalf of the participant.” The landowner may contact the participant to discuss conservation programs; the participant may disclose information regarding participation in the RMP program, but Districts and DCR may not.

Attending

Area I:

Area II: Claire Hilsen,

Area III: Marian Moody, Leslie Anne Hinton, Jim Tate, Jim Wallace, Keith Burgess, Etta Lucas, Charles Lively, Kristal Evens, Jim Wallace

Area IV:

Area V: Johnathan Woolridge

Area VI: Cole Charnock, Carmie Savage, Meaghann Terrien

DCR: Barbara McGarry, Scott Ambler, Roland Owens, Mark Hollberg, Amy Walker