

Meeting Minutes

TAC Animal Waste Subcommittee – 1st Meeting

September 22, 2025

Smith West Room, Augusta County Government Center

18 Government Center Lane, Verona, VA 24482 - (540)248-5600

Attendees:

TAC Subcommittee Member	Organization	Voting
Amanda Pennington	Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) (Chair)	Yes
Matt Carroll	Thomas Jefferson SWCD	Yes
Hunter Gravatt	Hanover-Caroline SWCD	Yes
Eric Paulson	Virginia State Dairyman's Association	Yes
Aaron Shull	Headwaters SWCD	Yes
Kevin Dunn	Peter Francisco SWCD	Yes
Steve Escobar	VA Horse Council	Yes
Jake Tabor	Virginia Farm Bureau	Yes
Michael Tabor	Blue Ridge SWCD	Yes
Darrell Marshall	VDACS	Yes
Nick Livesay	Lord Fairfax SWCD	Yes
Megan Dalton	Shenandoah Valley SWCD	Yes
Elizabeth Dillinger	VACDE	Yes
Kendall Dellinger	Culpepper SWCD	Yes
Others Present		
Ben Chester	DCR	No
James Martin	DCR	No
Sara Bottenfield	DCR	No
Tracy "Butch" Rohrbaugh	Headwaters SWCD	No
Leigh Pemberton	Hanover Caroline	No
Madison Coffey	DCR	No
Chris Hamilton	NRCS	No
Wheeler Wood	VCU L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs	No
Gina Barbour	VCU L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs	No

Voting Members Present: 14

Introductions

Amanda Pennington (DCR) called the meeting to order at 10:01 with a quorum of 14 voting members present. She invited everyone in the room to introduce themselves and sign the sign-in sheet. She asked James Martin (DCR) to give a few opening remarks.

Mr. Martin went over the changes to the ground rules for TAC subcommittees and full TAC meetings:

1. Items tabled by a subcommittee can be re-evaluated in two (2) years starting with this year’s recommendations. Formerly, items could not be re-evaluated for three (3) years.
2. Beginning in calendar year 2026 and each third year thereafter, the TAC will review the practices employed in the VACS program to assess their use and effectiveness.
3. At least two-thirds of members must vote in favor of a motion for it to carry. (This was previously 80%.)
4. Facilitators have been contracted to help facilitate the TAC process this year.

Mr. Martin then introduced Wheeler Wood from the VCU L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs, who will facilitate the meeting with Gina Barbour. Mr. Wood explained that the facilitator’s role is to be neutral and to guide the conversation, focusing on process and not on content. The facilitator wants to make sure everyone is heard and consensus is reached.

New Business

Ms. Pennington started the meeting by reading through/discussing the five suggestions that we need to review/address.

Discussion started with:

4A	<p>Create a new tax credit only BMP specification for decommissioning of a manure pits. The Animal Waste Subcommittee discussed and tabled the cost share request for this last year, however the Subcommittee wanted to consider tax credit only for this practice pending review of a draft specification to be prepared by the Shenandoah Valley Soil & Water Conservation District.</p>
-----------	---

Ms. E. Dellinger described the proposed spec WP—9 (attached). Mr. Martin requested when this would be eligible. Discussion was had about if the PE requirement is necessary. Mr. Martin asked about eligibility if the farm is sold or being sold. It was discussed that the section ii. Paying for a PE should be moved to number 1. Mr. Pemberton asked about what happens when a business goes under while they still have lifespan left. Mr. Chester suggested adding language that this practice is not eligible on projects that are under any type of lifespan/program. Mr. Tabor suggested changing the lifespan to 1 yr, discussion was had and agreed. Mr. Dunn suggested we update the NMP plan as it applies to be similar to the other WP—4 Specs. Mr. Marshall stated that the statement from the past closure provided by VDACS about disposal of manure and materials would be a good addition, it was adjusted as needed and added. Mr. Chester suggested we change the language from “improving soil or water quality”

Motion Mr. Tabor to accept language as presented, Mr. Gravatt seconded. Vote passed unanimously.

<p>1A</p>	<p>Update the WP-4LL and WP-4LC specs to allow for a feed lane with manure pack facilities. The description and purpose for both specs specify three distinct areas (feeding area, pack area, and manure storage). The pack area and feeding area combined are being limited to <u>the 75</u> sq. ft. per AU for manure packs while bedded pack facilities can have a feed lane in addition to the 75 sq. ft. per AU. There is conflicting language between the description/purpose and the cost-share authorized/not authorized sections.</p>
------------------	--

Mr. Livesay described the situation that brought forward the suggestion. That the difference in the bed pack and manure pack is based on management. There is inconsistency between the bedded pack and the manure pack. Mr. Dunn suggested that the difference is also due to the cost and the additional area that you have for storage in a manure pack. Ms. Pennington described the differences in the manure pack vs. bedded pack.

Motion: Mr. Livesay that: both LC and LL, regardless if it is managed as a manure pack or bedded pack, are eligible for 75 square feet per animal unit loafing area, separate feed lane, and appropriately sized manure storage area. Seconded Elizabeth Dellinger.

1 abstain - Tabor

2 oppose - Pennington, Dunn

Motion Passes.

<p>2A</p>	<p>All the WP-4 feeding specs still say cost share not authorized for manure generated outside of the facility even though clarification language was previously added to the WP-4 spec to say it could be from any qualifying group on the farm. The language from the WP-4 spec should be applied to WP-4B, WP-4SF, WP-4LL, WP-4LC specs.</p>
------------------	---

Mr. Livesay described that the language is inconsistent. Mr. Dunn suggested that the reason is due to moving manure from a different herd in another location would be a WP-4 situation. Ms. E. Dellinger stated that including language to allow wp-4 included in a different structure as well. Suggested to revise “storage of manure generated outside this facility” to add “however a wp-4 can be combined with this specification to store manure from additional qualifying groups.” And add this to the suite.

Motion: E. Dellinger: Suggested to revise “storage of manure generated outside this facility” to add “however a wp-4 can be combined with this specification to store

manure from additional qualifying groups.” And add this to the suite. Second by Nick Livesay.

Motion passes unanimously.

3A		Request that the WP-4 specification (B. Policies and Specifications 3. vii) allow for all manure that could be removed from poultry houses during the 180-day storage period <u>be</u> included in the sizing for litter storage facilities. Currently, the number of flocks is being adjusted back to 180 days, resulting in partial flocks being considered for the sizing. The reality is that farmers need space to store the manures for all cleanouts within the 180-day storage period.
----	--	--

Amanda described the issue being that sometimes we are providing less storage than needed. Ms. Dalton stated that this should also apply to broilers. Amanda suggested that when the flock length exceeds 90 days, size the manure storage to accommodate full cleanouts for two full flocks, even when that exceeds 180 days. Kevin stated that a lot of times we are providing huge storage while they are only used one week a year. Mr. Chester suggested that we provide up to 180 days of storage or up to 2 flocks.

Motion Mr. Escobar– Amanda’s suggested a change in language provided to that when the flock length exceeds 90 days, size the manure storage to accommodate production from two full flocks, even when that exceeds 180 days of manure production. Second by Mr. Shull.

Motion Passes Unanimously.

5A		WQ-12 should be under the Practices with <u>Two</u> -Program Year completion date carryover section: WQ-12 is a structural practice that includes surveying, an approved design, and contractors to do the work, all of which can be points of backlog for a project preventing it from getting completed in the required timeframe.
----	--	--

Mr. Livesay suggested that the additional item would allow more flexibility and not a time crunch. It is also the only practice without carryovers.

Mr. Tabor motion: To accept as submitted. Second by Ms. K. Dellinger.

Motion Passes unanimously.

Public Comment

Ms. Pennington opened the public comment period. There was no public comment.