Cover Crop/Nutrient Management TAC Subcommittee Meeting

Monday September 8, 2025

Central High School Educational Complex Auditorium

2748 Dogtown Road

Goochland, VA 23063

10:00 am – 3:00 pm

Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Marie Schirmacher called the meeting of the Cover Crop/Nutrient Management subcommittee to order at 10:03am. A quorum of 14 voting members was present. Mr. Spencer Yeager joined the meeting after lunch bringing quorum to 15. Ms. Schirmacher welcomed attendees and went over housekeeping items for the meeting location.

Attendance

Voting Members Present:

Marie Schirmacher, DCR
Allyson Ponn, Lord Fairfax SWCD
Alston Horn, Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Bob Waring, Colonial SWCD
Buck Tharpe, Southside SWCD
Cory Hoar, Virginia Dare SWCD
Courtney Coleman, Peanut SWCD
Jake Tabor, Virginia Farm Bureau Federation
Kemper Marable, Hanover-Caroline
Megan Trice, Shenandoah Valley SWCD
Spencer Yeager, Culpeper SWCD
Steve Jones, John Marshall SWCD
Tim Talley, Thomas Jefferson SWCD
Tom Hardiman, Virginia Grain Producers Association
Trevor Guy, Three Rivers SWCD

Voting Members Not Present

Hubert Bowman, Blue Ridge SWCD
Luke Hudson, Halifax SWCD

Non-Voting Participants Present
Lydia Fitzgerald-Taylor, NRCS
Olivia Leatherwood, DCR
Nick Moody, DCR
Andrew Smith, DCR
James Martin, DCR
Sara Bottenfield, DCR
Denney Collins, DCR
Hunter Quinones, DCR
Marissa Roland, DCR
Hunter Gravatt, Hanover-Caroline SWCD
Hunter Arehart, Shenandoah Valley SWCD
Shelby Foosness, Shenandoah Valley SWCD
Samantha Pereira, Colonial SWCD

Mr. James Martin opened the meeting with announcements about the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) process. These announcements included rule changes for calendar year 2025 and calendar year 2026 to include new voting criteria, facilitators, and a comprehensive review process to evaluate current Virginia Agricultural Cost-Share (VACS) practices. Mr. Martin introduced Mr. Wheeler Wood, facilitator.

Mr. Wood explained the role of the facilitators was to guide conversation. He reviewed the rules for discussion.

Ms. Schirmacher gave a brief overview of the matrix items. There were many suggestions for the SL-1 practice so she began review with those items.

Review of Cover Crop/Nutrient Management Matrix Items

9C. Allow field perimeter fence to be included as an eligible cost for SL-1 fields. Many folks are not willing to convert crops to hay ground but if they could graze the field, they are willing to do the SL-1.

Ms. Schirmacher reviewed the supporting documentation regarding long-term use on large fields over 10-15 years. There was discussion that VACS does not pay for perimeter fence. There was discussion from the committee about what lifespan this suggested change would be eligible for, as the fence would need to be maintained for many years. Committee members suggested making two specifications: one with fence and a minimum lifespan and one without fence. There was further discussion from the committee about these practices ranking out when funding drops in future years. Mr. Martin suggested to the committee if the concern is a producer is willing to convert from crop to pasture discussion should be about increasing incentive for SL-1 rather than adding fencing. Committee members asked for more information such as how many SL-1 practices are implemented every year, where those practices are, as well as information from the Chesapeake Bay

Foundation about these practices they have completed. The committee deferred further discussion until that information was provided, likely at the next subcommittee meeting.

Ms. Schirmacher presented the next item for discussion.

13C. Remove the restriction in the SL-1 that states, "State cost-share and tax credit will be provided only one time per field, while that field is under the same ownership." The SL-1 is a low cost, high benefit practice that should not be restricted. Rotating grass into crops is a standard practice to break weed cycles, improve soil health and there is still an environmental benefit establishing fields back up into grass for a long period of time. A 5-year lifespan is the technical lifespan for Pasture and Hay Planting (NRCS Practice Code and Standard 512) which is referenced in the VACS BMP Manual and Specifications for the SL-1 Practice.

The committee discussed a similar item from 2023. This specification is a permanent change to land use. There was discussion from the committee that land use changes are management decisions. The committee motioned to table item 13C. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Schirmacher introduced the next item for discussion.

1C. Create a CCI-SL-1 spec. Deferred from CY24.

Ms. Schirmacher presented a draft specification for review. There was discussion from the committee about when conversion starts and stops as discussed in a previous TAC year. Mr. Martin suggested the rate for a Continuing Conservation Initiative (CCI) should not disincentivize a producer from pursuing maintenance on the practice, but the rate should not be more than the initial conversion. There was further discussion from the committee regarding lifespans and renters versus landowners. Ms. Schirmacher will send out the draft specification for review so the committee can discuss it further at the next meeting.

Ms. Schirmacher introduced the next matrix item.

16C. SL-1 should be under the Practices with Two-Program Year completion date carryover section: a. SL-1 has seasonal restriction and is highly influenced by weather for installation and certification the same way that SL-11 and tree plantings are (all of which fall under the 2 PY carryover). b. Language from the carryover section should be removed to be consistent with the spec: (May not be carried over more than two planting seasons, i.e. spring and fall.)

The committee discussed how the seasonal restriction has been an issue for producers to implement timely but not an issue encountered often. Ms. Bottenfield explained how the SL-1 carryover works. There was further discussion from the committee about stand quality planting in spring versus fall, with spring yielding better results. The committee motioned to remove the language from the SL-1 specification, "may not be carried over more than two planting seasons ie spring and fall" to allow for three seasons of carryover. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Waring asked Ms. Bottenfield about receiving a written reply if suggestions did not make the matrix so that staff could bring the explanation back to the District Board. Ms. Bottenfield agreed to send an email reply. Ms. Bottenfield explained certain suggestions were not brought to the subcommittee because they fell outside the scope of the TAC.

9Sa Offer cost-share for crop field buffers less than 35': the width of border from edge of field required to obtain any cost share goes so far out into the good part of crop land that few farmers wish to participate. Our fields have 20-foot grass borders. This distance feels practical as it is an area which generally does not produce a profitable crop yet is fertilized along with the rest of the field. By having this smaller border we cut down on overall runoff as well as the quantity of fertilizer applied without losing profitability. If there was some cost share for a narrower border it is possible farmers would take advantage of the opportunity to establish them and benefit all waterways, wildlife, and farm financial strength.

There was discussion from the committee if the suggestion was asking for borders versus buffers. Buffers cannot be cut once installed. There was further discussion regarding Chesapeake Bay Model credit and what is received for a practice like this. Mr. Martin explained that buffers will receive the most credit in the model, but the suggestion is asking about borders. Members of the committee suggested the SL-1 or grass filter strips were options that could meet this need. The subcommittee motioned to table item 9Sa as there are already existing specifications that could meet this need. The motion passed unanimously with zero abstentions

12C. Consider a practice for planting native/pollinator plants on agricultural land consistent with NRCS Practice Code and Standard 327. These plantings may be done on cropland being converted perennial native plants that would address soil, water, and wildlife habitat degradation resource concerns to meet landowner objectives.

There was discussion from the subcommittee about this suggestion fitting into a summer cover crop specification or the existing SL-1 land conversion practice. If under the SL-1, the land must be managed somehow either by grazing or haying. Other members reminded the subcommittee NRCS already funds this practice frequently. The subcommittee asked for additional information from the submitter and will discuss further at the next meeting.

The subcommittee broke for lunch from 11:51am-12:40pm.

Spencer Yeager joined at 12:40pm.

2C. Change the 60% stand date from Dec. 15 to Jan. 1. For all VACS cover crop practices: Due to the change in planting dates in recent years, we recommend adjusting the date producers must achieve a good stand and good growth of vegetative

winter cover, by a minimum of 2 weeks, to match the adjustment made to the cover crop planting dates. It was the recommendation of Frank Long, Virginia Cooperative Extension Agent, to extend the date as far out as February or March to be comparable to our partner agency's cover crop standards. The meeting attendees discussed the likelihood of such a radical change being made, which is why we are making the suggestion to correlate to the planting date change, as a minimum. This will allow the producers planting cover crops up to the November 30th planting deadline sufficient time to achieve a good stand and good growth to meet the 60% coverage requirement. The specification could read: "A good stand and good growth of vegetative winter cover must be obtained by December 31 to protect the area from nutrient leaching and runoff in the fall and winter. All cover crop plantings must maintain a minimum of 60% cover crop plant material on the enrolled acres through the lifespan of the practice." Deferred in CY24.

The subcommittee asked for clarification on what the specification is requesting. Members of the subcommittee explained this was a stand date change, in addition to the field visit and data entry verification added last spring. There was discussion about inconsistent weather patterns across the regions of the state. DCR staff questioned if when reporting this data how the agency would explain checking the validity of the specification and if changing the date affected that check. The subcommittee requested DCR staff gather information on how reporting could be affected. The subcommittee will discuss further at the next meeting.

3C. The current Agricultural Best Management Practices (BMP) includes several important practices for the use of cover crops. The types of cover crop plants are largely based on grains, some legumes, and some brassicas. There is room for improvement. The Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) organization also recommends the use of cover crops, but their recommended list of plants is more extensive than the current Ag BMPs. The enclosed table shows the differences. Also, under SARE's manual the use of the cover crops is more diverse. The increased plant diversity has several advantages to soil enrichment. A richer diversity of a mix of cover plants reportedly can produce better soil organic matter and deeper root structures. Expand the number of cover crop plans included in the Virginia Ag BMPs based on the SARE manual. Deferred in CY24.

Ms. Schirmacher reached out for more information from Dr. Hunter Frame. Research had not been published yet. The item was deferred from the previous year because the research was not published. There were many questions from the subcommittee regarding the suitability of crops for Virginia's climate and regions. Several included on the list were not suitable for Virginia and thus would not achieve cover crop goals. The subcommittee asked to wait until the next subcommittee meeting to see if any additional information can be gathered. If not, the subcommittee will defer again citing a lack of information.

4C. Edit NM-5N and corresponding WFA-NM accurately reflect the type of tests for variable rate N application. The spec currently references soil tests which are not appropriate for determining variable rate application.
There was discussion from the subcommittee about what constitutes supporting documentation for Nitrogen testing. Several subcommittee members suggested the nutrient management plan, yield data, satellite imagery, tissue samples, and as-applied maps. There was further discussion from the subcommittee regarding the need for good supporting documentation when doing precision nutrient management, as it often requires specialized equipment and goes above and beyond. Ms. Bottenfield suggested language edits to the specification that says, "supporting data or documentation (e.g. satellite imagery, yield records, tissue samples, etc." The subcommittee motioned to add this language into the NM-5N and WFA-NM specification for clarity regarding tests used for variable N application. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Schirmacher introduced the next matrix item.

5C. Use seed count rather than bushels for cover crop seeding rates.
There was discussion from the subcommittee that seed count varies depending on crop. The committee suggested changing all crops listed in cover crop specifications to pounds per acre as that is standard. Ms. Bottenfield explained in previous years DCR required the seeding rate on cover crop practices but removed this requirement, as the requirement of any of the specifications is to meet 60% cover. The subcommittee motioned to table item 5C as the requirement from the specification is to obtain 60% cover regardless of seeding rate.

Ms. Schirmacher introduced the next matrix item.

6C. Modify cover crop BMP specifications to include cutting and composting of cover crops as an alternative to killing with herbicide.
Ms. Schirmacher presented additional information received with the suggestion where the submitter explained cover crops are "burned down" with herbicide. Several subcommittee members discussed that in the SL-8B specification, cutting is listed as termination and is permissible. Members also agreed that cutting cover crop and hauling reisude off the field is considering harvesting. There was further discussion from members that biomass aids in erosion control and decreased credit. The subcommittee motioned to table item 6C as cutting is permissible under the cover crop specifications and removal would decrease erosion control and credit in the Chesapeake Bay Model. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Schirmacher reviewed the next matrix item.

7C. Establish a BMP for composting animal and plant organic matter for the subsequent return of the compost organic matter to the soil.
The subcommittee discussed a previous matrix item regarding compositing. Item 15C in 2023 suggested creating a BMP for application of compost to cropland. The item was

tabled because the nutrient recommendations were out of line with the Virginia Nutrient Management Standards and Criteria with an unknown nitrogen release value. The subcommittee DCR staff to reach out for more information from the submitter as to the goal of the specification. Depending on the information, the subcommittee asked DCR staff to forward the suggestion to the applicable subcommittee if it is not in line with the work of the Cover Crop/Nutrient Management subcommittee. The subcommittee motioned the request for DCR to ask for additional information from the submitter and forward the suggestion along to the applicable subcommittee. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Schirmacher introduced the next matrix item.

8C. Add tobacco for sidedressing of nitrogen.
There was discussion from the subcommittee regarding what growing stage tobacco would be in to keep it consistent with the other crops listed in the NM-3C specification. Members know producers who grow tobacco are sidedressing nitrogen. The subcommittee asked for more information and will discuss this item further at the next meeting.

Ms. Schirmacher introduced the next matrix item.

10C. For the SL-8B practice, remove the approved rye cultivars list and allow all cereal rye varieties to be eligible for the $20 bonus. The Bay Model does not distinguish between tetraploid, diploid, or different varieties of cereal rye. If the Bay Model is valuing all cereal rye as the standard for N Effectiveness, why is VACS subdividing rye into different cultivars? All cereal rye is used as the standard (or reference value) for valuing N uptake for cover crops. Whereas, cereal rye is valued at 1.00 for N effectiveness and all other crops are based off of that value. For example, triticale has N effectiveness value of 0.86. (Source: Recommendations of the 2012-2013 Cover Crop Expert Panel, ADDITION OF NEW SPECIES TO COVER CROP BMP, Addition of New Cover Crop Species with Nitrogen Reduction Efficiencies for Use in Phase, 5.3.2 of the Chesapeake Bay Program Watershed Model.) Seed sourcing is becoming more difficult, and our District has found that even the seed growers/suppliers are unsure whether their rye is tetraploid "for indeterminate growth". Additionally, some of the cultivars on the SL-8B list are not tetraploids.

Ms. Bottenfield presented information to the subcommittee regarding the incentive on tetraploid rye. Originally the recommendation came from Virginia Tech as to the types of rye that were going to give the best biomass and thus the best erosion control. There was discussion from subcommittee members asking how to verify tetraploid versus non-tetraploid rye. Subcommittee members asked DCR staff to gather more information Virginia Tech. The subcommittee will discuss this item further at their next meeting.

Ms. Schirmacher introduced the next matrix item.

11C. Consider modifying the seeding rate for radishes in small grain mixtures with radishes in the cover crop specifications. The current minimum seeding rate (6lbs/acre) is too high for a mixture when planting with a seed drill. A minimum rate of two pounds per acre with small grain is suggested for small grain mixtures with radishes.
Subcommittee members shared that 2lbs per acre is the industry standard for mixtures with radishes. The subcommittee motioned to change the seeding rate to 2lbs/acre for small grain mixtures with radishes in all applicable cover crop specifications. The motion passed unanimously.

14C. The producer must sign up prior to April 1 and provide written verification of contracted sidedress application cost, including the PSNT results, to the District within two weeks of the sample analysis. The deadline for signup is currently April 1st and should be pushed back to May 1st for the signup of practices in a current WFA NM contract that was previously approved, this will allow producers to be able to have more flexibility in cost share participation to the suite of practices that are in WFA NM. Some producers will often wait until after April 1st to start planting and the cropping plan could change for them due to factors such as weather, current market conditions, pests/crop rotations and new land acquisitions. I have had multiple producers contact me about adding corn sidedress acres and VR N and P.

There was discussion from subcommittee members about planting date variability across regions, and the ability to carryover the practice across fiscal years. Many subcommittee members discussed the inability to payout on these contracts given the workload at the time of year and crossing over fiscal years. Sometimes producers do not start planting until well into May. Pushing the date would allow producers time to plan and Districts time to get the contracts approved. The subcommittee motioned to change the date for contract sign up to May 1st for WFA-NM nitrogen sidedresses, NM-5N, and NM-3C. The motion passed unanimously.

15C. Practices enrolled in precision Ag practices should not need a NMP because they are going beyond what is written in a plan…plan is useless.
There was discussion from committee members about precision agriculture and what is required in order to do precision agriculture. Members also discussed that plans are needed for credit in the Chesapeake Bay Model. Ms. Schirmacher shared that as a nutrient management plan writer, plans are a good way to get all parties involved communicating. The committee also discussed the possibility of nutrient management plans becoming required within the next few years. The subcommittee motioned to table item 15C as plans are the required avenue to receive credit in the Chesapeake Bay Model

Ms. Schirmacher introduced the last matrix item.

17C. Ditch nutrient capture practices.
The subcommittee asked for additional information for item 17C. There was discussion about existing specifications that could meet the need of this item. There was also discussion from the committee that this is a management choice. The subcommittee

motioned to table item 17C as existing specifications exist and/or the ability to change management of the land. Mr. Kemper Marable abstained from voting. The motion passed 13 to 0 with 1 abstention.

Public Comment
No public comment.

Ms. Schirmacher announced she will send out a Doodle Poll for the next meeting. She will information about meeting location when she has it.

Adjournment at 2:55pm

MATRIX OF ADVANCED COVER CROP NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2025 (CY25) TAC					
Item #	**Ag. BMP**	**Suggestion to the TAC**	**TAC Recommendations**	**DCR Supports**	**FY2027/2028**
1C		Create a CCI-SL-1 spec (refer to parameters set by full TAC in CY24). *Deferred in CY24*	DCR will send out a draft specification for CCI-SL-1 to be reviewed for discussion at next meeting.		
2C		Change the 60% stand date from Dec. 15 to Jan. 1. For all VACS cover crop practices: Due to the change in planting dates in recent years, we recommend adjusting the date producers must achieve a good stand and good growth of vegetative winter cover, by a minimum of 2 weeks, to match the adjustment made to the cover crop planting dates. It was the recommendation of Frank Long, Virginia Cooperative Extension Agent, to extend the date as far out as February or March to be comparable to our partner agency's cover crop standards. The meeting attendees discussed the likelihood of such a radical change being made, which is why we are making the suggestion to correlate to the planting date change, as a minimum. This will allow the producers planting cover crops up to the November 30th planting deadline sufficient time to achieve a good stand and good growth to meet the 60% coverage requirement. The specification could read: "A good stand and good growth of vegetative winter cover must be obtained by December 31 to protect the area from nutrient leaching and runoff in the fall and winter. All cover crop plantings must maintain a minimum of 60% cover crop plant material on the enrolled acres through the lifespan of the practice." *Deferred in CY24*	Subcommittee requested DCR staff gather more information regarding how changing stand date could affect reporting.		
3C		The current Agricultural Best Management Practices (BMP) includes several important practices for the use of cover crops. The types of cover crop plants are largely based on grains, some legumes, and some brassicas. There is room for improvement. The Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) organization also recommends the use of cover crops, but their recommended list of plants is more extensive than the current Ag BMPs. The enclosed table shows the differences. Also, under SARE's manual the use of the cover crops is more diverse. The increased plant diversity has several advantages to soil enrichment. A richer diversity of a mix of cover plants reportedly can produce better soil organic matter and deeper root structures. Expand the number of cover crop plans included in the Virginia Ag BMPs based on the SARE manual. *Deferred in CY24*	DCR will gather more information from Virginia Tech regarding variety suitability to Virginia's climate and data from current study looking at cover crop flowering and biomass production. Findings may be discussed at next meeting.		

MATRIX OF ADVANCED COVER CROP NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2025 (CY25) TAC					
Item #	**Ag. BMP**	**Suggestion to the TAC**	**TAC Recommendations**	**DCR Supports**	**FY2027/2028**
4C	NM-5N, WFA-NM	Edit NM-5N and corresponding WFA-NM to accurately reflect the type of tests used for variable rate N application. The spec currently references soil tests which are not appropriate for determining variable rate application.	Edit language in NM-5N and applicable WFA-NM specifications to say, " iii. Variable rate nitrogen applications or zone application of nitrogen based upon supporting data or documentation (e.g. satellite imagery, yield records, tissue test, etc.) ~~soil test results of (subfield) sampling~~ on row crops, specialty crops or small grains. Other macro-micro nutrients may be applied concurrently." Advance to Full TAC.		
7C		Establish a BMP for composting of animal and plant organic matter for the subsequent return of the compost organic matter to the soil (see supporting documentation).	DCR will request more information from submitting party and seek clarification for the intent of this practice. This item will be reviewed at the next scheduled meeting.		
8C	NM-3C, WFA-NM	Add tobacco for sidedressing of nitrogen.	DCR will reach out to Dr. Reed at Southern Piedmont AREC to confirm the appropriate stage of tobacco for sidedress application.		
9C	SL-1	Allow field perimeter fence to be included as an eligible cost for SL-1 fields. Many folks are not willing to convert crops to hay ground- but if they could also graze the field, they are willing to do the SL-1. (See additional supporting documentation)	DCR staff will gather additional information such as how many SL-1s are implemented through VACS each year, as well as information from the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, who have completed several of these practices. The subcommittee will review this item again at the next meeting.		
10C	SL-8B, SL-8M, WFA-CC	For the SL-8B practice, remove the approved rye cultivars list and allow all cereal rye varieties to be eligible for the $20 bonus. The Bay Model does not distinguish between tetraploid, diploid, or different varieties of cereal rye. If the Bay Model is valuing all cereal rye as the standard for N Effectiveness, why is VACS subdividing rye into different cultivars? o All cereal rye is used as the standard (or reference value) for valuing N uptake for cover crops. Whereas, cereal rye is valued at 1.00 for N effectiveness and all other crops are based off of that value. For example, triticale has N effectiveness value of 0.86. (Source: Recommendations of the 2012-2013 Cover Crop Expert Panel, ADDITION OF NEW SPECIES TO COVER CROP BMP, Addition of New Cover Crop Species with Nitrogen Reduction Efficiencies for Use in Phase, 5.3.2 of the Chesapeake Bay Program Watershed Model.) o Seed sourcing is	DCR staff will gather additional information about verifying tetraploid rye vs non-rye and present at the next subcommittee meeting.		

MATRIX OF ADVANCED COVER CROP NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2025 (CY25) TAC					
Item #	**Ag. BMP**	**Suggestion to the TAC**	**TAC Recommendations**	**DCR Supports**	**FY2027/2028**
		becoming more difficult, and our District has found that even the seed growers/suppliers are unsure whether their rye is tetraploid "for indeterminate growth". Additionally, some of the cultivars on the SL-8B list are not tetraploids.			
11C	SL-8 suite, WFA-CC	Consider modifying the seeding rate for radishes in small grain mixtures with radishes in the cover crop specifications. The current minimum seeding rate (6lbs/acre) is too high for a mixture when planting with a seed drill. A minimum rate of two pounds per acre with small grain is suggested for small grain mixtures with radishes.	Edit seeding rate to 2 lbs/ac in applicable cover crop specifications as 2 lbs/ac is an acceptable rate per Virginia Tech. Advance to Full TAC.		
12C		Consider a practice for planting native/pollinator plants on agricultural land consistent with NRCS Practice Code and Standard 327. These plantings may be done on cropland being converted perennial native plants that would address soil, water, and wildlife habitat degradation resource concerns to meet landowner objectives.	DCR will gather more information about the intention of the request (pollinators, perennial planting) and confer with NRCS standards and practices. The subcommittee will review this item again at the next meeting.		
14C	NM-3C, NM-5N, WFA-NM (nitrogen only)	The producer must sign up prior to April 1 and provide written verification of contracted sidedress application cost, including the PSNT results, to the District within two weeks of the sample analysis. The deadline for signup is currently April 1st and should be pushed back to May 1st for the signup of practices in a current WFA NM contract that was previously approved, this will allow producers to be able to have more flexibility in cost share participation to the suite of practices that are in WFA NM. Some producers will often wait until after April 1st to start planting and the cropping plan could change for them due to factors such as weather, current market conditions, pests/crop rotations and new land acquisitions. I have had multiple producers contact me about adding corn sidedress acres and VR N and P.	Change the producer application date from April 1st to May 1st in NM-3C, NM-5N, and WFA-NM practices. Advanced to Full TAC.		
16C	SL-1	SL-1 should be under the Practices with Two-Program Year completion date carryover section: a. SL-1 has seasonal restriction and is highly influenced by weather for installation and certification the same way that SL-11 and tree plantings are (all of which fall under the 2 PY carryover). b. Language from the carryover section should be removed to be consistent with the spec: (May not be carried over more than two planting seasons, i.e. spring and fall.)	Remove the language "(May not be carried over more than two planting seasons, i.e. spring and fall.)" from Guidelines page II-43 table *Practices with One-Year Program Completion Dates Eligible for Carryover.* Advanced to Full TAC.		

MATRIX OF DEFERRED COVER CROP NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS			
Item #	**Ag. BMP**	**Suggestion to the TAC**	**Reason for Deferring**

MATRIX OF TABLED COVER CROP NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS			
Item #	**Ag. BMP**	**Suggestion to the TAC**	**Reason for Tabling**
5C	CC	Use seed count rather than bushels for cover crop seeding rates	Item was tabled based on discussion that seed count varies depending on crop and based on specifications requiring a rate of 60% cover regardless of seeding rate.
6C		Modify cover crop BMP specifications to include cutting and composting of cover crops as an alternative to killing with herbicide (see supporting documentation).	Item was tabled as practices already include mechanical means for cover crop termination and certain practices prohibit the removal of cover crop residue. Removing residue for use in composting would result in change of Bay Model credit and would be enrollment in a different cover crop practice.
13C	SL-1	Remove the restriction in the SL-1 that states, “State cost-share and tax credit will be provided only one time per field, while that field is under the same ownership.” The SL-1 is a low cost, high benefit practice that should not be restricted. Rotating grass into crops is a standard practice to break weed cycles, improve soil health and there is still an environmental benefit establishing fields back up into grass for a long period of time. A 5-year lifespan is the technical lifespan for Pasture and Hay Planting (NRCS Practice Code and Standard 512) which is referenced in the VACS BMP Manual and Specifications for the SL-1 Practice.	This item was tabled as the practice concerns permanent land use change; Any decision to put land back into row crop and pasture/hay is a management decision of the producer.
15C	NM-5N, NM-5P	Practices enrolled in precision Ag practices should not need a NMP because they are going beyond what is written in a plan…plan is useless.	Item tabled as current precision NM specifications are designed to “support a higher intensity of [nutrient] management in the field than existing standard nutrient management practices,” therefore Nutrient Management Plans are a necessary component. These plans are essential to capturing credit for practices within the Bay Model, including enhanced nutrient application/usage.
17C		Ditch nutrient capture practices.	Item tabled due to existing specifications already meet the needs of this request.

MATRIX OF TABLED COVER CROP NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS			
Item #	**Ag. BMP**	**Suggestion to the TAC**	**Reason for Tabling**
9S.a		Transferred to Cover Crop/NM from Stream Protection and Forestry as it pertains to cropland conversion: Offer cost-share for crop field buffers less than 35': the width of border from edge of field required to obtain any cost share goes so far out into the good part of crop land that few farmers wish to participate. Our fields have 20 foot grass borders. This distance feels practical as it is an area which generally does not produce a profitable crop yet is fertilized along with the rest of the field. By having this smaller border we cut down on overall runoff as well as the quantity of fertilizer applied without losing profitability. If there was some cost share for a narrower border it is possible farmers would take advantage of the opportunity to establish them and benefit all waterways, wildlife, and farm financial strength.	Item was tabled as there are existing BMPs that meet the need of this request.