Overview of Results of 2021 Program Review of District Duties

4VAC50-70-130. Review of duties performed by soil and water conservation districts.

A. The department shall periodically conduct a comprehensive review of the RMP duties performed by each soil and water conservation district to evaluate whether requirements set forth by this chapter have been satisfactorily fulfilled. The department shall develop a schedule for conducting periodic reviews and evaluations. Each district shall receive a comprehensive review at least once every five years; however, the department may impose more frequent, partial, or comprehensive reviews with cause. Such reviews where applicable shall be coordinated with those being implemented by agency staff for other purposes that may include annual spot checks of BMPs implemented by districts through the Virginia Agricultural BMP Cost Share Program.

B. If a review conducted by the department indicates that the soil and water conservation district has not administered, enforced where authorized to do so, or conducted its duties in a manner that satisfies the requirements set forth within this chapter, the department shall document such deficiencies and convey the needed corrective actions in writing to the soil and water conservation district's board of directors within 30 days following the review.

C. When the department determines:

- 1. The deficiencies are due to the district's failure to satisfactorily perform the required duties with the resources at its disposal, the department shall provide close oversight, guidance, and training as appropriate to enable the district to fully perform the duties required by this chapter. If after such actions there remains one or more deficiencies that cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the department, the department may delay or withhold RMP allocated funding under its authority and control from the district that is not satisfactorily performing its RMP duties. Such duties may be assigned to another soil and water conservation district. Funds withheld from the district with deficiencies may be directed to the district that is performing the additional RMP duties.
- 2. The deficiencies are due to a work demand generated by the duties required by this chapter that exceed the district's existing resources, the department shall endeavor to assist the district in the performance of its duties and in finding a solution to the shortage of resources.

Recommended Motion:

No action is required by the Board for this agenda item.

Matthew J. Strickler Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources and Chief Resilience Officer

Clyde E. Cristman *Director*



Rochelle Altholz Deputy Director of Administration and Finance

Nathan Burrell
Deputy Director of
Government and Community Relations

Darryl M. Glover Deputy Director for Dam Safety, Flood Preparedness, and Soil & Water Conservation

Thomas L. Smith
Deputy Director of
Operations

September 23, 2021

Ms. Robin Rich-Coates, Chair Eastern Shore Soil and Water Conservation District 22545 Center Parkway Accomac, Virginia 23301-1330

Dear Ms. Rich-Coates:

As you may be aware, the Department of Conservation and Recreation (Department) conducts program review related to the duties of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (Districts) in implementing the Resource Management Plan Program. The results of the program reviews are shared with the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board. This year, a program review was conducted for the Eastern Shore Soil and Water Conservation District.

The Board and the Department wish to commend the District Board and District staff for all of their time and efforts related to implementing the Resource Management Plan Program (Program). As shown by the program review results, your District has exceeded expectations in administering and promoting this critical Program.

Thank you again for all of the District's assistance to agricultural producers and citizens and for all the District's efforts to improve Virginia's water quality.

Sincerely

Charles A. Arnason, Chair Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board Clyde E. Cristman, Director Department of Conservation and Recreation

cc: Carmie Savage, District Manager

Matthew J. Strickler Secretary of Natural Resources

Clyde E. Cristman *Director*



Rochelle Altholz Deputy Director of Administration and Finance

Russell W. Baxter
Deputy Director of
Dam Safety & Floodplain
Management and Soil & Water
Conservation

Nathan Burrell
Deputy Director of
Government and Community Relations

Thomas L. Smith Deputy Director of Operations

August 4, 2021

Robin Rich-Coates (Chm) PO Box 22 Machipongo, VA 23405

Dear Ms. Rich-Coates:

On June 23, 2021, staff from the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) Resource Management Plan (RMP) program conducted a required periodic review of the RMP duties performed by Eastern Shore SWCD. Program reviews consist of a personal interview between the Department and the District staff, a review of the District files and other applicable documents, a review of a sample of the RMPs approved by the District Board, review of the certification and compliance inspections (if applicable), and a review of the information entered into the DCR Conservation Planning Suite.

I have attached the draft program review documents for your review and comments. Below is a summary of the results.

Results of the Program Review

A. General Program Administration

Eastern Shore Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 30 out of a possible 30 points. The district has established a Technical Review Committee (TRC). All information is protected from FOIA as required. Technical Review Committee and district board meetings were conducted in accordance with the Administrative Process Act and all Guidance.

B. Review of Approved Plans

Eastern Shore Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points. The TRC has reviewed all of the RMPs within the required time (90 days) for revised submittals and requests for additional information.

Clear comments were provided to the plan developer. All of the required information and minimum standards were contained in the RMPs.

C. Verification Inspection of RMPs

Eastern Shore and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points. The TRC conducted a verification inspection when a request was submitted by the producer. All of the required information was complete and a current NMP was submitted and a NMP verification was provided by the NMP planner. The inspection ensured all of the required minimum standards had been completed by the producer.

D. Compliance Inspection of RMPs

No compliance inspections are due at this time.

E. Summary/Recommendations

Eastern Shore Soil and Water Conservation District has very adequately acted as the RMP program authority. They should be commended for their implementation and promotion of the program. There are no recommendations for the district at this time.

The results of this review will be presented to the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board at the September meeting. Should you have any questions or comments on the program review, please contact me at 540 416-5347.

Sincerely,

Landon Ambler

Resource Management Plan Program Coordinator

Cc:

Carmie M. Savage (District Manager) 22545 Center Parkway Accomac, VA 23301



Review of Eastern Shore Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Implementation of the Resource Management Plan (RMP) Program

The review of local program effectiveness is a responsibility of the Department of Conservation and Recreation as defined by Virginia RMP Regulations (4VAC50-70-130.), which states that the

"The Department shall periodically conduct a comprehensive review of the RMP duties performed by each soil and water conservation district to evaluate whether requirements set forth by this chapter have been satisfactorily fulfilled. The department shall develop a schedule for conducting periodic reviews and evaluations. Each District shall receive a comprehensive review at least once every five years; however, the Department may impose more frequent, partial, or comprehensive reviews with cause. Such reviews where applicable shall be coordinated with those being implemented by agency staff for other purposes that may include annual spot checks of BMPs implemented by districts through the Virginia Agricultural BMP Cost Share Program."

Programmatic requirements for a District are set out in the RMP regulations contained in 4VAC-50-70 et. seq. Specific checklists address the criteria for RMP program administration, RMP plan review, and RMP inspections.

The following approved Resource Management Plans were selected as part of this program review:

- 1. RMP-20-20-0001
- 2. RMP-20-20-0004
- 3. RMP-20-20-0007
- 4. RMP-20-20-0010
- 5. RMP-20-20-0017

The following Resource Management Plans Verification Inspections were reviewed as part of this program review:

- 1. RMP-20-20-0004
- 2. RMP-20-20-0007

The following Resource Management Plans Compliance Inspections were reviewed as part of this program review:

No compliance inspections are required at this time

Program reviews will consist of a personal interview between the Department and the District staff, a review of the District files and other applicable documents, a review of a sample of the RMPs approved by the District Board, review of the certification and compliance inspections (if applicable), and a review of the information entered into the DCR Conservation Planning Suite. Individual checklists will be used for each plan selected during the program review. A plan review, inspection review, and compliance review checklist will be used to determine that the selected RMPs were reviewed, approved, and inspected by the District in accordance with the RMP regulations. Each District will then be evaluated with a rating worksheet which reflects combined results from the individual checklists. Programs receiving a score of 70 percent or greater in each of the four review areas will be considered to have satisfactorily fulfilled their RMP duties. If one or more of the four program review areas receive a score of less than 70 percent, a program will be considered to have not satisfactorily fulfilled their RMP duties.

Results of the Program Review

A. General Program Administration

Eastern Shore Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 30 out of a possible 30 points.

The district has established a Technical Review Committee (TRC). All information is protected from FOIA as required. Technical Review Committee and district board meetings were conducted in accordance with the Administrative Process Act and all Guidance.

B. Review of Approved Plans

Eastern Shore Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points.

The TRC has reviewed all of the RMPs within the required time (90 days) for revised submittals and requests for additional information.

Clear comments were provided to the plan developer. All of the required information and minimum standards were contained in the RMPs.

C. Verification Inspection of RMPs

Eastern Shore Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points.

The TRC conducted a verification inspection when a request was submitted by the producer. All of the required information was complete and a current NMP was submitted and a NMP verification was provided by the NMP planner. The inspection ensured all of the required minimum standards had been completed by the producer.

D. **Compliance Inspection of RMPs**

No compliance inspections are due at this time.

E. Summary/Recommendations

Eastern Shore Soil and Water Conservation District has very adequately acted as the RMP program authority. They have excellent records and should be commended for their implementation and promotion of the program. There are no recommendations for the district at this time.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

PART I: General Program Administration Va Reg.4VAC50-70-70, 90 &120

Available points	Earned points	Criteria
10	10	District Board selected an RMP Technical Review Committee
10	10	District Board ensured that any personal or proprietary information collected in association with the RMP program remained confidential and exempt from the Virginia Freedom of Information Act
10	10	All meetings and proceedings are conducted in accordance with the Virginia Administrative Processes Act, other applicable laws and regulations, and Board and Department guidance.
30	30	TOTAL
Comments	:	·

PART II: Plan Review Va Reg.4VAC50-70-40, 50 & 70

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	
10	10	All plans were reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
For all plans s	ubmitted	for approval, notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90
days of receip	t	
10	10	100%
5		> 70%
0		< 70%
All disapprova	I notices	included a statement noting all plan deficiencies and specify the modifications, terms,
and conditions	s that wou	ıld permit approval of the plan
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
		als were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency or listing of RMP
deficiencies pi	rovided w	ithin 45 days of receipt
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved p	lans inclu	ided an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved p	lans were	e developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
5	5	100%
0		<100%
All approved p	lans inclu	ided the required components:
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
35	35	All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to land use
		type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).
100	100	TOTAL
Comments:		



(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

*PART III: Verification Inspections Va Reg.4VAC50-70-80 & 90

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	
10	10	All verification inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff
		member
20	20	In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated
		SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation
10	10	Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at
		least 48 hours in advance
20	20	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and
		fully implemented, the District should approve the RMP for certification. The District
		and/or designated SWCD staff shall submitted required documentation to DCR for action
20	20	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or
		NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written
		documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review
Have the V	oluntary	BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and
entered int	to the trac	king module as complete
20	20	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	100	TOTAL
Comments	5 :	



(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

*PART IV: Compliance Inspections Va Reg.4VAC50-70-80 & 90

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	o i i o i i o i o i o i o i o i o i o i
10	NA	All compliance inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member
5	NA	Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance
25	NA	Following an RMP compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District should submitted required documentation to DCR
		 BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and cking module as complete
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Onsite con	npliance i	inspections on all RMPs having been issued a Certificate of RMP Implementation were
conducted	l no less t	han once every three years, but not more than annually
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Following	an RMP c	ompliance inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented,
the Distric	t provided	d the owner or operator and DCR with written documentation that specified the deficiencies
within 10 c	days follo	wing the field review
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	NA	TOTAL
Comments	s: No con	npliance inspections have been required at this time.

^{*}To be completed if verification or compliance inspections have occurred within the review period



(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

Program Review Comments:
Suggest including a scan of the plan review and field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures and attaching them in the modules.

Program Reviewer Name/Title	Scott Ambler, RMP Program Manager
Program Reviewer Signature	33.Ce



(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

Reviev	wed By	y: Scot	tt Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry Review Date: 6/23/2	Date Plan Approved: 10/9/19
YES	NO	NA*	Criteria	1 11
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee	
Χ			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within	90 days of receipt
			1st Date Submitted: 9/20/20 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 10/9	
			2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			All disapproval notices and returned plans included adequate comments and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan	s noting all plan deficiencies
		Χ	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plants	an sufficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of receipt	
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
X			Approved plan included an associated assessment document complete	ed by the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP developer to include:	
X			Information on the location of the management unit	
X			Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity	res, environmentally sensitive
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP	
X			 Authorization for the RMP developer for right of entry and access to to obtain copies of any conservation or water quality plans necessa 	
Х			Copies of nutrient management plans, soil conservation plans from conservation or water quality plan that includes the implementation	
Х			 Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative the management unit that are currently implemented 	
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Appl	ication Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:	
Х			 A determination of the adequacy of existing BMPs, conservation p meeting the minimum standards set out in 4VAC50-70-40 	lans, and water quality plans in
Χ			 A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that with minimum standards 	will be utilized to meet the
X			A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to in the minimum standards	plement or maintain to meet
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards	
Χ			A schedule for the implementation of BMPs	
X			An inclusion of any current nutrient management plans, soil conser conservation or water quality plans that include the implementation	
Χ			7. Other information collected pursuant to the assessment	
X			All approved plans included required minimum standard practices rela (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).	ted to land use type
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan	
Χ			Soil Loss to "T"	
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)	
Х			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)	
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)	

Х			Perennial Streams Identified?
Х			RMP developer indicate method
COMM	COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)		



(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

Revie	wed B	y: Scot	tt Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 12/16/20
YES	NO	NA*	C	riteria	
Χ			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review	Committee	
Х			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was	s communicated within 90 day	s of receipt
			1st Date Submitted: 9/29/20 Date Approved, Ro	ejected or Returned: 12/16/20	Approved: YN
			2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
			3rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			All disapproval notices and returned plans include and specify the conditions that would permit app		ng all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of red		fficiency or listing of
		Х	1st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rej	=	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re		Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessm by an individual authorized by the RMP develop	-	the RMP developer or
Х			Information on the location of the manage		
Х			Description of the management unit, inclu- features, erosion issues, and agricultural a		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or operation.		
Х			Authorization for the RMP developer for right to obtain copies of any conservation or was a conservation or was a conservation.		
Х			Copies of nutrient management plans, soi conservation or water quality plan that inc	I conservation plans from NRC	S, RMPs, and any other
Х			Information on the location and status of a the management unit that are currently im	II BMPs and other alternative m	
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Cons		n Suite
X			Approved plans included the following compon		
Х			A determination of the adequacy of existing meeting the minimum standards set out in		nd water quality plans in
Х			A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards		utilized to meet the
Х			A complete list of the BMPs that the owne the minimum standards	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ent or maintain to meet
Х			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the n	ninimum standards	
Χ			A schedule for the implementation of BMP		
Х			An inclusion of any current nutrient manage conservation or water quality plans that includes the conservation or water quality plans that includes the conservation of the conservat	clude the implementation of BM	
Χ			7. Other information collected pursuant to the		
Х			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastur		land use type
Χ			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Х			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		Х	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and	d Hayland)	
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		

	Χ	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)
X		Perennial Streams Identified?
Х		RMP developer indicate method



(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	tt Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 7/16/20
YES	NO	NA*	C	Criteria Criteria	- I-I-
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review	v Committee	
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was		s of receipt
				ejected or Returned: 7/16/20	Approved: YN
			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
			•	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
X			All disapproval notices and returned plans include and specify the conditions that would permit app		ng all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a	•	fficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of red	ceipt	
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessn	nent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develop		
X			 Information on the location of the manage 	ement unit	
X			Description of the management unit, inclu features, erosion issues, and agricultural a		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or opera		
X			Authorization for the RMP developer for ri to obtain copies of any conservation or wa		
Х			Copies of nutrient management plans, soi conservation or water quality plan that inc	l conservation plans from NRC	S, RMPs, and any other
Х			6. Information on the location and status of a	all BMPs and other alternative m	
Х			the management unit that are currently im Approved plan was developed in the DCR Cons	servation Planning Application	n Suite
X			Approved plans included the following compon		
X			A determination of the adequacy of existing meeting the minimum standards set out in	ng BMPs, conservation plans, a	and water quality plans in
Х			A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards		utilized to meet the
Х			A complete list of the BMPs that the owne the minimum standards	er or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Χ			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the n	ninimum standards	
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMF	Ps .	
X			6. An inclusion of any current nutrient manage		plans, and any other
			conservation or water quality plans that in		IPs
Χ			Other information collected pursuant to the		
X			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastur		land use type
Χ			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Χ			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		Х	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and	d Hayland)	
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pastu	ure)	

Х			Perennial Streams Identified?
Х			RMP developer indicate method
COMM	COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)		



(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

Revie	wed B	y: Sco	tt Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 7/16/20
YES	NO	NA*		Criteria	
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review	v Committee	
Х			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan wa		s of receipt
				ejected or Returned: 7/16/20	Approved: YN
			2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, R	lejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, R	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			All disapproval notices and returned plans inclu and specify the conditions that would permit ap	proval of the plan	
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and		ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re		
		Х	1	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х		ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	* *	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
X			Approved plan included an associated assessr		the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develo 1. Information on the location of the management of the		
X			Description of the management unit, inclu		vironmentally cencitive
X			features, erosion issues, and agricultural		TVITOTITIETITALLY SETISITIVE
Х			Contact information for the owner or oper		
Х			Authorization for the RMP developer for r to obtain copies of any conservation or w		
Х			Copies of nutrient management plans, so conservation or water quality plan that in	il conservation plans from NRCS	S, RMPs, and any other
Х			Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented		
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite		
Х			Approved plans included the following compor		
Х			A determination of the adequacy of exist meeting the minimum standards set out in	n 4VAC50-70-40	*
X			 A complete list of existing BMPs identifie minimum standards 		
Х			A complete list of the BMPs that the owner the minimum standards	-	nt or maintain to meet
X			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the in the second		
X			A schedule for the implementation of BMI		
X			An inclusion of any current nutrient mana conservation or water quality plans that ir		
Х			Other information collected pursuant to the		
X			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastu		land use type
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
X			Soil Loss to "T"		
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland an	d Hayland)	
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Past	ure)	

Х			Perennial Streams Identified?		
Х			RMP developer indicate method		
COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)					



(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

Revie	wed By	y: Sco	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 12/16/20
YES	NO	NA*		Criteria	
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee		
Х			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan w		s of receipt
				Rejected or Returned: 10/28/20	Approved: Y (N)
				Rejected or Returned: 12/16/20	Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, I	Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
X			All disapproval notices and returned plans incl and specify the conditions that would permit ap		ng all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re		fficiency or listing of
		Х		ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		X	•••	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		X	11 '	Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
X			Approved plan included an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer or by an individual authorized by the RMP developer to include:		
Х			1. Information on the location of the manage		
X			Description of the management unit, incl features, erosion issues, and agricultura	uding acreage, water features, e	nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP		
X			Authorization for the RMP developer for right of entry and access to property and for authorization to obtain copies of any conservation or water quality plans necessary for the assessment		
X			Copies of nutrient management plans, soil conservation plans from NRCS, RMPs, and any other conservation or water quality plan that includes the implementation of BMPs		
Х			Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented		
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite		
Х			Approved plans included the following components:		
Х			A determination of the adequacy of existing BMPs, conservation plans, and water quality plans in meeting the minimum standards set out in 4VAC50-70-40		ind water quality plans in
Х			A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards		utilized to meet the
X			A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards		
Χ			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards		
Х			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs		
Χ			An inclusion of any current nutrient management plans, soil conservation plans, and any other conservation or water quality plans that include the implementation of BMPs		
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to t		
Х			All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).		
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
X			Soil Loss to "T"		
-		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland a	nd Hayland)	
-	1	X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	-	

	Χ	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)
X		Perennial Streams Identified?
Х		RMP developer indicate method



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

RMP #: 20-20-0004 Date Approved: 10/9/19 Date Certified: 3/22/21

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

YES	NO	NA	Criteria	
Х			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member	
X			In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation	
Χ			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module	
X			Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance	
X			Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection	
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan	
X			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion	
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)	
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)	
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)	
		X	Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete	
X			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action	
		X	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	
Х			Has the inspection document been attached in the module	



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

YES	NO	NA	Criteria	
Х			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member	
X			In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation	
Χ			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module	
X			Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance	
X			Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection	
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan	
X			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion	
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)	
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)	
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)	
		X	Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete	
X			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action	
		X	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	
Х			Has the inspection document been attached in the module	

Matthew J. Strickler Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources and Chief Resilience Officer

Clyde E. Cristman *Director*



Rochelle Altholz Deputy Director of Administration and Finance

Nathan Burrell
Deputy Director of
Government and Community Relations

Darryl M. Glover Deputy Director for Dam Safety, Flood Preparedness, and Soil & Water Conservation

Thomas L. Smith
Deputy Director of
Operations

September 23, 2021

Ms. Nicole Anderson Ellis, Chair Henricopolis Soil and Water Conservation District 8600 Dixon Powers Drive Henrico, Virginia 23273-0775

Dear Ms. Anderson Ellis:

As you may be aware, the Department of Conservation and Recreation (Department) conducts program review related to the duties of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (Districts) in implementing the Resource Management Plan Program. The results of the program reviews are shared with the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board. This year, a program review was conducted for the Henricopolis Soil and Water Conservation District.

The Board and the Department wish to commend the District Board and District staff for all of their time and efforts related to implementing the Resource Management Plan Program (Program). As shown by the program review results, your District has exceeded expectations in administering and promoting this critical Program.

Thank you again for all of the District's assistance to agricultural producers and citizens and for all the District's efforts to improve Virginia's water quality.

Sincerely

Charles A. Arnason, Chair Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board Clyde E. Cristman, Director Department of Conservation and Recreation

cc: Charles Lively, District Manager

Matthew J. Strickler Secretary of Natural Resources

Clyde E. Cristman *Director*



Administration and Finance

Russell W. Baxter

Deputy Director of

Dam Safety & Floodplain

Rochelle Altholz Deputy Director of

Deputy Director of
Dam Safety & Floodplain
Management and Soil & Water
Conservation

Nathan Burrell
Deputy Director of
Government and Community Relations

Thomas L. Smith

Deputy Director of

Operations

August 4, 2021

Nicole Anderson Ellis (Chair) 1431 Chaffins Bluff Lane Henrico, VA 23231

Dear Ms. Ellis:

On June 23, 2021, staff from the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) Resource Management Plan (RMP) program conducted a required periodic review of the RMP duties performed by Henricopolis SWCD. Program reviews consist of a personal interview between the Department and the District staff, a review of the District files and other applicable documents, a review of a sample of the RMPs approved by the District Board, review of the certification and compliance inspections (if applicable), and a review of the information entered into the DCR Conservation Planning Suite.

I have attached the draft program review documents for your review and comments. Below is a summary of the results.

Results of the Program Review

A. General Program Administration

Henricopolis Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 30 out of a possible 30 points. The district has established a Technical Review Committee (TRC). All information is protected from FOIA as required. Technical Review Committee and district board meetings were conducted in accordance with the Administrative Process Act and all Guidance.

B. Review of Approved Plans

Henricopolis Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points. The TRC has reviewed all of the RMPs within the required time (90 days) for revised submittals and requests for additional information.

Clear comments were provided to the plan developer. All of the required information and minimum standards were contained in the RMPs.

C. Verification Inspection of RMPs

Henricopolis Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points. The TRC conducted a verification inspection when a request was submitted by the producer. All of the required information was complete and a current NMP was submitted and a NMP verification was provided by the NMP planner. The inspection ensured all of the required minimum standards had been completed by the producer.

D. Compliance Inspection of RMPs

No compliance inspections are due at this time.

E. Summary/Recommendations

Henricopolis Soil and Water Conservation District has very adequately acted as the RMP program authority. They should be commended for their implementation and promotion of the program. There are no recommendations for the district at this time.

The results of this review will be presented to the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board at the September meeting. Should you have any questions or comments on the program review, please contact me at 540 416-5347.

Sincerely,

Landon Ambler

Resource Management Plan Program Coordinator

Cc:

Charles Lively (District Manager) PO Box 90775 Henrico, VA 23273-0775



Review of Henricopolis Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Implementation of the Resource Management Plan (RMP) Program

The review of local program effectiveness is a responsibility of the Department of Conservation and Recreation as defined by Virginia RMP Regulations (4VAC50-70-130.), which states that the

"The Department shall periodically conduct a comprehensive review of the RMP duties performed by each soil and water conservation district to evaluate whether requirements set forth by this chapter have been satisfactorily fulfilled. The department shall develop a schedule for conducting periodic reviews and evaluations. Each District shall receive a comprehensive review at least once every five years; however, the Department may impose more frequent, partial, or comprehensive reviews with cause. Such reviews where applicable shall be coordinated with those being implemented by agency staff for other purposes that may include annual spot checks of BMPs implemented by districts through the Virginia Agricultural BMP Cost Share Program."

Programmatic requirements for a District are set out in the RMP regulations contained in 4VAC-50-70 et. seq. Specific checklists address the criteria for RMP program administration, RMP plan review, and RMP inspections.

The following approved Resource Management Plans were selected as part of this program review:

- 1. RMP-40-15-0001
- 2. RMP-40-15-0004
- 3. RMP-40-15-0005
- 4. RMP-40-15-0009
- 5. RMP-40-15-0010

The following Resource Management Plans Verification Inspections were reviewed as part of this program review:

- 1. RMP-40-15-0005
- 2. RMP-40-15-0010

The following Resource Management Plans Compliance Inspections were reviewed as part of this program review:

No compliance inspections are required at this time

Program reviews will consist of a personal interview between the Department and the District staff, a review of the District files and other applicable documents, a review of a sample of the RMPs approved by the District Board, review of the certification and compliance inspections (if applicable), and a review of the information entered into the DCR Conservation Planning Suite. Individual checklists will be used for each plan selected during the program review. A plan review, inspection review, and compliance review checklist will be used to determine that the selected RMPs were reviewed, approved, and inspected by the District in accordance with the RMP regulations. Each District will then be evaluated with a rating worksheet which reflects combined results from the individual checklists. Programs receiving a score of 70 percent or greater in each of the four review areas will be considered to have satisfactorily fulfilled their RMP duties. If one or more of the four program review areas receive a score of less than 70 percent, a program will be considered to have not satisfactorily fulfilled their RMP duties.

Results of the Program Review

A. General Program Administration

Henricopolis Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 30 out of a possible 30 points.

The district has established a Technical Review Committee (TRC). All information is protected from FOIA as required. Technical Review Committee and district board meetings were conducted in accordance with the Administrative Process Act and all Guidance.

B. Review of Approved Plans

Henricopolis Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points.

The TRC has reviewed all of the RMPs within the required time (90 days) for revised submittals and requests for additional information.

Clear comments were provided to the plan developer. All of the required information and minimum standards were contained in the RMPs.

Some plan review checklist were not attached in the module. Although not required they are a good way to document the review and TRC/SWCD approval signatures.

C. Verification Inspection of RMPs

Henricopolis Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points.

The TRC conducted a verification inspection when a request was submitted by the producer. All of the required information was complete and a current NMP was submitted and a NMP verification was provided by the NMP planner. The inspection ensured all of the required minimum standards had been completed by the producer.

D. **Compliance Inspection of RMPs**

No compliance inspections are due at this time.

E. Summary/Recommendations

Henricopolis Soil and Water Conservation District has very adequately acted as the RMP program authority. They have excellent records and should be commended for their implementation and promotion of the program. There are no recommendations for the district at this time.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

PART I: General Program Administration Va Reg.4VAC50-70-70, 90 &120

Available points	Earned points	Criteria
10	10	District Board selected an RMP Technical Review Committee
10	10	District Board ensured that any personal or proprietary information collected in association with the RMP program remained confidential and exempt from the Virginia Freedom of Information Act
10	10	All meetings and proceedings are conducted in accordance with the Virginia Administrative Processes Act, other applicable laws and regulations, and Board and Department guidance.
30	30	TOTAL
Comments:		

Comments

PART II: Plan Review Va Reg.4VAC50-70-40, 50 & 70

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	
10	10	All plans were reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
For all plans		for approval, notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90
days of receip		
10	10	100%
5		> 70%
0		< 70%
All disapprov	al notices	included a statement noting all plan deficiencies and specify the modifications, terms,
and condition	s that wou	uld permit approval of the plan
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
		als were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency or listing of RMP
		rithin 45 days of receipt
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved	plans inclu	uded an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved	plans were	e developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
5	5	100%
0		<100%
All approved	plans incli	uded the required components:
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
35	35	All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to land use
		type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).
100	100	TOTAL
		uding a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

*PART III: Verification Inspections Va Reg.4VAC50-70-80 & 90

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	- Oritoria
10	10	All verification inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff
		member
20	20	In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation
10	10	Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance
20	20	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District should approve the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff shall submitted required documentation to DCR for action
20	20	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review
Have the V	oluntary	BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and
		cking module as complete
20	20	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	100	TOTAL
0		in all alians and a second of the official in a month and a health of the TDO/ON/OD and an action of the official in a month of t

Comments: Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

*PART IV: Compliance Inspections Va Reg.4VAC50-70-80 & 90

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	
10	NA	All compliance inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member
5	NA	Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance
25	NA	Following an RMP compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District should submitted required documentation to DCR
		BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and cking module as complete
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
		nspections on all RMPs having been issued a Certificate of RMP Implementation were han once every three years, but not more than annually
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
the Distric	t provided	compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, if the owner or operator and DCR with written documentation that specified the deficiencies wing the field review
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	NA	TOTAL
Comments	s: No con	apliance inspections have been required at this time.

^{*}To be completed if verification or compliance inspections have occurred within the review period



(For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

Program Review Comments:
Suggest including a scan of the plan review and field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures and attaching them in the modules.

Program Reviewer Name/Title	Scott Ambler, RMP Program Manager
	330e
Program Reviewer Signature	



(For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0001

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 9/3/15	
YES	NO	NA*	Criteria			
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee			
Х			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt			
				Rejected of Returned 7/24/15	Approved: Y N	
				Rejected or Returned: 8/20/15	Approved: Y N	
				lejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
X			All disapproval notices and returned plans included adequate comments noting all plan deficiencies and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan			
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and		ficiency or listing of	
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re	ceipt		
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer or			
			by an individual authorized by the RMP developer to include:			
Х			Information on the location of the management unit			
X			Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity			
Х			Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP			
Х			Authorization for the RMP developer for right of entry and access to property and for authorization to obtain copies of any conservation or water quality plans necessary for the assessment			
X			Copies of nutrient management plans, soil conservation plans from NRCS, RMPs, and any other conservation or water quality plan that includes the implementation of BMPs			
X			Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented			
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Cons	servation Planning Application	n Suite	
X			Approved plans included the following components:			
X			A determination of the adequacy of existing BMPs, conservation plans, and water quality plans in meeting the minimum standards set out in 4VAC50-70-40			
Х			A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards			
X			A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards			
Х			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the in the second	minimum standards		
Х			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMI	Ps		
Х			An inclusion of any current nutrient mana conservation or water quality plans that ir			
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to the assessment			
Х			All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).			
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan	•		
Х			Soil Loss to "T"			
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)			
Х			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland an	nd Hayland)		
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)			
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Past	rure)		

Х	Perennial Streams Identified?					
Х	RMP developer indicate method					
COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)						
	,					



(For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0004

Reviev	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 9/3/15		
YES	NO	NA*	Criteria				
Χ			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee				
X Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was co			-		s of receipt		
				Rejected or Returned: 9/3/15	Approved: YN		
			, ,	Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N		
				Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N		
X			All disapproval notices and returned plans included adequate comments noting all plan deficiencies and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan				
·		Χ	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and	a response regarding plan su	fficiency or listing of		
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re	eceipt			
		X	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N		
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N		
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, R	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N		
Χ			Approved plan included an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developed				
			by an individual authorized by the RMP developer to include:				
X			Information on the location of the management unit				
X			 Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity 				
Х			Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP				
Х			4. Authorization for the RMP developer for right of entry and access to property and for authorization to obtain copies of any conservation or water quality plans necessary for the assessment				
X			Copies of nutrient management plans, soil conservation plans from NRCS, RMPs, and any other conservation or water quality plan that includes the implementation of BMPs				
X			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to				
Х			the management unit that are currently implemented Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite				
X			Approved plans included the following components:				
X			A determination of the adequacy of existing BMPs, conservation plans, and water quality plans in meeting the minimum standards set out in 4VAC50-70-40				
X			A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards				
X			A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards				
Х			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards				
Х			5. A schedule for the implementation of BM	Ps			
X			6. An inclusion of any current nutrient management plans, soil conservation plans, and any other conservation or water quality plans that include the implementation of BMPs				
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to the assessment				
X			All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).				
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan	,			
X			Soil Loss to "T"				
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)				
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland ar	nd Hayland)			
	+		, , ,	- ,			
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)				

^	Perennial Streams Identified?
Х	RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0005

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	tt Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 9/3/15	
YES	NO	NA*	Criteria			
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee			
X				vs of receipt		
				Rejected or Returned: 9/3/15	Approved: YN	
				Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
			• •	Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
X			All disapproval notices and returned plans included adequate comments noting all plan deficiencies and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan			
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and	a response regarding plan su	fficiency or listing of	
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re	eceipt		
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, R	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
Χ			Approved plan included an associated assessment document completed by the RMP develope			
			by an individual authorized by the RMP developer to include:			
X			Information on the location of the management unit			
X			Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity			
Х			Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP			
Х			4. Authorization for the RMP developer for right of entry and access to property and for authorization to obtain copies of any conservation or water quality plans necessary for the assessment			
Х			Copies of nutrient management plans, soil conservation plans from NRCS, RMPs, and any other conservation or water quality plan that includes the implementation of BMPs			
Х			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to			
X			the management unit that are currently implemented Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite			
X			Approved plans included the following components:			
X			A determination of the adequacy of existing BMPs, conservation plans, and water quality plans in meeting the minimum standards set out in 4VAC50-70-40			
Х			A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards			
Х			A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards			
Х			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards			
Х			5. A schedule for the implementation of BM	Ps		
X			6. An inclusion of any current nutrient management plans, soil conservation plans, and any other conservation or water quality plans that include the implementation of BMPs			
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to the assessment			
Х			All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).			
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan	,		
X			Soil Loss to "T"			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)			
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland ar	nd Hayland)		
	1	X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	-		

Х			Perennial Streams Identified?		
Х			RMP developer indicate method		
COMM	COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)				



(For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0009

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	tt Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 9/17/15
YES	NO	NA*		Criteria	,
Χ			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Revie	w Committee	
Х			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan wa		s of receipt
				Rejected or Returned: 9/17/15	Approved: YN
			• • •	Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, F	Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			All disapproval notices and returned plans incluand specify the conditions that would permit ap		g all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and		ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re	eceipt	
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Ro	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, R	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assess	ment document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develo		
Χ			Information on the location of the management		
X			Description of the management unit, inclife features, erosion issues, and agricultural		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or ope	rator requesting the RMP	
Х			Authorization for the RMP developer for to obtain copies of any conservation or warring to obtain copies.		
X			5. Copies of nutrient management plans, so conservation or water quality plan that ir	oil conservation plans from NRCS	S, RMPs, and any other
X			Information on the location and status of the management unit that are currently in	all BMPs and other alternative m	
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Con	servation Planning Application	n Suite
Х			Approved plans included the following compo	nents:	
X			A determination of the adequacy of exist meeting the minimum standards set out it		nd water quality plans in
Х			A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards		utilized to meet the
X			A complete list of the BMPs that the own the minimum standards	er or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Χ			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the	minimum standards	
Х			A schedule for the implementation of BM	Ps	
Х			An inclusion of any current nutrient mana conservation or water quality plans that in		
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to the		
X			All approved plans included required minimun (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastu		land use type
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Х			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland a	nd Hayland)	
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
-		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pas	ture)	

^	Perennial Streams Identified?
Х	RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0010

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	tt Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 9/17/15
YES	NO	NA*		Criteria	,
Χ			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Revie	w Committee	
Х			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan wa		s of receipt
				Rejected or Returned: 9/17/15	Approved: YN
			• • •	Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, F	Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			All disapproval notices and returned plans incluand specify the conditions that would permit ap		g all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and		ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re	eceipt	
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Ro	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, R	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assess	ment document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develo		
Χ			Information on the location of the management		
X			Description of the management unit, inclife features, erosion issues, and agricultural		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or ope	rator requesting the RMP	
Х			Authorization for the RMP developer for to obtain copies of any conservation or warring to obtain copies.		
X			5. Copies of nutrient management plans, so conservation or water quality plan that ir	oil conservation plans from NRCS	S, RMPs, and any other
X			Information on the location and status of the management unit that are currently in	all BMPs and other alternative m	
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Con	servation Planning Application	n Suite
Х			Approved plans included the following compo	nents:	
X			A determination of the adequacy of exist meeting the minimum standards set out it		nd water quality plans in
Х			A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards		utilized to meet the
X			A complete list of the BMPs that the own the minimum standards	er or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Х			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the	minimum standards	
Х			A schedule for the implementation of BM	Ps	
Х			An inclusion of any current nutrient mana conservation or water quality plans that in		
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to the		
X			All approved plans included required minimun (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastu		land use type
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Х			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland a	nd Hayland)	
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
-		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pas	ture)	

Х			Perennial Streams Identified?		
Х			RMP developer indicate method		
COMM	COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)				



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0005 Date Approved: 9/3/15 Date Certified: 2/1/19

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

YES	NO	NA	Criteria		
X			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member		
X			In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation		
X			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module		
X			Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance		
X			Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection		
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
X			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion		
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)		
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)		
		X	Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
X			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action		
		х	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review		
Х			Has the inspection document been attached in the module		

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0010 Date Approved: 9/17/15 Date Certified: 3/18/19

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

YES	NO	NA	Criteria	
Х			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member	
Х			In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation	
Χ			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module	
X			Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance	
X			Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection	
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan	
X			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion	
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)	
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)	
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)	
		X	Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete	
X			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action	
		X	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	
Х			Has the inspection document been attached in the module	

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Matthew J. Strickler Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources and Chief Resilience Officer

Clyde E. Cristman *Director*



Rochelle Altholz Deputy Director of Administration and Finance

Nathan Burrell
Deputy Director of
Government and Community Relations

Darryl M. Glover Deputy Director for Dam Safety, Flood Preparedness, and Soil & Water Conservation

Thomas L. Smith
Deputy Director of
Operations

September 23, 2021

Mr. Kochensparger, Chair Monacan Soil and Water Conservation District Post Office Box 66 Goochland, Virginia 23063

Dear Mr. Kochensparger:

As you may be aware, the Department of Conservation and Recreation (Department) conducts program review related to the duties of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (Districts) in implementing the Resource Management Plan Program. The results of the program reviews are shared with the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board. This year, a program review was conducted for the Monacan Soil and Water Conservation District.

The Board and the Department wish to commend the District Board and District staff for all of their time and efforts related to implementing the Resource Management Plan Program (Program). As shown by the program review results, your District has exceeded expectations in administering and promoting this critical Program.

Thank you again for all of the District's assistance to agricultural producers and citizens and for all the District's efforts to improve Virginia's water quality.

Sincerely

Charles A. Arnason, Chair Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board Clyde E. Cristman, Director Department of Conservation and Recreation

cc: Keith Burgess, District Manager

Matthew J. Strickler Secretary of Natural Resources

Clyde E. Cristman *Director*



Rochelle Altholz Deputy Director of Administration and Finance

Russell W. Baxter
Deputy Director of
Dam Safety & Floodplain
Management and Soil & Water
Conservation

Nathan Burrell
Deputy Director of
Government and Community Relations

Thomas L. Smith

Deputy Director of

Operations

August 4, 2021

John Kochensparger (Chm.) PO Box 113 Powhatan, VA 23139

Dear Mr. Kochensparger:

On June 23, 2021, staff from the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) Resource Management Plan (RMP) program conducted a required periodic review of the RMP duties performed by Monacan SWCD. Program reviews consist of a personal interview between the Department and the District staff, a review of the District files and other applicable documents, a review of a sample of the RMPs approved by the District Board, review of the certification and compliance inspections (if applicable), and a review of the information entered into the DCR Conservation Planning Suite.

I have attached the draft program review documents for your review and comments. Below is a summary of the results.

Results of the Program Review

A. General Program Administration

Monacan Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 30 out of a possible 30 points. The district has established a Technical Review Committee (TRC). All information is protected from FOIA as required. Technical Review Committee and district board meetings were conducted in accordance with the Administrative Process Act and all Guidance.

B. Review of Approved Plans

Monacan Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points. The TRC has reviewed all of the RMPs within the required time (90 days) for revised submittals and requests for additional information.

Clear comments were provided to the plan developer. All of the required information and minimum standards were contained in the RMPs.

C. Verification Inspection of RMPs

Monacan Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points. The TRC conducted a verification inspection when a request was submitted by the producer. All of the required information was complete and a current NMP was submitted and a NMP verification was provided by the NMP planner. The inspection ensured all of the required minimum standards had been completed by the producer.

D. Compliance Inspection of RMPs

No compliance inspections are due at this time.

E. Summary/Recommendations

Monacan Soil and Water Conservation District has very adequately acted as the RMP program authority. They should be commended for their implementation and promotion of the program. There are no recommendations for the district at this time.

The results of this review will be presented to the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board at the September meeting. Should you have any questions or comments on the program review, please contact me at 540 416-5347.

Sincerely,

Landon Ambler

Resource Management Plan Program Coordinator

Cc

Keith Burgess, Conservation Specialist/ District Manager PO Box 66 Goochland, VA 23063



Review of Monacan Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Implementation of the Resource Management Plan (RMP) Program

The review of local program effectiveness is a responsibility of the Department of Conservation and Recreation as defined by Virginia RMP Regulations (4VAC50-70-130.), which states that the

"The Department shall periodically conduct a comprehensive review of the RMP duties performed by each soil and water conservation district to evaluate whether requirements set forth by this chapter have been satisfactorily fulfilled. The department shall develop a schedule for conducting periodic reviews and evaluations. Each District shall receive a comprehensive review at least once every five years; however, the Department may impose more frequent, partial, or comprehensive reviews with cause. Such reviews where applicable shall be coordinated with those being implemented by agency staff for other purposes that may include annual spot checks of BMPs implemented by districts through the Virginia Agricultural BMP Cost Share Program."

Programmatic requirements for a District are set out in the RMP regulations contained in 4VAC-50-70 et. seq. Specific checklists address the criteria for RMP program administration, RMP plan review, and RMP inspections.

The following approved Resource Management Plans were selected as part of this program review:

- 1. RMP-38-15-0001
- 2. RMP-38-15-0004
- 3. RMP-38-15-0005
- 4. RMP-38-15-0006
- 5. RMP-38-15-0007

The following Resource Management Plans Verification Inspections were reviewed as part of this program review:

- 1. RMP-38-15-0004
- 2. RMP-38-15-0005

The following Resource Management Plans Compliance Inspections were reviewed as part of this program review:

No compliance inspections are required at this time

Program reviews will consist of a personal interview between the Department and the District staff, a review of the District files and other applicable documents, a review of a sample of the RMPs approved by the District Board, review of the certification and compliance inspections (if applicable), and a review of the information entered into the DCR Conservation Planning Suite. Individual checklists will be used for each plan selected during the program review. A plan review, inspection review, and compliance review checklist will be used to determine that the selected RMPs were reviewed, approved, and inspected by the District in accordance with the RMP regulations. Each District will then be evaluated with a rating worksheet which reflects combined results from the individual checklists. Programs receiving a score of 70 percent or greater in each of the four review areas will be considered to have satisfactorily fulfilled their RMP duties. If one or more of the four program review areas receive a score of less than 70 percent, a program will be considered to have not satisfactorily fulfilled their RMP duties.

Results of the Program Review

A. General Program Administration

Monacan Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 30 out of a possible 30 points.

The district has established a Technical Review Committee (TRC). All information is protected from FOIA as required. Technical Review Committee and district board meetings were conducted in accordance with the Administrative Process Act and all Guidance.

B. Review of Approved Plans

Monacan Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points.

The TRC has reviewed all of the RMPs within the required time (90 days) for revised submittals and requests for additional information.

Clear comments were provided to the plan developer. All of the required information and minimum standards were contained in the RMPs.

Some plan review checklist were not attached in the module. Although not required they are a good way to document the review and TRC/SWCD approval signatures.

C. Verification Inspection of RMPs

Monacan Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points.

The TRC conducted a verification inspection when a request was submitted by the producer. All of the required information was complete and a current NMP was submitted and a NMP verification was provided by the NMP planner. The inspection ensured all of the required minimum standards had been completed by the producer.

Some verification inspection checklist were not attached in the module. Although not required they are a good way to document the inspectio and TRC/SWCD approval signatures.

D. Compliance Inspection of RMPs

No compliance inspections are due at this time.

E. Summary/Recommendations

Monacan Soil and Water Conservation District has very adequately acted as the RMP program authority. They have excellent records and should be commended for their implementation and promotion of the program. There are no recommendations for the district at this time.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

PART I: General Program Administration Va Reg.4VAC50-70-70, 90 &120

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	
10	10	District Board selected an RMP Technical Review Committee
10	10	District Board ensured that any personal or proprietary information collected in association with the RMP program remained confidential and exempt from the Virginia Freedom of Information Act
10	10	All meetings and proceedings are conducted in accordance with the Virginia Administrative Processes Act, other applicable laws and regulations, and Board and Department guidance.
30	30	TOTAL
Comments:		

PART II: Plan Review Va Reg.4VAC50-70-40, 50 & 70

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	
10	10	All plans were reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
For all plans s	ubmitted	for approval, notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90
days of receip	t	
10	10	100%
5		> 70%
0		< 70%
		included a statement noting all plan deficiencies and specify the modifications, terms,
and conditions	s that woเ	ıld permit approval of the plan
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
		als were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency or listing of RMP
deficiencies p		ithin 45 days of receipt
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved p	olans inclu	uded an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved p	olans were	e developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
5	5	100%
0		<100%
All approved p	olans inclu	uded the required components:
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
35	35	All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to land use
		type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).
100	100	TOTAL
Comments: Su	uggest incl	uding a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

*PART III: Verification Inspections Va Reg.4VAC50-70-80 & 90

Earned	Criteria
points	
10	All verification inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff
	member
20	In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated
	SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation
10	Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at
	least 48 hours in advance
20	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and
	fully implemented, the District should approve the RMP for certification. The District
	and/or designated SWCD staff shall submitted required documentation to DCR for action
20	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or
	NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written
	documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review
oluntary	BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and
o the trac	king module as complete
20	100%
	>70%
	<70%
100	TOTAL
	points 10 20 10 20 20 20 oluntary of the trace 20

Comments: Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

*PART IV: Compliance Inspections Va Reg.4VAC50-70-80 & 90

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	
10	NA	All compliance inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member
5	NA	Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance
25	NA	Following an RMP compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District should submitted required documentation to DCR
		BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and cking module as complete
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
		nspections on all RMPs having been issued a Certificate of RMP Implementation were han once every three years, but not more than annually
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
the Distric	t provided	compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, if the owner or operator and DCR with written documentation that specified the deficiencies wing the field review
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	NA	TOTAL
Comments	s: No con	apliance inspections have been required at this time.

^{*}To be completed if verification or compliance inspections have occurred within the review period



(For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

Program Review Comments:
Suggest including a scan of the plan review and field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures and attaching them in the modules.

Program Reviewer Name/Title	Scott Ambler, RMP Program Manager
Program Reviewer Signature	33Ce



(For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0001

Reviev	wed By	y: Scot	tt Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 3/28/16
YES	NO	NA*	Criteria	Ph
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee	
Χ			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 day	s of receipt
			1st Date Submitted: 8/13/15 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 11/13/15	Approved: Y N
			2 nd Date Submitted: 1/14/16 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 3/4/16	Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: 3/11/16 Date Approved Rejected or Returned: 3/28/16	Approved: Y N
Х			All disapproval notices and returned plans included adequate comments noting and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan	g all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan suf	ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of receipt	
		X	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		X	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessment document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP developer to include:	
X			Information on the location of the management unit	
X			Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, e features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity	nvironmentally sensitive
X			Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP	
X			 Authorization for the RMP developer for right of entry and access to prop- to obtain copies of any conservation or water quality plans necessary for 	
X			Copies of nutrient management plans, soil conservation plans from NRCS conservation or water quality plan that includes the implementation of BN	
X			Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative m the management unit that are currently implemented	easures applicable to
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application	n Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:	
Х			 A determination of the adequacy of existing BMPs, conservation plans, a meeting the minimum standards set out in 4VAC50-70-40 	
X			A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be minimum standards	
X			 A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to impleme the minimum standards 	ent or maintain to meet
X			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards	
X			A schedule for the implementation of BMPs	
X			An inclusion of any current nutrient management plans, soil conservation conservation or water quality plans that include the implementation of BM	
X			Other information collected pursuant to the assessment	
X			All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).	land use type
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan	
Χ			Soil Loss to "T"	
Х			Cover Crops (Cropland)	
		Х	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)	
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	
		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)	

X		Perennial Streams Identified?
X		RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0004

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 3/28/16
YES	NO	NA*	Cr	iteria	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review	Committee	
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was		s of receipt
				ected or Returned: 11/13/15	Approved: Y (N)
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ected or Returned: 3/4/16	Approved: Y N
				ected or Returned: 3/28/16	Approved: Y N
X			All disapproval notices and returned plans include and specify the conditions that would permit appr		g all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a	response regarding plan suf	ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of reco	eipt	
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Reje	cted or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Reje	cted or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Reje	ected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessme	ent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develope	r to include:	
Х			 Information on the location of the manager 	nent unit	
Χ			Description of the management unit, includ features, erosion issues, and agricultural action		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or operat	or requesting the RMP	
X			Authorization for the RMP developer for rig to obtain copies of any conservation or wat		
X			Copies of nutrient management plans, soil conservation or water quality plan that inclinate the conservation of the conse	conservation plans from NRCS	S, RMPs, and any other
Χ			Information on the location and status of all the management unit that are currently imp	BMPs and other alternative m	
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conse	rvation Planning Application	n Suite
Х			Approved plans included the following compone	nts:	
Χ			A determination of the adequacy of existing meeting the minimum standards set out in a set out.		nd water quality plans in
Х			A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards		
Χ			 A complete list of the BMPs that the owner the minimum standards 		ent or maintain to meet
Х			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the mi	nimum standards	
X			A schedule for the implementation of BMPs		
X			An inclusion of any current nutrient manage conservation or water quality plans that included		
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to the	assessment	
Х			All approved plans included required minimum s (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture		land use type
Χ			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Х			Soil Loss to "T"		
Χ			Cover Crops (Cropland)		
Χ			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and	Hayland)	
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pastur	e)	<u> </u>

X		Perennial Streams Identified?
X		RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0005

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 3/28/16
YES	NO	NA*	C	riteria	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review	Committee	
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was		s of receipt
				ejected or Returned: 11/13/15	Approved: Y (N)
				ejected or Returned: 3/4/16	Approved: Y N
				jected or Returned: 3/28/16	Approved: Y N
X			All disapproval notices and returned plans includ and specify the conditions that would permit app	•	g all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a	response regarding plan suf	ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of rec	eipt	
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Reje	ected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Reje	ected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rej	ected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Χ			Approved plan included an associated assessm	ent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP developed		
X			 Information on the location of the manage 		
X			Description of the management unit, include features, erosion issues, and agricultural a		nvironmentally sensitive
Χ			Contact information for the owner or opera	tor requesting the RMP	
Х			 Authorization for the RMP developer for rig to obtain copies of any conservation or wat 		
Χ			Copies of nutrient management plans, soil conservation or water quality plan that incl	conservation plans from NRCS	S, RMPs, and any other
Х			Information on the location and status of al the management unit that are currently imp		neasures applicable to
Χ			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conse	ervation Planning Application	n Suite
Χ			Approved plans included the following compone	ents:	
Х			 A determination of the adequacy of existin meeting the minimum standards set out in 	4VAC50-70-40	
Х			 A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards 	in the assessment that will be	utilized to meet the
Χ			 A complete list of the BMPs that the owner the minimum standards 	or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
X			 A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the m 	inimum standards	
X			A schedule for the implementation of BMPs	s	
X			An inclusion of any current nutrient manage conservation or water quality plans that inc		
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to the		
X			All approved plans included required minimum s (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture		land use type
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Χ			Soil Loss to "T"		
Χ			Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		Χ	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and	l Hayland)	
		Χ	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pastu	re)	

Χ		Perennial Streams Identified?
X		RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0006

Reviev	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 3/28/16
YES	NO	NA*	Criteria	
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee	
Χ			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 day	ys of receipt
			1st Date Submitted: 8/13/15 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 11/13/15	Approved: Y N
			2 nd Date Submitted: 1/14/16 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 3/4/16	Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: 3/11/16 Date Approved Rejected or Returned: 3/28/16	Approved: Y N
X			All disapproval notices and returned plans included adequate comments noting and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan	ng all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan su	fficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of receipt	
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessment document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP developer to include:	
X			Information on the location of the management unit	
Х			Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, e features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity	environmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP	
Х			 Authorization for the RMP developer for right of entry and access to prop to obtain copies of any conservation or water quality plans necessary for 	
Х			Copies of nutrient management plans, soil conservation plans from NRC conservation or water quality plan that includes the implementation of BI	
Х			Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative r the management unit that are currently implemented	
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Applicatio	n Suite
Х			Approved plans included the following components:	
X			 A determination of the adequacy of existing BMPs, conservation plans, a meeting the minimum standards set out in 4VAC50-70-40 	and water quality plans in
Х			 A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be minimum standards 	utilized to meet the
Х			 A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement the minimum standards 	ent or maintain to meet
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards	
Х			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs	
X			An inclusion of any current nutrient management plans, soil conservation conservation or water quality plans that include the implementation of BN	
X			7. Other information collected pursuant to the assessment	
Х			All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).	land use type
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan	
Х			Soil Loss to "T"	
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)	
		Х	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)	
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	
	1	X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)	

Χ		Perennial Streams Identified?
X		RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0007

Reviev	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 3/28/16
YES	NO	NA*	C	riteria	1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review	/ Committee	
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was		s of receipt
				ejected or Returned: 11/13/15	Approved: Y (N)
			• •	ejected or Returned: 3/4/16	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned: 3/28/16	Approved: Y N
Х			All disapproval notices and returned plans include and specify the conditions that would permit app		g all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a	response regarding plan suf	ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of red	ceipt	
		X	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rej	ected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		X	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rej	ected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessm	nent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develop		
X			 Information on the location of the manage 	ement unit	
Х			Description of the management unit, include features, erosion issues, and agricultural a		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or operation	ator requesting the RMP	
Х			Authorization for the RMP developer for right to obtain copies of any conservation or was a conservation or was a conservation.		
Х			Copies of nutrient management plans, soi conservation or water quality plan that inc	I conservation plans from NRCS	S, RMPs, and any other
Х			Information on the location and status of a the management unit that are currently im	II BMPs and other alternative m	
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Cons	ervation Planning Application	n Suite
Х			Approved plans included the following compon	ents:	
X			A determination of the adequacy of existing meeting the minimum standards set out in		nd water quality plans in
X			A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards		utilized to meet the
X			 A complete list of the BMPs that the owne the minimum standards 	r or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Х			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the n	ninimum standards	
Х			A schedule for the implementation of BMP	² s	
Х			An inclusion of any current nutrient manage conservation or water quality plans that includes the conservation or water quality plans that includes the conservation or water quality plans that includes the conservation of		
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to the		
Х			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastur		land use type
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan	•	
Х			Soil Loss to "T"		
<u> </u>		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
Х			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and	d Hayland)	
<u> </u>		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	1	X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pastu	uro)	

Χ		Perennial Streams Identified?
X		RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0004 Date Approved: 3/28/16 Date Certified: 5/30/19

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

	,				
YES	NO	NA	Criteria		
X			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member		
Х			In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation		
X			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module		
X			Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance		
Х			Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection		
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
X			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion		
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)		
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)		
		X	Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
X			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action		
×		х	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review		
			Has the inspection document been attached in the module		

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0005 Date Approved: 3/28/16 Date Certified: 5/30/19

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

YES	NO	NA	Criteria
Х			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member
Х			In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation
Χ			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module
X			Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance
			Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs
X			and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty
			crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan
Х			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)
		X	Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete
X			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action
		х	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review
Х			Has the inspection document been attached in the module

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.

Matthew J. Strickler Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources and Chief Resilience Officer

Clyde E. Cristman *Director*



Rochelle Altholz Deputy Director of Administration and Finance

Nathan Burrell
Deputy Director of
Government and Community Relations

Darryl M. Glover Deputy Director for Dam Safety, Flood Preparedness, and Soil & Water Conservation

Thomas L. Smith
Deputy Director of
Operations

September 23, 2021

Mr. Ronnie Lewis, Chair Tidewater Soil and Water Conservation District Post Office Box 677 Gloucester, Virginia 23061

Dear Mr. Lewis:

As you may be aware, the Department of Conservation and Recreation (Department) conducts program review related to the duties of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (Districts) in implementing the Resource Management Plan Program. The results of the program reviews are shared with the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board. This year, a program review was conducted for the Tidewater Soil and Water Conservation District.

The Board and the Department wish to commend the District Board and District staff for all of their time and efforts related to implementing the Resource Management Plan Program (Program). As shown by the program review results, your District has exceeded expectations in administering and promoting this critical Program.

Thank you again for all of the District's assistance to agricultural producers and citizens and for all the District's efforts to improve Virginia's water quality.

Sincerely

Charles A. Arnason, Chair Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board Clyde E. Cristman, Director Department of Conservation and Recreation

cc: LaVerne Calhoun, District Manager

Matthew J. Strickler Secretary of Natural Resources

Clyde E. Cristman *Director*



Deputy Director of Administration and Finance

Rochelle Altholz

Russell W. Baxter
Deputy Director of
Dam Safety & Floodplain
Management and Soil & Water
Conservation

Nathan Burrell
Deputy Director of
Government and Community Relations

Thomas L. Smith

Deputy Director of

Operations

August 4, 2021

Ronnie Lewis (Chm) 1535 Buckley Hall Road Dutton, VA 23050

Dear Mr. Lewis:

On June 23, 2021, staff from the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) Resource Management Plan (RMP) program conducted a required periodic review of the RMP duties performed by Tidewater SWCD. Program reviews consist of a personal interview between the Department and the District staff, a review of the District files and other applicable documents, a review of a sample of the RMPs approved by the District Board, review of the certification and compliance inspections (if applicable), and a review of the information entered into the DCR Conservation Planning Suite.

I have attached the draft program review documents for your review and comments. Below is a summary of the results.

Results of the Program Review

A. General Program Administration

Tidewater Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 30 out of a possible 30 points. The district has established a Technical Review Committee (TRC). All information is protected from FOIA as required. Technical Review Committee and district board meetings were conducted in accordance with the Administrative Process Act and all Guidance.

B. Review of Approved Plans

Tidewater Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points. The TRC has reviewed all of the RMPs within the required time (90 days) for revised submittals and requests for additional information.

Clear comments were provided to the plan developer. All of the required information and minimum standards were contained in the RMPs.

C. Verification Inspection of RMPs

Tidewater Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points. The TRC conducted a verification inspection when a request was submitted by the producer. All of the required information was complete and a current NMP was submitted and a NMP verification was provided by the NMP planner. The inspection ensured all of the required minimum standards had been completed by the producer.

D. Compliance Inspection of RMPs

No compliance inspections are due at this time.

E. Summary/Recommendations

Tidewater Soil and Water Conservation District has very adequately acted as the RMP program authority. They should be commended for their implementation and promotion of the program. There are no recommendations for the district at this time.

The results of this review will be presented to the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board at the September meeting. Should you have any questions or comments on the program review, please contact me at 540 416-5347.

Sincerely,

Landon Ambler

Resource Management Plan Program Coordinator

Cc:

LaVerne Calhoun (District Manager) PO Box 677 Gloucester, VA 23061



Review of Tidewater Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Implementation of the Resource Management Plan (RMP) Program

The review of local program effectiveness is a responsibility of the Department of Conservation and Recreation as defined by Virginia RMP Regulations (4VAC50-70-130.), which states that the

"The Department shall periodically conduct a comprehensive review of the RMP duties performed by each soil and water conservation district to evaluate whether requirements set forth by this chapter have been satisfactorily fulfilled. The department shall develop a schedule for conducting periodic reviews and evaluations. Each District shall receive a comprehensive review at least once every five years; however, the Department may impose more frequent, partial, or comprehensive reviews with cause. Such reviews where applicable shall be coordinated with those being implemented by agency staff for other purposes that may include annual spot checks of BMPs implemented by districts through the Virginia Agricultural BMP Cost Share Program."

Programmatic requirements for a District are set out in the RMP regulations contained in 4VAC-50-70 et. seq. Specific checklists address the criteria for RMP program administration, RMP plan review, and RMP inspections.

The following approved Resource Management Plans were selected as part of this program review:

- 1. RMP-1-18-0001
- 2. RMP-1-18-0003
- 3. RMP-1-18-0004
- 4. RMP-1-18-0005
- 5. RMP-1-19-0001

The following Resource Management Plans Verification Inspections were reviewed as part of this program review:

- 1. RMP-1-18-0001
- 2. RMP-1-18-0003
- 3. RMP-1-18-0004
- 4. RMP-1-18-0005
- 5. RMP-1-19-0001

The following Resource Management Plans Compliance Inspections were reviewed as part of this program review:

No compliance inspections are required at this time

Program reviews will consist of a personal interview between the Department and the District staff, a review of the District files and other applicable documents, a review of a sample of the RMPs approved by the District Board, review of the certification and compliance inspections (if applicable), and a review of the information entered into the DCR Conservation Planning Suite. Individual checklists will be used for each plan selected during the program review. A plan review, inspection review, and compliance review checklist will be used to determine that the selected RMPs were reviewed, approved, and inspected by the District in accordance with the RMP regulations. Each District will then be evaluated with a rating worksheet which reflects combined results from the individual checklists. Programs receiving a score of 70 percent or greater in each of the four review areas will be considered to have satisfactorily fulfilled their RMP duties. If one or more of the four program review areas receive a score of less than 70 percent, a program will be considered to have not satisfactorily fulfilled their RMP duties.

Results of the Program Review

A. General Program Administration

Tidewater Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 30 out of a possible 30 points.

The district has established a Technical Review Committee (TRC). All information is protected from FOIA as required. Technical Review Committee and district board meetings were conducted in accordance with the Administrative Process Act and all Guidance.

B. Review of Approved Plans

Tidewater Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points.

The TRC has reviewed all of the RMPs within the required time (90 days) for revised submittals and requests for additional information.

Clear comments were provided to the plan developer. All of the required information and minimum standards were contained in the RMPs.

Some plan review checklist were not attached in the module. Although not required they are a good way to document the review and TRC/SWCD approval signatures.

C. Verification Inspection of RMPs

Tidewater Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points.

The TRC conducted a verification inspection when a request was submitted by the producer. All of the required information was complete and a current NMP was submitted and a NMP verification was provided by the NMP planner. The inspection ensured all of the required minimum standards had been completed by the producer.

Some verification inspection checklist were not attached in the module. Although not required they are a good way to document the inspection and TRC/SWCD approval signatures.

D. **Compliance Inspection of RMPs**

No compliance inspections are due at this time.

E. Summary/Recommendations

Tidewater Soil and Water Conservation District has very adequately acted as the RMP program authority. They have excellent records and should be commended for their implementation and promotion of the program. There are no recommendations for the district at this time.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

PART I: General Program Administration Va Reg.4VAC50-70-70, 90 &120

Available points	Earned points	Criteria
10	10	District Board selected an RMP Technical Review Committee
10	10	District Board ensured that any personal or proprietary information collected in association with the RMP program remained confidential and exempt from the Virginia Freedom of Information Act
10	10	All meetings and proceedings are conducted in accordance with the Virginia Administrative Processes Act, other applicable laws and regulations, and Board and Department guidance.
30	30	TOTAL
Comments:		

Comments

PART II: Plan Review Va Reg.4VAC50-70-40, 50 & 70

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	
10	10	All plans were reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
For all plans	submitted	for approval, notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90
days of recei		
10	10	100%
5		> 70%
0		< 70%
All disapprov	al notices	included a statement noting all plan deficiencies and specify the modifications, terms,
and condition	าร that woเ	uld permit approval of the plan
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
		als were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency or listing of RMP
deficiencies	provided w	rithin 45 days of receipt
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved	plans inclu	uded an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved	plans were	e developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
5	5	100%
0		<100%
All approved	plans incl	uded the required components:
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
35	35	All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to land use
		type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).
100	100	TOTAL
Comments: S	Suggest incl	uding a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

*PART III: Verification Inspections Va Reg.4VAC50-70-80 & 90

Earned	Criteria
points	
10	All verification inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff
	member
20	In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated
	SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation
10	Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at
	least 48 hours in advance
20	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and
	fully implemented, the District should approve the RMP for certification. The District
	and/or designated SWCD staff shall submitted required documentation to DCR for action
20	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or
	NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written
	documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review
oluntary	BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and
o the trac	king module as complete
20	100%
	>70%
	<70%
100	TOTAL
	points 10 20 10 20 20 20 oluntary of the trace 20

Comments: Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

*PART IV: Compliance Inspections Va Reg.4VAC50-70-80 & 90

Available	Earned	Criteria
		Criteria
points	points	
10	NA	All compliance inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff
		member
5	NA	Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance
25	NA	Following an RMP compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and
		fully implemented, the District should submitted required documentation to DCR
		BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and
entered int		king module as complete
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Onsite con	npliance i	nspections on all RMPs having been issued a Certificate of RMP Implementation were
conducted	l no less t	han once every three years, but not more than annually
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Following	an RMP c	ompliance inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented,
		the owner or operator and DCR with written documentation that specified the deficiencies
		wing the field review
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	NA	TOTAL
Comments	No con	ipliance inspections have been required at this time.

^{*}To be completed if verification or compliance inspections have occurred within the review period



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

Program Review Comments:
Suggest including a scan of the plan review and field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures and attaching them in the modules.

Program Reviewer Name/Title	Scott Ambler, RMP Program Manager
Program Reviewer Signature	<i>330</i> e



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0001

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 7/2/18
YES	NO	NA*	(Criteria	+ PP
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review	v Committee	
Х			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan wa		ys of receipt
				ejected of Returned 6/4/18	Approved: Y (N)
				Rejected or Returned: 7/2/18	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	All disapproval notices and returned plans inclu and specify the conditions that would permit ap		ng all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and	a response regarding plan su	fficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re	ceipt	
		X	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		X	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
X			Approved plan included an associated assessn	nent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develop		
X			 Information on the location of the manage 	ement unit	
X			Description of the management unit, inclu features, erosion issues, and agricultural		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or oper	ator requesting the RMP	
Х			Authorization for the RMP developer for ri to obtain copies of any conservation or wa		
X			Copies of nutrient management plans, so conservation or water quality plan that income the conservation or water quality plan that income the conservation or water quality plan that income the conservation of the conserva	il conservation plans from NRC	S, RMPs, and any other
X			Information on the location and status of a the management unit that are currently in	all BMPs and other alternative n	
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Cons		n Suite
Х			Approved plans included the following compor	nents:	
Х			A determination of the adequacy of existi meeting the minimum standards set out ir		and water quality plans in
Х			A complete list of existing BMPs identifie minimum standards		utilized to meet the
Х			A complete list of the BMPs that the owner the minimum standards	er or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Х			 A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the r 	minimum standards	
Χ			A schedule for the implementation of BMF	Ps	
Х			An inclusion of any current nutrient managed conservation or water quality plans that in		
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to th		
Х			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastu	standard practices related to	land use type
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan	•	
Х			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
Х			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland an	d Hayland)	
Х			Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Past	ure)	

^	Perennial Streams Identified?
Х	RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0003

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 7/2/18
YES	NO	NA*		Criteria	
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review	w Committee	
Χ			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan wa		s of receipt
				Rejected of Returned 6/4/18	Approved: Y (N
				Rejected or Returned: 7/2/18	Approved: Y N
				lejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	All disapproval notices and returned plans inclu and specify the conditions that would permit ap		ng all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and	-	fficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re	ceipt	
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, R	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Χ			Approved plan included an associated assessi	nent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develo		
Х			 Information on the location of the manag 	ement unit	
X			Description of the management unit, inclu features, erosion issues, and agricultural		nvironmentally sensitive
Χ			3. Contact information for the owner or oper		
Х			Authorization for the RMP developer for r to obtain copies of any conservation or w		
X			Copies of nutrient management plans, so conservation or water quality plan that in	il conservation plans from NRC	S, RMPs, and any other
X			Information on the location and status of the management unit that are currently in	all BMPs and other alternative n	
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Con-		n Suite
X			Approved plans included the following compo		
X			A determination of the adequacy of exist meeting the minimum standards set out in		and water quality plans in
X			A complete list of existing BMPs identifie minimum standards		utilized to meet the
X			 A complete list of the BMPs that the owner the minimum standards 	er or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Х			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the	minimum standards	
Х			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMI	Ps	
Х			An inclusion of any current nutrient mana conservation or water quality plans that ir		
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to the		
X			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastu	standard practices related to	land use type
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan	,	
X			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland ar	nd Hayland)	
	<u> </u>	X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	• •	
	1	X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Past	ure)	

^	Perennial Streams Identified?
Х	RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0004

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 7/2/18
YES	NO	NA*		Criteria	
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review	w Committee	
Χ			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan wa		s of receipt
				Rejected of Returned 6/4/18	Approved: Y (N
				Rejected or Returned: 7/2/18	Approved: Y N
				lejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	All disapproval notices and returned plans inclu and specify the conditions that would permit ap		ng all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and	-	fficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re	ceipt	
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, R	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Χ			Approved plan included an associated assessi	nent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develo		
Х			 Information on the location of the manag 	ement unit	
X			Description of the management unit, inclu features, erosion issues, and agricultural		nvironmentally sensitive
Χ			3. Contact information for the owner or oper		
Х			Authorization for the RMP developer for r to obtain copies of any conservation or w		
X			Copies of nutrient management plans, so conservation or water quality plan that in	il conservation plans from NRC	S, RMPs, and any other
X			Information on the location and status of the management unit that are currently in	all BMPs and other alternative n	
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Con-		n Suite
X			Approved plans included the following compo		
X			A determination of the adequacy of exist meeting the minimum standards set out in		and water quality plans in
X			A complete list of existing BMPs identifie minimum standards		utilized to meet the
X			 A complete list of the BMPs that the owner the minimum standards 	er or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Х			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the	minimum standards	
Х			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMI	Ps	
Х			An inclusion of any current nutrient mana conservation or water quality plans that ir		
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to the		
X			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastu	standard practices related to	land use type
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan	,	
X			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland ar	nd Hayland)	
	<u> </u>	X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	• •	
	1	X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Past	ure)	

^	Perennial Streams Identified?
Х	RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0005

Reviev	wed By	/: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 7/2/18
YES	NO	NA*	C	 Criteria	1
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review	v Committee	
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was		s of receipt
				ejected of Returned 9/18/18	Approved: Y N
			·	ejected or Returned: 9/26/18	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned: 9/27/18	Approved: Y N
		Х	All disapproval notices and returned plans include and specify the conditions that would permit app	-	g all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a		ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re-	ceipt	
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Χ			Approved plan included an associated assessn	nent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develop		
X			 Information on the location of the manage 	ement unit	
X			Description of the management unit, inclu features, erosion issues, and agricultural a		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or opera	ator requesting the RMP	
Х			Authorization for the RMP developer for ri to obtain copies of any conservation or wa		
Х			Copies of nutrient management plans, soi conservation or water quality plan that inc	l conservation plans from NRC	S, RMPs, and any other
X			Information on the location and status of a the management unit that are currently im	all BMPs and other alternative m	
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Cons	servation Planning Application	n Suite
X			Approved plans included the following component		
X			A determination of the adequacy of existi meeting the minimum standards set out in	ng BMPs, conservation plans, a	nd water quality plans in
X			A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards		utilized to meet the
X			A complete list of the BMPs that the owner the minimum standards	er or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Х			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the r	ninimum standards	
Х			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMF	Ps .	
X			6. An inclusion of any current nutrient manage conservation or water quality plans that in		
Х			7. Other information collected pursuant to the		
X			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture)	standard practices related to	land use type
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan	,	
X			Soil Loss to "T"		
	1	Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and	d Hayland)	
	1	X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)	· ·	

^	Perennial Streams Identified?
Х	RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-19-0001

Reviev	wed B	y: Scot	tt Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 3/28/19	
YES	NO	NA*	Criteria		
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee		
Χ			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt		
			1st Date Submitted: 3/1/19 Date Approved Rejected or Returned: 3/28/19	Approved: Y N	
			2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
		Х	All disapproval notices and returned plans included adequate comments notin and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan	g all plan deficiencies	
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan suf RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of receipt	ficiency or listing of	
		Х	1st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N	
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessment document completed by by an individual authorized by the RMP developer to include:	the RMP developer or	
Х			Information on the location of the management unit		
X			Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, er features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity	nvironmentally sensitive	
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP		
X			Authorization for the RMP developer for right of entry and access to property and for authorization to obtain copies of any conservation or water quality plans necessary for the assessment		
X			5. Copies of nutrient management plans, soil conservation plans from NRCS, RMPs, and any other conservation or water quality plan that includes the implementation of BMPs		
X			Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented		
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite		
Х			Approved plans included the following components:		
X			 A determination of the adequacy of existing BMPs, conservation plans, a meeting the minimum standards set out in 4VAC50-70-40 	nd water quality plans in	
Х			A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be minimum standards	utilized to meet the	
Х			 A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to impleme the minimum standards 	nt or maintain to meet	
Х			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards		
Χ			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs		
Х			An inclusion of any current nutrient management plans, soil conservation conservation or water quality plans that include the implementation of BM		
Х			Other information collected pursuant to the assessment		
Х			All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).		
Χ			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Χ			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Χ	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		Х	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)		
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)		

Х			Perennial Streams Identified?		
Х			RMP developer indicate method		
COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)					



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0001 Date Approved: 7/2/18 Date Certified: 5/30/19

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

YES NO NA						
In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection Current Nutrient Management Plan X Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion X Cover Crops (Cropland) X Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland) X Stream Exclusion (Pasture) X Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture) Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	YES	NO	NA	Criteria		
X SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation X Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module X Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection X Current Nutrient Management Plan X Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion X Cover Crops (Cropland) X Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland) X Stream Exclusion (Pasture) X Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture) X Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture) Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	Χ			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member		
Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection Current Nutrient Management Plan Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion X Cover Crops (Cropland) X Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland) X Stream Exclusion (Pasture) X Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture) Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	X					
Least 48 hours in advance	X			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module		
x and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection X Current Nutrient Management Plan X Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion X Cover Crops (Cropland) X Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland) X Stream Exclusion (Pasture) X Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture) X Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	X					
X Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion X Cover Crops (Cropland) X Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland) X Stream Exclusion (Pasture) X Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture) Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	Х			and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty		
X Cover Crops (Cropland) X Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland) X Stream Exclusion (Pasture) X Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture) X Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	Χ			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
X Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland) X Stream Exclusion (Pasture) X Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture) X Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	Х			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion		
X Stream Exclusion (Pasture) X Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture) X Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review			Χ	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
X Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture) X Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)		
X Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	Χ			Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
X been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review			X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)		
X fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review			X			
X NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review	X			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action		
X Has the inspection document been attached in the module			x	NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review		
	Χ			Has the inspection document been attached in the module		

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0003 Date Approved: 7/2/18 Date Certified: 5/30/19

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

YES	NO	NA	Criteria		
Х			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member		
X			In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation		
Χ			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module		
X			Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance		
			Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs		
X			and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty		
			crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection		
Χ			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Х			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion		
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)		
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)		
		X	Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
Х			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action		
v		х	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review		
Х			Has the inspection document been attached in the module		

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0004 Date Approved: 7/2/18 Date Certified: 4/16/19

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

YES	NO	NA	Criteria		
Х			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member		
Х			In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation		
Χ			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module		
X			Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance		
X			Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection		
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
X			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion		
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)		
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)		
		X	Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
X			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action		
		X	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review		
Х			Has the inspection document been attached in the module		

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0005 Date Approved: 9/27/18 Date Certified: 6/2/20

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

YES	NO	NA	Criteria		
Х			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member		
X			In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation		
Χ			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module		
X			Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance		
			Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs		
X			and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty		
			crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection		
Χ			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Х			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion		
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)		
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)		
		X	Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
Х			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action		
v		х	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review		
Х			Has the inspection document been attached in the module		

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-19-0001 Date Approved: 3/28/19 Date Certified: 6/2/20

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

YES	NO	NA	Criteria		
X			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member		
X			In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation		
Х			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module		
х			Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance		
x			Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection		
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Х			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion		
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		Х	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)		
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		Χ	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)		
		X	Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and		
X			fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or		
			designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action		
			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or		
		X	NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written		
			documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review		
X			Has the inspection document been attached in the module		

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.

Matthew J. Strickler Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources and Chief Resilience Officer

Clyde E. Cristman *Director*



Rochelle Altholz Deputy Director of Administration and Finance

Nathan Burrell
Deputy Director of
Government and Community Relations

Darryl M. Glover Deputy Director for Dam Safety, Flood Preparedness, and Soil & Water Conservation

Thomas L. Smith
Deputy Director of
Operations

September 23, 2021

Ms. Giannina D. Frantz, Chair Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District 4811 Carr Drive Fredericksburg, Virginia 22408

Dear Ms. Frantz:

As you may be aware, the Department of Conservation and Recreation (Department) conducts program review related to the duties of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (Districts) in implementing the Resource Management Plan Program. The results of the program reviews are shared with the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board. This year, a program review was conducted for the Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District.

The Board and the Department wish to commend the District Board and District staff for all of their time and efforts related to implementing the Resource Management Plan Program (Program). As shown by the program review results, your District has exceeded expectations in administering and promoting this critical Program.

Thank you again for all of the District's assistance to agricultural producers and citizens and for all the District's efforts to improve Virginia's water quality.

Sincerely

Charles A. Arnason, Chair Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board Clyde E. Cristman, Director Department of Conservation and Recreation

cc: Marta Perry, District Manager

Matthew J. Strickler Secretary of Natural Resources

Clyde E. Cristman *Director*



Rochelle Altholz Deputy Director of Administration and Finance

Russell W. Baxter
Deputy Director of
Dam Safety & Floodplain
Management and Soil & Water
Conservation

Nathan Burrell
Deputy Director of
Government and Community Relations

Thomas L. Smith Deputy Director of Operations

August 4, 2021

Giannina D. Frantz (Chair) 1109 Century Oak Dr Fredericksburg, VA 22401

Dear Ms. Frantz:

On June 23, 2021, staff from the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) Resource Management Plan (RMP) program conducted a required periodic review of the RMP duties performed by Tri-County/City SWCD. Program reviews consist of a personal interview between the Department and the District staff, a review of the District files and other applicable documents, a review of a sample of the RMPs approved by the District Board, review of the certification and compliance inspections (if applicable), and a review of the information entered into the DCR Conservation Planning Suite.

I have attached the draft program review documents for your review and comments. Below is a summary of the results.

Results of the Program Review

A. General Program Administration

Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 30 out of a possible 30 points. The district has established a Technical Review Committee (TRC). All information is protected from FOIA as required. Technical Review Committee and district board meetings were conducted in accordance with the Administrative Process Act and all Guidance.

B. Review of Approved Plans

Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 95 out of a possible 100 points. The TRC did not reviewed all of the RMPs within the required time (90 days) for revised submittals and requests for additional information. One plan (17-17-0002) was not reviewed for over 180 days. Clear comments were provided to the plan developer. All of the required information and minimum standards were contained in the RMPs.

C. Verification Inspection of RMPs

Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points. The TRC conducted a verification inspection when a request was submitted by the producer. All of the required information was complete and a current NMP was submitted and a NMP verification was provided by the NMP planner. The inspection ensured all of the required minimum standards had been completed by the producer.

D. Compliance Inspection of RMPs

No compliance inspections are due at this time.

E. Summary/Recommendations

Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District has very adequately acted as the RMP program authority. They should be commended for their implementation and promotion of the program. There are no recommendations for the district at this time.

The results of this review will be presented to the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board at the September meeting. Should you have any questions or comments on the program review, please contact me at 540 416-5347.

Sincerely,

Landon Ambler

Resource Management Plan Program Coordinator

Cc:

Marta Perry, District Manager 4811 Carr Drive Fredericksburg, VA 224083



Review of Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Implementation of the Resource Management Plan (RMP) Program

The review of local program effectiveness is a responsibility of the Department of Conservation and Recreation as defined by Virginia RMP Regulations (4VAC50-70-130.), which states that the

"The Department shall periodically conduct a comprehensive review of the RMP duties performed by each soil and water conservation district to evaluate whether requirements set forth by this chapter have been satisfactorily fulfilled. The department shall develop a schedule for conducting periodic reviews and evaluations. Each District shall receive a comprehensive review at least once every five years; however, the Department may impose more frequent, partial, or comprehensive reviews with cause. Such reviews where applicable shall be coordinated with those being implemented by agency staff for other purposes that may include annual spot checks of BMPs implemented by districts through the Virginia Agricultural BMP Cost Share Program."

Programmatic requirements for a District are set out in the RMP regulations contained in 4VAC-50-70 et. seq. Specific checklists address the criteria for RMP program administration, RMP plan review, and RMP inspections.

The following approved Resource Management Plans were selected as part of this program review:

- 1. RMP-17-17-0002
- 2. RMP-17-18-0001
- 3. RMP-17-18-0002
- 4. RMP-17-18-0005
- 5. RMP-17-20-0003

The following Resource Management Plans Verification Inspections were reviewed as part of this program review:

1. RMP-17-17-0002

The following Resource Management Plans Compliance Inspections were reviewed as part of this program review:

No compliance inspections are required at this time

Program reviews will consist of a personal interview between the Department and the District staff, a review of the District files and other applicable documents, a review of a sample of the RMPs approved by the District Board, review of the certification and compliance inspections (if applicable), and a review of the information entered into the DCR Conservation Planning Suite. Individual checklists will be used for each plan selected during the program review. A plan review, inspection review, and compliance review checklist will be used to determine that the selected RMPs were reviewed, approved, and inspected by the District in accordance with the RMP regulations. Each District will then be evaluated with a rating worksheet which reflects combined results from the individual checklists. Programs receiving a score of 70 percent or greater in each of the four review areas will be considered to have satisfactorily fulfilled their RMP duties. If one or more of the four program review areas receive a score of less than 70 percent, a program will be considered to have not satisfactorily fulfilled their RMP duties.

Results of the Program Review

A. General Program Administration

Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 30 out of a possible 30 points.

The district has established a Technical Review Committee (TRC). All information is protected from FOIA as required. Technical Review Committee and district board meetings were conducted in accordance with the Administrative Process Act and all Guidance.

B. Review of Approved Plans

Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 95 out of a possible 100 points.

The TRC did not reviewed all of the RMPs within the required time (90 days) for revised submittals and requests for additional information. One plan (17-17-0002) was not reviewed for almost six months.

Clear comments were provided to the plan developer. All of the required information and minimum standards were contained in the RMPs.

C. Verification Inspection of RMPs

Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District receive a score of 100 out of a possible 100 points.

The TRC conducted a verification inspection when a request was submitted by the producer. All of the required information was complete and a current NMP was submitted and a NMP verification was provided by the NMP planner. The inspection ensured all of the required minimum standards had been completed by the producer.

Some verification inspection checklist were not attached in the module. Although not required they are a good way to document the inspection and TRC/SWCD approval signatures.

D. Compliance Inspection of RMPs

No compliance inspections are due at this time.

E. Summary/Recommendations

Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District has very adequately acted as the RMP program authority. They have excellent records and should be commended for their implementation and promotion of the program. There are no recommendations for the district at this time.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

PART I: General Program Administration Va Reg.4VAC50-70-70, 90 &120

Available	Earned	Criteria
		Criteria
points	points	
10	10	District Board selected an RMP Technical Review Committee
10	10	District Board ensured that any personal or proprietary information collected in
		association with the RMP program remained confidential and exempt from the Virginia
		Freedom of Information Act
10	10	All meetings and proceedings are conducted in accordance with the Virginia
		Administrative Processes Act, other applicable laws and regulations, and Board and
		Department guidance.
30	30	TOTAL
Comments:		

Comments

PART II: Plan Review Va Reg.4VAC50-70-40, 50 & 70

7 (1 C) 11. 1 1411 1 C	view vai	teg.4 v 1000 10 40, 00 ti 10		
Available	Earned	Criteria		
points	points			
10	10	All plans were reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee		
For all plans submitted for approval, notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90				
days of receip	t			
10		100%		
5	5	> 70%		
0		< 70%		
		included a statement noting all plan deficiencies and specify the modifications, terms, ald permit approval of the plan		
10	10	100%		
5	10	>70%		
0		<70%		
	n submitt	als were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency or listing of RMP		
		rithin 45 days of receipt		
10	10	100%		
5		>70%		
0		<70%		
All approved p	lans inclu	uded an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer		
10	10	100%		
5		>70%		
0		<70%		
All approved p	lans were	e developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite		
5	5	100%		
0		<100%		
All approved p	lans inclu	uded the required components:		
10	10	100%		
5		>70%		
0		<70%		
35	35	All approved plans included required minimum standard practices related to land use		
		type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture).		
100	95	TOTAL		
Comments: Pl	an 17-17-C	0002 was not reviewed for over 180 days.		



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

*PART III: Verification Inspections Va Reg.4VAC50-70-80 & 90

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	
10	10	All verification inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff
		member
20	20	In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated
		SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation
10	10	Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at
		least 48 hours in advance
20	20	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and
		fully implemented, the District should approve the RMP for certification. The District
		and/or designated SWCD staff shall submitted required documentation to DCR for action
20	20	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or
		NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written
		documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review
Have the V	/oluntary	BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and
entered in	to the trac	cking module as complete
20	20	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	100	TOTAL
Comments	S :	



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

*PART IV: Compliance Inspections Va Reg.4VAC50-70-80 & 90

Available	Earned	Criteria
points	points	Ontona
10	NA	All compliance inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member
5	NA	Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance
25	NA	Following an RMP compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District should submitted required documentation to DCR
		BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and cking module as complete
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
		nspections on all RMPs having been issued a Certificate of RMP Implementation were
20	NA	han once every three years, but not more than annually 100%
	NA	100% >70%
10 0		<pre></pre> <pre><70%</pre>
J	on DMD o	
		compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented,
		d the owner or operator and DCR with written documentation that specified the deficiencies
		wing the field review
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	NA	TOTAL
Comments	: No con	ipliance inspections have been required at this time.

^{*}To be completed if verification or compliance inspections have occurred within the review period



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

Reviewed By:Scott Ambler/Barbara Mcgarry

Program Reviewer Signature

Review Date: 6/23/21

Program Review Comments:						
Program Reviewer Name/Title	Scott Ambler, RMP Program Manager					

4



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

RMP #: 17-17-0002

Reviev	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 2/21/18
YES	NO	NA*		 Criteria	7 40 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Х					
	Х		Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan wa		s of receipt
	Х			ejected of Returned 6/30/17	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned: 2/21/18	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	All disapproval notices and returned plans inclu- and specify the conditions that would permit ap		g all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a	-	ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re-	ceipt	
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Χ			Approved plan included an associated assessn	nent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develop		
Χ			 Information on the location of the manage 		
X			Description of the management unit, inclu features, erosion issues, and agricultural		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or operation.		
X			Authorization for the RMP developer for ri to obtain copies of any conservation or wa		
X			Copies of nutrient management plans, soi	l conservation plans from NRCS	S, RMPs, and any other
X			conservation or water quality plan that inc 6. Information on the location and status of a	all BMPs and other alternative m	
			the management unit that are currently im		- Cuita
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Cons Approved plans included the following components		1 Suite
			A determination of the adequacy of existing the state of the adequacy of		nd water quality plans in
X			meeting the minimum standards set out ir	4VAC50-70-40	
X			A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards	d in the assessment that will be	utilized to meet the
Х			A complete list of the BMPs that the owne the minimum standards	er or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Х			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the r	ninimum standards	
Χ			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMF	Ps .	
Х			6. An inclusion of any current nutrient manag		
			conservation or water quality plans that in		Ps
Χ			7. Other information collected pursuant to th		
X			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastu		land use type
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Χ			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Χ	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
		Χ	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland an	d Hayland)	
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Past	ure)	

X RMP developer indicate method	Х		Perennial Streams Identified?
	Х		RMP developer indicate method

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

The plan was not reviewed for over 180 days.



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

RMP #: 17-18-0001

Reviev	wed By	y: Scot	tt Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 8/22/18
YES	NO	NA*	(Criteria	
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee		
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan wa		s of receipt
				ejected of Returned 7/20/18	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned: 8/22/18	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	All disapproval notices and returned plans incluand specify the conditions that would permit app	=	g all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a		ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re-		, 0
		Х	-	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х		ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х		ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessn	nent document completed by	
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develor		•
Χ			Information on the location of the manage		
Χ			2. Description of the management unit, inclu		nvironmentally sensitive
			features, erosion issues, and agricultural		
Χ			Contact information for the owner or operation.		
X			 Authorization for the RMP developer for ri to obtain copies of any conservation or wa 		
Х			Copies of nutrient management plans, soi	il conservation plans from NRCS	S, RMPs, and any other
			conservation or water quality plan that inc		
X			Information on the location and status of a the management unit that are currently im		easures applicable to
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Cons		n Suite
X			Approved plans included the following compon		
X			A determination of the adequacy of existi	ng BMPs, conservation plans, a	nd water quality plans in
v			meeting the minimum standards set out in 2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified		utilized to meet the
X			minimum standards	u iii tile assessifietit tilat wiii be	utilized to meet the
Х			A complete list of the BMPs that the owner	er or operator agrees to impleme	nt or maintain to meet
			the minimum standards		
Χ			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the r		
Χ			A schedule for the implementation of BMF		
^				acment plane soil concentation	
X			6. An inclusion of any current nutrient manage		
X			conservation or water quality plans that in	clude the implementation of BM	
X			conservation or water quality plans that in 7. Other information collected pursuant to the	clude the implementation of BM e assessment	Ps .
X			conservation or water quality plans that in 7. Other information collected pursuant to th All approved plans included required minimum	clude the implementation of BM e assessment standard practices related to	Ps .
X X X			conservation or water quality plans that in 7. Other information collected pursuant to th All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture)	clude the implementation of BM e assessment standard practices related to	Ps .
X X X			conservation or water quality plans that in 7. Other information collected pursuant to th All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture Current Nutrient Management Plan	clude the implementation of BM e assessment standard practices related to	Ps .
X X X		Y	conservation or water quality plans that in 7. Other information collected pursuant to th All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture Current Nutrient Management Plan Soil Loss to "T"	clude the implementation of BM e assessment standard practices related to	Ps .
X X X		X	conservation or water quality plans that in 7. Other information collected pursuant to th All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) Current Nutrient Management Plan Soil Loss to "T" Cover Crops (Cropland)	clude the implementation of BM e assessment standard practices related to re).	Ps ,
X X X		X X X	conservation or water quality plans that in 7. Other information collected pursuant to th All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture Current Nutrient Management Plan Soil Loss to "T"	clude the implementation of BM e assessment standard practices related to re).	Ps

Х			Perennial Streams Identified?		
Х			RMP developer indicate method		
COMM	COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)				



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

RMP #: 17-18-0002

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 8/22/18
YES	NO	NA*	C	riteria	1 - 4-4
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee		
Х			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was		s of receipt
				ejected of Returned 7/20/18	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned: 8/22/18	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		х	All disapproval notices and returned plans include and specify the conditions that would permit app		g all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a	-	ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of rec		, ,
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rej	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х		, ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessm	nent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develop	per to include:	•
Х			Information on the location of the manage	ement unit	
X			Description of the management unit, include features, erosion issues, and agricultural agricultural and agricultural agri		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or operations of the owner or operations.		
X			4. Authorization for the RMP developer for ri	ght of entry and access to prope	
			to obtain copies of any conservation or wa		
Х			Copies of nutrient management plans, soi conservation or water quality plan that inc	cludes the implementation of BN	/IPs
X			Information on the location and status of a the management unit that are currently im		neasures applicable to
Χ			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Cons		n Suite
Χ			Approved plans included the following compon	ents:	
Х			A determination of the adequacy of existing meeting the minimum standards set out in		nd water quality plans in
X			A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards		utilized to meet the
Х			A complete list of the BMPs that the owne the minimum standards	r or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Х			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the n	ninimum standards	
Х			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMP	Ps .	
Х			6. An inclusion of any current nutrient manag	gement plans, soil conservation	plans, and any other
			conservation or water quality plans that in		Ps
X			Other information collected pursuant to the		
X			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastur		land use type
Χ			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Χ			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
Χ			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and	d Hayland)	
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pastu	ure)	

Х			Perennial Streams Identified?		
Х			RMP developer indicate method		
COMM	COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)				



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

RMP #: 17-18-0005

Revie	wed By	y: Scot	t Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 8/22/18
YES	NO	NA*	C	riteria	1 - 4-4
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee		
Х			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was		s of receipt
				ejected of Returned 7/20/18	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned: 8/22/18	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		х	All disapproval notices and returned plans include and specify the conditions that would permit app		g all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a	-	ficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of rec		, ,
		Х	1 st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Rej	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х		, ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessm	nent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develop	per to include:	•
Х			Information on the location of the manage	ement unit	
X			Description of the management unit, include features, erosion issues, and agricultural agricultural and agricultural agri		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or operations of the owner or operations.		
X			4. Authorization for the RMP developer for ri	ght of entry and access to prope	
			to obtain copies of any conservation or wa		
Х			Copies of nutrient management plans, soi conservation or water quality plan that inc	cludes the implementation of BN	/IPs
X			Information on the location and status of a the management unit that are currently im		neasures applicable to
Χ			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Cons		n Suite
Χ			Approved plans included the following compon	ents:	
Х			A determination of the adequacy of existing meeting the minimum standards set out in		nd water quality plans in
X			A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards		utilized to meet the
Х			A complete list of the BMPs that the owne the minimum standards	r or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Х			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the n	ninimum standards	
Х			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMP	Ps .	
Х			6. An inclusion of any current nutrient manag	gement plans, soil conservation	plans, and any other
			conservation or water quality plans that in		Ps
X			Other information collected pursuant to the		
X			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastur		land use type
Χ			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Χ			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
Χ			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and	d Hayland)	
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pastu	ure)	

Х			Perennial Streams Identified?		
Х			RMP developer indicate method		
COMM	COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)				



(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

RMP #: 17-20-0003

Revie	wed By	y: Sco	tt Ambler, Barbara Mcgarry	Review Date: 6/23/21	Date Plan Approved: 5/15/20
YES	NO	NA*	C	riteria	
Х			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee		
Χ			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was		s of receipt
				ejected or Returned: 5/15/20	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
				ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		х	All disapproval notices and returned plans inclu- and specify the conditions that would permit app		ng all plan deficiencies
		Х	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a	•	fficiency or listing of
			RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of re-		
		Х	1st Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	-	Approved: Y N
		Х	2 nd Date Submitted: Date Approved, Re	jected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
		Х		ejected or Returned:	Approved: Y N
Х			Approved plan included an associated assessn	nent document completed by	the RMP developer or
			by an individual authorized by the RMP develor		·
Χ			Information on the location of the manage	ement unit	
X			Description of the management unit, inclu features, erosion issues, and agricultural agricultural and agricultural agricu		nvironmentally sensitive
Х			Contact information for the owner or operation.		
X			4. Authorization for the RMP developer for ri		erty and for authorization
			to obtain copies of any conservation or wa	ater quality plans necessary for	the assessment
X			Copies of nutrient management plans, soi conservation or water quality plan that inc		
X			Information on the location and status of a the management unit that are currently im		neasures applicable to
Х			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Cons		n Suite
Х			Approved plans included the following compon	ents:	
X			A determination of the adequacy of existi meeting the minimum standards set out in		and water quality plans in
X			A complete list of existing BMPs identified minimum standards		utilized to meet the
Х			A complete list of the BMPs that the owner the minimum standards	r or operator agrees to impleme	ent or maintain to meet
Х			A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the r	ninimum standards	
Х			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMF	Ps .	
Х			6. An inclusion of any current nutrient manag	gement plans, soil conservation	plans, and any other
			conservation or water quality plans that in		lPs .
X			7. Other information collected pursuant to the		
X			All approved plans included required minimum (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pastur		land use type
Х			Current Nutrient Management Plan		
Χ			Soil Loss to "T"		
		Х	Cover Crops (Cropland)		
Χ			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland an	d Hayland)	
		Х	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)		
		Х	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Paste	ure)	

Х			Perennial Streams Identified?		
Х			RMP developer indicate method		
COMM	COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)				



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW VERIFICATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

RMP #: 17-17-0002 Date Approved: 2/21/18 Date Certified: 4/11/19

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler Review Date: 6/23/21

		•				
YES	NO	NA	Criteria			
Х			All inspections were performed by the District or a designated SWCD staff member			
X			In response to requests from RMP owners or operators, local District and/or designated SWCD staff conducted inspections to verify RMP implementation			
Χ			Has the RMP Implementation requested form been signed and attached in the module			
X			Prior to any inspection or re-inspection, the owner or operator was provided notice, at least 48 hours in advance			
X			Does verification inspection documentation and field conditions show all required BMPs and required minimum standard practices related to land use type (cropland or specialty crops, hayland, or pasture) were adequate and fully implemented at the time of inspection			
Χ			Current Nutrient Management Plan			
Χ			Soil Loss to "T"/ gross & gully erosion			
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)			
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)			
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)			
		Χ	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)			
		X	Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were able, at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete			
X			Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined to be adequate and fully implemented, the District approved the RMP for certification. The District and/or designated SWCD staff submitted required documentation to DCR for action			
		х	Following an RMP verification inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 30 days following the field review			
	X		Has the inspection document been attached in the module			

COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)

Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.