

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*

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

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

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'L. Ambler', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

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.

	RMP PROGRAM REVIEW DISTRICT RATING (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 points	Earned points	Criteria
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 receipt		
10	10	100%
5		> 70%
0		< 70%
All disapproval notices included a statement noting all plan deficiencies and specify the modifications, terms, and conditions that would permit approval of the plan		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency or listing of RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of receipt		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved plans included an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved plans were developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite		
5	5	100%
0		<100%
All approved plans included 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:		



**RMP PROGRAM REVIEW
DISTRICT RATING**
(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 points	Earned points	Criteria
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 Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
20	20	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	100	TOTAL
Comments:		

	RMP PROGRAM REVIEW DISTRICT RATING (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 points	Earned points	Criteria
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
Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Onsite compliance inspections on all RMPs having been issued a Certificate of RMP Implementation were conducted no less than once every three years, but not more than annually		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Following an RMP compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator and DCR with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 10 days following the field review		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	NA	TOTAL
Comments: No compliance inspections have been required at this time.		

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

**RMP PROGRAM REVIEW****DISTRICT RATING**

(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

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "S. Ambler", written over a light blue horizontal line.



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

RMP #: 20-20-0001

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 10/9/19**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 9/20/20 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 10/9/19 Approved: <u>Y</u> 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
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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

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



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

RMP #: 20-20-0004

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved:
12/16/20**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 9/29/20 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 12/16/20 Approved: <u>Y</u> 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
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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)

		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)
X			Perennial Streams Identified?
X			RMP developer indicate method
COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

RMP #: 20-20-0007

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 7/16/20**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 6/29/20 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 7/16/20 Approved: <u>Y</u> 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
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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

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



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

RMP #: 20-20-0010

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 7/16/20**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 6/29/20 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 7/16/20 Approved: <u>Y</u> 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
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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

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



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Eastern Shore SWCD

RMP #: 20-20-0017

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved:
12/16/20**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 9/29/20 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 10/28/20 Approved: Y N
			2 nd Date Submitted: 10/30/20 Date Approved , Rejected or Returned: 12/16/20 Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)

		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)
X			Perennial Streams Identified?
X			RMP developer indicate method
COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed)			



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
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
		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
X			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: Eastern Shore SWCD

RMP #: 20-20-0007

Date Approved: 7/16/20

Date Certified: 1/6/21

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
		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
X			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*

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

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



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

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'L. Ambler', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

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.

	RMP PROGRAM REVIEW DISTRICT RATING (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:		

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

Available points	Earned points	Criteria
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 receipt		
10	10	100%
5		> 70%
0		< 70%
All disapproval notices included a statement noting all plan deficiencies and specify the modifications, terms, and conditions that would permit approval of the plan		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency or listing of RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of receipt		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved plans included an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved plans were developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite		
5	5	100%
0		<100%
All approved plans included 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: Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.		



**RMP PROGRAM REVIEW
DISTRICT RATING**
(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 points	Earned points	Criteria
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 Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
20	20	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	100	TOTAL
Comments: Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.		

	RMP PROGRAM REVIEW DISTRICT RATING (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 points	Earned points	Criteria
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
Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Onsite compliance inspections on all RMPs having been issued a Certificate of RMP Implementation were conducted no less than once every three years, but not more than annually		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Following an RMP compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator and DCR with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 10 days following the field review		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	NA	TOTAL
Comments: No compliance inspections have been required at this time.		

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

**RMP PROGRAM REVIEW****DISTRICT RATING**

(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

Program Reviewer Signature

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "S. Ambler", written over a light blue horizontal line.



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0001

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 9/3/15**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 6/10/15 Date Approved, Rejected or <u>Returned</u> : 7/24/15 Approved: Y <u>N</u>
			2 nd Date Submitted: 7/24/15 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 8/20/15 Approved: <u>Y</u> N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

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



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0004

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 9/3/15**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 6/10/15 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 9/3/15 Approved: <u>Y</u> 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
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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	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.			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0005

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 9/3/15**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 6/10/15 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 9/3/15 Approved: <u>Y</u> 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
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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

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



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0009

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 9/17/15**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 8/21/15 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 9/17/15 Approved: <u>Y</u> 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
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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	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.			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Henricopolis SWCD

RMP #: 40-15-0010

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 9/17/15**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 8/21/15 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 9/17/15 Approved: <u>Y</u> 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
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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

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

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

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

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'L. Ambler', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

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.

	RMP PROGRAM REVIEW DISTRICT RATING (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 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 points	Earned points	Criteria
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 receipt		
10	10	100%
5		> 70%
0		< 70%
All disapproval notices included a statement noting all plan deficiencies and specify the modifications, terms, and conditions that would permit approval of the plan		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency or listing of RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of receipt		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved plans included an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved plans were developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite		
5	5	100%
0		<100%
All approved plans included 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: Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.		



**RMP PROGRAM REVIEW
DISTRICT RATING**
(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

Available points	Earned points	Criteria
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 Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
20	20	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	100	TOTAL
Comments: Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.		

	RMP PROGRAM REVIEW DISTRICT RATING (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 points	Earned points	Criteria
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
Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Onsite compliance inspections on all RMPs having been issued a Certificate of RMP Implementation were conducted no less than once every three years, but not more than annually		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Following an RMP compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator and DCR with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 10 days following the field review		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	NA	TOTAL
Comments: No compliance inspections have been required at this time.		

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

**RMP PROGRAM REVIEW****DISTRICT RATING**

(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

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "S. Ambler", is written over a light blue horizontal line.



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0001

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 3/28/16**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st 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 all plan deficiencies and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
X			Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	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.			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0004

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 3/28/16**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st 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 all plan deficiencies and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
X			Cover Crops (Cropland)
X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	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.			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0005

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 3/28/16**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st 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 all plan deficiencies and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
X			Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	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.			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0006

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 3/28/16**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st 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 all plan deficiencies and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	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.			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Monacan SWCD

RMP #: 38-15-0007

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 3/28/16**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st 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 all plan deficiencies and specify the conditions that would permit approval of the plan
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	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.			



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
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
		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
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.



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
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
		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
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*

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

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



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

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'L. Ambler', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

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.

	RMP PROGRAM REVIEW DISTRICT RATING (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:		

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

Available points	Earned points	Criteria
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 receipt		
10	10	100%
5		> 70%
0		< 70%
All disapproval notices included a statement noting all plan deficiencies and specify the modifications, terms, and conditions that would permit approval of the plan		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency or listing of RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of receipt		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved plans included an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved plans were developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite		
5	5	100%
0		<100%
All approved plans included 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: Suggest including a scan of the plan review checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.		



**RMP PROGRAM REVIEW
DISTRICT RATING**
(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

Available points	Earned points	Criteria
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 Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
20	20	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	100	TOTAL
Comments: Suggest including a scan of the field inspection checklist with TRC/SWCD approval signatures.		

	RMP PROGRAM REVIEW DISTRICT RATING (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 points	Earned points	Criteria
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
Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Onsite compliance inspections on all RMPs having been issued a Certificate of RMP Implementation were conducted no less than once every three years, but not more than annually		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Following an RMP compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator and DCR with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 10 days following the field review		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	NA	TOTAL
Comments: No compliance inspections have been required at this time.		

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



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW

DISTRICT RATING

(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



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0001

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 7/2/18**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 3/21/18 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 6/4/18 Approved: Y N
			2 nd Date Submitted: 6/20/18 Date Approved , Rejected or Returned: 7/2/18 Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
X			Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	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.			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0003

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 7/2/18**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 3/21/18 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 6/4/18 Approved: Y N
			2 nd Date Submitted: 6/20/18 Date Approved , Rejected or Returned: 7/2/18 Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	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.			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0004

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 7/2/18**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 3/21/18 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 6/4/18 Approved: Y N
			2 nd Date Submitted: 6/20/18 Date Approved , Rejected or Returned: 7/2/18 Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	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.			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-18-0005

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 7/2/18**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 5/29/18 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 9/18/18 Approved: Y N
			2 nd Date Submitted: 9/24/18 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 9/26/18 Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: 9/26/18 Date Approved , Rejected or Returned: 9/27/18 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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	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.			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Tidewater SWCD

RMP #: 1-19-0001

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 3/28/19**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 3/1/19 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 3/28/19 Approved: <u>Y</u> 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
		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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

X			Perennial Streams Identified?
X			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	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
		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
X			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
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
		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
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.



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
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
		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
X			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
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
		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
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.



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
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
		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
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*

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

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

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'L. Ambler', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

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.

	RMP PROGRAM REVIEW DISTRICT RATING (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 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 points	Earned points	Criteria
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 receipt		
10		100%
5	5	> 70%
0		< 70%
All disapproval notices included a statement noting all plan deficiencies and specify the modifications, terms, and conditions that would permit approval of the plan		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency or listing of RMP deficiencies provided within 45 days of receipt		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved plans included an associated assessment document completed by the RMP developer		
10	10	100%
5		>70%
0		<70%
All approved plans were developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite		
5	5	100%
0		<100%
All approved plans included 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: Plan 17-17-0002 was not reviewed for over 180 days.		



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW

DISTRICT RATING

(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 points	Earned points	Criteria
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 Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
20	20	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	100	TOTAL
Comments:		

	RMP PROGRAM REVIEW DISTRICT RATING (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 points	Earned points	Criteria
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
Have the Voluntary BMPs identified in the plan that were eligible at the time of inspection, been verified and entered into the tracking module as complete		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Onsite compliance inspections on all RMPs having been issued a Certificate of RMP Implementation were conducted no less than once every three years, but not more than annually		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
Following an RMP compliance inspection, if the RMP was determined NOT adequate or NOT fully implemented, the District provided the owner or operator and DCR with written documentation that specified the deficiencies within 10 days following the field review		
20	NA	100%
10		>70%
0		<70%
100	NA	TOTAL
Comments: No compliance inspections have been required at this time.		

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

**RMP PROGRAM REVIEW****DISTRICT RATING**

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler/Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

Program Review Comments:

Program Reviewer Name/Title

Scott Ambler, RMP Program Manager

Program Reviewer Signature

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "S. Ambler", is written over a light blue horizontal line.



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

RMP #: 17-17-0002

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 2/21/18**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
	X		Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
	X		1 st Date Submitted: 4/14/17 Date Approved, Rejected or <u>Returned</u> : 6/30/17 Approved: Y <u>N</u>
			2 nd Date Submitted: 8/7/17 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 2/21/18 Approved: <u>Y</u> N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

X			Perennial Streams Identified?
X			RMP developer indicate method
COMMENTS: (use back if additional space is needed) The plan was not reviewed for over 180 days.			



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST (For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

RMP #: 17-18-0001

Reviewed By: Scott 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 was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 5/18/18 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 7/20/18 Approved: Y <u>N</u>
			2 nd Date Submitted: 8/8/18 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 8/22/18 Approved: <u>Y</u> N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
		X	Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

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



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

RMP #: 17-18-0002

Reviewed By: Scott 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 was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 5/18/18 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 7/20/18 Approved: Y N
			2 nd Date Submitted: 8/8/18 Date Approved , Rejected or Returned: 8/22/18 Approved: Y N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

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



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

RMP #: 17-18-0005

Reviewed By: Scott 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 was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 5/18/18 Date Approved, Rejected or Returned: 7/20/18 Approved: Y <u>N</u>
			2 nd Date Submitted: 8/8/18 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 8/22/18 Approved: <u>Y</u> N
			3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

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



RMP PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

(For Program Review Only)

District: Tri-County/City SWCD

RMP #: 17-20-0003

Reviewed By: Scott Ambler, Barbara McGarry

Review Date: 6/23/21

**Date Plan
Approved: 5/15/20**

YES	NO	NA*	Criteria
X			Plan was reviewed by the RMP Technical Review Committee
X			Notice of approval or disapproval of the plan was communicated within 90 days of receipt
			1 st Date Submitted: 2/21/20 Date <u>Approved</u> , Rejected or Returned: 5/15/20 Approved: <u>Y</u> 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
		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
		X	All revised plan submittals were reviewed and a response regarding plan sufficiency 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
		X	3 rd Date Submitted: Date Approved, 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:
X			1. Information on the location of the management unit
X			2. Description of the management unit, including acreage, water features, environmentally sensitive features, erosion issues, and agricultural activity
X			3. Contact information for the owner or operator requesting the RMP
X			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			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			6. Information on the location and status of all BMPs and other alternative measures applicable to the management unit that are currently implemented
X			Approved plan was developed in the DCR Conservation Planning Application Suite
X			Approved plans included the following components:
X			1. 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			2. A complete list of existing BMPs identified in the assessment that will be utilized to meet the minimum standards
X			3. A complete list of the BMPs that the owner or operator agrees to implement or maintain to meet the minimum standards
X			4. A confirmation of BMPs that achieve the minimum standards
X			5. A schedule for the implementation of BMPs
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
X			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).
X			Current Nutrient Management Plan
X			Soil Loss to "T"
		X	Cover Crops (Cropland)
X			Buffers to Perennial Stream (Cropland and Hayland)
		X	Stream Exclusion (Pasture)
		X	Stream Crossing or Limited Access (Pasture)

X			Perennial Streams Identified?
X			RMP developer indicate method
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
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
		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
	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.