

# State Conservation Commission Meeting

July 17, 2019

Genetti Hotel, Williamsport PA

## 'Draft' Agenda

### **Briefing Session – July 17, 2019 – 10:00 AM (Washington Room)**

- Review of Business Agenda
- PA Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Program Reauthorizations – Eric Cavazza, Bureau of Abandoned Mine Reclamation, DEP
- Pa Farm Bill Update and Discussion

### **Business Session – July 17, 2019 – 2:15 PM (Terrace Room)**

#### **A. Opportunity for Public Comment**

#### **B. Business and Information Items**

1. Approval of Minutes
  - a. May 14, 2019 (A)
  - b. June 11, 2019 (A)
2. Nutrient & Odor Management Program
  - a. Act 38 Nutrient Management Technical Manual, Version 11.0 - Frank Schneider, SCC (A)
  - b. Nutrient Management/Manure Management Program Administrative Manual, Version 5.0 - Frank Schneider, SCC (A)
  - c. Dean James - Cotner Farms, LCC, Nutrient Management Plan Amendment, Northumberland County - Michael Walker, SCC (A)
3. Conservation District Fund Allocation Program
  - a. Conservation District Fund and Unconventional Gas Well Fund 'Proposed' FY 2019-20 CDFAP Allocations; Karen Books, DEP; Karl Brown, SCC (A)
  - b. Proposed FY2019-20 Leadership Development Program Budget – Johan E. Berger, SCC (A)
4. Dirt, Gravel and Low Volume Road Program 'Proposed' FY2019-20 Allocations to Conservation Districts– Roy Richardson, SCC; Steve Bloser, Center for DGLVR Studies)

5. Draft Policy for Removal of a Conservation District Director for Misfeasance or Malfeasance; Karl Brown, SCC (A)
6. 'Building for Tomorrow' Leadership Development Program Update - Matthew Miller, Leadership Development Program Coordinator PACD (NA)
7. Spotted Lanternfly Education and Control Activities Update – Michael Hutchinson [Ruth Welliver], BPI (NA)
8. Pa Integrated Water quality and Assessment Report (Section 303(d) & 305(b))- Gary Walters DEP (NA)

### **C. Written Reports**

1. Program Reports
  - a. Act 38 Nutrient and Odor Management Program Measurables Report
  - b. Act 38 Nutrient Management and Manure Management Program CD Evaluations
  - c. Certification and Education Program Accomplishment Report
  - d. Act 38 Facility Odor Management Program & Status Report on Plan Reviews
  - e. REAP Accomplishment Report
2. Ombudsman Program Reports – Southern Allegheny Region (Blair County Conservation District) and Lancaster County Conservation District.

### **D. Cooperating Agency Reports**

#### **Adjournment**

Next Public Meetings August 20, 2019 Conference Call  
September 10, 2019 Public Meeting

**STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING  
PA Department of Agriculture, Harrisburg, PA  
Tuesday, May 14, 2019 1:00 p.m.**

***Draft Minutes***

Members Present: Secretary Russell Redding, PDA; Mike Flinchbaugh; Donald Koontz; Ross Orner; Ron Rohall; Ron Kopp; Pete Vanderstappen, NRCS; Drew Gilchrist, DCNR (via phone) for Secretary Cindy Adams Dunn; Adam Walters, DCED; Chris Houser, PSU for Dr. Richard Roush; Brenda Shambaugh, PACD.

**A. Public Input**

There were no public comments presented.

**B. Business and Information Items**

1. a. Approval of Minutes – March 12, 2019 - Public Meeting.
- b. Approval of Minutes – April 9, 2019 – Conference Call.

*Don Koontz moved to approve the March 12, 2019 and the April 9, 2019 public meeting minutes. Motion seconded by Mike Flinchbaugh. Motion carried.*

2. Nutrient and Odor Management Program

- a. FY2019-20 Nutrient Management Program Budget. Frank Schneider, SCC, reported that conditional approval is being requested for the FY2019-20 Nutrient Management Program Budget Proposal. Approval will be contingent on final approval of the FY2019-20 State Budget. Commission staff has prepared two budget proposals. One is based on FY 2018-19 funding levels (\$3,169,000), and one is based on funding supplements proposed in Governor Wolf's Pennsylvania Farm Bill Proposal (\$6,202,000). Increased funding levels proposed under the PA Farm Bill will allow the Commission to:

- Prioritize funding to conservation districts, recognizing their key role in carrying out the mandates of the Nutrient and Odor Management Act (Act 38).
- Dedicate funding to farmers for plan development, implementation of financial assistance programs and Conservation Excellence grants in the amount of \$2,366,000.
- Provide funding for educational and technical support, provided by the Pennsylvania State University (PSU) program partners, Dr. Charlie White, Dr. Robert Mikesell, and program staff from the College of Agricultural Sciences.
- Increase the Commission's Personnel budget with the addition of two additional staff persons to carry out functions in the proposed PA Farm Bill, based on anticipated operational expenses and union contract personnel costs from the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture budget office.

- Provide funding to PAOneStop in the amount of \$250,000 for ongoing maintenance, updates, and support.
- Maintain the Commission’s operational budget at current levels.
- Provide up to \$20,000 for field proofing and testing of the revised P Index, if needed.

Ross Orner moved to “conditionally” approve the proposed FY 2019-20 Nutrient Management Program Budget. This budget would become effective upon the approval of a final FY2019-20 State Budget. Motion seconded by Ron Rohall. Motion carried.

b. FY2019-20 Nutrient Management & Manure Management Delegation Agreement Allocations. Frank Schneider, SCC, reported that each year, the Commission approves funding allocations to support activities performed by participating conservation districts under the Nutrient/Manure Management Delegation Agreement. Funding levels are based on a workload analysis and for the last eight years, these agreements have been funded at \$56,000 per full-time equivalent. Commission staff has prepared two proposals for consideration and conditional approval. The first is without the inclusion of the PA Farm Bill - based on FY 2018-19 (previous year) funding levels at \$56,000 per FTE, and the second is with the inclusion of the PA Farm Bill based on funding levels as supplemented in Governor Wolf’s PA Farm Bill Proposal at \$60,000 per FTE.

Don Koontz moved to approve the proposed FY 2019-20 Nutrient and Manure Management Delegation Agreement Funding. These allocations will become effective upon approval of a final FY 2019-20 State Budget. Motion seconded by Ron Rohall. Motion carried.

c. Penn State University, Proposals for Education and Technical Support Activities (FY2019-20) Work Plans and Budget. Johan Berger, SCC, reported that each year, the Commission contracts with Penn State College of Agricultural Sciences for educational and technical support services related to Nutrient/Manure Management, Odor Management, and Manure Hauler and Brokers certification programs. Services for these three certification programs are covered by two different agreements. Each agreement is for three years in duration, with funding levels approved each year. Funding for year three of the Odor Management and Manure Hauler Education agreement is proposed at \$158,084 (no change), and funding for the Nutrient/Manure Education agreement is proposed at \$204,242 (decrease of \$2,580).

Mike Flinchbaugh moved to approve the proposed annual work plans and funding for the Nutrient/Manure Management, Odor Management, and Manure Hauler education program educational contracts. Motion seconded by Ross Orner. Motion carried.

d. 2019 Appointments to the Nutrient Management Advisory Board. Frank Schneider, SCC, reported that there are five appointments for the Nutrient Management Advisory Board up for consideration. These include: Katie Turner (environmental organization member), Ed Hartman (dairy), Joseph Duris (hydrologist), Andrew Flinchbaugh (swine), and Chris Young (fertilizer industry).

These appointments have been made by the Commission chairperson and require confirmation by the Commission.

Don Koontz moved to approve the nominations of Katie Turner, Ed Hartman, Joseph Duris, Andrew Flinchbaugh, and Chris Young. Motion seconded by Ron Rohall. Mike Flinchbaugh abstained from voting. Motion carried.

e. Odor Management Program – ‘Proposed’ Program Guidance and Technical Manual (Version 3.0). Karl Dymond, SCC, reported that the current version of the Odor Management Program Technical Manual was released in 2013, and in 2018, Commission staff began the process to update this manual. Suggested revisions were solicited from individuals certified to write odor management plans, conservation district staff, and other individuals. Staff reviewed comments received with the NMAB on April 18, 2019 and determined that 8 of 9 comments received had merit for incorporation into the revised manual.

Ron Kopp made a motion to approve Version 3.0 of the Odor Management Program Guidance and Technical Manual. Motion seconded by Mike Flinchbaugh. Motion carried.

### 3. Dirt, Gravel, and Low Volume Road Program

a. Request for Participation in the Dirt, Gravel, and Low Volume Road Program – Delaware County Conservation District. Roy Richardson, SCC, and Steve Bloser, Center for DGLVR Studies, reported that the Delaware County Conservation District has requested the opportunity to participate in the Low Volume Road portion of the Dirt, Gravel, and Low Volume Road Program. Delaware has not participated in this program to date. While they have few, if any, Dirt and Gravel Roads, they do have eligible Low Volume Roads within their county. Staff has developed a 4-year contract agreement that will allow them to participate in the Low Volume Road Program and will “sync” them with the contract cycle of the other 65 participating conservation districts.

Ross Orner made a motion to approve Delaware County Conservation District’s request to participate in the Low Volume Road Program under a four- (4) year contract. Motion seconded by Don Koontz. Motion carried.

b. Revised DGLVR Program Administrative Manual. Roy Richardson reported that beginning in 2019, Commission and Center staff began drafting revisions to the DGLVR Program Administrative Manual. This manual was first developed in 2014 and updated in 2017. Proposed changes were circulated to all conservation districts in January 2019, and the DGLVR Program Policy and Planning committee has reviewed the proposed changes as well as comments submitted by the conservations districts. A final draft form of the revised manual has been reviewed and approved by PDA Legal Counsel, and a final draft version with “tracked” changes has been provided to the Commission. Significant changes were made in the area of quarterly reporting, allowable administrative expenses, prevailing wage, in-kind contributions, stream crossing replacements, permits, and advancement of funds. The following are significant Administrative Manual changes:

- Quarterly Reporting: Move to quarterly reporting required updates to several sections (3.3, 3.9, 3.10)
- Administrative/Education Wording: Clarification of allowable administrative and education expenses.
- Prevailing Wage: Updated and clarified CD role in documenting prevailing wage. Included new notification letter and verification form as part of project contracts with grant recipients.
- In-Kind Contributions: Added provision that in-kind spending must meeting Program policies
- Stream Crossing Replacements: No round pipes over three feet allowed in streams; policy application to small streams
- Appendices:
  - Contract: minor wording changes, two new attachments dealing with Prevailing Wage
  - Project Completion Report: minor changes to project closeout summary
  - Organization: Appendices reorganized and attachments to contract incorporated into single appendix
- Permits:
  - Old Wording: Could not advance funds on project until permit was in hand
  - New Wording: “Any required project permits must be obtained by the grant recipient before work can begin on the portion of the project related to the permit.”

Ron Rohall made a motion to approve the proposed revisions to the Dirt, Gravel, and Low Volume Road Program Administrative Manual. Motion seconded by Ross Orner. Motion carried.

c. Center for Dirt and Gravel Road Studies, Education, and Technical Assistance Agreement

i. FY2014-18 Agreement ‘Proposed One-Year Extension to FY2019. Roy Richardson reported that the Commission is in the final year of a five-year agreement with the Penn State Center for Dirt and Gravel Road Studies for educational and technical assistance for the DGLVR Program. This agreement included annual allocations of \$1,372,000 for a total of \$6,860,000 over the life of the contract and is set to expire June 30, 2019. Currently, this agreement has approximately \$500,000 in unspent funds. Commission staff is recommending that the effective date of this agreement be extended for one year to June 30, 2020 to allow the Center to complete several demonstration projects that will be used as a part of the annual training conference. The Comptroller’s Office has approved the request to extend this agreement, and staff is requesting the Commission’s approval to extend the agreement.

Don Koontz made a motion to approve the proposed one-year extension of the DGLVR Program five-year contract with the Center for Dirt and Gravel Road Studies. Motion seconded by Ron Rohall. Motion carried.

ii. 'Proposed' New 5-Year DGLVR Program Agreement with the Penn State Center for Dirt and Gravel Road Studies (FY2019-2023). Roy Richardson reported that the Penn State Center for Dirt and Gravel Road Studies provides educational and technical assistance to the Commission and county conservation districts to assist them in carrying out the DGLVR Program in Pennsylvania. These services are provided through a five-year agreement between the Commission and the Center. A copy of the proposed five-year agreement and proposed budget was provided to Commission members.

Ron Rohall made a motion to approve the proposed five-year (FY 2019-2023) DGLVR Program agreement with the Penn State Center for Dirt and Gravel Road Studies (pending review). Motion seconded by Mike Flinchbaugh. Motion carried.

d. Conservation District DGLVR Program Spending Update. Roy Richardson reported that Commission members have asked staff to update them regarding conservation district spending as a part of the close-out of their five-year program agreement which was extended through June 30, 2019. In March, districts had approximately \$14.6 million remaining under their old contracts. As of April 26, 2019, that amount has decreased to approximately \$8.05 million, and it is anticipated that the amount of unspent funds will continue to decrease over the next 45 days.

Action: No action required.

4. Proposed Revisions to the FY2018-19 REAP Guidelines and Application. Joel Semke, SCC, reported that each year, the Commission updates its REAP Guidelines and Applications for the upcoming fiscal year. Commission staff is recommending minor changes to the guidelines and application for FY 2019-20. These proposed changes relate to the signature portion of the "sponsorship" application, and to a proposed Nutrient/Manure Management Plan questionnaire.

Mike Flinchbaugh moved to approve the Proposed FY 2019-20 REAP Guidelines and Application. Motion seconded by Don Koontz. Ron Kopp and Ross Orner abstained from voting. Motion carried.

5. Draft Policy for Removal of a Conservation District Director for Misfeasance or Malfeasance. Karl Brown, SCC, reported that Commission and agency staff have been working with legal counsel to begin developing a draft policy on the dismissal of a conservation district director for purposes of misfeasance or malfeasance in office. As per Conservation District Law, the Commission is to establish "policy" to guide this process.

#### Procedures for Investigation and Removal

- Any person, including a district employee or district director, with reason to believe that a district director acted with malfeasance or misfeasance in performing the duties of a district director may initiate a complaint regarding such allegation.
- If the investigative entity determines that the allegation has merit and the

district director either admits to the misconduct or a ruling is made by a court or other body with appropriate jurisdiction that the district director engaged in the misconduct, the county governing today may remove the district director from the position.

- The county governing body may postpone a decision on removing a district director until all potential appeals from the investigative entity's final determination on the alleged misconduct have been exhausted by the district director.
- A county governing body may determine that misconduct outside the scope of the director's duties may be the basis for removal if that misconduct is of such a nature to immediately place the district director's character into question.
- The county governing body shall notify the SCC of their intent to remove a district director for reasons of malfeasance, misfeasance, or for reasons outlined above or in a situation where a director is to be removed for being absent from regular district meetings three or more times during a year without due cause.

*Don Koontz made a motion for the draft copy of the proposed policy for Removal of a Conservation District Director for Malfeasance or Misfeasance to be circulated to conservation districts and other interested parties for a 45-day review period and be presented to the Commission on July 17, 2019 for final consideration. Motion seconded by Ron Rohall. Motion carried.*

6. Proposed Bradford County Conservation District Stream Reconstruction Pilot Program Under the Chapter 105 Water Obstructions and Encroachments Program Emergency Permit. Sid Freyermuth, DEP, reported that the Bradford District, in cooperation with DEP, has developed a pilot program to test the feasibility of utilizing authority under Chapter 105 to issue emergency permits for stream restoration activities. Changes to Bradford's Chapter 105 delegation agreement are being proposed to facilitate this 3-year pilot program. Additional information and materials were provided to the Commission.

*Ron Rohall made a motion to approve the proposed amendments to the Bradford Conservation District's 105 Delegation Agreement for purposes of carrying out the stream restoration pilot program. Motion seconded by Ron Kopp. Motion carried.*

7. Chesapeake Bay Program 'Draft' WIP III Overview. Karl Brown, SCC, reported on behalf of DEP. The draft WIP III quantifies strategies that achieve approximately 66% of the nitrogen and 100% of the phosphorus reduction goals. Pennsylvania intends to meet both nutrient reduction goals: increased tracking of undocumented practices; reporting of other program initiatives that also improve local water quality; development and implementation of the Countywide Action Plans. Focusing efforts for a dedicated funding source to ensure success and address the funding gap. The next steps for the Phase III WIP are as follows:

- Write the first draft of the Phase III WIP and revise Phase III WIP – submit by April 12, 2019
- Invite public comment on draft Phase III WIP from April 12 to June 7, 2019
- Phase III WIP finalized and submitted by August 9, 2019
- Phase 1 Countywide Action Plan development begins in July 2019



- Phase 2 begins in February 2020

Action: No action required.

### **C. Written Reports – Self Explanatory**

1. Program Reports
  - a. Act 38 Nutrient and Odor Management Programs Report
  - b. Act 38 Facility Odor Management Program – Status Report on Plan Reviews
  - c. Certification and Education Programs Accomplishment Report
  - d. REAP Program
2. Ombudsman Program Reports – Southern Allegheny Region (Blair County Conservation District and Lancaster County Conservation District)

### **D. Cooperating Agency Reports – DCNR, PDA, Penn State, DCED, DEP, NRCS, PACD**

**DCNR** – Drew Gilchrist reported that DCNR, through its Bureau of Recreation and Conservation, funds park development, land acquisition, trail development, and river’s conservation work. Our most recent grant round closed in April, and DCNR received over 400 applications with requests totaling more than \$100 million. Staff will spend the Summer of 2019 reviewing the applications and anticipate awarding about \$40 million in project funding in Fall 2019. This funding will leverage, locally, a minimum of \$40 million in additional funding from local sources. Secretary Dunn has been very active recently promoting the Governor’s Restore PA initiative across the state to find additional resources to help DCNR meet this demand.

**PDA** – Secretary Redding reported that the Spotted Lanternfly quarantine was extended to include 14 counties. The goal is to obtain and suppress this pest. A scientific solution is needed to control the Spotted Lanternfly and its host plants. The economic impacts of this pest are social, environmental, and economical. An online permitting process, like Pennsylvania’s, is being adopted by other states. For the first time in Pennsylvania’s history, the Farm Bill is not disaster-related. A disaster-ready account is needed to fund problems. Secretary Redding posed the question: How do we service and appeal to markets with agriculture? Pennsylvania is number two in the country for organic agriculture. For marketing purposes, it is good to connect ‘organic’ with PA Preferred. Karl Brown thanked Ross Orner for his years of service (25) on the Commission.

**PSU** – Chris Houser reported that four years ago, the Penn State Extension took on the project of providing online training for Spotted Lanternfly. There is now a manure management course online for people to create their own plan. Penn State Extension will work with farmers on pasture needs. The Extension water team won an award in April 2019.

**DCED** – no report.

**DEP** – no report.

**NRCS** – Pete Vanderstappen reported that NRCS is in the process of doing the EQIP program. Bradford County has 30 or 40 Emergency Watershed Protection (EWP) Program sites.

**PACD** – Brenda Shambaugh reported that last week was Conservation District week. It was busy with events and meetings with House and Senate members to advocate for districts. Agricultural Boot Camps I and II took place recently and were successful. Districts, who received Chesapeake Bay Program special project funding, got a letter from Secretary McDonnell, DEP, saying that projects needed to be completed by July. Then a week later, they received a letter from the EPA saying that they can have until 2020. Districts are now confused by the conflicting dates.

**Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

Next Public Meeting: June 11, 2019 – Conference Call

July 17, 2019 – Genetti Hotel, Williamsport, PA

**STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION CONFERENCE CALL**  
**PA Department of Agriculture, Room 405**  
**Tuesday, June 11, 2019 @ 8:30 am**

***DRAFT MINUTES***

**Members Present:** Deputy Secretary Greg Hostetter for Secretary Russell Redding, PDA; Secretary Patrick McDonnell, DEP; Drew Gilchrist for Secretary Cindy Adams-Dunn, DCNR; Denise Coleman, NRCS; Adam Walters, DCED; Chris Houser for Dr. Richard Roush, Penn State; Ross Orner; MaryAnn Warren; Ron Kopp; Ron Rohall; Don Koontz; Mike Flinchbaugh; and Brenda Shambaugh, PACD.

**B. Agency/Organization Updates**

1. DCNR – Drew Gilchrist

Drew reported that the DCNR is developing a Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan. “Do you enjoy spending time in Pennsylvania’s local and state parks and forests and on our trails and rivers? A few minutes of your time could really help the DCNR understand how and why you enjoy outdoor recreation.” Survey results will help the DCNR and partners determine outdoor recreation programs and funding priorities for Pennsylvania’s next five-year outdoor recreation plan. This survey should take less than ten minutes to complete. DCNR is administering it in cooperation with the Center for Survey Research at Penn State Harrisburg.

2. PACD – Brenda Shambaugh

Brenda reported that through a cooperative agreement, the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and the National Association of Conservation Districts (NACD), have made \$9 million available in technical assistance grants to six Pennsylvania conservation districts to help implement Farm Bill Programs. The following counties received annual technical assistance capacity grants: Jefferson, Tioga, Lehigh, Northampton, Northumberland, and York.

3. Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture – Deputy Secretary Greg Hostetter

Deputy Secretary Hostetter reported that there are a number of bills moving through the House and Senate:

HB 1526: Amendments to Agrilink – should pass the House in the week of June 17, 2019

HB 1517: Creation of the Conservation Excellence Grant Program

SB 634: Creation of this bill dealing with soil and conservation  
SB 622: Segregation of Resource Enhancement and Protection from  
PA Tax Code

There is a swine exhibition quarantine order. Recommendations are being made to county fairs to enforce the same protocols as the Farm Show. African swine fever is a highly contagious and deadly viral disease affecting both domestic and wild pigs of all ages.

4. Penn State – Chris Houser

Chris Houser reported that there is a research appointment vacancy announcement in Watershed Management and Resources, which will close on Friday, June 14, 2019. More than 20,000 people went through the Spotted Lanternfly permitting course.

5. DEP – Secretary Patrick McDonnell

Secretary McDonnell reported that the Leadership Development New Manager Orientation will occur next week in State College. Fred Fiscus went over the agenda for this meeting. Fifteen people will attend these meetings.

6. NRCS – Denise Coleman

Denise Coleman reported that NRCS was recently awarded an additional \$5 million in EQIP funds. When it is decided where this money will be distributed, Denise will let the Commission know.

7. DCED – Adam Walters

Adam Walters mentioned Restore PA. Secretary Davin testified before the Democratic Policy Committee on Restore PA. There were 99 co-sponsors in the House and 25 co-sponsors in the Senate.

## **C. Information and Discussion Items**

1. **PA Farm Bill Update – Deputy Secretary Greg Hostetter**

Deputy Secretary Greg Hostetter reported that the Pennsylvania Farm Bill would invest more than \$24 million in Pennsylvania's agriculture industry to grow opportunities and resources, remove regulatory burdens, and cultivate future generations of leaders within agriculture.

The plan provisions encompass the following areas:

- Agricultural Business Development and Succession Planning
- Creating more processing capabilities to accommodate a growing animal agriculture sector.
- Removing regulatory burdens and strengthening the state's business
- Strengthening Pennsylvania's workforce to ensure the next generation is prepared to lead
- Protecting agriculture infrastructure
- Increasing market opportunities and making Pennsylvania the nation's leading organic state.

An update was provided regarding the PA Farm Bill and legislative action to date.

2. **Dirt, Gravel, and Low Volume Road Program, Spending Update – Roy Richardson**

As of June 4, 2019, there were \$4.47 million remaining in old funds under the old agreements with county conservation districts. Of that amount, \$4.43 million is committed to projects and approximately \$40,000 (less than 1%) is not committed to projects at the local level. Roy Richardson provided an update on the progress to close out old agreements with participating conservation districts and how the results of this close-out process may impact conservation district allocation for FY 2019-20.

3. **Nutrient and Odor Management Program**

a. **Nutrient Management Program Technical Manual** – Frank Schneider reported that staff has been working since August 2018 to solicit and review potential changes to the Nutrient Management Program Technical Manual. One-hundred nine comments were received, and fifty-seven of these comments were deemed to have merit for consideration. Staff will present these proposed changes for Commission consideration at the meeting on July 17, 2019.

b. **Nutrient Management and Manure Management Program Administrative Manual** – Frank Schneider reported that staff has been working since August 2019 to solicit and review potential changes to the Nutrient Management and Manure Management Program Administrative Manual. A total of fifty-three suggested changes were received, and twenty-four of these suggestions merit consideration. Staff will present these proposed changes for Commission consideration at the meeting on July 17, 2019.

4. **Spotted Lanternfly Update**

Johan Berger reported that the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture Bureau of Plant Industry has indicated that additional funds will be available to county conservation districts in the quarantine zone for FY 2019-20. These funds will allow participating districts to assist outreach, education, and control activities.

5. **105 Program Agriculture Conservation Permitting Workgroup Continues Work - Karl Brown**

The 105 Program Agricultural Conservation Permitting Workgroup, which originally met on April 12, 2019, met again on May 23, 2019. Discussions included concerns related to agricultural BMP installations, as well as DGLVR BMP installations. The group has scheduled two separate field visits – one in Adams County (6-21-19) to review and discuss issues related to AG BMP installations, and one in Cumberland County (6-14-19) to review and discuss issues related to DGLVR BMP installations. After these field visits, the entire workgroup will meet once again to consider opportunities to improve 105 permitting for both AG conservation and DGLVR BMPs.

6. **SCC Policy Work Group Update – Karl Brown**

SCC, PDA, and DEP staff (Johan Berger, Karen Books, Karl Brown, Susan Despot, and Fred Fiscus) have scheduled regular meetings (every two weeks) to discuss policy matters related to conservation district operations and commission operations. The work group has prioritized the review and update of policies and practices related to financial accountability (charts of accounts, audit standards, cross-cut financial spreadsheets, etc.) and issues related to conflict of interest, donations, and acceptance of grants. In regards to our final draft policy on Removal of Conservation District Directors (misfeasance/malfesance), the policy draft was circulated (5-17-19) to conservation districts for a forty-five day comment period, which closes on July 1, 2019. No comments have been received to date.

7. **2019 PACD/SCC Joint Annual Conference Update – Fred Fiscus**

PACD and the SCC will meet for their Joint Annual Conference on July 17 and 18, 2019 at the Genetti Hotel and Conference Center in Williamsport, PA. The Commission meeting will take place on July 17 with a briefing session in the morning and a business meeting in the afternoon. Fred Fiscus gave some clarification on the registration process for Commission members.

8. **Communications Work Group – Karl Brown**

Commission and agency staff met with a work group comprised of district staff, a district director, and PACD staff to discuss how to improve communications between districts, the Commission and state agencies. An initial meeting was held on April 26, 2019 to discuss existing and new opportunities to enhance communications, and the structure and purpose of the work group going forward. A follow-up meeting of the work group will be held in August.

9. **Next Meeting and Tentative Agenda Items**

- a. July 17, 2019 at the Genetti Hotel, Williamsport, PA
- b. Tentative Action Items
  - i. Nutrient Management Technical Manual Updates Version 11
  - ii. Nutrient Management Administrative Manual Updates
  - iii. Conservation District Fund Allocation Program (CDFAP) Allocations
  - iv. Dirt, Gravel, and Low Volume Road Program Allocations
  - v. Leadership Development Program Budget (FY 2019-20)
  - vi. Policy for Removal of a District Director
- c. Non-Action Items:
  - i. Leadership Development Program Update
  - ii. DEP 305 b Report
  - iii. Spotted Lanternfly Update
  - iv. DCED Energy Horizons presentation (to follow SCC public meeting)

10. **Adjournment** - The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 a.m.



**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

DATE: July 1, 2019

TO: Members  
State Conservation Commission

THROUGH: Karl G. Brown, Executive Secretary  
State Conservation Commission

FROM: Frank X. Schneider, Director  
Nutrient and Odor Management Programs

RE: Act-38 Nutrient Management Program Technical Manual –  
Version 11.0

**Action Requested**

Action is requested to approve version 11.0 of the Pennsylvania Nutrient Management Program Technical Manual.

**Background**

State Conservation Commission (SCC) staff has been working on updates to the Nutrient Management Program Technical Manual (Tech Manual).

The current version (Version 10.0) of the Tech Manual was released in October 2017. In August 2018, SCC staff held an open comment period for users of the Tech Manual to submit comments and suggestions for revisions.

The SCC employed a Technical Manual Workgroup that consisted of representatives from the SCC, PSU, DEP, and NRCS to review the comments received.

SCC staff received a total of 109 comments/suggestions and the Tech Manual Workgroup deemed that 57 comments/suggestions had merit.

The Nutrient Management Advisory Board (NMAB) was briefed on these items at their April 2019 meeting. The NMAB, which did not have a quorum, had no significant issues with proposed changes.

The following revisions are proposed.

1. Manual Cover Page:
  - a. Updated Version #; Updated Planning Tool Version #; Updated dates



2. Preface:
  - a. Update Version #
3. Table of Contents:
  - a. Update dates
4. NMP Submissions:
  - a. Updated CAFO NMP review guidance
5. Identification of CAOs:
  - a. Added Guidance on What is required of commercial NMS to submit to delegated CDs /SCC to prove an operation is not a CAO.
  - b. Added Guidance on What is required of commercial NMS to submit to delegated CDs /SCC to prove an existing CAO is no longer a CAO and wished to withdrawal from the program
  - c. Updated animal weights in the sample CAO Calculation
6. NMP Summary:
  - a. Added guidance to refer to Appendix 2 for detailed discussion on Operation Acres / Animal Equivalent Units / Animal Equivalent Units per Acre
  - b. Added a discussion on the whole farm note that should be used in regards to the requirements for fall manure applications that require at least 25% cover
  - c. Updated guidance that the Manure Storage Winter Capacity Planning Level for CAFOs is to be used for Liquid, Semi-Solid, and Solid manure storages
7. Appendix 1-NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN AGREEMENT AND RESPONSIBILITIES:
  - a. Updated guidance on Ag E&S plan verification
8. Appendix 2-OPERATION INFORMATION:
  - a. Added mortality compost to the operation description, if applicable
  - b. Added Facilities to the Names & Addresses of Owners of Rented or Leased Land
  - c. Updated guidance on emergency manure stacking areas, if needed, that they should correspond with the operation map
9. Appendix 3 - MANURE GROUP INFORMATION:
  - a. Updated web links
  - b. Added guidance that *“If any of the animals included in the small quantity manure group are grazed on pasture, the pasture information must be entered into Appendix 3 in order to calculate the amount of uncollected manure.”*
  - c. Added guidance to Refer to Section V: Plan Review and Implementation for guidance on manure analysis report dates for plan submission
10. Appendix 4 - CROP AND MANURE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION:
  - a. Updated weblinks
  - b. Added *“Pastures that are grazed by animals in a small quantity animal group must be included in Appendix 4 and meet all the requirements of CMU”*
  - c. Added *“Refer to Section V: Plan Review and Implementation for guidance on soil test report dates for plan submission.”*

- d. Updated Commercial Vegetable Crop Removal Values of 100 lb. N, 50 lb. P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, and 215 lb. K<sub>2</sub>O per acre
  - e. Added a section titled “Poultry Outdoor Access Areas” to provide guidance on how the outdoor areas that birds have access to should be treated in the NMP
  - f. Added guidance on how the manure application rates for pastures should be calculated and that if the grazing calculator is used it must be included in Appendix 10
11. Appendix 5 - PHOSPHORUS INDEX:
- a. Updated weblinks
  - b. Removed manure storage structure installation from list of significant farm management changes that would trigger the need for the P-Index
12. Appendix 8 –IMPORTER/BROKER AGREEMENTS AND NBSS:
- a. Added *“The signed agreements do not need to be re-signed or updated with each NMP Update or Amendment, unless a substantial change has occurred with the template provided or the parties or provisions contained in the signed document. Substantial changes could include changes in manure amounts, changes in types of manure, change in application season, and change in acres available.”*
  - b. Added guidance on when importers may or may not need a Chapter 91 MMP
  - c. Added guidance on the Review of Exporting Information
  - d. Added guidance that the current manure analysis or the running average analysis can be used
  - e. Removed references to P Banking, as P Banking for NBS is no longer an option for exported manure
  - f. Removed the requirement for manure exported out of state to have the other state confirm the farm meets that States requirements
13. Appendix 10 – SUPPORTING INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION:
- a. Removed the requirement for manure used out of state on owned or rented land to have the other state confirm the farm meets that States requirements
14. Section IV – RECORD KEEPING AND INFORMATIONAL REQUIREMENTS:
- a. Added language for BMP designs and certification for new liquid and semi-solid manure storage facilities.
15. Section V – PLAN REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION:
- a. Added guidance that if the NMP is deemed administratively incomplete, the entire NMP should be returned
  - b. Updated Ag E&S Guidance to match with DEP guidance
16. Section VI – PLAN AMENDMENTS AND TRANSFERS:
- a. Updated guidance on a change in crop management that results in a reduction of greater than 20% in nitrogen necessary for realistic expected crop yields or in the amount of nitrogen that the crops will use in the given crop year
17. Supplement 1 - AGRONOMY GUIDE TABLES:
- a. Updated tables
18. Supplement 2 – SAMPLE NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN:

- a. Will be updated with new version once approved
- 19. Supplement 3 – SAMPLE NUTRIENT BALANCE SHEET (EXCEL):
  - a. Will be updated with new version once approved
- 20. Supplement 4 – SAMPLE NUTRIENT BALANCE SHEET (WORD):
  - a. Will be updated with new version once approved
- 21. Supplement 12 – MANURE EXPORT SHEET:
  - a. Updated weblink
  - b. Reformatted forms so they print on a single page

### Summary

SCC staff asks for approval of version 11.0 of the Pennsylvania Nutrient Management Program Technical Manual.

If approved, final document processing will occur and the Technical Manual will have a release date of October 2019 and an effective date for NMP submitted for Crop Year 2021 and beyond.

**Version 11.0 of the Pennsylvania Nutrient Management Program Technical Manual is too large to send electronically.**

**If you are interested in seeing a copy, please contact Frank Schneider at [fschneider@pa.gov](mailto:fschneider@pa.gov) or 717-705-3895.**



**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

DATE: July 1, 2019

TO: Members  
State Conservation Commission

THROUGH: Karl G. Brown, Executive Secretary  
State Conservation Commission

FROM: Frank X. Schneider, Director  
Nutrient and Odor Management Programs

RE: Pennsylvania Nutrient Management and Manure Management  
Manual Program Administrative Manual – Version 5.0

**Action Requested**

Action is requested to approve version 5.0 of the Pennsylvania Nutrient Management and Manure Management Manual Program Administrative Manual.

**Background**

The Administrative Manual is the framework guidance document on how delegated conservation districts implement the Nutrient Management and Manure Management delegation agreement.

The current version (Version 4.0) of the Manual was released in November 2017.

State Conservation Commission (SCC) staff has been working on updates to the Administrative Manual. In August 2018, SCC staff held an open comment period for users of the Administrative Manual to submit comments and suggestions for revisions.

SCC staff received a total of 53 comments/suggestions and deemed that 24 of the comments had merit. SCC and Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) staff reviewed the comments/suggestions and made the following updates/refinements to the Administrative Manual:

1. Chapter 1 - General Act 38 and Manure Management - Manual Program Information
  - i. No significant changes.
2. Chapter 2 - General Program Duties
  - i. Updated guidance on record keeping for CAO calculations performed by a CD
  - ii. Updated Pa Bulletin NMP submission guidance

- iii. Updated guidance that if the NMP is deemed administratively incomplete, the entire NMP should be returned
- iv. Updated record retention to add manure storage certifications
- v. Added PracticeKeeper as the repository for quarterly reporting
- 3. Chapter 3 - Program Operations
  - i. Added guidance on plan review and version stamps
  - ii. Clarified language that if a NMP is withdrawn from review, there is a 30-day period to resubmit but if close to the expiration date for CAO and CAFOs they could be subject to enforcement by the SCC and/or DEP for noncompliance.
  - iii. Added PracticeKeeper as the repository for quarterly reporting.
  - iv. Updated the days for conducting on-site evaluations of waivers. It was always 20 days, but was listed as 30 days inadvertently in the current version
  - v. Updated guidance that the facility loading and unloading area is designed to retain or divert from off-site migration of any spills of 3,000 gallons or less. It has always been 3,000 gallons but was inadvertently listed as 6,000 gallons in the current version
  - vi. Added guidance that anytime a CD does a status review or inspection of a CAFO, the DEP regional office should be invited and copied on all correspondence
  - vii. Added that when CDs provide a list of NMS that they also provide the factsheet “Choosing a Nutrient Management Planner”
- 4. Chapter 4 - Act 38 Compliance Strategy and DEP County Conservation District Agricultural Compliant Response Policy
  - i. Updated language in several form letters
  - ii. Updated DEP Ag Inspection Form to current version
- 5. Chapter 5 - Appendices
  - i. Updated Pa Bulletin Notification contact
  - ii. Updated program contacts
- 6. Chapter 6 - Blank Forms / Sample Letters / Review Guidelines
  - i. New:
    - 1. VAO Withdraw Acknowledgement Letter
    - 2. Procedures for Changing Status Under Act 38 Letter
    - 3. Letter Acknowledging NMPs Submitted After Manure Applied or Exported
  - ii. Updated:
    - 1. Nutrient Management Act Program Withdrawal – CAO
    - 2. Waiver Acknowledgment Letter
    - 3. Plan Review Guidance
    - 4. Nutrient Balance Sheet Receipt Acknowledgment letter
    - 5. Plan Review Timeframe Extension Request
    - 6. Sample Administrative Incomplete Review Letter
    - 7. Plan approval Letter for CAOs
    - 8. Record Keeping Forms
    - 9. Quarterly Report Guidance

**Summary**

SCC staff asks for approval of version 5.0 of the Pennsylvania Nutrient Management and Manure Management Manual Program Administrative Manual. If approved, final

document processing will occur and the administrative manual will have a release date of October 2019.

**Version 5.0 of the Pennsylvania Nutrient Management and Manure Management Manual Program Administrative Manual is too large to send electronically.**

**If you are interested in seeing a copy, please contact Frank Schneider at [fschneider@pa.gov](mailto:fschneider@pa.gov) or 717-705-3895.**





COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

**The Nutrient Management Plan for Crop Year 2020, 2021, and 2022 for Cotner Farms is too large to send electronically.**

**Attached are following Sections:**

- **Cover Page**
- **Table of Contents**
- **NMP Summary**
- **Appendix 1**
- **Appendix 2**

**If you are interested in seeing a complete copy, please contact Frank Schneider at [fschneider@pa.gov](mailto:fschneider@pa.gov) or 717-705-3895.**



**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**Date:** July 3, 2019  
**To:** Members  
**From:** Karl G. Brown  
 Executive Secretary  
**RE:** ‘Proposed’ Allocation Concepts  
 FY 2019-20 Conservation District Fund Allocation Program

**Action Requested:**

Adopt an allocation concept for the FY 2019-20 Conservation District Fund Allocation Program (CDFAP).

**Background:**

The State Conservation Commission is scheduled to consider FY 2019-20 allocations for the Conservation District Fund Allocation Program (CDFAP) at its July 17, 2019 meeting. Information for this action is based on appropriation figures provided in the Governor's enacted FY 2019-20 Pennsylvania state budget.

Funds provided for distribution under this action are traditionally provided through line item appropriations to DEP and PDA, and through an earmarked transfer from the Unconventional Gas Well Fund (UGWF) to the Conservation District Fund (CDF). For FY 2019-20, the enacted state budget includes the following specific line item amounts:

**FY 2019-20 ‘Enacted’ State Budget:**

DEP CDF Line Item	\$2,506,000
PDA CDF Line Item	\$869,000
UGWF CDF Transfer	<u>\$3,948,625</u>
Total .....	\$7,323,625

*Please note that a Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment, afforded under Act 13, was made to the UGWF transfer for FY 2019-20 in an amount of \$73,625.00, an approximate increase of 1.9% for the 2018 calendar year collection timeframe.*

In addition to the funds listed above, the UGWF will distribute an additional \$3.948 million directly to conservation districts through the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PUC) in the form of "block grants". The PUC block grant allocation will be \$59,827.65 per conservation district for FY 2019-20.

*Please note, the Commission does not have decision-making authority over PUC-UGWF revenue provided to conservation districts.*

As has been provided in previous years, program staff developed allocation concepts for the Commission to consider at its July meeting. Two (2) allocation concepts have been developed and are provided with this memo as Attachments 1 and 2. These were developed based on information in the enacted state budget and a proposal submitted by the Lycoming County Conservation District. A FY2019-20 concept comparison table, Attachment 3, (*Attachment 3*) and a copy of the FY2018-19 allocation concept approved by the Commission in July 2018, Attachment 4, are also provided for reference.

The following is a summary of the proposed concepts:

**Concept 1 - Distribution of 'line item' appropriations under the enacted FY2019-20 state budget and 'well-count' allocations based on a 5-year average.**

- State appropriations maintained at FY2018-19 levels (\$3.375 Million)
- Supports 'department' program priorities for positions (Manager, E&S and Agricultural technicians).
- Portion of UGWF revenue (\$90,233) deferred to maintain funding for E&S and Agricultural technicians at a maximum level of \$16,225 per position.
- Statewide special project funds (\$325,000) taken off the top of UGWF at FY2018-19 funding levels.
- 50/50 split of remaining UGWF revenue
  - \$15,000 base for counties where 5-year average of DEP regulated spudded well is greater than 'zero (O)'.
    - **5-Year average (2014-2018)** of DEP regulated spudded wells

**Concept 2 - Distribution of 'line item' appropriations under the enacted FY2019-20 state budget and 'well-count' allocations based on a 15-year average (Lycoming Concept).**

- State appropriations maintained at FY2018-19 levels (\$3.375 Million)
- Supports 'department' program priorities for positions (Manager, E&S and Agricultural technicians).
- Portion of UGWF revenue (\$90,233) deferred to maintain funding for E&S and Agricultural technicians at a maximum level of \$16,225 per position.
- Statewide special project funds (\$325,000) taken off the top of UGWF at FY2018-19 funding levels.
- 50/50 split of remaining UGWF revenue
  - \$15,000 base for counties where 15-year average of DEP regulated spudded well is greater than 'zero (O)'.
    - **15-Year average (2004-2018)** of DEP regulated spudded wells

If Commission members have any questions, or need any additional information, please feel free to talk with either Karen Books at 717-772-5649, Fred Fiscus at 717-772-5660 or Johan Berger at 717-772-4189 as they were actively involved in developing these concepts and this background information.

Attachments (4)

2	Allocation of CDFAP Line Items and \$1,766,696 (50%) SCC UGWF Monies - Statewide Special Projects (SSP allocation item 'D')				Additional CDFAP Allocation of Remaining \$1,766,696 (50%) of SCC UGWF Monies		E	F	G
	A1	A2	A3	B	15 Year Average	C			
FY2019-20 Approved Budget Line Item + UGW (50/50) \$15,000 base 15 yr. Avg. Rev: 7/02/2019	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Adams	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Allegheny	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 112,315	\$ 59,828	\$ 172,142
Armstrong	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 125,767	\$ 59,828	\$ 185,595
Beaver	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 110,366	\$ 59,828	\$ 170,193
Bedford	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 96,689	\$ 59,828	\$ 156,517
Berks	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Blair	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 15,080	\$ 26,768			\$ 96,113	\$ 59,828	\$ 155,941
Bradford	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 245,703	\$ 59,828	\$ 305,531
Bucks	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Butler	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 161,641	\$ 59,828	\$ 221,469
Cambria	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 96,913	\$ 59,828	\$ 156,741
Cameron	\$ 22,350	\$ 12,378	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 99,620	\$ 59,828	\$ 159,448
Carbon	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768			\$ 65,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 125,171
Centre	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 102,208	\$ 59,828	\$ 162,036
Chester	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Clarion	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768			\$ 83,793	\$ 59,828	\$ 143,620
Clearfield	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 10,675	\$ 26,768			\$ 105,971	\$ 59,828	\$ 165,799
Clinton	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 107,037	\$ 59,828	\$ 166,865
Columbia	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Crawford	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 96,913	\$ 59,828	\$ 156,741
Cumberland	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Dauphin	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Delaware	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 3,000	\$ 26,768			\$ 68,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 128,171
Elk	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 115,316	\$ 59,828	\$ 175,143
Erie	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Fayette	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 132,787	\$ 59,828	\$ 192,614
Forest	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768			\$ 82,189	\$ 59,828	\$ 142,016
Franklin	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Fulton	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Greene	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 248,911	\$ 59,828	\$ 308,739
Huntingdon	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768			\$ 80,464	\$ 59,828	\$ 140,292
Indiana	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 100,932	\$ 59,828	\$ 160,759
Jefferson	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 101,518	\$ 59,828	\$ 161,346
Juniata	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Lackawanna	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 4,000	\$ 26,768			\$ 69,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 129,171
Lancaster	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Lawrence	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 103,346	\$ 59,828	\$ 163,174
Lebanon	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Lehigh	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Luzerne	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Lycoming	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 201,430	\$ 59,828	\$ 261,258
McKean	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 109,331	\$ 59,828	\$ 169,159
Mercer	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 103,122	\$ 59,828	\$ 162,950
Mifflin	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Monroe	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Montgomery	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Montour	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Northampton	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Northumberland	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768			\$ 65,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 125,171
Perry	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Philadelphia							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Pike	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768			\$ 65,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 125,171
Potter	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 15,525	\$ 26,768			\$ 106,906	\$ 59,828	\$ 166,734
Schuylkill	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Snyder	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Somerset	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 98,758	\$ 59,828	\$ 158,586
Sullivan	\$ 21,050	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 111,601	\$ 59,828	\$ 171,429
Susquehanna	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 272,953	\$ 59,828	\$ 332,781
Tioga	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 202,930	\$ 59,828	\$ 262,758
Union	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Venango	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 96,913	\$ 59,828	\$ 156,741
Warren	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 96,792	\$ 59,828	\$ 156,620
Washington	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 295,943	\$ 59,828	\$ 355,771
Wayne	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Westmoreland	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 130,717	\$ 59,828	\$ 190,545
Wyoming	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 110,232	\$ 59,828	\$ 170,060
York	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
<b>Totals</b>	\$ 1,473,800	\$ 1,067,003	\$ 924,430	\$ 1,766,696	720.0	\$ 1,766,698	\$ 6,998,627	\$ 3,948,625	\$ 10,947,252

**NOTES**

**CHART 2** illustrates a distribution of CDFAP FY2019-20 'Line Item' appropriations under the approved FY2019-20 state budget AND a 50/50 split of ACT 13 UGW Funds (UGWF) distributed by the State Conservation Commission under the CDFAP Statement of Policy. Applies a \$15,000 base grant to each county where the 15-year average of documented spudded gas wells is greater than 'zero (0)'. And, a per well credit is provided based on a 15 year average of spudded wells, in their respective county, based on well count information provided by DEP.

**CDFAP/UGW Available Funding (FY2019-20)**

CDFAP/UGWF	\$	3,948,625	*
DEP 'Line Item' Approp.	\$	2,506,000	
PDA 'Line Item' Approp.	\$	869,000	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>7,323,625</b>	
PUC Block Grant	\$	3,948,625	**
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>11,272,250</b>	

**DISTRIBUTION INFORMATION 'DENOTED' BY COLUMN/ITEM ('A' thru 'G')**

A1, A2 & A3 = DEP/PDA 'Line Items' (\$3.375M)

- 1) Supports 'department' program priorities (Manager, E&S Tech, ACT)
- 2) Relative to FY2018-19 distribution
  - <sup>1</sup> DM funding - NO CHANGE
  - <sup>2</sup> 1st Tech - NO CHANGE
  - <sup>3</sup> CHANGE

\* Special Note: A portion of Act 13 revenue diverted to column A2 & A3 to equalize technician funding allocations for 1st E&S and ACT Technicians to \$16,225. Total UGWF utilized \$90,233 funds. Same as 18-19

B = 'CDFAP/UGWF Monies' - 50% of SCC UGWF (\$1,766,696) - equal amount distributed to ALL districts - INCREASED

C = 'UGWF Year 8' - 50% of SCC UGWF (\$1,766,696) - SLIGHT INCREASE

- 1) \$15,000 base grant ONLY to counties where the 15-year average of documented spudded gas wells is greater than 'zero (0)'.
- 2) Funding distributed ONLY to counties where the 15-year average of documented spudded gas wells is greater than 'zero (0)', based on a 15 year average of DEP documented

D = Funding needs for 'priority' statewide special projects (~ \$325,000) - INCREASE

- 1) Allocated from UGW funds prior to allocation to CDFAP priorities and well count districts.

E = Total CDFAP 'Line items' and 'UGWF' distributed by the State Conservation Commission to conservation district.

F = UGW 'Block Grant' - \$3.948M/66 districts - equal amounts distributed by PUC to ALL districts. \*\*

G = Total of all funds distributed to conservation district - PUC 'Block Grant'; CDFAP 'Line Items' & SCC UGWF.

**SPECIAL NOTES:**

\* UGW funding includes an increase of \$73,625 due to CPI adjustment distributed across items B & C.

\*\* The SCC does not have decision-making authority over PUC Block Grant revenue distribution.

<b>D</b> Statewide Special Projects (SSP)
ACT Boot Camp \$ 25,000
Leadership Development \$ 175,000
Ombudsman \$ 125,000
<b>\$ 325,000</b>

**Grand Total of All Allocations \$ 11,272,252**

1	Allocation of CDFAP Line Items and \$1,766,696 (50%) SCC UGWF Monies - Statewide Special Projects (SSP allocation item 'D')				Additional CDFAP Allocation of Remaining \$1,766,696 (50%) of SCC UGWF Monies		E	F	G
	A1	A2	A3	B	5 Year Average	C			
FY2019-20 Approved Budget Line Item + UGW (50/50) \$15,000 base 5 yr. Avg. Rev: 7/02/2019	Manager (\$22,350)	1st E&S Tech. (\$16,225)	ACT Tech. (\$16,225)	CDFAP UGWF Monies (\$26,768)	Unconventional Well Count per County for 2014 - 2018 as collected by DEP	UGWF Collection Year 8 \$3.948 M - CDFAP UGWF Monies - SSP = \$1,766,696 (\$15,000 base + \$ 1683.64 /well)	CDFAP Line Items + SCC UGWF Funds = Total CDFAP/UGWF Funds distributed by SCC	PUC UGWF Block Grant to CCDs Year 8 (2018 funds) \$3,948,625 (\$59,827.65)	PUC UGWF Block Grant + CDFAP Line Items + SCC UGWF Funds = Total Year 8 CDFAP & UGWF Funds (2018 UGWF funds)
County									
Adams	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Allegheny	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 132,261	\$ 59,828	\$ 192,089
Armstrong	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	21.2	\$ 50,693	\$ 123,170	\$ 59,828	\$ 182,997
Beaver	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	15.8	\$ 41,602	\$ 125,863	\$ 59,828	\$ 185,691
Bedford	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	17.4	\$ 44,295	\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Berks	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Blair	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 15,080	\$ 26,768			\$ 80,423	\$ 59,828	\$ 140,251
Bradford	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	52.4	\$ 103,223	\$ 184,791	\$ 59,828	\$ 244,619
Bucks	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Butler	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	65.2	\$ 124,773	\$ 206,341	\$ 59,828	\$ 266,169
Cambria	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Cameron	\$ 22,350	\$ 12,378	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	10.8	\$ 33,183	\$ 110,904	\$ 59,828	\$ 170,732
Carbon	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768			\$ 65,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 125,171
Centre	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	0.4	\$ 15,673	\$ 97,242	\$ 59,828	\$ 157,069
Chester	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Clarion	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768			\$ 82,700	\$ 59,828	\$ 142,528
Clearfield	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 10,675	\$ 26,768	1.4	\$ 17,357	\$ 76,018	\$ 59,828	\$ 135,846
Clinton	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 100,272	\$ 59,828	\$ 160,100
Columbia	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	2.2	\$ 18,704	\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Crawford	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Cumberland	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Dauphin	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Delaware	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 3,000	\$ 26,768			\$ 68,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 128,171
Elk	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	22.8	\$ 53,387	\$ 134,955	\$ 59,828	\$ 194,783
Erie	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Fayette	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	14.6	\$ 39,581	\$ 121,149	\$ 59,828	\$ 180,977
Forest	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768			\$ 65,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 125,171
Franklin	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Fulton	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Greene	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 333,625	\$ 59,828	\$ 393,452
Huntingdon	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768	140.8	\$ 252,057	\$ 65,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 125,171
Indiana	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	0.4	\$ 15,673	\$ 97,242	\$ 59,828	\$ 157,069
Jefferson	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 99,599	\$ 59,828	\$ 159,426
Juniata	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	1.8	\$ 18,031	\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Lackawanna	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 4,000	\$ 26,768			\$ 69,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 129,171
Lancaster	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Lawrence	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	8.0	\$ 28,469	\$ 110,037	\$ 59,828	\$ 169,865
Lebanon	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Lehigh	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Luzerne	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Lycoming	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	30.6	\$ 66,519	\$ 148,088	\$ 59,828	\$ 207,915
McKean	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	10.6	\$ 32,847	\$ 114,415	\$ 59,828	\$ 174,242
Mercer	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	7.0	\$ 26,785	\$ 108,354	\$ 59,828	\$ 168,181
Mifflin	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Monroe	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Montgomery	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Montour	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Northampton	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Northumberland	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768			\$ 65,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 125,171
Perry	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Philadelphia							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Pike	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768			\$ 65,343	\$ 59,828	\$ 125,171
Potter	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 15,525	\$ 26,768	9.8	\$ 31,500	\$ 112,368	\$ 59,828	\$ 172,195
Schuylkill	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Snyder	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Somerset	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Sullivan	\$ 21,050	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	14.0	\$ 38,571	\$ 118,839	\$ 59,828	\$ 178,667
Susquehanna	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	146.4	\$ 261,485	\$ 343,053	\$ 59,828	\$ 402,881
Tioga	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	34.2	\$ 72,580	\$ 154,149	\$ 59,828	\$ 213,976
Union	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Venango	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Warren	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Washington	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	166.6	\$ 295,494	\$ 377,063	\$ 59,828	\$ 436,890
Wayne	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
Westmoreland	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768	13.0	\$ 36,887	\$ 118,455	\$ 59,828	\$ 178,283
Wyoming	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225		\$ 26,768	19.2	\$ 47,326	\$ 112,669	\$ 59,828	\$ 172,497
York	\$ 22,350	\$ 16,225	\$ 16,225	\$ 26,768			\$ 81,568	\$ 59,828	\$ 141,396
<b>Totals</b>	\$ 1,473,800	\$ 1,067,003	\$ 924,430	\$ 1,766,696	826.6	\$ 1,766,697	\$ 6,998,626	\$ 3,948,625	\$ 10,947,251
	\$2,540,803		\$924,430						
	\$3,465,233								
					<b>D</b>	Statewide Special Projects (SSP)			Grand Total of All Allocations \$ 11,272,251
						ACT Boot Camp \$ 25,000			
						Leadership Development \$ 175,000			
						Ombudsman \$ 125,000			
						<b>\$ 325,000</b>			

NOTES

CHART 1 illustrates a distribution of CDFAP FY2019-20 'Line Item' appropriations under the approved FY2019-20 state budget AND a 50/50 split of ACT 13 UGW Funds (UGWF) distributed by the State Conservation Commission under the CDFAP Statement of Policy. Applies a \$15,000 base grant to each county where the 5-year average of documented spudded gas wells is greater than 'zero (0)'. And, a per well credit is provided based on a 5 year average of spudded wells, in their respective county, based on well count information provided by DEP.

CDFAP/UGW Available Funding (FY2019-20)

CDFAP/UGWF	\$	3,948,625 *
DEP 'Line Item' Approp.	\$	2,506,000
PDA 'Line Item' Approp.	\$	869,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>7,323,625</b>
PUC Block Grant	\$	3,948,625 **
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>11,272,250</b>

DISTRIBUTION INFORMATION 'DENOTED' BY COLUMN/ITEM ('A' thru 'G')

A1, A2 & A3 = DEP/PDA 'Line Items' (\$3.375M)

- 1) Supports 'department' program priorities (Manager, E&S Tech, ACT)
- 2) Relative to FY2018-19 distribution
  - 1 DM funding - NO CHANGE
  - 2 1st Tech - NO CHANGE
  - 3 CHANGE

\* Special Note: A portion of Act 13 revenue diverted to column A2 & A3 to equalize technician funding allocations for 1st E&S and ACT Technicians to \$16,225. Total UGWF utilized \$90,233 funds. Less then 18-19

B = 'CDFAP/UGWF Monies' - 50% of SCC UGWF (\$1,766,696) - equal amount distributed to ALL districts - INCREASED

C = 'UGWF Year 8' - 50% of SCC UGWF (\$1,766,696) - SLIGHT INCREASE

- 1) \$15,000 base grant ONLY to counties where the 5-year average of documented spudded gas wells is greater than 'zero (0)'.
- 2) Funding distributed ONLY to counties where the 5-year average of documented spudded gas wells is greater than 'zero (0)', based on a 5 year average of DEP documented

D = Funding needs for 'priority' statewide special projects (~ \$325,000) - INCREASE

- 1) Allocated from UGW funds prior to allocation to CDFAP priorities and well count districts.

E = Total CDFAP 'Line items' and 'UGWF' distributed by the State Conservation Commission to conservation district.

F = UGW 'Block Grant' - \$3.948M/66 districts - equal amounts distributed by PUC to ALL districts. \*\*

G = Total of all funds distributed to conservation district - PUC 'Block Grant'; CDFAP 'Line Items' & SCC UGWF.

SPECIAL NOTES:

\* UGW funding includes an increase of \$73,625 due to CPI adjustment distributed across items B & C.

\*\* The SCC does not have decision-making authority over PUC Block Grant revenue distribution.

FY2019-20 CDFAP/UGWF - PROPOSED ALLOCATION CONCEPT FY2019-20 (5 Yr. Avg. vs. 15 Yr. Avg. Well Count Data Comparison)

Comparison	Additional CDFAP Allocation of Remaining \$1,766,696 (50%) of SCC UGWF Monies		Additional CDFAP Allocation of Remaining \$1,766,696 (50%) of SCC UGWF Monies		DIFFERENCE 5 Year Average vs. 15 Year Average ( ) denotes decrease	% DIFF
	5 YEAR Average	C	15 YEAR Average	C		
FY2019-20 Approved Line Item + UGW (50/50) \$15,000 base 5Yr_15Yr Comparison. Rev: 7/02/19	Unconventional Well Count per County for 2014 - 2018 as collected by DEP		Unconventional Well Count per County for 2004 - 2018 as collected by DEP			
County		UGWF Collection Year 8 \$3.948 M - CDFAP UGWF Monies - SSP = \$1,766,696 (\$15,000 base + \$ 1683.64 /well)		UGWF Collection Year 8 \$3.948 M - CDFAP UGWF Monies - SSP = \$1,766,696 (\$15,000 base + \$ 1724.70 /well)		
Adams						
Allegheny	21.2	\$ 50,693.17	9.1	\$ 30,747	\$ (19,947)	-39%
Armstrong	15.8	\$ 41,601.51	16.9	\$ 44,199	\$ 2,598	6%
Beaver	17.4	\$ 44,295.34	8.0	\$ 28,798	\$ (15,498)	-35%
Bedford		\$ -	0.1	\$ 15,121	\$ 15,121	100%
Berks						
Blair		\$ -	0.4	\$ 15,690	\$ 15,690	100%
Bradford	52.4	\$ 103,222.74	86.5	\$ 164,135	\$ 60,912	59%
Bucks						
Butler	65.2	\$ 124,773.33	37.7	\$ 80,073	\$ (44,700)	-36%
Cambria			0.2	\$ 15,345	\$ 15,345	100%
Cameron	10.8	\$ 33,183.31	4.0	\$ 21,899	\$ (11,285)	-34%
Carbon						
Centre	0.4	\$ 15,673.46	3.3	\$ 20,640	\$ 4,966	32%
Chester						
Clarion	1.4	\$ 17,357.10	2.0	\$ 18,449	\$ 1,092	6%
Clearfield		\$ -	8.7	\$ 29,953	\$ 29,953	100%
Clinton	2.2	\$ 18,704.01	6.1	\$ 25,469	\$ 6,765	36%
Columbia		\$ -				
Crawford			0.2	\$ 15,345	\$ 15,345	100%
Cumberland						
Dauphin						
Delaware						
Elk	22.8	\$ 53,386.99	10.9	\$ 33,747	\$ (19,640)	-37%
Erie						
Fayette	14.6	\$ 39,581.14	21.0	\$ 51,219	\$ 11,638	29%
Forest			1.1	\$ 16,845	\$ 16,845	100%
Franklin						
Fulton						
Greene	140.8	\$ 252,056.51	88.3	\$ 167,343	\$ (84,714)	-34%
Huntingdon		\$ -	0.1	\$ 15,121	\$ 15,121	100%
Indiana	0.4	\$ 15,673.46	2.5	\$ 19,363	\$ 3,690	24%
Jefferson	1.8	\$ 18,030.55	2.9	\$ 19,950	\$ 1,919	11%
Juniata						
Lackawanna						
Lancaster						
Lawrence	8.0	\$ 28,469.12	3.9	\$ 21,778	\$ (6,691)	-24%
Lebanon						
Lehigh						
Luzerne						
Lycoming	30.6	\$ 66,519.38	60.8	\$ 119,862	\$ 53,342	80%
McKean	10.6	\$ 32,846.58	7.4	\$ 27,763	\$ (5,084)	-15%
Mercer	7.0	\$ 26,785.48	3.8	\$ 21,554	\$ (5,232)	-20%
Mifflin						
Monroe						
Montgomery						
Montour						
Northampton						
Northumberland						
Perry						
Philadelphia						
Pike						
Potter	9.8	\$ 31,499.67	6.4	\$ 26,038	\$ (5,462)	-17%
Schuylkill						
Snyder						
Somerset			1.3	\$ 17,190	\$ 17,190	100%
Sullivan	14.0	\$ 38,570.96	9.5	\$ 31,333	\$ (7,238)	-19%
Susquehanna	146.4	\$ 261,484.90	102.3	\$ 191,385	\$ (70,100)	-27%
Tioga	34.2	\$ 72,580.49	61.7	\$ 121,362	\$ 48,782	67%
Union						
Venango			0.2	\$ 15,345	\$ 15,345	100%
Warren		\$ -	0.1	\$ 15,224	\$ 15,224	100%
Washington	166.6	\$ 295,494.42	115.6	\$ 214,375	\$ (81,119)	-27%
Wayne						
Westmoreland	13.0	\$ 36,887.32	19.8	\$ 49,149	\$ 12,262	33%
Wyoming	19.2	\$ 47,325.89	17.3	\$ 44,889	\$ (2,437)	-5%
York						
Totals	826.6	\$ 1,766,696.82	720.0	\$ 1,766,698		
	Number of well count cds	25	Number of well count cds	35		
	Number w '0' wells	41	Number w '0' wells	31		

**NOTES:**

The following information illustrates the number of conservation districts in the noted category as a result of applying '15 YEAR AVERAGE' well count data versus '5 YEAR AVERAGE' well count data in 'Column C'.

Category	Count	Minimum	Maximum
# Conservation Districts where funding INCREASES (5yr to 15yr)	21	\$1,092	\$60,912
# Conservation Districts where funding DECREASES (5yr to 15 yr)	14	(\$2,437)	(\$84,714)
# Conservation Districts that 'DROP OUT' of the allocation funding stream (5yr to 15yr)	0		
# Conservation Districts that 'COME INTO' the allocation funding stream (5yr to 15yr)	6		
# Conservation Districts that 'STAY IN' the allocation funding stream (5yr to 15yr)	4		





COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

**DATE:** July 2, 2019

**TO:** Members  
State Conservation Commission

**FROM:** Johan E. Berger, Director  
Financial, Certification and Conservation District Programs

**RE:** Fiscal Year 2019-20 Program Budget Proposal  
'Building for Tomorrow' Leadership Development Program

**Action Requested**

Approve the 'Building for Tomorrow' Leadership Development Program Fiscal Year 2019-2020 (FY2019-20) annual budget of \$175,000. An approval of this proposed budget would support several training initiatives for conservation district staff and directors.

**Background**

The 'Building for Tomorrow' Leadership Development Program is a collaborative effort of Pennsylvania's Conservation Partnership, including the State Conservation Commission, Pa Department of Environmental Protection, Pa Department of Agriculture, USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service, PSU Cooperative Extension, PACD and conservation districts. This professional development program for conservation district directors and staff was created by the Partnership over 30 years ago with a collective goal to create a training program that provides the necessary information for conservation district directors and staff to effectively develop and manage conservation district activities and programs.

Program activities are developed and overseen by the Leadership Development Committee (Committee) that consists of representatives from the Partnership agencies and organizations. The Committee recognizes the scope and complexity of programming and funding at conservation districts has dramatically increased exponentially over the decades. Thus, the need for updated leadership skill sets for directors and staff is essential to manage the rapid changes in district staff and board relationships and conservation district program development.

The Committee has developed a list of programs and associated resource needs described in *Attachment 1 - 'Building for Tomorrow' Leadership Development Program "Proposed 2019-2020 Budget"* for program implementation. The "proposed" FY2019-20 budget totals \$175,000 including costs for program activities; costs for support of the Committee and its sub-committees and costs for support of the Program Coordinator.



## **Recommendation**

The program initiatives and budget noted in *Attachment 1* include the continued employment of a Leadership Development Program coordinator and several customary annual program priorities the Committee determined important in the continued effort to enhance and improve conservation district capacity. These initiatives include:

1. *Full-Time Leadership Development Coordinator* - To facilitate program initiatives, the Committee recognizes the necessity to continue to devote resources for a Leadership Development Program Coordinator to assist the Committee. The position is currently hosted by PACD through a contract with the State Conservation Commission.
2. *District Management Summit and Staff Training Conference* – These annual meetings allow district management staff to receive leadership training, exchange expertise and experiences on managing district activities and examine common issues and provides technical staff opportunities to address their inter-personal and leadership knowledge and skills associated with working and relating to the community they serve.
3. *Strategic Planning Grants*: This project reimburses districts for approved expenses associated with completing a strategic plan. A Committee goal is to support 5 conservation districts and provide up to \$1,500 in grants to support a district’s efforts to develop a strategic plan.
4. *Director Training and Support* - This project will continue the development of several initiatives that include an update to the Director’s Handbook and a one-day, statewide Train-the-Trainer session for DEP Field Representatives and District Managers to focus on director orientation materials and methods.
5. *Management Training Initiative* - This project will continue to implement a manager orientation program (‘Manager Boot Camp’) and the development of a Manager’s Handbook.
6. *Regional Trainings for District Directors* - This project would continue to conduct regional statewide trainings to address Board officer responsibilities that include running a public board meeting, fiscal management and oversight of the conservation district’s finances and other topics relevant to the duties and responsibilities of Board of Director officers.
7. *District Transition support* - As a district transitions from a “county employment” affiliation to “independent employment” status they may require assistance in developing a transition plan. The intent of the project it to provide support to a “transitioning” conservation district engaging other conservation district staff, directors and other experts who have already been through a transition or that have expertise in areas that are important for the transition process.

Thank you for your consideration of this budget proposal. The consideration of these recommendations will allow the Committee to move forward in implementation of these important initiatives under the Leadership Development Program in Pennsylvania.

Attachment



# Proposed 2019-2020 Program Budget

PROPOSED PROJECT	Proposed Budget
<p><b>Full-Time Leadership Development Coordinator:</b>            It is critical that the development, organization and implementation of quality, meaningful leadership and development programs and materials be overseen by a full-time coordinator. Based centrally the coordinator can help assure the efficient coordination of resources available from conservation partners as well as non-traditional partners are secured and made available. Project budget includes salary, benefits, office &amp; overhead costs, travel and computer equipment.</p> <p>Leadership Development Program Coordinator activities include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Facilitate meetings and planning sessions for the Committee;</li> <li>b. Assist the Committee in the review and evaluation of current training needs of conservation district directors and staff, including the review and analysis of recent director and staff training needs surveys;</li> <li>c. Coordinate the development and implementation of priority training initiatives established by the Committee;</li> <li>d. Review current Leadership Development Program resources and develop a plan to reintroduce and distribute existing resources where appropriate.</li> </ol>	<b>\$98,000</b>
<p><b>Committee Initiatives:</b>            Committee meeting expenses including materials, equipment, and expenditures supporting activities between the Committee, its subcommittees and Leadership Development Program Coordinator and the maintenance of the Pa Leadership Development Program website.</p>	<b>\$6,500</b>
<p><b>The 'District Transition Support':</b>            As a district transitions to independent employment status they may require assistance in developing a transition plan. The intent of the project it to provide support to a "transitioning" conservation district from other conservation district staff, directors and other experts who have already been through a transition or that have expertise in areas that are important for the transition process. This assistance will help to ensure the "transitioning" conservation district continues to be a well-functioning district throughout the transition process from a "county employment" affiliation to "independent employment" status.</p>	<b>\$2,500</b>
<p><b>2019 District Management Summit:</b>            This annual meeting allows district management staff to receive leadership training, exchange expertise and experiences on managing district activities and examine common issues, without other commitments or distractions within an environment of shared trust and confidentiality. The Management Summit is scheduled for early September 2019.</p>	<b>\$11,000</b>
<p><b>2020 Staff Training Conference:</b>            District Staff are taking on increasingly sophisticated and visible roles and program responsibilities within their respective communities. While there are many "program-related" technical trainings, there are few opportunities on those agendas to address the inter-personal and leadership knowledge and skills associated with working and relating to the constituents they serve. This project involves the planning, development and facilitating state conservation district staff conference to address those needs. A conference is tentatively scheduled for February 2020.</p>	<b>\$11,000</b>

	<b>Proposed Budget</b>
<p><b>Strategic Planning Grants:</b></p> <p>A renewed interest in strategic planning has excited inspired over 65% of conservation districts to have met with partners, municipalities and community representatives to complete strategic business plans. This project reimburses districts for up to \$1,500 in approved expenses associated with completing a strategic plan. A Committee goal is to support five conservation districts in their efforts to develop strategic plans in 2019-2020.</p>	<b>\$7,500</b>
<p><b>Director Training and Support:</b></p> <p>Delivery of a director training and orientation program has been demonstrated to be most effective if delivered both at the local level and within 6 months of being appointed. This project proposes the development of several initiatives to be overseen by a representative work group to help supplement local training programs and provide a team of mentors available to new board members. Initiatives may include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An update to the current Director’s handbook to reflect changes in laws, regulations and policies related to District Director job duties. It is anticipated that LD Program Coordinator will have primary responsibility for work.</li> <li>2. 1-day Statewide Train-the Trainer for DEP Field Reps and District Managers (both of whom were identified by directors as the primary source of orientation) to share orientation materials, successful approaches and identify needed tools.</li> <li>3. Continuation of the Director Orientation workgroup, consisting of representatives of local districts and LD Partners to continue the following tasks: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Review and recommend changes to the Director Handbook to reflect the needs of the “modern” conservation district director</li> <li>b. Update the director job description and individual learning plan and develop a recommended “learning syllabus” for new directors</li> <li>c. Develop a “County-level” delivery system of orientation and Director Handbook knowledge</li> <li>d. Investigate the development of a formal inter-district director mentorship program.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Review and update on-line ‘Director Training Modules and other content delivery mechanisms.</li> </ol>	<b>\$7,500</b>
<p><b>Management Training Initiative:</b></p> <p>District Management has grown in sophistication and complexity, often including managers, middle managers and team leaders. With increasing District responsibilities, budgets and program scope, knowledgeable, capable management continues to be a vital component of District capacity. This project will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued development of an accreditation/training plan, evaluate training materials and options available through several venues and sources for the development of professional managers</li> <li>• Continued development and facilitation of a Manager Boot Camp training program and related events.</li> <li>• Develop a Manager’s Handbook</li> <li>• Continue support of a Manager Training / Accreditation Workgroup to develop and oversee above projects</li> </ul>	<b>\$16,000</b>
<p><b>Regional Trainings for District Directors</b></p> <p>The delivery of specific trainings at the regional level has been a well-received and effective method. With the increase in complexity, sophistication and scope of responsibilities and programming at the District level it is vital that District Directors and their corresponding staff receive current and valuable information. This project proposes that no less than six regional trainings be held around the State to address topics including, but not limited to: chair responsibilities in running a public board meeting, treasurer and/or accounts supervisor responsibilities, and other relevant topics as approved by the LD Committee and the Director Training Subcommittee.</p>	<b>\$15,000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$175,000</b>



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

**Date:** July 2, 2019

**To:** State Conservation Commission

**From:** Roy Richardson, Dirt, Gravel, and Low Volume Roads Program Coordinator

**Through:** Karl G. Brown, Executive Secretary

**RE:** Dirt, Gravel, and Low Volume Roads Program Allocations

**Background**

At its March, 2019 meeting, the State Conservation Commission (Commission) approved policy regarding unspent funds under the old (2013-2018) 5-year funding agreement with Conservation Districts (Districts) as follows:

1. Districts were given until May 24, 2019 to enter all their contract information into the GIS system. After that date, districts that have not committed all their funds under the old agreement shall not be eligible for a new allocation (FY 2019-20). These districts may be eligible for an allocation in FY 2020-21 if they meet the spending requirements at that time.
2. Districts that do not have all their funds under the old agreement spent by June 30, 2019 will have their FY 2019-20 allocations reduced by the amount of unspent funds remaining in their old agreement.
3. Any funds that are not allocated to a district, as per recommendations 1 & 2 above, will be reallocated to other eligible districts for FY 2019-20.

Funding recommendations have traditionally been taken to the Commission at the May business meeting, but because of the June 30 deadline, the allocation recommendation could not take place at that time.

**Paved Low Volume Road Conservation District Allocations.**

Allocations for both LVR and DGR are formula driven. For Low Volume Roads, the formula is as follows:

**Miles Urban Road > 500' to Stream X 1 = A** (*urban, no stream*)

**Miles Urban Road < 500' to Stream X 3 = B** (*urban, stream*)

**Miles Non-Urban Road > 500' to Stream X 3 = C** (*non-urban, no stream*)

**Miles Non-Urban Road < 500' to Stream X 4 = D** (*non-urban, stream*)

**Miles of road near HQ/EV stream X 1 = E** (*HQ/EV "bonus"*)

$$\text{County Allocation} = \left( \frac{\text{A + B + C + D + E for County}}{\text{A + B + C + D + E for State}} \right) \times \text{Total to be distributed to Counties}$$

**How LVR Allocation Formula Works:**

Each county receives points for miles of road in the four categories above (A, B, C, and D above represent these "points"). Points are based on the miles of road in each category, multiplied by the weighting factor for that category (1, 3, 3, 4 respectively). Miles of roads in any of the four categories above are given an additional "bonus" weighting of X1 if they are within 1,000' of a High Quality or Exceptional Value stream. A County's points are totaled, and divided by the statewide point total to obtain a percentage for each county. If a county has 2% of the statewide point total, they would receive 2% of the allocation. A minimum allocation of \$40,000 and a maximum allocation of \$550,000 is also in effect.

**Changes to LVR Allocations for FY 2019-20:**

Note the total LVR funds allocated annually to Conservation District has remained constant since the funding increase in FY 2014-15.

**Allocation Factors:** Each year, the data layers used for allocation factors are updated to the most recently available data. Changes for FY 2019-20 were minimal and had a very minor impact on CD allocations.

**Delaware:** At its May 2019 meeting, the Commission approved the addition of Delaware to the LVR Program (not DGR) and approved them to receive an allocation for FY 2019-20. This generally caused a slight decrease for districts when the Delaware Conservation District was included into the existing allocation formula.

**Districts Not Receiving FY 2019-20 Allocations:** One district did not receive an allocation for FY 2019-20. The \$40,000 in funding that would have been allocated to this district was distributed to other eligible districts through the allocation formula.

**Districts Receiving Reduced FY 2019-20 Allocations:** Six districts had unspent old funding as of June 30th, 2019. These districts had their FY 2019-20 allocations reduced by their amount of unspent old funds. The \$150,287 in funding reduced from these districts were distributed to other eligible districts through the allocation formula.

**Staff recommends approval of the district allocations for Low Volume Roads, based on the allocation formula approved by the SCC on January 17, 2018 shown above.**

**Dirt and Gravel Road Conservation District Allocations**

Allocations for both LVR and DGR are formula driven. For Dirt and Gravel Roads, the formula is:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{Worksites Factor } 50\% = \frac{\text{County Miles of Worksites}}{\text{State Miles of Worksites}} + \text{SEE NOTE BELOW } (1/3) \frac{\text{County \# of Worksites}}{\text{State \# of Worksites}} \\
 \text{Unpaved Road Factor } 45\% = \text{Miles of Unpaved Road in County} + \text{Miles of Unpaved Road in County within 1,000' of HQ/EV stream} \\
 \text{Stone Cost Factor } 5\% = \frac{\text{Stone Cost in County (minus)- Minimum Stone cost in State}}{\text{Minimum Stone cost in State}}
 \end{array}$$

**\*Note:** As approved at the January 2018 Commission meeting, the "Number of Worksites" factor is being phased out of the formula over three years, leaving miles of worksites as the only worksite factor. In FY 2018-19, a factor of two-thirds was multiplied against the "# Worksite" factor. For FY 2019-20, a factor of one-third is multiplied against the "# Worksite" factor. In FY 2020-21, this factor will be eliminated.

**How D&G Allocation Formula Works:**

"Worksites" are road segments that are causing stream impacts, and have been field verified by Conservation Districts. Allocations are determined by creating an index value for each county using the above formula and weighting. Each county's index value is then compared to the statewide total of index values to obtain a percentage. A county whose index value is 2% of the statewide total would receive 2% of the funding. A minimum allocation of \$100,000 and a maximum allocation of \$1,375,000 are also in effect. All data derived from District GIS records.

**Changes to DGR Allocations for FY 2019-20:**

Note the total DGR funds allocated annually to Conservation District has remained constant since the funding increase in FY 2014-15.

**Unpaved Road Assessments:** An assessment is the process of inspecting unpaved roads in the field to determine where they are impacting the waters of the Commonwealth. These identified "worksites" are eligible to eventually become funded projects, and have been a major factor in allocating CD funding since the Program began in 1997. Statewide, over 850 additional miles of worksite have been identified over the past year. In addition, over 200 miles of publicly owned unpaved roads have been added to the statewide inventory during these assessments. Reassessment was completely voluntary. Approximately 9 districts completed substantial reassessments over the past year, with another 10 districts adding only slightly to their inventory. The remaining 46 districts completed minimal or no assessments. Districts identifying additional worksites generally saw an increase in FY 2019-20 allocations.

**Districts Receiving Reduced FY 2019-20 Allocations:** Six districts had unspent old funding as of June 30th, 2019. These districts have their FY 2019-20 allocations reduced by their amount of unspent old funds. The \$179,191 in funding reduced from these districts were distributed to other eligible districts through the allocation formula.

**Overall Impacts:** The large number of factors outlined above make it difficult to attribute allocation changes for each district to any one factor for FY 2019-20. In general, districts that did not meet SCC requirements to spend old 5-year contract funds received a reduced DNG allocation for FY 2019-20, and districts who did significant reassessments saw allocation increases.

**Staff recommends approval of the conservation district allocations for Dirt and Gravel Roads, based on the allocation formula shown above.**

**PA State Conservation Commission**  
**Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Maintenance Program**  
**DIRT AND GRAVEL Proposed Conservation District FY 19-20 Allocations**  
**for SCC approval 7/17/2019**

*FY 19-20 Low Volume Road funds allocated separately*

<b>County</b>	<b>for comparison 2018-19</b>	<b>FOR APPROVAL 2019-20</b>	<b>notes</b>
Adams	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Allegheny	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Armstrong	\$ 888,591	\$ 858,592	
Beaver	\$ 101,307	\$ 101,350	
Bedford	\$ 278,748	\$ 265,342	
Berks	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Blair	\$ 100,000	\$ 42,571	*
Bradford	\$ 1,375,000	\$ 1,375,000	max
Bucks	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Butler	\$ 161,753	\$ 158,014	
Cambria	\$ 116,899	\$ 120,672	
Cameron	\$ 133,909	\$ 134,032	
Carbon	\$ 100,000	\$ 59,189	*
Centre	\$ 152,364	\$ 154,417	
Chester	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Clarion	\$ 365,944	\$ 358,486	
Clearfield	\$ 425,852	\$ 439,773	
Clinton	\$ 170,116	\$ 170,527	
Columbia	\$ 373,205	\$ 394,425	
Crawford	\$ 770,393	\$ 604,168	
Cumberland	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Dauphin	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Elk	\$ 157,226	\$ 158,392	
Erie	\$ 336,534	\$ 368,609	
Fayette	\$ 246,907	\$ 245,801	
Forest	\$ 113,628	\$ 159,231	
Franklin	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Fulton	\$ 140,878	\$ 140,409	
Greene	\$ 398,445	\$ 382,010	
Huntingdon	\$ 295,120	\$ 319,797	
Indiana	\$ 519,915	\$ 562,555	
Jefferson	\$ 316,027	\$ 491,686	
Juniata	\$ 104,463	\$ 79,885	*

<b>County</b>	<b>for comparison 2018-19</b>	<b>FOR APPROVAL 2019-20</b>	<b>notes</b>
Lackawanna	\$ 128,935	\$ 105,548	
Lancaster	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Lawrence	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Lebanon	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Lehigh	\$ 106,907	\$ 71,165	*
Luzerne	\$ 200,551	\$ 191,107	
Lycoming	\$ 417,236	\$ 430,973	
McKean	\$ 274,594	\$ 297,877	
Mercer	\$ 208,813	\$ 193,249	
Mifflin	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Monroe	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Montgomery	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Montour	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
Northampton	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	min
N'uberland	\$ 212,799	\$ 199,161	
Perry	\$ 144,139	\$ 144,627	
Pike	\$ 113,947	\$ 103,110	
Potter	\$ 835,165	\$ 836,788	
Schuylkill	\$ 185,722	\$ 181,975	
Snyder	\$ 124,959	\$ 123,093	
Somerset	\$ 293,636	\$ 463,417	
Sullivan	\$ 364,836	\$ 350,955	
Susquehanna	\$ 1,375,000	\$ 1,375,000	max
Tioga	\$ 1,052,060	\$ 1,041,153	
Union	\$ 100,000	\$ 81,654	*
Venango	\$ 512,942	\$ 519,562	
Warren	\$ 565,657	\$ 555,790	
Washington	\$ 354,797	\$ 344,423	
Wayne	\$ 496,123	\$ 486,301	
Westmoreland	\$ 159,534	\$ 154,375	
Wyoming	\$ 279,605	\$ 261,495	
York	\$ 368,820	\$ 362,269	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 18,620,000</b>	<b>\$ 18,620,000</b>	

**NOTES:**

min = minimum DGR allocation (\$100,000)

max = maximum DGR allocation (\$1,375,000)

\* = allocation below minimum due to reduction of unspent old funds

**PA State Conservation Commission**  
**Dirt, Gravel, and Low-Volume Road Maintenance Program**  
**LOW VOLUME ROAD Proposed Conservation District FY 19-20 Allocations**  
**for SCC approval 7/17/2019**

*FY 19-20 Dirt and Gravel Road funds allocated separately*

County	for comparison 2018-19	FOR APPROVAL 2019-20	notes
Adams	\$ 116,285	\$ 117,865	
Allegheny	\$ 268,189	\$ 271,754	
Armstrong	\$ 132,837	\$ 136,761	
Beaver	\$ 103,178	\$ 104,189	
Bedford	\$ 178,249	\$ 181,308	
Berks	\$ 252,793	\$ 255,695	
Blair	\$ 83,327	\$ 84,767	
Bradford	\$ 97,837	\$ 101,600	
Bucks	\$ 197,067	\$ 199,173	
Butler	\$ 181,787	\$ 184,796	
Cambria	\$ 110,414	\$ 112,355	
Cameron	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	min
Carbon	\$ 50,005	\$ 13,882	*
Centre	\$ 106,505	\$ 107,875	
Chester	\$ 226,983	\$ 229,708	
Clarion	\$ 91,750	\$ 93,548	
Clearfield	\$ 113,902	\$ 107,531	
Clinton	\$ 58,531	\$ 59,246	
Columbia	\$ 83,274	\$ 83,114	
Crawford	\$ 100,520	\$ 103,301	
Cumberland	\$ 127,412	\$ 129,252	
Dauphin	\$ 122,186	\$ 123,931	
Delaware	\$ -	\$ 84,228	
Elk	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	min
Erie	\$ 125,691	\$ 128,424	
Fayette	\$ 144,620	\$ 146,809	
Forest	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	min
Franklin	\$ 124,398	\$ 126,313	
Fulton	\$ 61,662	\$ 62,536	
Greene	\$ 102,837	\$ 104,855	
Huntingdon	\$ 106,596	\$ 108,558	
Indiana	\$ 165,456	\$ 169,007	
Jefferson	\$ 96,623	\$ 97,795	

County	for comparison 2018-19	FOR APPROVAL 2019-20	notes
Juniata	\$ 66,995	\$ 68,108	
Lackawanna	\$ 83,388	\$ 84,813	
Lancaster	\$ 271,171	\$ 274,287	
Lawrence	\$ 99,704	\$ 101,404	
Lebanon	\$ 81,451	\$ 82,381	
Lehigh	\$ 124,127	\$ 109,585	
Luzerne	\$ 151,800	\$ 154,141	
Lycoming	\$ 131,371	\$ 134,745	
McKean	\$ 60,134	\$ 58,304	
Mercer	\$ 128,660	\$ 131,215	
Mifflin	\$ 56,586	\$ 57,340	
Monroe	\$ 125,429	\$ 128,000	
Montgomery	\$ 174,013	\$ 176,855	
Montour	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	min
Northampton	\$ 123,548	\$ 125,459	
N'uberland	\$ 101,622	\$ 102,147	
Perry	\$ 103,698	\$ 104,873	
Pike	\$ 40,000	\$ -	IE
Potter	\$ 58,249	\$ 24,370	*
Schuylkill	\$ 148,163	\$ 150,278	
Snyder	\$ 65,163	\$ 65,793	
Somerset	\$ 174,212	\$ 178,010	
Sullivan	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	min
Susquehanna	\$ 58,938	\$ 60,435	
Tioga	\$ 57,693	\$ 59,891	
Union	\$ 45,370	\$ 18,395	*
Venango	\$ 71,046	\$ 71,218	
Warren	\$ 58,530	\$ 59,960	
Washington	\$ 201,062	\$ 169,732	
Wayne	\$ 90,032	\$ 91,966	
Westmoreland	\$ 269,550	\$ 274,135	
Wyoming	\$ 40,402	\$ 41,700	
York	\$ 254,981	\$ 258,284	

**TOTAL \$ 7,448,000 \$ 7,448,000**

**NOTES:**

IE = Ineligible for FY 19-20 LVR allocation

min = minimum LVR allocation (\$40,000)

\* = allocation below minimum due to reduction of unspent old funds



July 3, 2019

To: Members  
State Conservation Commission

From: Karl G. Brown  
Executive Secretary

RE: Draft Policy for Removal of a Conservation District Director for  
Misfeasance or Malfeasance

Additional information pertaining to this agenda item will be provided at our  
July 17, 2019 Commission Meeting.

July 3, 2019

To: Members  
State Conservation Commission

From: Karl G. Brown  
Executive Secretary

RE: 'Building for Tomorrow' Leadership Development Program Update

Additional information pertaining to this agenda item will be provided at our July 17, 2019 Commission Meeting.

July 3, 2019

To: Members  
State Conservation Commission

From: Karl G. Brown  
Executive Secretary

RE: Spotted Lanternfly Education and Control Activities Update

Additional information pertaining to this agenda item will be provided at our July 17, 2019 Commission Meeting.

July 2, 2019

To: Members  
State Conservation Commission

From: Karl G. Brown  
Executive Secretary

RE: Pa Integrated Water Quality and Assessment Report (Section 303(d) & 305(b))

The *Pa Integrated Water Quality and Assessment Report* is a requirement of the Federal Clean Water Act Sections 303(d) and 305(b). Section 303(d) is the list of waters that require the development of a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and Section 305(b) is the report of the water quality condition of all surface waters of the Commonwealth, either meeting (attaining) or not meeting (impaired) the applicable water quality standards and protected uses.

This report is the thirteenth in a series of reports prepared for Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 303(d) listing, and Section 305(b) reporting. This listing and report are compiled and submitted to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) once every two years. Unlike the 305(b) report, EPA must approve or disapprove the 303(d) list.

Gary Walters, Environmental Program Manager, Water Quality Division DEP will present an overview of the report at the July 17, 2019 public meeting.



**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

DATE: July 1, 2019

TO: State Conservation Commission Members

FROM: Frank X. Schneider, Director  
Nutrient and Odor Management Programs

THROUGH: Karl G. Brown  
Executive Secretary

RE: Nutrient and Odor Management Programs Report

The Nutrient and Odor Management Program Staff of the State Conservation Commission offer the following report of measurable results for the time-period of May / June 2019.

For the months of May and June 2019, staff and delegated conservation districts have:

1. Odor Management Plans:
  - a. 7 OMPs in the review process
  - b. 2 OMPs approved
  - c. 1 OMP Denied
  - d. 2 OMP approvals rescinded
2. Managing fifteen (15) enforcement or compliance actions, currently in various stages of the compliance or enforcement process.
3. Continue to daily answer questions for NMP and OMP writers, NMP reviewers, delegated Conservation Districts, and others.
4. Assisted DEP with various functions and as workgroup members in Federal and State settings for the Chesapeake Bay Program.
5. Continue to work on updating the following
  - a. NM Technical Manual
  - b. NM/MM Administrative Manual
  - c. OMP Program Technical manual and Program Guidance
  - d. OMP BMP reference List
  - e. OMP Vegetative Buffer
  - f. Handling P in NBS's
  - g. Excel and Word NMP Planning Tools



**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

DATE: July 1, 2019

TO: State Conservation Commission Members

FROM: Frank X. Schneider, Director  
Nutrient and Odor Management Programs

THROUGH: Karl G. Brown  
Executive Secretary

RE: Act-38 Nutrient and Manure Management Program Evaluations

In October 2018, SCC staff started to perform combined Nutrient and Manure Management Program Evaluations with delegated Conservation Districts during the current 5-year delegation agreement time frame.

During these evaluations, SCC and DEP staffs are reviewing the performance of conservation districts under the current agreements. The intent is to evaluate all conservation districts in a 4-year timeframe with an overall goal of improving and enhancing program delivery.

The specific purpose of these evaluations is to verify that the districts are meeting the obligations contained in their delegation agreements. In addition, the evaluation provides the conservation districts with the opportunity to comment on the program requirements, SCC and DEP policies and procedures, SCC and DEP training, administrative and technical support, and the district's working relationship with the SCC and DEP Regional Office and other related agencies or partners. It also allows SCC and DEP staff to make recommendations and suggestions aimed at assisting the conservation district in enhancing and/or improving its administration of the program.

Between January 1, 2019 and June 30, 2019, a total of seven (7) conservation districts were evaluated. Six (6) districts evaluated were meeting program requirements and had an overall ranking of "satisfactory", while one (1) conservation evaluated was "non-satisfactory" and will be re-evaluated in six months.

**Below are highlights of SCC/DEP recommendations (number of times).**

1. The district has an excellent working relationship with program partners which greatly helps with program implementation (6 of 7)

2. The district is doing a good job of program education and outreach and promoting cost share programs for plan development and implementation (2 of 7)
3. The district is doing a good job of relationship building and engagement with agricultural producers. (3 of 7)
4. The district is very active in assisting operators with MMP development and implementation. (1 of 7)
5. The SCC appreciates the districts efforts in promoting REAP within their county (3 of 7)
6. The SCC appreciates the districts efforts in providing outreach to their CAOs concerning Odor Management (1 of 7)
7. The SCC appreciates the way, and when, the district gets their SCC Regional Coordinator involved with compliance issues, not calling the SCC with every question, but also not waiting until the situation becomes overwhelming, and always doing so in a profession manner (4 of 7)
8. DEP acknowledges and appreciates the districts prompt submission of their Quarterly Reports to the Department for both the Act 38 and Chapter 91 Programs (3 of 7)
9. The SCC recommends to contact SCC Regional Coordinator when the district cannot perform all required annual on-site status review inspections (1 of 7).
10. It is suggested that the district maintains file notes (Con-6 notes) in each NMP file (4 of 7)
11. The district should consider keeping paper copies of all required documents in each NMP file in accordance with the guidance in the Administrative Manual (1 of 7)
12. The district should consider adopting a technical assistance policy consistent with the Administrative Manual (1 of 7)
13. The district should not be developing Act 49 Nutrient Balance Sheets (1 of 7)
14. The district is reminded to copy DEP on all official correspondence with CAFO operations (1 of 7)
15. The district should be using the standard inspection report forms from the Administrative Manual for all Act 38 and Chapter 91 complaints respectively (1 of 7)
16. The district is encouraged to sign and/or review reciprocal agreement with another conservation district to aid each other in reviewing NMPs. This is especially helpful when dealing with staff turnover and for final nutrient management specialist certification requirements (5 of 7)
17. The SCC acknowledges the districts close working relationship, and reliance on NRCS and PACD for their technical assistance and engineering needs, but still encourages the district to let their staff get NRCS job approval on appropriate Ag BMPs (3 of 7)
18. The district is reminded to be sure to meet the annual NM education and outreach requirements as outlined in the delegation agreement (1 of 7)
19. The district should consider adopting a technical assistance policy consistent with the Administrative Manual (4 of 7)
20. The district is encouraged to provide education and outreach to those operations who may be impacted by the new standard animal weights and could potentially become CAOs or CAFOs. (1 of 7)

21. The district should consider better organizing their Chapter 91 filing system (1 of 7)
22. The district should consider developing and adopting a manure management outreach, education, training and planning compliance implementation strategy (1 of 7)
23. The SCC recommends technical comments should not be included in the formal administrative completeness review letter (1 of 7)
24. The SCC recommends that DEP comments should be copied and pasted below CD staff comments on the formal comment letter for CAFOs and all comments sent to plan writer at one time (1 of 7)
25. The SCC recommends that when the district believes a NMP will exceed the first 90-day review timeframe, that the district should complete and submit "Plan Review Extension requests and discuss review issues with SCC Regional Coordinator. (1 of 7)
26. The SCC recommends that if planner does not address all the comments within the requested 30-day timeframe and the plan is deficient, that the district should consider recommending disapproval of these plans and/or report these plan writers to SCC. (1 of 7)
27. The SCC and DEP recommend that formal letters be sent to operators after all complaint investigations visits (1 of 7)
28. The district is reminded that their Delegation Agreement obligates them to performing NM Status Reviews on all CAO and CAFOs every year, and on all VAOs once every 3 years (2 of 7).

**Below are highlights of conservation district comments (number of times)**

1. The district suggests that a more navigable/searchable technical manual would cut down on calls to SCC staff (1 of 7)
2. The district would benefit from additional Practice Keeper training (3 of 7)
3. The district staff time is very limited to devote to assisting operators with plan and BMP implementation due to significant time spent with training (certification and others), CBP inspections and plan reviews. Review time is significant for several very large dairy CAFOs in the county that amend their NMPs nearly every year. (1 of 7)
4. The district characterizes their farmers' receptiveness to the Act 38 Program as resistant and burdensome, due largely to the cost of plan development. It is very hard to recruit VAOs since MMPs do not expire, and there is no incentive to be a VAO. The district offers that providing cost-share assistance may help with this issue. (3 of 7)
1. Regarding educational and training, the district offers that they have the following needs:
  - a. Administrative training;
  - b. Refresher technical trainings;
  - c. Regional trainings and workshops;
  - d. The district would like to see a basic visual factsheet regarding manure application rates (Ex: What different rates per acre would look like) and setbacks, etc. developed for farm workers who apply manure for their bosses;



- e. Consider development of a handout concerning the benefits of holding an Act 38 NMP and/or other additional educational items to promote Act 38 NMPs;
  - f. Education outreach to emphasize the limited liability protection concerning the higher level of planning being utilized under Act 38;
  - g. Are we marketing these programs in the best way? (social media, Facebook, apps);
  - h. The district suggests having a standard NM / MM display that could be loaned out would be beneficial. (5 of 7)
2. The district offers that the SCC is very responsive to inquiries and requests for assistance (3 of 7).
  3. Regarding ways to improve trainings, the district offers that:
    - a. For technical trainings (for staff already NM certified) that NMSs could send in questions or concerns ahead of time, with those questions or concerns then being addressed in an educational setting;
    - b. Along with the current technical trainings, providing administrative training could be helpful;
    - c. Odor Management;
    - d. Having more of a focus on the non-typical situations that can occur on farms and within plans;
    - e. At the SCC's Annual Conference, have a time for "*Stories from the Field*" such as NRCS does during their annual Technician Engineering Workshop. (3 of 7)
  4. Regarding ways support from state staff could be improved, the district offers that:
    - a. Timeliness from DEP on compliance issues could be improved;
    - b. Consistency among staff could be improved;
    - c. Having a focus on the big picture, as well as, the relevant details;
    - d. Be more supportive towards new employees as they work to get their NM Certification. (2 of 7)
  5. The district would like to have sufficient funding to employ a full-time ag conservation technician (2 of 7)
  6. The scope of the program has really changed and is challenging for both participants and staff (1 of 7)
  7. More flexibility is needed in the required complexity of NMPs used to count towards NMPR certification. This could delay the advancement in job positions for the district staff. Some counties are dealing with mostly export plans and even limited acres of land application should be acceptable. Suggest SCC facilitate the coordination of eligible plans between counties (1 of 7).
  8. In relation to the 2/21/2017 policy direction for "Submitting Nutrient Management Plans after Manure Has Already Been Applied, Exported, or Utilized in a Crop Year" does not hold the operator accountable. It allows them to operate for a crop year without an "approved" plan and there is no penalty imposed for not having an approved NMP. The "acknowledgement" seems to give the operator a pass to be without an approved plan for a year. Board action should be taken on the acknowledgement. Then, the next three-year plan can be dealt with separately. The operator needs to be held responsible for the late plan

- submission. In our opinion, NMCs assume no penalty will be enforced and just continue submitting late and admin incomplete plans. It seems there should be a penalty imposed for the period of time without an approved plan or at the least for the spreading/export event. We experienced two late NMP submissions with admin incomplete issues. In the one case that was referred to SCC, no enforcement action was taken and the 3-year NMP took over 6 months to get it through the approval process. *NOTE: The approved policy requires the plan writer and operator to submit a NMP for the crop year that has already begun and also submit a NMP for the next three crop years (or 1 year if they choose single year planning). With the policy, there are two NMPs submitted with the 1<sup>st</sup> (current crop year) reviewed and acknowledged and the 2<sup>nd</sup> (next crop year(s)) reviewed and acted upon. The correspondence on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> plan are sent at the time of BOD action (1 of 7*
9. The district is concerned that some NMCs are not performing timely and quality work for their clients (late or administratively incomplete submissions). Currently, some NMCs do not take deadlines seriously as there have not been any repercussions to fear. Since there is limited means to penalize NMCs, the district encourages the SCC to hold the operator accountable in these instances (1 of 7).
  10. Regarding ways to help the plan review process, the district offers that the SCC should reconsider the timing of all plans being due and having to be reviewed in a short timeframe. SCC should encourage NMCs to submit plans earlier in the year, even though the current plan does not expire until September 30. Changing the timing of the 3A/3B/3C Plan Renewal Notice letters and deadline to June 1 would allow for the processing time needed so most approvals could be completed prior to the October 1 start of the crop year. CD staff propose sending 3A letter in January with June 1 deadline; 3B letter in April with same June 1 deadline; 3C "FINAL NOTICE" letter in May with same June 1 deadline. Using the same deadline in all letters keeps it consistent instead of the current procedure of adding another 60 or 30 additional days when a deadline is missed. In lieu of no changes to the timing of letters and deadlines, enforcement activities need to be carried out. (1 of 7)
  11. In relation to Act 38 program, the district would like the SCC to follow through and support CDs when we refer cases for enforcement. At the point, we refer a case, we feel we have followed the procedures to obtain compliance. Operators and NMCs do not take the program seriously because enforcement in the form of a penalty is lacking. Operators need fined when plans are submitted late or administratively incomplete close to the deadline. We understand NMCs may be the reason for the late or administratively incomplete plans, but if the operators were actually penalized they would learn to better scrutinize their choice of planners and push their NMCs to do the job they were hired for. The operator needs to be held accountable when their NMC doesn't complete the plan on time. The excuse that the NMC did not get it done should not be an out for the operator. (1 of 7)
  12. In relation to Chapter 91 program, the district would like DEP to follow through and support CDs when we refer cases for enforcement. At the point, we refer a case, we feel we have followed the procedures to obtain compliance. Operators do not take the program seriously because enforcement in the form of a penalty is

- lacking. The operator needs to be held accountable when they do not submit the required plan or implement the temporary controls. (1 of 7)
13. The district would appreciate if DEP would respond to the notification acknowledging receipt of notice and whether or not they have comments on the NMP.
  14. The district offers that those getting certified as NMCs (commercial planners) should be required to go through the Plan Review class, so they realize and understand what plan reviewers will be checking. (1 of 7)
  15. The district would like to receive inspection reports when DEP refers farm operations to them which DEP has inspected and found out of compliance (2 of 7)
  16. The district requests a checklist of required documents to be retained at CD office' as well as' one for Act 38 operators be developed (1 of 7)
  17. Regarding the CAFO Program, the district offers that with DEP only being on 1 CAFO inspection in six years, they are concerned that farmers are starting to see the CAFO program as having no teeth (1 of 7)



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
**STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**DATE:** July 2, 2019  
**TO:** State Conservation Commission  
**FROM:** Johan E. Berger  
 Financial, Certification and Conservation District Programs  
**SUBJ:** 2019 Program Accomplishments: Nutrient and Odor Management Specialist;  
 Commercial Manure Hauler & Broker Certification programs

**Certification Program Summary**

State Conservation Commission staff facilitate training and certification programs for persons interested in ‘commercial’ or ‘public’ certification to develop or review nutrient management or odor management plans under the Act 38 *Nutrient Management and Facility Odor Management* programs. Training is also facilitated for commercial manure haulers and brokers seeking certification under the Act 49 *Commercial Manure Hauler and Broker Certification* program.

**Program Accomplishments (January 1, 2019 to June 30, 2019)**

1. Program staff facilitated one certification cycle of course work for the Nutrient Management Specialist certification program beginning March 2019. Sixteen (16) individuals completed the necessary certification coursework to achieve provisional certification in commercial and public certification categories. Each cycle includes twelve (12) days of training in eight (8) courses. The next certification cycle begins August 21, 2019
2. One certification cycle of coursework for the Commercial Manure Hauler and Broker certification program was offered in March 2019. Twenty-eight (28) commercial manure haulers or brokers completed their required coursework and certification requirements. Each cycle contains two (2) days of coursework.
3. Program staff issued the following licenses to individuals who successfully completed certification requirements and/or continuing education requirements for license renewals:
  - a. Nutrient Management and Odor Management Specialists:.....26
  - b. Nutrient Management Specialist (Provisional License) ..(pending completion of current certification cycle) ..... 15
  - c. Commercial Manure Haulers and Brokers:..... 195

Total licenses monitored and maintained by Commission staff on behalf of PDA:

- a. Nutrient Management Specialists..... 285
  - b. Odor Management Specialists .....32
  - c. Commercial Manure Haulers and Brokers ..... 843
4. Approved credits for eligible continuing education programs scheduled from January 1 to March 31, 2019:
- a. Nutrient Management & Odor Management Specialist certification: ..... 36 events
  - b. Commercial Manure Hauler and Broker certification:..... 24 events
5. Program staff performed six (6) site inspections regarding record keeping requirements under the Act 49 Commercial Manure Hauler and Broker Certification Program.



**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**DATE:** June 26, 2019

**TO:** Members  
State Conservation Commission

**FROM:** Karl J. Dymond  
State Conservation Commission *KJ Dymond*

**SUBJECT:** July 2019 Status Report on Facility Odor Management Plan Reviews

**Detailed Report of Recent Odor Management Plan Actions**

In accordance with Commission policy, attached is the Odor Management Plans (OMPs) actions report for your review. No formal action is needed on this report unless the Commission would choose to revise any of the plan actions shown on this list at this time. This recent plan actions report details the OMPs that have been acted on by the Commission and the Commission's Executive Secretary since the last program status report provided to the Commission at the May 2019 Commission meeting.

**Program Statistics**

Below are the overall program statistics relating to the Commission's Odor Management Program, representing the activities of the program from its inception in March of 2009, to June 25, 2019.

The table below summarizes approved plans grouped by the Nutrient Management Program Coordinator Areas and by calendar year (minus any rescinded plans).

	Central	NE/NC	SE/SC	West	Totals
<b>2009</b>	7	6	28	1	42
<b>2010</b>	5	7	25	2	39
<b>2011</b>	10	12	15	2	39
<b>2012</b>	9	17	16	2	44
<b>2013</b>	10	11	38	3	62
<b>2014</b>	13	16	44	2	75
<b>2015</b>	15	15	61	2	93
<b>2016</b>	19	16	59	4	98
<b>2017</b>	25	24	44	3	96
<b>2018</b>	14	13	40	1	68
<b>2019</b>	5	3	3		11
<b>Total</b>	132	140	373	22	
<b>Grand Total</b>					667

As of June 25, 2019, there are six hundred sixty-seven **approved** plans and/or amendments, nine plans have been **denied**, thirteen plans/ amendments have been **withdrawn** without action taken, sixty-five plans/ amendments were **rescinded**, and seven plans/ amendments are going through the **plan review process**.

# OMP Status Report

Action	OMP Name	County	Municipality	Species	AEUs	OSI Score	Status	Amended
4/30/2019	Esh, Norman	Lycoming	Washington Twp	Layers	24.50	57.4	Rescinded	
5/24/2019	Graywood Farms, LLC	Lancaster	Fulton Twp	Cattle	190.00	18.9	Approved	A
5/24/2019	Miller, Joseph A	Jefferson	McCalmont Twp	Veal	82.76	79.6	Rescinded	D
5/24/2019	Miller, Joseph A	Jefferson	McCalmont Twp	Multi	97.00	81.2	Rescinded	A
5/24/2019	Miller, Joseph A	Jefferson	McCalmont Twp	Veal	100.06	77.9	Rescinded	C
5/24/2019	Miller, Joseph A	Jefferson	McCalmont Twp	Veal	117.37	84.2	Rescinded	B
5/24/2019	Miller, Joseph A	Jefferson	McCalmont Twp	Multi	97.00	81.2	Rescinded	
5/30/2019	Stoltzfus, Samuel – Toy Cow Dairy	Lycoming	Limestone Twp	Multi	94.0	18.6	Denied	
6/6/2019	Byler, Valentine	Armstrong	Wayne Twp	Veal	46.45	46.2	Rescinded	
6/10/2019	Evergreen Farms, Inc - Home Farm	Huntingdon	Franklin Twp	Cattle	580.00	16.3	Approved	B

*As of June 25, 2019*



**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**DATE:** July 2, 2019  
**TO:** State Conservation Commission  
**FROM:** Johan E. Berger  
 Financial, Certification and Conservation District Programs  
**SUBJ:** 2018 -2019 Program Accomplishments (January 2018 to July 2019)  
 Resource Protection and Enhancement Program (REAP)

**REAP Program Summary**

The Resource Enhancement and Protection (REAP) Program allows farmers, businesses, and landowners to earn state tax credits in exchange for the implementation of conservation Best Management Practices (BMPs) on Pennsylvania farms. REAP is a “first-come, first-served” program – no rankings. The program is administered by the State Conservation Commission and the tax credits are awarded by the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue. Eligible applicants receive between 50% and 75% of project costs in the form of State tax credits for up to \$150,000 per agricultural operation.

**Program Accomplishments**

The FY2018 REAP application period opened on August 1, 2018. Below is a summary of the FY2017 round of REAP applications and a summary of the FY2018 round, to date (1.) and, a summary of REAP activities from January 1, 2019 to June 30, 2019 (2). Approximately twelve (12) applications received in program year 2017, representing approximately \$1.1 million, could not be considered under the FY2017 allocation. These applications were held for consideration in the FY2018-19 round of applications for REAP.

**(1.) FY 2017 & FY 2018**

<b>Applications</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>Other Public Funds</b>	<b>REAP Requests</b>	<b>Credits Granted</b>
2017 307	\$27.1 million	\$5.6 million	\$10.4 million	\$8.1 million
2018 234	\$26.2 million	\$5.0 million	\$10.2 million	\$2.3 million

<b>a) <u>REAP Request – project types</u></b>	<b><u>FY2017</u></b>	<b><u>FY2018</u></b>
1) Proposed.....	\$2.40 million	\$3.8 million
2) Completed Projects .....	\$8.50 million	\$6.4 million
b) No-Till Equipment.....	\$3.85 million	\$3.7 million
c) Structural BMPs (including cover crops) .....	\$6.4 million	\$5.9 million
d) Plans (Ag E&S, Conservation, Manure Management, Nutr. Mgmt.) .....	\$178,500	\$127,500
e) Low Disturbance Residue Management Equipment .....	\$283,000	\$329,000
f) Precision Ag Equipment .....	\$145,000	\$92,800



**(2.) January 01, 2019 – June 30, 2019**

1. Tax Credits issued to applicants for completed projects ..... \$2.98 million
2. Number of BMPs completed associated with issued tax credits..... 122
3. Number of new tax credit ‘sales’ completed.....*105 sale transactions*
4. Value of new tax credits processed through ‘sales’.....*\$2.5 million*
5. Number of site inspections conducted on completed projects ..... 9
6. Educational and promotional activities included one press release:
  - 2 speaking events
  - 1 Press release



## BUILDING BRIDGES

Farmers\* Municipalities\* Citizens  
Conservation Districts\* Agribusiness

To: Members June 30, 2019  
State Conservation Commission  
From: Beth Futrick  
Agriculture/Public Liaison  
Through: Karl G. Brown, Executive Secretary  
State Conservation Commission  
Re: Ombudsman Program Update – Southern Alleghenies Region

### **Activities: May-June 2019**

- Organized a regional equine workshop (manure & E/S management) in Blair County
- Organizing mini-pasturewalks developed for new/beginning grazers (three planned for this summer)
- Developing “multi-functional buffer” workshops to highlight growing: nut trees, herbs, fruit, cut flowers, etc. in a riparian buffer. the multi-functional riparian buffer at Natureworks Park (Planned for this fall at BCCD property)
- Assisting Dr. Machtinger, Penn State U, with a SARE grant to develop education for pest fly control in poultry facilities.
- Assisting Shelly Dehoff with developing “ombudsman” presentation in partnership with PSATS and PA Ag Law Center – to be delivered at PSATS event 2019.
- Coordinated/hosted a producer event at Penn State Altoona “Ag Income Opportunities and the New Farm Bill”
- Prepared a Right-to-Farm/ACRE presentation for Westmoreland Ag Summit

### **Meetings/Trainings/Events**

- Westmoreland Ag Summit planning meeting (May 13)
- Stormwater grant(s) meeting with Altoona Curve Baseball managers (May 14)
- Pasturewalk planning meeting (May 23)
- Stormwater grant(s) meeting with Lakemont Partnership (May 29)
- Cambria County fly complaint farm visit (June 5)
- Equine Pasturewalk (June 8)
- Fly Workshop planning meeting with Penn State (June 11)
- Farm to School meeting at Hollidaysburg Area High School (June 11)
- Pasturewalk planning meeting at Davis Farm (June 13)
- Ag Summit (farmer event) Westmoreland Conservation District (June 19)
- Multifunctional Riparian Buffer planning meeting with DCNR and Penn State Ext (June 25)
- Clinton County fly complaint farm visit (June 26)
- Multi-County pasture walk in Huntingdon Co (June 27)

### **Conflict Issues/Municipal Assistance –**

- Cambria County- Fly complaint
- Reviewing Timber Harvest ordinances and E/S plan review requirements/permitted fees
- Clinton County – Fly complaint
- Allegheny County – manure/odor complaint

### **Reports & Grant Applications**

- BCCD Board Report
- DCNR multi-functional riparian buffer grant progress report



## BUILDING BRIDGES

Farmers \* Municipalities \* Citizens  
Conservation Districts \* Agribusiness

To: Members  
State Conservation Commission

From: Shelly Dehoff  
Agriculture/Public Liaison

Through: Karl G. Brown, Executive Secretary  
State Conservation Commission

Re: Agricultural Ombudsman Program Update

July 17, 2019

**Activities:** Since mid-May 2019, I have taken part or assisted in a number of events, including the following:

- Helping plan LCCD legislative breakfast for later in the summer
- Coordinated future goals/efforts with Beth Futrick for Ombudsman Program
- Working with American Farmland Trust to help create Women for the Land Learning Circle; attended planning meeting for November event
- attended Healthy Soils, Healthy Streams at Steve Groff's farm as part of Lanc Clean Water Week
- Events as South Central Task Force Agriculture Subcommittee Planning Specialist
  - arranging grain bin rescue kit training in Adams and Franklin Counties for Fall 2019
  - ran monthly Ag Subcommittee meetings
  - met with Public Information Officer for SCTF to start assisting with social media outreach
  - organizing meeting of 8 county CART coordinators for this SCTF region
  - attended quarterly Executive Committee meeting
- Planning presentations at PSATS Fall regional meetings in cooperation with PA Ag Law Center
- Continued 2019 Lanc Co Ag Week and Denim & Pearls planning efforts
- Attended and assisted at Lancaster Co. Agriculture Council meeting
- Volunteered at Family Farm Days at milking parlor viewing deck
- Attended Mushroom Farmers of PA meeting in Chester Co.

**Local Government Interaction:** I have been asked to provide educational input regarding agriculture:  
**none currently**

**Moderation or Liaison Activities:** I have been asked to provide moderation or liaison assistance with a particular situation:  
**None currently**

**Research and Education Activities:**

**Farm & Home Center**—still working with building manager to look at safety/security preparedness and communication options for all tenants at Farm & Home Center

**York Co**— inquiry about Tiger mosquito control methods

**Adams Co**— inquiry from horse farm about fly control methods on that operation

**Fly Complaint Response Coordination:** I have taken complaints or am coordinating fly-related issues in:

**York**— multiple complaints from one area

**Lancaster**— multiple complaints from previous site

**Perry Co**—ongoing situation; long term issues