AGRICULTURE COST SHARE PROGRAM
Technical Review Committee

December 18, 2024 - 1:30 PM

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

TRC Members: John Beck, Erin Rivers, Dianne Farrer, Starla Harwood, Rick McSwain, Benjy Strope, Rodney Wright, Rachel Smith, Dewitt Hardee, David Harris

Guests: David Williams, Michael Shepherd, Julie Henshaw, Lisa Fine, Shelby Kaplan, Lorien Deaton, Allie Dinwiddie, Roger Toledo, Lorien Deaton, Chris Love, Bryan Evans

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
   A. Call to Order at 1:31 PM
   B. October Meeting Minutes
      a. Dewitt Hardee motions to approve and Rachel Smith seconds.
      b. Motion is approved, no objections or abstentions

2. Commission Meeting Updates
   A. The Waste Application System and Constructed Wetlands BMPs were approved by the Soil and Water Conservation.

3. Waste Management Workgroup Updates (ACTION ITEMS)

   A. Concentrated Nutrient Source Management System
      a. John Beck reviewed the workgroup recommendations. There were no suggested revisions from the committee.
      b. Benjy Strope motions to approve the changes, Dewitt Hardee seconds.
         i. Motion approved, no abstentions or objections.

   B. Insect Control Practice
      a. The committee provided revisions making it clear that there is an option to come to the full committee for BMP approval, and not just the TRC subcommittee for this practice.
      b. Benjy Strope motions to approve the changes, Dianne Farrer seconds.
      c. Motion approved, no abstentions or objections.

   C. Solids Separation from Tank/Raceway-Based Aquaculture Production

a. There was discussion around the use of 'fish', as these systems can have prawns or other species.
b. The Committee discussed the difference in aquaculture system types in different parts of the state. This BMP focuses on raceway type systems that are directly tied to surface waters. Recirculation systems are closed systems and not included with this BMP.
c. Dewitt Hardee motions to approve the changes, Rachel Smith seconds.
    a. Motion approved, no abstentions or objections.

4. Continued Discussion on Adding Flash Grazing to Livestock Exclusion Fencing BMP

A. Staff reviewed the discussion to date. Discussion continued on setbacks, timing and maintenance of the riparian area with flash grazing. Concerns on the water quality and riparian vegetation impact of allowing flash grazing were expressed. Discussion ensued on the timing (specific timeframe vs seasonal) and duration of the practice. There was general agreement that the buffer zone is not meant for regular grazing, but to maintain the growth occurring in this area. The district would have to give guidance on use, timing and stocking density. One time a year was discussed as adequate if the goal is to maintain growth, but this can also depend on the number of cattle. Allowing enough time for important woody vegetation to mature was noted as important to add, which could be 5-10 years depending on the species and deer browsing. It was agreed upon that if there is an emergency water source needed, cattle should be allowed into the buffer area with permission.

B. The group discussed restrictions to this practice where other ACSP BMPs have been installed and are under active maintenance, such as streambank projects and riparian buffers. A clause stating this BMP cannot be used where it can cause harm to a conservation practice/easement or contradict current policy may be added.

C. Staff suggested having a workgroup specific to this practice.

5. Member Items
A. None

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 PM

ACSP Technical Review Committee

December 18, 2024

Technical Review Committee Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Commission Meeting Updates
3. Waste Management BMP Workgroup Updates
4. Flash Grazing with Livestock Exclusion Fencing Discussion
5. Member Items

TRC Membership

John Beck, Chair	Division of Soil and Water Conservation
Erin Rivers	Cooperative Extension Service/ NC State University
Niroj Aryal	School of Agriculture, NC A & T State University
Dianne Farrer	N. C. Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
Starla Harwood	Farm Service Agency
Anne Coan	N. C. Farm Bureau Federation
Dewitt Hardee	N. C. State Grange
Brandon King	State Resource Conservationist, NRCS
Jim Kjelgaard	State Conservation Engineer, NRCS
Rachel Smith	Division of Soil and Water Conservation
Rick McSwain	Division of Soil and Water Conservation
Anne Deaton	Division of Marine Fisheries
Benjy Strope	Wildlife Resources Commission
Rodney Wright	Rockingham Soil and Water Conservation District Employee
David Harris	Durham Soil and Water Conservation District Supervisor

2. Commission Meeting Update

- All recommended Waste Management BMPs were approved
  - Waste Application Systems BMP
  - Constructed Wetlands BMP

3. Waste Management BMP Workgroup

Goals

- Update the NC ACSP BMP policies that address livestock waste management
- Review in groups of 3-4 through FY2024-2025
- Have all the BMPs updated by FY2026 to align with the next Average Cost List Update

3. Waste Management BMP Workgroup

Membership

Brandi Talton – Wayne SWCD	James Lamb – SWCC, Sampson Supervisor
Adam Hilton – Davidson SWCD	Dianne Farrer – NCDA
James Vincent – Pitt SWCD	Rick McSwain – DSWC
Henry Faison – Sampson SWCD	Michael Shepherd – DSWC
Jessica Perrin – Orange SWCD	Sam Edwards – DSWC
Lee Holcomb – NRCS	Mark Seibert – DSWC
Stephanie Kulesza – NCSU	Chris Love – DSWC
Christine Lawson – DWR	John Beck – DSWC

3. Waste Management BMPs

SWCC Approved

- Dry Stack
- Lagoon Biosolids Removal
- Waste Impoundment Closure
- Manure/Litter Transport
- Retrofit of On-going Animal Operations
- Constructed Wetlands
- Waste Application System

TRC Agenda

- Concentrated Nutrient Source Management System
- Insect Control Practice
- Solids Separation from Tank/ Raceway-based Aquaculture Production

Workgroup Approved

- Odor Control Management System
- Storm Water Management System

In-Progress

- Feeding/ Waste Storage Structure
- Heavy Use Area Protection
- Livestock Mortality Management System

Remaining

- Manure Composting Facility
- Waste Treatment Lagoon/ Storage Pond

3.A. Concentrated Nutrient Source Management System

- Minor updates to policy language
  - Included specific program names
  - Updated Average Cost “List” name
  - Added the 90% option
  - Changed area office approval to Division
  - Specified 590 Nutrient Management reference
- Added DWR approval reminder for permitted operations
- Some NRCS reference standards are listed with an additional reference to “any approved ACSP BMP as needed per system design”

Concentrated Nutrient Source Management System

Definition/Purpose

A Concentrated Nutrient Source Management System is a system of vegetative and structural measures used to manage the collection, storage, and/or treatment of areas where agricultural products may cause an area of concentrated nutrients. Examples could include sweet potato culls and silage leachate. (DIP)

Policies

1. Concentrated Nutrient Source Management System components must adhere to existing NCACSP BMP policies and NC NRCS standards.

2. Elements and items already a part of the NCACSP Average Cost ~~Guide~~ List will be paid at 75/90% of average cost; includes grading, vegetation, and pipe. Other approved BMPs (e.g., filter strip, critical area planting, and diversion) may be incorporated into the Concentrated Nutrient Source Management System. For components not found in the Average Cost ~~Guide~~ List, cost will be based on 75/90% of actual cost with ~~area office~~Division approval required.

3. For systems ~~W~~where nutrients are land applied, the application must be in accordance with a nutrient management plan that conforms to the NRCS 590 Nutrient Management standard.

~~3.~~4. For any treatment system associated with a Division of Water Resources (DWR) permitted confined animal operation that will be in line with existing treatment systems on the facility, shall obtain prior approval from DWR before installation.

CONCENTRATED NUTRIENT SOURCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	
Maintenance Period	10 years
BMP Units	EACH
Required Effects	ACRES_AFFECTED ANIMAL TYPE ANIMAL UNITS N and P Waste Managed
JAA~~/NRCS standards unless otherwise noted~~	~~ECS - 590 - Nutrient Management~~ NRCS Area Office or Division of Soil and Water Conservation Professional ~~e~~Engineer must approve engineering designs.
~~Supporting Practices~~NRCS Standards	ECS - 393 - Filter Strip ECS - 342 - Critical Area Planting ECS - 362 ~~-~~ – Diversion ECS - 590 - Nutrient Management Any approved ACSP BMP as needed per system design

CS2 /Reference Materials.	NC-ACSP-11 Signature Page Map with BMP locations, fields, and roads. ~~NC-WMP Form~~ Nutrient Management Plan (~~i~~if applicable)
Additional Spot-check Requirements	All waste management systems for operations not permitted by the Division of Water Resources must be spot-checked annually for five years following implementation.

3.A. Concentrated Nutrient Source Management System

- Action: *Approve the Concentrated Nutrient Source Management System BMP revisions*

3.B Insect Control Practice

- Name changed to “system” to match the definition
- Removed reference to specific 1217 guidance amendments that may change
  - ➢Replaced with reference to the checklist
- Requesting the TRC Subcommittee for Waste Management Measures provide ‘system’ approval
- Requiring an approved WMP that addresses system updates where necessary
- NRCS standard references FOTG to include any appropriate BMP

Agriculture Cost Share Program

Insect Control ~~Practice~~System

Definition/Purpose

An Insect Control system means a practice or combination of practices (planting windbreaks, pre-charging structures, incorporation of waste into soil, etc.) which manages or controls insects from confined animal operations, waste treatment and storage structures, and waste applied to agricultural land. (DIP)

Policies

1. Consideration will be given to practices to minimize insects as listed in the Insect Control Checklist appendix of the 1217 Interagency Group Guidance Document.

~~1.~~2. Novel or ~~U~~unproven technology or techniques must be approved or recommended by the NCSU Animal and Poultry Waste Management Center.

~~2.~~3. ~~Consideration will be given to practices to minimize insects as listed in the Insect Control Checklist appendix of the 1217 Interagency Group Guidance Document Attachment 10 of the Fourth Guidance Memo dated January 2, 1997~~.

4. Each insect control BMP or contract with an insect control BMP must be approved by the ~~Technical Review Committee~~TRC Subcommittee for Waste Management Measures.

~~3.~~5. An approved waste management plan that meets NRCS standards is required for all contracts. The plan must be revised, if necessary, to meet any changes in the operation which alter the waste management needs of the operation.

INSECT CONTROL ~~PRACTICE~~SYSTEM	
Maintenance Period	10 years
BMP Units	EACH
Required Effects	ACRES_AFFECTED ANIMAL TYPE ANIMAL UNITS N and P Waste Managed
JAA~~/NRCS standards unless otherwise noted~~	Professional Engineer ~~Or~~ ~~NRCS Field Office Technical Guide as appropriate.~~
NRCS standards and specifications	NRCS Field Office Technical Guide as appropriate
CS2 Reference Materials	NC-ACSP-11 Signature Page Map with BMP location, fields, and roads. ~~NC WMP Form~~Waste Management Plan

(May 2019, July 2012)

Commented [JB1]: Insect Control Checklist for Animal Operations _Novemebr 1– (ncagr.gov)

Commented [JB2R1]: Soil & Water - SB 1217 Interagency Guidance Committee | NC Agriculture

Commented [JB3R1]: Add links to website

Commented [JB4]: Add link to website

Commented [JB5R4]: Animal and Poultry Waste Management Center - College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (ncsu.edu)

Commented [JB6]: Insect Control Checklist for Animal Operations _Novemebr 1– (ncagr.gov)

Commented [JB7R6]: Soil & Water - SB 1217 Interagency Guidance Committee | NC Agriculture

Commented [JB8R6]: Add links to website

Commented [JB9]: Formsite Link added to website

Additional Spot-check Requirements	All waste management systems for operations not permitted by the Division of Water Resources must be spot-checked annually for five years following implementation.

3.B. Insect Control System

- Action: *Approve the Insect Control System BMP revisions*

3.C. Solids Separation from Tank/Raceway-Based Aquaculture Production

- Updated the definition to match the DIP
- Added reference to the manure/litter transport incentive
- Added WMP requirement, when needed
- Updated required JAA – Waste Separation Facility (632)

Solids Separation from Tank/Raceway-Based Aquaculture Production

Definition/ Purpose

A system for the removal, storage and dewatering of solid waste from the effluent of tank or raceway-based aquaculture production systems. ~~(DIP)~~ The system is used to

~~To~~ capture organic solids from the effluent stream of fish production systems that would otherwise flow to effluent ponds for storage and further treatment. ~~These solids~~This waste comes from uneaten feed and ~~waste~~ feces generated by fish while being fed within a tank-or raceway-based fish farm~~within the aquaculture production systems~~. (DIP)

Policies

1. By signing the Cost Share Agreement (NC-ACSP-2), the cooperator and/or landowner acknowledges and agrees that they are responsible for the maintenance or replacement of all equipment cost shared as a component of waste management measure(s) at their expense.

2. Items for reimbursement under the maximum are all equipment, materials, construction, installation, vegetation, and pumps.

3. A maximum of two geotubes and a year supply of polymer per system will be eligible for reimbursement.

4. Cost share will not pay for any motorized vehicles used in transporting/applying waste. Cooperators may utilize the manure/litter transportation incentive with this practice.

5. For all operations, cost share payments are limited to a $35,000 lifetime cap.

~~4.~~6. An approved waste management plan that meets NRCS standards is required for all contracts. The plan must be revised, if necessary, to meet any changes in the operation which alter the waste management needs of the operation.

~~5. Cost share will not pay for any motorized vehicles used in transporting/applying waste.~~

SOLIDS SEPARATION FROM TANK/RACEWAY-BASED AQUACULTURE PRODUCTION	
Maintenance Period	10 years
BMP Units	EACH
Required Effects	ANIMAL TYPE ANIMAL UNIT ACRES_AFFECTED N and P WASTE MANAGED

(September 2019, March 2019, July 2012)

JAA~~/NRCS standards unless otherwise noted~~	NRCS – ENG - 632 - Waste Separation Facility
NRCS Standards and Supporting Practices	NRCS – ENG - 632 - Waste Separation Facility NRCS – ECS -590 - Nutrient Management
CS2 Reference Materials	NC-ACSP-11 Signature Page Map with BMP location, fields, and roads. ~~NC-ACSP-WMP Form~~ Waste Management Plan
Additional Spot-check Requirements	All waste management systems for operations not permitted by the Division of Water Resources must be spot-checked annually for five years following implementation.

3.C. Solids Separation from Tank/Raceway-based Aquaculture Production

- Action: *Approve the Solids Separation from Tank/Raceway-based Aquaculture Production BMP revisions*

4. Flash Grazing with Livestock Exclusion Fencing

Review

- Proposing to add flash grazing to the ACSP Livestock Exclusion Fencing BMP using the NRCS 382 Fence standard with a 24-hour flash grazing period
- Proposed revisions were applied to the BMP and General Policy
  - Included requirements from the general policy in the BMP
  - Revised setback descriptions and requirement
  - Created standardized forms to streamline documentation requirements
  - Added an emergency exception process

4. Flash Grazing with Livestock Exclusion Fencing

Review

New Forms

1. Cooperator Acknowledgement Forms
   - One with flash grazing, one without
   - Includes set back requirements and O&M
2. Fence Approval: required when fence is planned but not contracted
3. Fence Statement: required when less fencing is installed than was planned on the contract

4. Flash Grazing with Livestock Exclusion Fencing

Summary of Proposed Flash Grazing Policies

R e v i e w

- Left use to the discretion of the District board and conservation planner, providing authority for districts to determine applicability locally
- Minimum 20 ft. set back from the top of the streambank required
- Permitted for one 24-hour period when soil is dry enough to minimize trampling damage, plant cover is abundant, and plants are not emerging or setting seed
- Use the Access Control Implementation Requirement to document permitted activities
- Flash grazing of restored streams and streambanks is not permitted until vegetation is fully established
- Temporary fencing is recommended to protect streambanks while using forage adjacent to the stream.

4. Flash Grazing Outstanding Questions

- The following list of high-level questions were developed from the discussion during the October TRC meeting

4. Flash Grazing Outstanding Questions

1. How to clarify permitted activities related to grazing access?
2. Can flash grazing overlap with BMP under active maintenance?
3. How to manage any conflict with special funding? ex. UFB where the intent is to exclude livestock.
4. How to handle modifications to systems that were installed prior to flash grazing allowance?
5. Is there a way to clarify setback requirements and have them encompass all BMPs?
6. How does flash grazing interface with Riparian Buffer Protection Programs?
7. Are annual spot checks needed? How would this impact compliance?
8. What are the JAA implications?

4. Flash Grazing Outstanding Questions

- Today we will discuss the first two questions related to the function and acceptable uses of flash grazing, focusing on new policy #5

1. How to clarify permitted activities related to grazing access?
2. Can flash grazing overlap with BMP under active maintenance?

4. Permitted activities related to grazing access

- Additional language was added to #5 to clarify that the purpose of flash grazing is to control vegetation (not to access water).

"5. Flash grazing to control vegetation within excluded riparian areas is permitted at the discretion of the District board and conservation planner. Field offices unwilling to assist operators in achieving success and monitor flash grazing activities should not offer this practice to cooperators in their district.

4. Permitted activities related to grazing access

- The current language on access and timing is subjective.

  "Flash grazing is permitted for one 24-hour period when soil is dry enough to minimize trampling damage, plant cover is abundant, and plants are not emerging or setting seed. "

- What is the spacing between events? How frequently can livestock re-enter?
- What are the appropriate conditions for grazing to avoid damage in sensitive areas? "Dry enough soils" is subjective.
- Depending on cover, plant may emerge or set seed most of the year.

4. Permitted activities related to grazing access

Option

Flash grazing is permitted up to three times a year for one 24-hour period when soil is dry enough to avoid degrading soil stability, plant cover is abundant, and plants are not emerging or setting seed. Thus, June 15 through September 15 is the only allowable timeframe to allow growth and replenishment of root stocks.

4. Flash Grazing Overlapping Existing BMPs

- The original recommendation permitted grazing access once vegetation was established.

  "d. Flash grazing of restored streams and streambanks is not permitted until vegetation is fully established."'

- 'Established' may be mis-interpreted and ill-timed grazing can inhibit vegetation establishment.
- Received comments on restricting grazing where cost-shared BMPs are implemented.

4. Flash Grazing Overlapping Existing BMPs

- If streams/banks/riparian zones have been improved with state funds should grazing be allowed?
- Received recommendations to restrict grazing where state funds were used to establish vegetation or where there is an active conservation easement.
  - May impact CREP easements
- Stream Restoration and Streambank and Shoreline Protection policies mandate 20 feet minimum of undisturbed native vegetation or restored riparian area adjacent to the installed practice.
- Critical Area Planting policy includes livestock exclusion when greater than ½ acre or slopes are greater than 30%.

4. Flash Grazing Overlapping Existing BMPs

- Impacted ACSP BMPs may include but are not limited to:
  - Riparian Buffer
  - Stream Restoration
  - Streambank and Shoreline Protection
  - Critical Area Planting
  - Agricultural Pond Repair/Retrofit
  - Wetland Restoration System

4. Flash Grazing Overlapping Existing BMPs

Options:

1. Flash grazing of repaired streams and streambanks is not permitted during the maintenance period of any cost shared BMP, including, but not limited to Riparian Buffer, Stream Restoration, Streambank and Shoreline Protection, Critical Area Planting, Agricultural Pond Repair/Retrofit, or Wetland Restoration System.
2. Flash grazing is restricted in buffer areas that are encumbered by a conservation easement to enhance/protect water quality or where a forested riparian buffer has been established with cost share funds.
3. Flash grazing in excluded riparian areas is not permitted within active conservation easements (CREP) or during the maintenance period of any cost shared BMP. This includes, but is not limited to Riparian Buffer, Stream Restoration, Streambank and Shoreline Protection, Critical Area Planting, Agricultural Pond Repair/Retrofit, or Wetland Restoration System.

Agriculture Cost Share Program

Livestock Exclusion Fencing

Definition/Purpose

A Livestock Exclusion Fencing means a system of permanent fencing (board, barbed, high tensile or electric wire) installed to exclude livestock from streams and critical areas not intended for grazing to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation, pathogen contamination and pollution from dissolved, particulate, and sediment-attached substances. (DIP)

Policies

1. Livestock exclusion requires permanent fence and the average cost includes cost of all materials, gates, and labor for installation of fencing.

2. A ~~landowner~~ cooperator may, as part of a stream protection system, **provide fencing at ~~his/her~~their own cost.** All fencing installed at the ~~applicant's~~ cooperator's expense must meet NRCS Standards or technical staff with appropriate JAA can document~~s~~ the fencing does not meet standard but will serve the intended purpose for the duration of the contract. A statement confirming fence installation must accompany the RFP. The location of non-cost shared fencing must be indicated on the conservation plan map.

3. Technical staff shall have the responsibility for determining appropriate setbacks for cost shared fencing in accordance with Agriculture Cost Share Program policy (see Stream Protection Management Measures General Policy for setback requirements and documentation) and NRCS standards as follows:

    a. Cost shared fencing must be set back a minimum of ten (10) feet from the top of the stream bank unless other provisions apply. Maintenance flexibility may require additional setbacks.

    b. Livestock exclusion in conjunction with heavy use area protection measures (i.e. loafing lots, barns, feeding stations, watering facilities, stock trails), or if livestock are concentrated in the vicinity of the stream, or if runoff from areas of livestock concentration could reach the stream, then the cost shared fence ~~shall~~ is required to have ~~be set back~~ a minimum setback of twenty (20) feet from the top of the stream bank ~~(i.e. heavy use area protection measures, loafing lots, barns, feeding stations, watering facilities, stock trails)~~. The only allowable exception to the 20-foot set back requirement for cost shared fencing is if the tank, heavy use area, etc. is located a minimum of one hundred (100) feet from the top of the stream bank, the minimum setback for cost shared fencing shall be ten (10) feet.

    c. If stream riparian areas have been damaged or destroyed, then fencing should be set back far enough to permit the establishment of woody vegetation on the stream banks.

    d. If the stream bank or channel erosion is such that there exists the potential for the fence posts to be undermined by the stream during the life of the fence, then setbacks should be increased significantly (field determination).

    ~~e. For all cost shared BMPs which require fencing, a statement indicating the~~

(December 2024, July 2019, July 2012)

Commented [JB1]: Form created

~~setback distance from all existing or planned practices or structures to the stream bank must be included in the conservation plan, and distances must be indicated on the plan map (tank, heavy use area, barn etc.). (Note: "Meets set back requirements" is not acceptable. Actual set back distances must be indicated.)~~

4. Heavy use areas which are components of 15A NCAC 02T.1300 certified animal waste management plans must meet additional buffer requirements as included in SB 1217 interagency guidance documents.

5. Flash grazing to control vegetation within excluded riparian areas is permitted at the discretion of the District board and conservation planner. Field offices unwilling to assist operators in achieving success and monitor flash grazing activities should not offer this practice to cooperators in their district.

   a. Fencing must be located a minimum of 20 feet from the top of the streambank.
   b. Flash grazing is permitted three times a year for one 24-hour period when soil is dry enough to minimize trampling damage, plant cover is abundant, and plants are not emerging or setting seed. Thus, June 15 through September 15 is the only allowable timeframe to allow growth and replenishment of root stocks.
   c. Plans must include specifications for livestock type, livestock number, access timing, forage amounts, grazing duration, forage composition, and allowable grazing heights to prevent resource concerns. The height of forage residues following grazing should be based on environmental conditions and plant species. The forage residue stubble height must not average ~~be~~ less than six ~~four~~ inches.
   d. Flash grazing of restored streams and streambanks is not permitted until vegetation is fully established.
   e. Temporary fencing is recommended to protect streambanks while using forage adjacent to the stream.
   f. Flash grazing is restricted in buffer areas that are encumbered by a conservation easement to enhance/protect water quality or where a forested riparian buffer has been established with cost share funds.

~~5.~~6. Unapproved allowance of livestock re-entry to streams or stream banks at any time during the 10-year life-of-a-practice for stream bank protection systems is a violation of the maintenance agreement. ~~**Using livestock to mow stream banks is never allowed!**~~

~~6.~~7. In cases of emergency, cooperators may contact their district and request a temporary exception to fencing policies. Duration of exception will be determined by the district and supporting notes will be included in the contract file. Emergencies may be defined as power outages, pump failures, extreme periods of drought and/or depletion or contamination of the existing water source.

~~7.~~8. If cost share is received for cropland conversion to permanent vegetation the cooperator cannot receive cost share for livestock exclusion, watering facilities, etc., on the same field for the life of the contract.

(December 2024, July 2019, July 2012)

Commented [JB2]: New cooperator acknowledgement form with O&M for setback distance and/or flash grazing now covers this requirement

Commented [JB3]: Benjy M Strope
Don't want them to think they can use it as another pasture.

Commented [JB4]: Benjy M Strope
Plants should be doing this all growing season long.

Commented [JB5]: John R Isenhour
If a full restoration of the stream has been paid for should grazing be allowed? Seems to leave some room for interpretation of "established". Language to restrict grazing when trees were established as part of restoration should be considered to limit impact of vegetation paid for to meet a riparian forest buffer purpose.

~~8.~~9. If significantly less fencing than planned in the contract is installed, a statement signed by the technician must be submitted to the Division explaining why the fencing was canceled from the contract (see Stream Protection Management Measures General Policy). **Failure to install required fencing constitutes non-compliance for all BMPs in the stream protection system.**

~~9.~~10. ACSP funds shall not be used to cost share for fencing using used materials.

Commented [JB6]: New form created

Commented [JB7]: Benjy M Strope
Are you trying to say you can't use previously used fencing materials?

Commented [JB8R7]: Yes, we have always required new fence materials with our projects.

LIVESTOCK EXCLUSION FENCING	
Maintenance Period	10 years
BMP Units	LIN FT
Required Effects	ACRES_AFFECTED ANIMAL TYPE ANIMAL UNITS
JAA	SWCC - Livestock Exclusion Fence NRCS - ECS - 382 Fence NRCS - ECS - 472 - Access Control
NRCS Standards and Reference Materials	NRCS - ECS - 382 - Fence NRCS - ECS - 472 - Access Control
CS2 Reference Materials	NC-ACSP-11 Signature Page Map with BMP location, fields, and roads Livestock Exclusion Fencing Cooperator Acknowledgement Form NC-ACSP-Fence (if applicable) NC-ACSP-3A Fencing Statement (if applicable)

(December 2024, July 2019, July 2012)

5. Member Items

Open Discussion

TRC Meeting Schedule

- **February 26, 2025**
- April 23, 2025
- May 28, 2025
- June 25, 2025

- 4th Wednesday of the month (except December)
- 1:30 – 3:30 PM