Nutrient Management (Act 38) Onsite Status Review / Inspections



Learning Goals

- Overview of on-site status review
- Guidance for frequency
- Prioritization scheme
- Procedural outline
- Status review of BOD members or CD staff
- Follow Up
- Identifying continuing violators

Overview – Act 38 On-Site Status Reviews

- o Provide valuable information
 - CD
 - Operator
 - SCC
- o Emphasis to education
- When necessary, assistance to gain voluntary compliance
- Form and letter that show compliance or noncompliance

Guidelines for the frequency and number of on-site status reviews

- CAO Yearly
- CAFO Yearly
- VAO Once every 3 years (1/3 of all county VAOs each year)
- Operation out of compliance / Complaints As needed
- Follow the Crop Year dates
- Contact SCC Regional Coordinator if you can not perform all inspections

Prioritization scheme for on-site status reviews

- Out of compliance operations
- Operation is in special protection watershed
- Systematic scheme to minimize travel
- Biosecurity

Information to be reviewed in the office and on-site includes:

- Plan Implementation
- Record Keeping
- Manure Storage Information
- Animal Concentration Areas

Prepare Ahead of Time

- Be mindful of and respect the operator's time
- Review NMP in office
- Review file notes page and history of past Status Reviews in office
- Review Status Review form and complete as much of the form as possible before leaving the office.
- Think through the visit:
 - What records will you need to see;
 - o What areas of the farm will you need to see;
 - o What BMPs will need to be evaluated;
 - What files & biosecurity items will you need;
 - What questions on the form are not necessary or pertinent to the operation

Procedural outline for on-site status reviews

- Select the appropriate operations
- Contact the operation and set up date/time
- Review NMP and file in office
- Review Biosecurity Procedures, ask operator if they have any additional procedures
- Meet with Operator and conduct status review
- Discuss findings
- Follow Up

Status Review Form

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ON-SITE STATUS REVIEW REPORT

Date:			
Operation Name:			
Person (s) Interviewed (Operator);			
Report Completed By (Inspector);			
Others Present:			
Date of Plan Approval:			
Operation Type (CAO, VAO or CAFO):			
Date of next 3 year Plan review:			
Program Complia	ınce		
(* = Potential Act)	38 Viola	tions)	
1. Nutrient Management Plan Implementation	Yes	No	N/A
a. Is the operation current with its required plan review deadline?	-	-*	
b. Are actual animal numbers consistent with the plan?		□*	
c. Acreage receiving manure application			
d. Does plan information and mapping represent operation?		□*	
e. Are all sources of nutrient pollution addressed in the plan?		-*	
f. Is plan implementation on schedule?		□*	
g. Are installed BMPs being maintained?	_	□*	
h. Are manure application rates being followed?		□*	
If no, explain:			
i. Is a certified manure hauler or broker being utilized?	0	0	
Hauler/Broker name and certification number:			
j. Is a "current" Conservation Plan or Ag E & S Plan in effect?	0	n*	
k. Are all Critical Runoff Problem Areas (CRPAs) addressed?		-*	
I. Is excess manure handled according to the plan?		□*	
m. Is the manure spreader calibrated to apply planned rates?		□*	
n. Is <u>emergency</u> stacking required in the plan?			
If yes, is the site identified on plan maps?		□*	
 Are required <u>in-field</u> stacking procedures implemented? 			
If yes, are site(s) identified on plan maps?		□*	
If yes, are site(s) appropriate?		□*	
Is manure applied within 120 days (CAFOs 15 days)			
or covered?		□*	
p. Are fall/winter manure applications according to plan?		o*	
q. Are the required setbacks being observed?		- *	
r. Are pastured animals being managed as outlined in the plan?		□ *	
2. Record Keeping; Are the following records maintained at the op-	eration?		
a. Crop yields:		□*	
 b. Manure/fertilizer application rates (includes comm. hauler): 		□*	
c. Soil test results current:		-*	
d. Manure analysis results:		□*	

Status Review Form General Information

Date:	
Operation Name:	
Person (s) Interviewed (Operator):	
Report Completed By (Inspector):	
Others Present:	
Date of Plan Approval:	
Operation Type (CAO, VAO or CAFO):	
Date of next 3 year Plan review:	

Program Compliance (* = Potential Act 38 Violations)

(" – Potential Act S	o viola	uons)	
1. Nutrient Management Plan Implementation	Yes	No	N/A
a. Is the operation current with its required plan review deadline?		$\frac{\mathbf{No}}{\Box^{\star}}$	
b. Are actual animal numbers consistent with the plan?		□*	
c. Acreage receiving manure application			
d. Does plan information and mapping represent operation?		□ *	
e. Are all sources of nutrient pollution addressed in the plan?		□*	
f. Is plan implementation on schedule?		□ *	
g. Are installed BMPs being maintained?		□*	
h. Are manure application rates being followed?		□*	
If no, explain:			
i. Is a certified manure hauler or broker being utilized?			
Hauler/Broker name and certification number:			
j. Is a "current" Conservation Plan or Ag E & S Plan in effect?		□*	
k. Are all Critical Runoff Problem Areas (CRPAs) addressed?		□*	
l. Is excess manure handled <u>according to</u> the plan?		□*	
m. Is the manure spreader calibrated to apply planned rates?		□*	
n. Is <u>emergency</u> stacking required in the plan?			
If yes, is the site identified on plan maps?		□*	
o. Are required <u>in-field</u> stacking procedures implemented?			
If yes, are site(s) identified on plan maps?		□*	
If yes, are site(s) appropriate?		□*	
Is manure applied within 120 days (CAFOs 15 days)			
or covered?		□*	
p. Are fall/winter manure applications according to plan?		□*	
q. Are the required setbacks being observed?		□*	
r. Are pastured animals being managed as outlined in the plan?		□*	

2. Record Keeping; Are the following records maintained at	the ope	ration?	•	
a. Crop yields:			□ *	
b. Manure/fertilizer application rates (includes comm. hauler	r):		□*	
c. Soil test results current:			□*	
d. Manure analysis results:			□ *	
	Yes	No	N/A	
e. Manure export sheets:		□*		
f. Nutrient balance sheets:		□*		
g. Rerun of the P-Index every 3 years:	П	⊓*		

3. Manure Storage Information (where applicable)				
Note: Although they may not be Act 38 violations, "No" answers in	this sect	ion requ	ire reme	≥dial
action.				
a. Storage type and size:				
b. Is perimeter fence and warning signage in place/maintained?				
c. Is the structure free of significant cracks or structural damage?				
d. Are embankments free of manure saturated areas (seepage)?				
e. Are interior/exterior slopes free of holes, trees or erosion?				
f. Has storage been certified by a Professional Engineer?		□*		
g. Is Emergency Response Plan available on the operation?	п	-*	п	

4. Animal Concentration Areas (ACAs)

- a. Are there ACAs on the operation (farmstead or pasture)? $\hfill\Box$ $\hfill\Box$
- b. Is surface water adequately protected from runoff?
- c. Is erosion properly controlled at stream access point?
- d. Is manure collected and handled appropriately?
- e. Is animal access to stream properly controlled?
- f. Are pastures free of ACAs where runoff is reaching a stream?

Status Review Form Conclusion

Inspector Notes:	Yes	No
Are there violations of Act 38 regulations?		
If yes, specific violations (indicate section number and letter above):		
Are corrective actions needed?		
If yes, set approximate re-inspection date:	_	<u> </u>
Further action required (indicate section number and letter above):		
Additional Comments:		
Signature of Inspector:		
Signature of Operator:		
Operator signature does not signify guilt or agre	amant)	

Documenting findings

- Completed Status Review Form in File and with Operator (copy to specialist that prepared NMP)
- Formal letter sent to operator indicting the outcome and action that may be needed (copy DEP if a CAFO)
- Provide Technical Assistance as appropriate
- Request assistance for your SCC regional coordinator
- Quarterly reporting

Follow-up for on-site status reviews

- Follow up to noncompliance is a regulatory requirement
- Follow-up technical assistance visits will likely be necessary
- NMP Update or Amendment may be needed
- All Follow-up's should use inspection report forms, not on-site status review forms, and a copy provided to operator (and Follow up letter)
- If compliance can not be achieved, other efforts will be made, as described in Chapter 4 of the Adm Manual
- SCC Regional Coordinator assistance is always available
- When compliance is achieved, final letter should document

Status Reviews for Conservation District Board of Director members or other Conservation District staff NMPs

- Notify your SCC Regional Coordinator
- SCC regional Coordinator will then work with you on options that could include:
 - o SCC performing the on-site status review
 - SCC and CD performing a joint on-site status review
 - o SCC overseeing the CDs on-site status review

Identifying Continuous violators to the SCC

- Follow up to noncompliance finding is a regulatory requirement.
 - CD needs to give deadline to comply and reinspection date
 - CD needs to follow through with re-inspecting, again documenting, and sending follow up documentation to operator.
 - o Checking back next year in UNACCEPTABLE
- Continuous violators should be referred to the SCC
- Detailed discussion in Chapter 4 of the Administrative Manual

Summary

- Familiarity with:
 - o On-site status review process
 - Completion of form(s)
 - o Documentation
 - o Follow-up visits and documentation
 - Interactions between on-site status reviews, follow-ups, and the compliance and enforcement process
 - o Frequency of on-site status reviews
 - o Filing
 - o Follow up

Questions

Frank X Schneider, Director – Nutrient and Odor Management Programs

SCC Regional Coordinators

https://extension.psu.edu/programs/nutrientmanagement/scc/manual