Watershed Agricultural Program SOP

3.1.01.1

BMP PRIORTIZATION AND WORKLOAD DEVELOPMENT

This procedure describes the process to implement the BMP Prioritization and Workload Development Guideline (3.1.01).

1. Calculate Farm Ranking Score
    A. Farm Ranking Score will be calculated using the most current information in the FAME Database (see Attachment 1 for a description of the ranking data and formulas)
    B. Farm Ranking score will be calculated annually by October 31
2. Assess Project viability and readiness *(information from the most recent Status Review should be considered in this process)*
    A. At least annually, by November 15, WF Planners will assess all projects for implementation readiness
    B. Projects may be rated as not viable for several reasons
        1. BMPs within the project require a revision before implementation
        2. Farm circumstances that require a delay in implementation
3. Associate BMPs into Projects: As WFPs are reviewed for approval, BMPs will be associated into projects for implementation using the following criteria
    A. BMPs constituting a conservation system *(two or more BMPs that work together to perform a specific water quality protection function)* should be associated as a Project for joint implementation
    B. BMPs that have a physical connection *(two or more BMPs that share physical components or are constructed on the same site)*, but not in the same system, may be associated as a Project for joint implementation
    C. BMPs that offer the opportunity for significant cost saving if constructed together may be associated as a project for joint implementation.
    D. A BMP with no other associated BMPs will be considered a Project
    E. When a WFP is recommended for approval the project associations will be noted in the Coaches review minutes and entered into the FAME database upon approval
4. Prioritize Projects:
    A. Only BMPs and IRCs approved by the September Coaches meeting and entered in the FAME database by October 31st will be considered for workload. Emergency repairs and priority repairs will be considered on a case by case basis and may be added to the workload at any time.
    B. Projects will be prioritized considering the BMP from highest priority Pollutant Category within the project. Projects will be ranked within categories by the farm

ranking score. Each Project will be assigned a priority number, 1 being the highest priority.

1. Riparian buffer and CREP practices will be highest priority. The buffer Project with the highest farm ranking score will be assigned Priority number 1, with each subsequent project being assigned the next higher priority number
2. Starting with Pollutant Category I proceeding to Category XI, Projects will be assigned Priority numbers ordered by Pollutant Category then by the farm ranking score.
3. As a result of this process, all Projects will receive a Priority Number

5. Develop Implementation Areas: The Project Planning Group (see attachment 2) will annually, by November 30 define Implementation Areas for the year, and assign projects to the appropriate implementation areas. These areas will include, but are not limited to:
   A. Rollover Projects
   B. Buffer and CREP
   C. BMP Repair and Replacement
   D. New Large and Small Farm BMPs
   E. East of Hudson Farm BMPs
   F. Other areas as defined by the Project Planning Group
6. Adjust prioritization of Repair and Replacement BMPs
   A. Failing BMPs that are causing, or may imminently cause significant environmental issues should be implemented first within the BMP Repair and Replacement Implementation Area, regardless of priority number.
   B. Repair and Replacement BMPs where the current design and implementation has caused, or imminently will cause significant management issues for the farmer may be given special prioritization and be implemented before BMPs with lower priority number.
7. Allocate funding to each Implementation Area
   A. The Project Planning Group will annually, by September 15, allocate funding for each Implementation Area defined
   B. Allocation will be based on available funding for implementation (from all sources) and other factors identified by the Project Planning Group
8. Develop workload
   A. Based on Implementation Area funding allocation, viable projects will be added to the workload based on Priority Number
   B. Projects in excess of the allocated funding should be included in the workload to anticipate possible problems or delays in implementation

9. The Project Planning Group will assign the prioritized workload to the planning staff and technical staff by January 15.
10. The planning staff will have until the June Ag Committee to revise any plans if necessary.
    A. Planners will coordinate any necessary engineering consults and technical visits for a project.
    B. Any IRC revisions must be completed by the June Ag Committee to be considered a part of the final workload.
    C. Any BMPs that need revising must be completed by the June Ag Committee to be considered a part of the final workload (i.e. approved funding, BMP type)
11. The Project Planning Group will assign the finalized workload to program staff for design and construction in July.
    A. Assignments will be made first considering workgroup, then as a whole program as needed
12. The Prioritized Workload will be submitted to the WAC Ag Committee or East of Hudson Committee for review and approval at least by the September Ag Committee meeting each year

Attachment 1: Farm Ranking Score factors, data requirements, weighting, and formulas

Part I: West of Hudson Farms

Factors	Description		Points
AU/ac	animal density - AU divided by acres AU: number of 1000 lb animal equivalents on the farm - from ASR Acres: total of hayland, cropland and pasture acres on farm - from NMP	AU/ac x 30 score caped at 30	30
% VH P	percentage of the acres on the farm with a soil test P of greater than 39 - from NMP	<1% = 0, >35% = 20, >1% and <35% = ((1-((.35-% VH P)x100))/34)x20	20
Field av. distance to stream	average of the distance to a watercourse for all fields on farm - from NMP	>500 = 0, <50 = 15 >50 and <500 = (1-((av dist to stream-50)/450))x15	15
Farmstead proximity to a watercourse	distance of the primary livestock housing location to a watercourse* - from planner/GIS	>1000 = 0, <300 = 10 >300 and <1000 = (1-((av dist to stream-300)/700))x10	10
Young Stock	presence of young stock on the farm - from planner	<1=0, >10=25 >1 and <10 (1-((10-#of Youngstock)/10))*25	25
		Total Points	100

*Farmstead Proximity to a Watercourse: The distance (in feet) of the primary livestock housing location (barn) to a watercourse visible on GIS aerial photography, rounded to the nearest 25 feet.

Watercourse means a visible path through which surface water travels on a regular basis, including an intermittent stream, which is tributary to the water supply. A drainage ditch, swale or surface feature that contains water only during and immediately after a rainstorm or a snowmelt shall not be considered a watercourse.

Part II: East of Hudson Farms

EoH Farm Ranking Procedure for BMP Prioritization

Factors	Description	Scoring Formula	Points Possible
Animal Density	AU divided by acres AU: number of 1000 lb animal equivalents on the farm - from ASR Acres: total pasture acres on farm - from NMP	0-1.9 AU/ac = 0, 2-4.9 AU/ac = 5, >5 AU/ac=10 score capped at 10	10
Phosphorous Saturation	percentage of the hayland, cropland, and pastureland acres on the farm with a Morgan Equivalent soil test P of greater than 39 lbs./acre - from NMP	<1% = 0, >35% = 20, >1% and <35% = 15x(1-(((0.35-%VHP)x100)/34))	20
Priority Sub-Basin	farm located within an EoH priority reservoir sub-basin	N=0 Y=10	10
Field average distance to watercourse	average of the distance (ft.) to a watercourse for all fields on farm - from NMP	>500 = 0, <50 = 15 >50 and <500 = 10x(1-((avdisttostream -50)/450))	15
Distance of a Pollutant Category I, II or III issue to watercourse	distance (ft.) of the location of a Category I, II or III issue to a watercourse - from planner/GIS	>1000 = 0, <300 = 20 >300 and <1000 = 10x(1-((P.C. I-III dist to stream-300)/700))))	20
Pathogen Risk (Young Stock)	Type and number (head) of young stock under 12 months of age - from ASR (add total from all groups, Total score capped at 15)	"Large Crypto shedding species" (dairy, beef, horse etc) #of Young stock (score capped at 15) "Small Crypto shedding species" (sheep, goat, hogs etc) #of Young stock/5 (score capped at 15) "non-Crypto shedding species" (chickens, turkeys, rabbits, fish, etc) 0 (no points)	15
Professional Judgment	Points awarded or deducted at planner's discretion based on individual farm situations*	Up to 10 points (added or deducted)	10
		Total Points	100

Watershed Agricultural Program SOP

High Priority Basins	**Lower Priority Basins**
Kensico	East Branch
West Branch	Middle Branch
Boyd's Corner	Amawalk
Cross River	Bog Brook
Croton Falls	Diverting
Titicus	
Muscoot	
Croton	

* Examples include: Participant has been awaiting WFP implementation commencement for 18+ months (maximum +10 points); Documented case(s) of Participant *not* adhering to past BMP O&M agreements (maximum deduction: 10 points); Nursery, greenhouse or crop farm without AUs that imports manure or compost (maximum +10 points); Other urgent WQ issue is not accurately assessed by this metric (maximum +10 points).

Attachment 2: Project Planning Group Composition

The Project Planning Group will be appointed and convened by the WAP Manager and will consist of senior WAP staff (including partnering agencies). The Group will include:

West of Hudson Project Planning Group Composition

WAP Manager

WAP Large Farm Coordinator

SWCD Technical Coordinator

NRCS Program Engineer

SWCD Data & Budget Specialist

DEP Representative

Others appointed by the WAP Manager

EoH Project Planning Group Composition

EoH Program Coordinator

EoH Conservation Planner

EoH Project Engineer

WAP Manager

NRCS District Conservationist

NYC DEP Agricultural Program Manager