

Pennsylvania's Phase III Watershed Implementation Plan
Agriculture Workload Needs Assessment

State Actions, On the Ground Implementation						
Activity	Position	Agency	Number		Cost	
			Existing	New	Existing	New
Agriculture						
Agriculture Permitting	Permit Engineers and Env. Eng. Manager	DEP – SCRO	2.5	0	\$395,552	
Agriculture Compliance	Inspectors	DEP – Regional Offices	5.5	7	\$572,357	\$728,455
Agriculture Compliance	Compliance Specialists	DEP- Regional Offices	2	2.5	\$237,898	\$297,373
Agriculture Compliance	Inspector Supervisors	DEP – Regional Offices	1	2	\$135,662	\$271,324
Agriculture Compliance	Program Specialist	DEP – Central Office	1.5	1	\$203,493	\$135,662
Nutrient and Odor Management (Act 38)	Conservation Program Specialists	State Conservation Commission	7	0	\$728,000	
Nutrient Management Support (Act 38)	Penn State Extension	Penn State University	5	0	\$356,000	
Nutrient Management (Act 38)	NM Technicians	Conservation Districts	39	0	\$3,510,000	
Technical Assistance, Planning, Inspections	Bay Technicians	Conservation Districts	35	50	\$3,150,000	\$4,500,500
BMP Design, Engineering Support	Bay Engineers	Conservation Districts	8	10	\$720,000	\$900,000
<i>Subtotal Agriculture (Agency Resources)</i>			19.5	12.5	\$2,272,962	\$1,432,814
<i>Subtotal Agriculture (External Resources)</i>			87	60	\$7,736,000	\$5,400,500

There is a significant need for more “boots on the ground” to assist farmers and help ensure compliance with the regulatory requirements. Agency staff resources, along with conservation district and Penn State Extension, are identified above. However, private industry, non-governmental entities and federal agency staff are needed to fill gaps in planning and technical assistance across the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The existing scope and breadth of coverage is unknown. The workload analysis showed a need for at least 87 private, non-governmental, and federal staff providing direct technical assistance for Agricultural BMP implementation. This number does not include supervisors, administrative support or contractors providing construction services, so the total number could be greater.

In calculating the resource needs for Agriculture implementation, the following factors were considered:

- Permitting - Average number of NPDES CAFO and Water Quality Management (WQM) Permits reviewed and approved for agricultural facilities per year. Time spent includes permit review and approval, staff meetings, client communications, responding to Right to Know Law requests, responding to DEP central office information requests, site visits and field work.
- Compliance - Average number of DEP and Conservation District inspections and site visits per year for CAFOs and non-CAFOs (this includes the Chesapeake Bay Agriculture Inspection Program); average number of hours per inspection including preparation time, travel time, data management activities, and planning assistance; time

Pennsylvania's Phase III Watershed Implementation Plan
Agriculture Workload Needs Assessment

spent on continued non-compliance, preparing documentation and follow-up inspections; complaint investigation and documentation; time spent on data management (administrative) for mailings and reporting purposes.

- Technical Assistance –
 - Engineering/Structural Practices (Manure Storage/Barnyards) - Includes an estimated time for design and construction checks; pre-construction meetings, meetings with private consultants, engineers, farmers, and contractors. (17% of livestock and poultry operations annually)
 - Engineering/Structural Practices (Grassed Waterways, Diversions, Terraces, Stream Crossings, etc.) – Includes estimated time for design and construction checks; pre-construction meetings, meetings with private consultants, engineers, farmers, contractors. (5% of all agricultural operations annually)
 - Non-structural practices (Contour lines/strips, Fence, Prescribed Grazing Plans, No-Till/Cover Crop Assistance, Workshops/Field Days, etc.) – Includes estimated time for travel, survey, tracking payments; workshop events, field days, meetings with farmers. (5% of all agricultural operations annually)
- Enforcement – Average number of enforcement actions performed by DEP Central and Regional Offices per year and average amount of time spent per action.

Specific to County Conservation District staff costs, current funding is provided at \$65,500 per Full Time Equivalent (FTE). In order to keep qualified and certified staff engaged and employed at the conservation districts, it has been noted that this amount of funding does not provide comparable salary and benefits over time, which results in significant staff turnover and many certified and qualified staff leaving the field all together. One of the commitments noted in the Chesapeake Executive Council's *Directive in Support of Agricultural Technical Assistance and Conservation Practice Implementation* is the following:

- Provide stable and sufficient technical assistance to help farmers implement the conservation practices necessary to meet the Bay TMDL goals.

To accomplish this commitment, a close look at conservation district agriculture staffing costs needs to be made, with an adjustment of federal and state funding provided for staff. Therefore, a funding estimate of \$90,000 per FTE has been made for existing and future conservation district staff needs.