

**From:** [Laurie Crowe](#)  
**To:** [Jennings, Jonathan \(ECY\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: October 2 cafo permit comments  
**Date:** Friday, October 02, 2015 4:43:39 PM  
**Attachments:** [October 2 cafo permit comments.pdf](#)  
**Importance:** High

---

*Laurie Crowe*

**District Coordinator  
Livestock Nutrient Management Program Specialist  
South Yakima Conservation District  
PO Box 1766  
200 Cheyne Road  
Zillah, WA 98953  
509.829.9025  
509.829.9027 (fax)  
509.952.3431 (cell)**

---

**From:** Laurie Crowe [mailto:[lc@syacd.us](mailto:lc@syacd.us)]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 02, 2015 4:39 PM  
**To:** [jonathan.jennings@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:jonathan.jennings@ecy.wa.gov).  
**Subject:** October 2 cafo permit comments  
**Importance:** High

Hi Jon,

Thank you for taking our comments. If you have any questions, please call.

*Laurie Crowe*

**District Coordinator  
Livestock Nutrient Management Program Specialist  
South Yakima Conservation District  
PO Box 1766  
200 Cheyne Road  
Zillah, WA 98953  
509.829.9025  
509.829.9027 (fax)  
509.952.3431 (cell)**

October 2, 2015

Via email: jonathan.jennings@ecy.wa.gov

Heather Bartlett, Water Quality Program Manager  
Washington Department of Ecology  
c/o Jon Jennings  
PO Box 47696  
Olympia, WA 98504-7696

Re: Comment on Draft CAFO Permit

Following are comments provided by South Yakima Conservation District.

- S1.A States "all authorized discharges and activities..." Ecology should explain exactly what the "authorized discharges and activities" are.
- S2.A Ecology has determined that storage ponds are "discharging to groundwater." This virtually put every dairy facility in the state under a CAFO permit. The dairies ponds have/are built to NRCS standards and specifications (industry standards), which were approved by all EPA & Ecology and have been used for the last 30+ years with out any new science or recommendations from Ecology or EPA.
- S2.F1a. Unfortunately, the wording does not allow any dairy facility to terminate their permit. Who decides what the natural background of soil is and where is that information.
- S3.A1. The verbiage for these standards need to be attached to the permit or put in detail in the "definitions."
- S3.B A TMDL does not belong in a CAFO permit. If an area in under a TMDL, all "growers/producers" would have to follow the requirements.
- S3.C This sounds like Dam Safety regulations, not day to day engineering. Engineering for waste storage ponds, etc. already are engineered go through "private" PE firms and are much faster than Ecology. 180 is way too long of a time period. It should not matter to Ecology as long as it is done by a qualified entity/person. Ecology should not be competing with private entities.
- S4.A3. AKART should not be used. Industry standard is BMP's.
- S4.B,C Most of what you are requiring in your MPPP is already in the DNMP, which is required by all licensed dairy facilities according to 90.64. By adding another "plan" just confuses the matter. It didn't work well last time either. There is already too much conflict between each agencies rules and regulations. We don't need to add another layer. Since the Dept of Ag inspects, and the Districts develop the plans, maybe it would be wise to have them work together to put together one plan that would work for all.

The turn-around-time for plan revisions is too short for Conservation Districts, or most anyone else.

The underground mapping requirements for the plan are impossible for planners to do and would be costly to do.

A lot of the facilities do not have any engineering plans and certifications due to the age of the structures. Most facilities have been around since the 70's. There needs to be a way around this requirement.

A big factor in this CAFO permit is the many differences between the west-side and the east-side. The east side is a desert climate and needs to be treated as such. We do not want vegetation on our storage ponds due to varmints. Why would manure solids on a pond not be allowed? We do not use T-Sum 200. That is meant for west side grasses. Field run-off practices are much different as well.

Need to specify what "regularly inspected" infrastructure means. Daily, weekly, monthly, etc.?

You can't always incorporate manure within 24 hours.

We do not agree with the matrix approach. It does not allow for any flexibility. The soil test was never meant to be a regulatory tool. It is supposed to be a tool to help with nutrient budgeting. Some nutrients that show high on a soil test may not be available for uptake. That does not mean over application. No, Ecology should not develop templates...there are hundreds out there already.