DAIRY AND LIVESTOCK SUBGROUP #1:
FOSTERING MARKETS FOR NON-DIGESTER PROJECTS

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CDFA'S ALTERNATIVE MANURE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

I. **2018 Program**
   A. Conduct new workshops on Quantification Methodology (QM) and application requirements and allow comment prior to finalizing 2018 program.
   B. Clearly explain the criteria and process for how CDFA will determine the final AMMP funding amount within the stated range of $19-33 million and how that intersects with the DDRDP process.

II. **Application**
   A. Extend timeline for completing applications.
   B. Simplify application.
   C. Consider a phased application, e.g. short concept first, followed by a full proposal with more details if the short concept is accepted.
      1. Seek input from technical assistance providers, engineers, and AMMP's Technical Advisory Committee on how this would work, including the level of detail needed in the short concept stage and what, if any, assurance would be made to applicants that are passed to the full proposal stage to allow for greater certainty for producers investing in new engineering and design costs.
   D. Practices should have predetermined potential DAC impacts vs. expecting farmer to determine those.

III. **Practices**
   A. Develop a formal process by which new practices can be introduced and vetted for inclusion in the AMMP, similar to the process in Healthy Soils Program

IV. **QM & Calculator**
   A. Adapt QM calculator so it allows stacking of practices, and clearly explain how to use the calculator to do that.
   B. Account for different separator efficiencies.

V. **Technical Assistance (TA)**
   A. Provide more 1:1 technical assistance vs. workshops.
   B. TA providers <u>must</u> have right expertise (this wasn't always the case in the last round). Specifically, TA providers should have permitting expertise and a good knowledge of how AMMP itself works is critical, in addition to understanding dairies. CDFA may consider training to support long-term development of needed technical expertise in this area.
   C. Evaluate 2017 TA program to assess if it did a good job, including what worked and what didn't.

VI. **Support / Additional Information**
   A. Provide a lot more guidance / clarity on the permitting requirements (e.g. what is and is not actually required for different practices vs. a list of potential permits that may or may not apply). This was a major obstacle in the 2017 program and should be relatively easy to address.
   B. Provide a summary feedback document, pulling together feedback CDFA sent/will send to 2017 applicants (anonymized/generalized).
   C. Based on the summary feedback and other input received, create one or two example applications that show what CDFA is looking for / what "good" looks like.
   D. Allow more frequent or on-going Q&A.
      1. Time periods for submitting and responding to questions in 2017 were too far apart.
      2. Allow individuals to submit questions and then post the Q&A for all to see within a short time frame.