



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION VII
CONCENTRATED ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATION INSPECTION CHECKLIST – SHORT FORM

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

FACILITY NAME John and Kim Vang Farm, MOGS10356			INSPECTION DATE August 13, 2024	ARRIVAL TIME 10:30 a.m.
ADDRESS (b) (6)			INSPECTOR Suzanne Ward	
CITY Neosho	STATE Missouri	ZIP CODE 64850	STATE INSPECTOR (If Present) David Halbrook	
LEGAL DESCRIPTION (Quarter, Section, Township, Range) Section 13, T26N, R32W		COUNTY Newton	TEMPERATURE 70 ° F	PRECIPITATION TYPE Rainy
Facility Owner and Operator:	NAME John Neng Vang	PHONE (b) (6)		
	NAME Kim Vang	PHONE Same as above		
Additional participants:	NAME Larry Smith, Butterball, Field Technician	PHONE No contact information provided		
	NAME Jay Moseley, Butterball, Field Technician	PHONE jmoseley@butterball.com		
	NAME David Halbrook, MoDNR, SWRO	PHONE 471-891-4390		
Business/Corporate Status: No business established				

B. ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATION INFORMATION

TYPE OF OPERATION	NUMBER OF ANIMALS*	CAPACITY	TYPE OF CONFINEMENT
☐ BEEF CATTLE	_____	_____	☐ OPEN LOT
☐ DAIRY	_____	_____	☐ DUAL CONFINEMENT
☐ SWINE	_____	_____	☒ TOTAL CONFINEMENT
☒ TURKEYS	~20,000	144,000	☐ OTHER _____
☐ CHICKENS	_____	_____	
☐ OTHER _____	_____	_____	

* Number present at the time of Inspection

1.	Are animals stabled/confined and feed/maintained for 45 days or more during a twelve-month period?	☒ YES	☐ NO
2.	Are any crops, vegetation, forage growth, or post-harvest residues sustained in the normal growing season over any portion of the lot or facility where animals are kept?	☐ YES	☒ NO
3.	Do the animals have direct access to waters of the United States and/or its tributaries?	☐ YES	☒ NO
4.	Does the facility have the ability to discharge livestock waste to water of the United States via a man-made conveyance (Culvert, Ditch, Field Tile, etc.)?	☐ YES	☒ NO
	If Yes, provide a detailed description of the conveyance.		

C. EXISTING LIVESTOCK WASTE CONTROL FACILITIES

1.	Does the facility have any existing Livestock Waste Control Facilities (LWCF)?	☐ YES	☒ NO
a.	LWCF Type: ☐ Sedimentation, Settling Basin, or Solid Settling Structure ☐ Holding Pond, Lagoon, or Settled Open Feedlot Effluent Basin ☐ Other (Please Specify) _____		

b.	What is the total capacity of the LWCF?	N/A	
c.	What is the required storage capacity?	N/A	
d.	Does the LWCF collect all or partial runoff from the facility?	N/A	
e.	Is process wastewater from the feedstock storage area collected/controlled? N/A	☐ YES	☐ NO
f.	Does the facility maintain records onsite that document the liquid levels for this LWCF? N/A	☐ YES	☐ NO
g.	Type of Outfall: ☒ None ☐ Riser Pipe ☐ Spill Way ☐ Slatted Gate ☐ Other (Please Specify) _____		
h.	Provide a detailed description of the area receiving the discharge from the outfall. N/A		

D. LIVESTOCK WASTE MANAGEMENT

1.	Does the facility have any existing livestock waste management systems?	☒ YES	☐ NO
If yes, provide a detailed description of the waste management system (include structure types, capacity and condition. Include solid and liquid manure handling, feed storage areas, and/or mortality waste). The facility consists of nine houses for grow-out phase turkeys. Four houses (#1-4) are located south of Foliage Road and five houses (#5-9) are north of Foliage Road (Photos 6, 40). Access to both sets of houses is limited by locking gates (Photo 39). Feed is stored and dispensed by bulk feed bins at each house. At the time of the inspection, all bin pads were free of grain spills and vegetation was controlled around all houses (Photos 7, 8, 12, 13, 21). I observed turkey feathers on the driveway in front of Houses 5-9 (Photo 54). Water is sourced by a groundwater well and distributed by underground lines with a valve at each house (Photo 51). Water is treated with 56% acetic acid (Photo 46). I observed seven 55-gallon drums stored outside on the House 7 bin pad (Photos 44, 45). The Butterball representatives said the drums are supposed to be returned to the supplier but they have been on site for approximately six months. Additionally, they said they were unsure of the contents because they believed the product had been used and drums should be empty. Waste solids (litter and mortality compost) are stored in a metal and concrete barn south of Foliage Road (Photo 15). Ralph Beiler is contracted to conduct de-caking (sifting waste litter from clean litter) in each house after the flock is removed. Each house is also chemically sanitized after de-caking. Flocks are finished and removed approximately every 13 to 18 weeks. Mr. Beiler said each house has a total cleanout every two years. Routine mortalities are mixed with litter to be composted in the north and south bays of the barn (Photos 17, 25). Butterball provides additional carbon if needed. The Butterball representatives showed an example of the Single Age Mortality Charts that are kept at each house to record daily mortalities (Photo 53). I observed uncovered litter overflowing out of the back/west side of the barn (Photos 18, 24). The facility did not have a runoff collection system in place. Butterball representatives said the overflowing litter has been there about one week since the flocks in Barns 5-9 were sold and de-caking was conducted. I walked down-gradient of the barn and did not observe a discharge from the production area at the time of the inspection (Photo 23). Mr. Beiler said the barn is not large enough to hold litter as its removed. Rain started in the area around 9:00 a.m. It was still raining when I arrived at the facility, but rain ceased before my departure around noon. I observed contaminated storm water ponding in front of the litter/compost barn (Photos 27, 16) and running off of the staging area and through the grass towards House 2 (Photos 28-31, 33). The contaminated runoff flowed south along House 2 through an unvegetated channelized area, then ceased flow, soaking into the soil (Photos 34-38). The channelized area ended near the end of the barn and the down gradient area was vegetated. I walked down gradient of House 2 and did not observe a discharge from the production area at the time of the inspection (Photo 20). Litter and compost are exported to Ralph Beiler. The facility does not conduct annual nutrient analysis on each unique source of land-applied manure; therefore, nutrient analysis is not provided to the recipient of exported			

	material. Additionally, Mr. Beiler said the Manure Export Guidance is not provided. The facility does not maintain records showing the date, recipient name and address, and amount of litter/compost that leaves the permitted operation. Mr. Beiler has a poultry farm in the area. He said that the exported solids are land applied on Mr. Beiler's own farm and other farms within about a 10-mile radius using a spreader truck.
--	--

E. RECEIVING SURFACE WATERS

1.	Provide a detailed description of the flow path from the facility to the nearest named surface water and complete a <i>Stream Nexus Form</i> . (Include <u>detailed</u> descriptions of all unnamed tributaries, ditches, and/or other flow paths <i>i.e.</i> , depth, width, color, odor, slope, amount of water present, soil type, erosivity, etc.) The facility is located approximately one-half mile north of Baynham Branch, which flows east to west. I observed Baynham Branch at Lime Kiln Drive (Photos 2, 3). For the production area south of Foliage Road, runoff from the west side of the driveway appears to sheet flow west into a forested area that is owned by Mr. Vang then south towards Baynham Branch. Runoff from the east side of the driveway appears to sheet flow south towards Baynham Branch through agricultural fields. For the production area north of Foliage Road, most of the runoff flows to the east then south through agricultural fields. Runoff from the north side of House 9 may sheet flow north for approximately one mile through a forested area then to Carver Branch. Carver Branch is not listed as a receiving stream in the Missouri State Operating Permit.		
3.	What is the name of the nearest named surface water?	Baynham Branch	
4.	USGS Classification of the named surface water:	☒ Perennial	☐ Intermittent

F. DISCHARGES

1.	Is the facility currently discharging livestock waste from the production area?	☐ YES	☒ NO
2.	Was a sample taken? (If YES, then attach sampling report, including a detailed description of the sampling methods and protocols used, including representative samples, background, holding times where the samples were collected, a detailed description of the weather conditions, and preservation techniques.)	☐ YES	☒ NO
3.	Provide a detailed description of the flow pathway and the area(s) receiving the discharge(s). (Include Photographs) See Section D. Livestock Waste Management for description of contaminated stormwater observed on site. The facility did not document or report any discharges in the last five years.		

G. OTHER COMMENTS/NOTES

On August 13, 2024, I conducted a Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation Compliance Evaluation Inspection pursuant to section 308(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. This checklist and attachments present my findings and observations. I conducted the inspection in accordance with EPA Region 7 Standard Operating Procedures.

I contacted John Vang on Monday, August 12, 2024, to schedule an inspection on Tuesday, August 13, 2024, and he agreed. Prior to meeting Mr. Vang, I conducted visual reconnaissance of Baynham Branch from Lime Kiln Drive and of the facility from Foliage Drive to identify any areas of concern from the public right-of-way. I arrived at the facility at approximately 10:30 a.m. accompanied by David Halbrook, MoDNR Southwest Regional Office, and met with John and Kim Vang, owners, and Jay Mosely and Larry Smith, Butterball. I presented my credentials and explained the purpose of the inspection was to evaluate the facility's compliance status with the Clean Water Act under the authority of Section 308 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Mr. Mosely asked if I had been at any other farms recently and I informed him that I had not. Mr. Halbrook also said he had not been to other farms. Mr. Mosely said they wanted to prevent the spread of pneumovirus. Mr. Vang and Mr. Mosely provided access to the facility. I explained that the scope of the inspection would include a records review and visual inspection, including the collection of photographs, documents, and samples. I provided Mr. Vang with a printed copy of the U.S. EPA Small Business Resource Information Sheet (EPA-300-F-21-002) and the U.S. EPA Notice Regarding Propriety/Confidential Business Information Sheet and Form. I made Mr. Vang aware of his confidentiality rights and informed him that he had 10 business days to return the form signed if he wanted to make any claims. He did not raise CBI claims during the inspection.

I took 57 photos during the visual inspection. Descriptions of all photos taken are listed in Attachment 2 – Photo Log. Visual images of 36 photographs are displayed in Attachment 1 – Photographs.

Following the visual portion of the inspection, I held a close-out meeting. I discussed the documents I needed to review and provided Mr. Vang a handwritten document request (Photo 56). Mr. Vang does not conduct visual inspections of the production areas and waste management areas so records were not available. Mr. Vang does not keep record of litter/compost export, but he provided Ralph Beiler’s contact information and said that Mr. Beiler might have documentation including sample analysis. Mr. Beiler did not provide documentation of litter/compost transfer or nutrient analysis; however, he said that de-caking would occur around the dates that a flock is removed.

I discussed my observations with Mr. and Mrs. Vang and the Butterball representatives. I provided a Notice of Preliminary Findings, which Mr. Vang signed as an acknowledgement of receipt (Attachment 8). Mr. Vang’s son, Daniel Vang, provided a response via email on August 20, 2024 (Attachment 9). He stated they would continue working to get the requested documents and that they had gravel delivered and a small berm created to address contaminated stormwater in front of the litter/compost barn.

Following the on-site inspection, I requested documents via email from Mr. Vang on August 14, 2024, Mr. Mosely on August 21, 2024, and Mr. Beiler on August 22, 2024. On August 27, 2024, Mr. Mosely provided the Excel spreadsheet “Vang placement and livability numbers” (Attachment 10), which documents animal numbers, flock removal dates, and mortality numbers.

Staff with MoDNR provided annual reports submitted by the facility. I reviewed Annual Reports for activities conducted in 2019 through 2023 (Attachment 5). Animal numbers provided from Butterball did not match with animal numbers provided in the Annual Reports for all years reviewed. Additionally, the Annual Reports provided total tons of waste generated and transferred each year, although I was told by the facility that records are not kept and that the volume of waste transferred is unknown. A summary manure export report was not included in any of the Annual Reports reviewed.

ATTACHMENTS INCLUDED WITH THIS CHECKLIST	
1.	Photographs
2.	Photo Log
3.	Aerial Map
4.	Missouri State Operating Permit MOGS10356
5.	Annual reports 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023
6.	MoDNR July 12, 2022 Inspection Report with Letter of Warning
7.	MoDNR October 28, 2022 Return to Compliance
8.	Notice of Preliminary Findings
9.	Facility Response
10.	Vang placement and livability numbers

SIGNATURE		DATE
SUZANNE WARD  Digitally signed by SUZANNE WARD Date: 2024.09.03 08:59:17 -05'00'		
PRINT NAME:		
Suzanne Ward, Physical Scientist, Region 7/ECAD/Water Branch		

SIGNATURE		DATE
NICOLE MORAN  Digitally signed by NICOLE MORAN Date: 2024.09.03 10:58:11 -05'00'		
PRINT NAME:		
Nicole Moran, Supervisor, Region 7/ECAD/Water Branch		