

# Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

## Conference Call Summary

Meeting materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24786/>

---

### **Actions & Decisions:**

**Decision:** The AgWG confirmed the new at-large membership that will serve 2-year terms, and confirmed Rick Hissong as the alternate member for Marilyn Hershey.

**Decision:** The AgWG agreed to table the recommendations on representing TP in the nutrient trends for swine data until the March workgroup meeting.

**Decision:** The AgWG made a recommendation to not set a floor for loading rates from land uses, such that loading rates from land uses can go below the forest land use loading rate.

**Decision:** The AgWG agreed to hold a 1-day face-to-face quarterly meeting on March 16 at the CBP Offices in Annapolis, MD. The agenda and materials will be distributed and posted as soon as they are available. The AgWG also agreed to hold a tentative 2-day face-to-face meeting in April.

---

### **Welcome, introductions, roll-call, review meeting minutes**

Workgroup Chairs

- Meeting minutes from the January 26<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved.

### **Finalization of At-Large Membership**

All

**Decision:** The AgWG confirmed the new at-large membership that will serve 2-year terms, and confirmed Rick Hissong as the alternate member for Marilyn Hershey.

### **Update on Phase 6 Model Development Schedule**

Dave Montali

Dave Montali, Tetra Tech MWG Co-Chair, updated the workgroup on the current [development schedule](#) for the Phase 6 suite of modeling tools.

#### Discussion:

- Chris Brosch asked if the AgWG should discuss the proposed plan for reviewing the draft final version of the Phase 6 model, specifically with regard to the AMS assigned review.
  - Dave Montali suggested that everyone review subjects they are proficient in, and noted that the AMS acts as a sub-group of the AgWG, and perhaps should defer to the workgroup leadership for direction on their fatal flaw review.
  - Mark Dubin: The AgWG will work with the AMS moving forward in regards to their role in this review. The document for the strategic review is still draft.
- Chris Brosch: Have Matt or Curt discussed with Rich Batiuk on what items were assigned to the AMS in this document?

- Matt Johnston: We haven't reviewed this yet; we take our direction from the AgWG, and we assumed that the AgWG would review this document and provide feedback. Then the AMS would receive the marching orders from the AgWG and report back.
- Chris Brosch: So this would be another agenda item for the AgWG to provide guidance to the AMS.
- Jim Cropper made a comment regarding sub-watershed reviews in order to identify potential circumstances that may account for trends in the pollutant loads.

### **Incorporation of Livestock Characterization Data in Phase 6 Model**

Matt Johnston

Matt Johnston, UMD, presented [documentation](#) on how data from the AgWG-approved turkey, swine, and layer characterization pilot projects will be incorporated into the Phase 6 suite of modeling tools.

#### Discussion:

- Matt Johnston noted that states should submit sample data into the future in order to adjust the baseline of nutrient production.
- Matt presented recommendations for no change in nitrogen concentration over time, and increasing TP concentration 20% for 1985 through 1997. TP concentrations will then decrease 4% annually for 1998 through 2002.
- Jill Whitcomb: What is the definition of barnyard, specifically?
  - Johnston: We have a land use that represents feeding space, which includes poultry houses and swine barns, etc. There's an amount of nutrients running off of feeding space, and that amount is defined by the Animal Waste Mgmt. Systems panel.
- Kelly Shenk: For the broiler data, we were fortunate to have UD's long-term record of poultry data. So we could see the reduction through time, but as I understand we don't have that long-term record for swine.
  - Johnston: Correct. We have plenty of samples back through time, but only stretch to the 1998 at the earliest. The problem there is that the values are volatile.
- Matt Monroe: Could we submit annually for future numbers?
  - Johnston: Yes – and we use a 3-year rolling average. And it does apply to poultry data.
- Ed Kee asked the workgroup if they would support the proposed recommendations for swine moving forward.
  - Tim Sexton expressed support.
- Ed Kee expressed concern about making a decision without having had time to review the proposal.
  - Matt Johnston noted that if the AgWG did not endorse this recommendation, that it still needed to be implemented into the model very shortly. He also noted that the workgroup would have the opportunity to review the values in the fatal flaw period.
  - Tim Sexton: What's the significance of entering the historical data? According to my records, we had a 43% change in total P concentrations before phytase introduction and post-phytase introduction – both in PA and VA. Your current levels that have been presented are accurate, so I'm wondering what role does the historical values play at this point in time?
  - Matt Johnston: I decided that it made sense to reflect the phytase so that we can agree that we considered it in the final model.
- Tim Sexton motioned to formally endorse the motion put forward from Matt Johnston.
- Pennsylvania requested to review the data before making a formal decision, and suggested the item be tabled until a later meeting.

- Matt Johnston noted that the recommendations will be implemented into the model today, and Tim Sexton noted that the number will be reviewed in the fatal flaw period and concerns would be potentially raised at that time.

**Decision:** The AgWG agreed to table the recommendations on representing TP in the nutrient trends for swine data until the March workgroup meeting.

### **Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee Update**

Curt Dell & Matt Johnston

Curt Dell, USDA, and Matt Johnston, UMD, updated the AgWG on the [work](#) of the Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee.

#### Discussion:

- Jim Cropper: How good is the APLE model in detecting P in fertilizers and manures that's not available for plant uptake?
  - Curt Dell: That would probably be best to defer to the Modeling Workgroup. It seems to me that areas with high manure application rates had over-prediction.
- Kelly Shenk: Can you give me a better understanding of the process for reviewing P in soils?
  - Curt Dell: We were just asked to provide input on this issue that's being primarily handled by the Modeling Workgroup.
  - Matt Johnston: The AMS was charged with inputs, so we've developed the history of P inputs from fertilizer and manure. The Modeling Workgroup came back to the AMS and asked for them to look at P soil and output from the soil. I imagine that once the AMS feels comfortable with the soil history, we'll bring that forward to the AgWG and you can bless it for use in the model.

### **Understanding Phase 6 Loads from Non-Forest Land Uses That Are Lower Than Forest Loads– Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting**

Loads from land uses other than forest are sometimes lower than forest loads. The [circumstances](#) that cause this to arise and the frequency of occurrences were discussed.

#### Discussion:

- Jim Cropper: If you apply a BMP to a land use like open space, I would see nothing wrong with the loading rate being lower than forest. In addition, when leaves fall into the streams during autumn, it can provide a significant source of nutrients.
  - Olivia Devereux: There is a harvested forest land use that you can apply BMPs on.
  - Chris Brosch: I don't want to pick on this example, but when we discuss water control structures – that is nowhere near a natural condition. You can install those on wooded wetlands and expect to get the same result. So I don't have a problem with land uses loading less than forest.
  - Alisha Mulkey: I agree with Chris. I do think there are situations, as we move forward in the absence of having planning targets right now, where I wouldn't want to constrain us too early.
  - Jill Whitcomb: I agree with that as well.
- Mark Dubin: So for next month's quarterly meeting, we will be discussing a potentially revised E3 for agriculture.
- Olivia Devereux: These are just draft scenarios, and things will of course change as decisions are made.

- Dave Montali: I want to add that we did hear comments that there are some adverse possibilities about having a land use that loads less than forest and then converting it to forest – there was a worry about having loads going up as a result of application of BMPs.
- Dave Montali asked if there could be two separate recommendations and treatments in the model from each workgroup – if the AgWG recommends loading rates go below forest, and the USWG recommends the opposite. Olivia Devereux replied that this is what would likely happen.

**Decision:** The AgWG made a recommendation to not set a floor for loading rates from land uses, such that loading rates from land uses can go below the forest land use loading rate.

**March Quarterly Meeting Planning**

All

- Jill Whitcomb suggested holding a conference call meeting in addition to a 1-day 3/16 face-to-face meeting in order to accommodate schedules and the agenda items.
- Ed Kee: I think it’s inappropriate to add a day to this meeting, so I would propose that Lindsay Thompson and I meet with Mark Dubin and prioritize the list of agenda topics based on when decisions/actions are required.
- Tim Sexton asked if the April meeting could be transitioned into a 1-day face-to-face meeting.
- Mark Dubin suggested scheduling a 2-day meeting in advance, and shortening the meeting if necessary.

**Decision:** The AgWG agreed to hold a 1-day face-to-face quarterly meeting on March 16 at the CBP Offices in Annapolis, MD. The agenda and materials will be distributed and posted as soon as they are available. The AgWG also agreed to hold a tentative 2-day face-to-face meeting in April.

**Wrap-Up/Review of Action and Decision Items/Announcements** Workgroup Chairs, M. Dubin, L. Gordon

Lindsey reviewed the actions and decisions from the meeting.

**Next meeting: Thursday, March 16<sup>th</sup> 10:00 – 3:00 Face-to-Face Quarterly Meeting  
 CBP ‘Fish Shack’ Conference Room, 410 Severn Avenue  
 Annapolis, MD 21403**

**Participants:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Ed Kee	DDA <i>Retired</i>
Lindsey Thompson	DE-MD Agribusiness Assoc.
Mark Dubin	UMD
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Jason Keppler	MDA
Bobby Long	VA DCR
Tim Sexton	VA DCR
Chris Brosch	DDA
Clint Gill	DDA
Jill Whitcomb	PA DEP

Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Matt Monroe	WV DEP
Joel Blanco	EPA R3
Kelly Shenk	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Marel King	CBC
Bill Angstadt	Angstadt Consulting
Bill Chain	CBF
Marilyn Hershey	Ar Joy Farms LLC
Ken Staver	UMD
Paul Bredwell	US Poultry and Egg Assoc.
Tim Garcia	USDA
Curt Dell	USDA
Ron Ohrel	American Dairy Assoc. NE
Robin Pellicano	MDE
Dave Montali	Tetra Tech
Matt Johnston	UMD
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Jim Cropper	Northeast Pasture Consortium
Rick Hissong	Mercer Vu Farms Inc