

## Feedback on consolidating agricultural land uses for the Phase 7 model.

| Role              | Name             | Affiliation | Comments  |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|---|
| Signatory Members | Chris Brosch     | DE          | <b>Consolidate</b><br>Want to consolidate grains and with/without manure.   |
|                   | Alisha Mulkey    | MD          | <b>Consolidate</b><br>Want to consolidate grains and with/without manure. MD is also in agreement with Bill K. We plan at the farm level to address resource concerns and apply BMPs. This is different from how the model can discern the land uses and how we report BMPs.  |
|                   | Cassie Davis     | NY          | <i>Not present.</i>   |
|                   | Scott Heidel     | PA          | <b>Consolidate</b><br>Explore any additional model test runs with various scenarios so we know how consolidation might impact loads and BMP reductions. Same would apply to any changes in general; need to see modeling.   |
|                   | Hunter Landis    | VA          | <b>Consolidate</b><br>Tim Larson was absent, so Hunter provided notes. Support for consolidating grains and with/without manure, as well as more model test runs.   |
|                   | Dave Montali     | WV          | <b>Stand Aside</b><br>Support consolidation in general but simplifying to the land classes is too far. Support for consolidating ag + urban open space. Need distinction for leguminous stuff. Potential concern with consolidating grain because loading rates are different.  |
|                   | Jeff Sweeney     | EPA         | <b>Stand Aside</b><br>In P5 of the model we had more simple land use categories, but we shifted to more detailed land uses in P6 because we felt we needed categories with more understandable crop names to CAST users (e.g., soybeans vs other crops).  |
| At-Large Members  | Ken Staver       | UMD         | <b>Keep Same Land Uses</b><br>Need more clear justification for why we should change the current land uses. Don't understand why keeping it the same would have a negative impact, or how consolidating it would be an advantage. Current specificity of land uses is helpful for BMP targeting.<br>With/without manure should remain separate land uses, but I support revisiting how we determine the application rates for with/without manure because it was previously done with a very small dataset. |
|                   | Tamie Veith      | USDA-ARS    | <b>Keep Same Land Uses</b><br>The current categories are useful to translate farm and field level data to CAST  |
|                   | Candiss Williams | USDA-NRCS   | <i>Not present.</i>   |
|                   | Alex Soroka      | USGS        | <b>Consolidate</b><br>Support for consolidate with/without manure.  |
| Chair             | Zach Easton      | VT          | <b>Keep Same Land Uses</b><br>Should not simplify. The issues raised seem more like data and communication problems than a land use/BMP problem. The specificity as is can incentivize treatment of high loading land uses.   |