

Meeting Minutes  
July 18th, 2019  
10:00 AM-12:00 PM  
Conference Call

**Workgroup Areas of Focus**

**Accounting & Reporting • Implementation • Innovation**

**Data & Modeling • CBP Assignments**

**Summary of Actions and Decisions:**

- **Action:** The AgWG will have one week to further review the June Meeting Minutes. Please provide edits/comments using track changes in the Word document and send to myself ([wagner.alexandra@epa.gov](mailto:wagner.alexandra@epa.gov)) by **COB Thursday, July 25**. Final approval will take place via email or at our next AgWG meeting.
- **Action:** The AgWG will have two weeks to review the Draft AgWG Response to the [\*Chesapeake Executive Council Directive in Support of Agricultural Technical Assistance and Conservation Practice Implementation\*](#) (attached). Please provide edits/comments using track changes in the Word document and send to myself ([wagner.alexandra@epa.gov](mailto:wagner.alexandra@epa.gov)) and Loretta Collins ([Lcollins@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:Lcollins@chesapeakebay.net)) by **COB Thursday, August 1**. Final approval will take place via email or at our next AgWG meeting.
- **Action:** The AgWG jurisdictions will schedule a meeting to informally discuss management of soil amendments in their respective states. They will come back to the AgWG with information to drive a conversation for next steps toward quantification of soil amendments at a future meeting.

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

Workgroup Chairs

- Roll-call of the governance body
- Roll-call of the meeting participants
- **Action:** The AgWG will have one week to further review the June Meeting Minutes. Please provide edits/comments using track changes in the Word document and send to myself ([wagner.alexandra@epa.gov](mailto:wagner.alexandra@epa.gov)) by **COB Thursday, July 25**. Final approval will take place via email or at our next AgWG meeting.

**Prioritization Review: Mapping out the Next Year (15 min)**

A. Wagner, L. Collins

A quick review of the discussion and on-line voting by the AgWG at the June 20<sup>th</sup> meeting regarding prioritization of issues pertaining to the AgWG.

- The results from the prioritization can be found on the calendar page.

**Accounting and Reporting:**

- Loretta Collins noted that resource improvement BMPs are a broad concern within jurisdictional members and interested parties. Communication and outreach are an important aspect of this issue that needs to be addressed.

- Jill Whitcomb: Specific to RI practices, there are 16 or so that are approved and associated checklists. There is a need to review the approval process for these practices. We also need to review what exists in state regulations and guidance documents regarding implementing BMPS that may or may not meet NRCS practice standards. The checklists may not be the best way to verify due to the overwhelming amount of practices that need verification.
  - Jason Keppler: We will do some research on this at the Bay Program office.

#### Implementation:

- No additional comments.

#### Data and Modeling:

- Guralp Toor: For nutrient fertility research, there is not a real funding mechanism interested. We need to make more progress on this issue. Perhaps we should sit down with Jake Reilly from NFWF and discuss research needs and interested land grant universities. If CBPO could lead the coordination of this effort, it may be helpful to organize a meeting to discuss this.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk: Kristen Hughes Evans with Sustainable Chesapeake is a field liaison for NFWF. She will be reaching out to land grant universities to coordinate a meeting to discuss this issue in late August or early September.
  - Loretta Collins will follow up with Kristen Hughes Evans offline.
- Mark Dubin: Several projects are moving along looking at poultry and swine data in VA. More details to share by next month.
  - Chris Brosch: What is the process for this data collection?
  - Mark Dubin: We are using the same process used in 2016 for providing information working with interested folks. We will be working with other partners in VA and other states using the VA data gathering as a baseline.
  - Chris Brosch: Should this be formalized by the AgWG in order to provide the right support and oversight for these projects?
  - Mark Dubin: Protocols for model input data for Phase 6 from AMS (Ag Modeling Subcommittee) and their reports are the basis of our protocol, which were approved by the AgWG.
- Chris Brosch noted that the AMS was a group of professional experts that discussed these questions and gave oversight to this process, which does not exist anymore.
  - Jason Keppler: Would the formal process be reinstating the AMS?
  - Kelly Shenk: I view this as a project that the Bay Program Partnership agreed to undertake when we approved the Poultry Litter Subcommittee recommendations. This is a commitment we made as the AgWG to update these data and that Mark Dubin and Paul Bredwell would report back to the AgWG with updates and presentations.
  - Paul Bredwell: I mentioned that some states do not want to participate in this data collection and the protocol was established in 2016 with the pilot project.
  - Chris Brosch: I voted to approve the report, not to approve the process.
  - Frank Schneider: I agree, I approved the report and I thought this was a once and done collection. I did not think this process was up for approval.
  - Jill Whitcomb: Everything comes back to the modeling tools. When we are given updates, we need to understand how new data will impact the model and that needs to be described in more detail when we approve things.
  - Jason Keppler: This will be a future discussion on an AgWG agenda so we can continue this discussion at a later meeting.

## **Data & Modeling**

### **Ag Census 2017: Notable Trends (30 min)**

Jeff Sweeney

Jeff Sweeney, EPA-CBP, discussed the 2017 Ag Census including notable trends emerging from the 2017 data release earlier this spring.

- Note: For each graph, the first slide for each animal type shows what is currently in CAST and the second slide shows what will be in the CAST version released on Nov 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Ken Staver: Is there data used after the 2017 Ag Census?
  - Jeff Sweeney: No, it's using the projection method this group decided on.
  - Suchith Ravi: For broilers and turkeys, we did find 2018 Census data which is showed here and explains the dip in 2018 from that data point.
- Chris Brosch: I think the AgWG should reconsider the methods that were used to provide these numbers and trends.
  - Jill Whitcomb: If there are concerns with the process or data, there should be an open door for a conversation and adaptive management to fix any issues.
  - Jeff Sweeney: The deadline for this milestone period is fast approaching. If you want to change things for the next milestone period, now is the time to begin discussions.
- Kelly Shenk: Did the AMS consider economic issues in these projections, particularly with the dairy industry?
  - Chris Brosch: No, we focused on the numbers in preparation for Phase III WIPs. The AMS was given 3 choices and 2 meetings to discuss which choice we could live with before the modelers had to move forward.
- Jason Keppler: We will have 2019 progress based on 2012 and a 2017? (correct)
- Jeff Sweeney noted that 2019 progress will have 2 versions. The first is the old projection based on 2012 data. The second is a rerun of 2019 progress including new data methods and sector data to start fresh at the new milestone period. We also will edit the history to align with what happened in the real world.
- Paul Bredwell: This protocol has been in place since I've been on the AgWG. It confuses me why folks that have been involved are confused by this. Logically, this leads back to collecting data from industry groups. There is a difference in the datasets we collect from industry folks and this relates back to forecasting.

## **CBP Assignments**

### **Moving Forward: Ag TA and Conservation Practice Implementation (30 min)**

L. Collins

Review updated draft response to Oct 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018 charge to the AgWG from the CBP Management Board regarding the CBP Executive Council's [Directive in Support of Agricultural Technical Assistance and Conservation Practice Implementation](#). A formal response to the charge will be presented for approval and any possible edits.

- Loretta Collins noted that there have been minor edits since the last version presented and this will go to the Executive Council on Sept 5.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk: There are some clear leaks between our priority results and our response to this directive. There may be an opportunity to better link these documents. One of our top priorities is technical assistance and we could better express that in the response document.
- Several workgroup members noted they did not have time to review the updated document and would like more time.
- **Action:** The AgWG will have two weeks to review the Draft AgWG Response to the [Chesapeake Executive Council Directive in Support of Agricultural Technical Assistance and Conservation Practice Implementation](#) (attached). Please provide edits/comments using track changes in the

Word document and send to myself ([wagner.alexandra@epa.gov](mailto:wagner.alexandra@epa.gov)) and Loretta Collins ([Lcollins@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:Lcollins@chesapeakebay.net)) by **COB Thursday, August 1**. Final approval will take place via email or at our next AgWG meeting.

## **Data & Modeling**

### **Soil Amendments (20 min)**

Group Discussion

A continuation of the June conversation on the issue of soil amendment (e.g., compost) application on agricultural land in the watershed. Soil amendments are not currently accounted for as a load source in the CBP Phase 6 watershed model.

- Frank Schneider: This is a discussion that needs to be had in a separate meeting starting with how each state handles their regulations.
  - Ken Staver: That seems reasonable to get a general idea of the quantity we are looking at. In MD, everything is included in nutrient management plans. It still seems like a quantification issue that needs more thought. We should get a handle on the flows of manure recycled into compost for accounting purposes.
- Jason Keppler: Any new information we find will likely inform the next version of the model.
- **Action:** The AgWG jurisdictions will schedule a meeting to informally discuss management of soil amendments in their respective states. They will come back to the AgWG with information to drive a conversation for next steps toward quantification of soil amendments at a future meeting.

### **New Business & Announcements (15 min)**

- Barry Frantz noted that Michael Carlo is the new acting Chesapeake Bay Coordinator with NRCS. He will be moving back to PA NRCS in August and is unsure of his level of participation going forward.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk brought up the CAC thank you letter discussed at the previous meeting.
  - Loretta Collins noted that there was concern about our role in writing letters because of the makeup of the AgWG membership and potential conflicts of interest

**Next meeting: Thursday, Sept 19<sup>th</sup> 10AM - 12 PM. Conference Call**

Meeting Participants:

Jason Keppler	MDA
Matt Monroe	WV DA
Loretta Collins	UMD
Allie Wagner	CRC
Chris Brosch	DDA
Clint Gill	DDA
Greg Albrecht	NY State Dept. of Ag and Markets
Frank Schneider	PA State Conservation Commission
Marel King	CBC
Kelly Shenk	EPA
Jill Whitcomb	PA DEP
Adam Lyon	MDA
Elizabeth Hoffman	MDA

Kristen Saacke-Blunk	Headwaters, LLC
Paul Bredwell	U.S Poultry and Egg
Jeremy Daubert	VT
Dr. Gurpal Toor	UMD
Ken Staver	UMD
Emily Dekar	USC
Cassandra Davis	NY DEC
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Ron Ohrel	American Dairy Association
Mark Dubin	UMD
Jeff Hill	Lancaster County Conservation District
Barry Frantz	NRCS
Michael Carlo	NRCS
Gary Felton	UMD
Kendall Tyree	VA SWCD
Laura Exar	UMD
Sara Ramotnik	UMD
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Hilary Swartwood	CRC
Suchith Ravi	UMCES