

Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

June 16th, 2016

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Conference Call Summary

Meeting materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/23300/>

Actions and Decisions:

ACTION: AgWG members should send Dr. Shawn Hawkins (shawkins@utk.edu), Jeremy Hanson (jchanson@vt.edu), and/or Mark Dubin (mdubin@chesapeakebay.net) any comments or questions on the AWMS preliminary report as early on as possible.

ACTION: Matt Johnston will pull crop removal values from Meisinger and Randall 1991 to include in the revised AMS Crop Removal Table for Beta 3, and will work offline with members of the AMS to finalize these values.

ACTION: Mark Dubin and Lindsey Gordon will work with Pennsylvania Representatives and the AgWG in order to schedule a conference call in mid-July dedicated to making a workgroup recommendation on the Pennsylvania farm self-assessment project.

ACTION: Mark Dubin will convey the AgWG's formal request that the Management Board consider the expertise within the relevant Source Sector Workgroup when allowing that workgroup to have a significant role in the development of a policy panel to resolve policy issues related to BMP expert panels.

- | | | |
|-------|--|------------------|
| 10:00 | Welcome, introductions, roll-call, review meeting minutes | Workgroup Chairs |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meeting minutes from the May 19th call were approved.• The latest version of the AgWG 2016 timeline will be posted to the AgWG website under the 'Projects and Resources' tab, and will also be available on the meeting materials page. Please email either Mark Dubin (mdubin@chesapeakebay.net) or Lindsey Gordon (gordon.lindsey@epa.gov) with questions. | |
| 10:05 | Animal Waste Management Systems Panel Preliminary Report | S. Hawkins |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shawn Hawkins, Panel Chair, provided an update on the panel's drafted preliminary report and current panel considerations.• Sexton: In the reduction, does that include the difference between the influent and effluent nutrient reductions for the particular animal waste system?<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Hawkins: Broadly speaking, yes. The panel's main focus is to justify for a beginning and an ending – before and after. We're trying to identify how much manure is collected and available for use after. | |

ACTION: AgWG members should send Dr. Shawn Hawkins (shawkins@utk.edu), Jeremy Hanson (jchanson@vt.edu), and/or Mark Dubin (mdubin@chesapeakebay.net) any comments or questions on the AWMS preliminary report as early on as possible.

10:20 Cover Crops Preliminary BMP Panel Reports

K. Staver

- The Cover Crops Panel presented their revised preliminary report. The report is posted to the [calendar event page](#). The AgWG will be asked to formally approve the report during the July face-to-face meeting.
- Karl Brown: Was there any consideration that when you apply the fall manure, the total pool of nutrients at that point in time might be greater, but did you look at the other end of the crop uptake and consider whether the fact that it's being put onto a cover creates any additional uptake? Sounds like you're dinging people just because there's more nutrients, but did you look at the other side of the equation?
 - Staver: The amount of uptake will generally be higher, and as you add N, uptake will increase. We also have specific land uses, so cover crops will be attached to a land use.
- Tom Simpson: Is there a land use that includes manure application to fallowed ground in the fall? Wouldn't that, because losses from silage may be higher with or without that application, but with the application regardless of the crop if it's on fallow ground in the fall that'll be the high loss and where this practice will be targeted?
 - Johnston: Manure application to fallow ground hasn't been around for a few model versions. Instead, we broke out our major crops (corn, soybeans, sorghum) into those acres that receive manure and those that don't receive manure. In reality, some of those acres are probably receiving fall applications, but in the model the timing of application matters very little.

10:35 Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee (AMS) Update

M. Johnston

- Matt reviewed the methods, including nutrient spread, to be used in the upcoming Beta 3 calibration version of the model.
- Sexton: In regards to Beta 3, is there going to be any way to allocate fertilizer sales on urban and turf land?
 - Johnston: I think the Urban Stormwater Workgroup will be addressing that question in a few weeks. At the moment, we have far too many nutrients going down on urban land.
 - Matt will provide the AgWG will fertilizer application data when it becomes available from the Urban Stormwater Workgroup.
- Brosch: You mentioned that the rates we're looking at match nutrient management condition. However, some of the major crops like corn, are accommodating a combination of current conditions for non-NM and NM on the landscape based on some states' annual report data. So it's taking into account the recommendations, but also a certain level of non-NM in many cases for those major crops.
- Chris Brosch raised concerns on some of the legume fixation values.
- Johnston: The AMS had agreed to revise all of the crop removal values.
- Lindsay Thompson: I would encourage Matt and Chris to try and resolve some of these issues before the Beta 3 is released, because after that we will only have the Beta 4 to use for planning purposes and get a good look at what the final model will look like.

ACTION: Matt Johnston will pull crop removal values from Meisinger and Randall 1991 to include in the revised AMS Crop Removal Table for Beta 3, and will work offline with members of the AMS to finalize these values.

11:15 Penn State Farm Self-Assessment Project

S. Taglang

- PA DEP presented the results of the recent farm self-assessment project conducted in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed of Pennsylvania by Penn State University. Penn State and PA DEP are currently developing a verification methodology in preparation for submitting the implementation data for the Phase 6 model inputs by September 30, 2016.
- The AgWG will be asked to approve of the methodology in July in order to fit within the BMP verification guidelines and protocols so that the final report can be delivered in September 2016.
- Jason Keppler: The framework is pretty explicit that any former reported practices need to be verified prior to reporting up through NEIEN, so I'm curious what your intent is in terms of what data is to be reported out of this process? Is it the entire 30,000 farms extrapolated from the 7,000, or is it something else?
 - Taglang: We're not going to extrapolate any of this information to the 30,000 farms, or the 20,000 farms that are part of the Penn State data collection effort. We're specifically attempting to report the 700 that we have visited, and we're investigating how to potentially expand that to the 7,000 that reported the information.
 - Keppler: I'd be curious as to the CBP's stance on this effort, and whether any of the other jurisdictions would be able to request that similar data get included in the model as well.
 - Dubin: Rich has been involved with discussion along with myself. This discussion is coming to the AgWG, no decisions are being asked today, and this is just to give everyone a heads up on a future decision. Part of this will be the AgWG begin asked to review the verification guidance table that was developed, and to take a stance on whether this is an acceptable procedure.
- Steve Taglang proposed a conference call for the AgWG in order to make a decision on the farm-survey in advance of July 18th.

ACTION: Mark Dubin and Lindsey Gordon will work with Pennsylvania Representatives and the AgWG in order to schedule a conference call in mid-July dedicated to making a workgroup recommendation on the Pennsylvania farm self-assessment project.

11:35 AgWG Discussion on Manure Treatment Technologies Policy Panel

All

- The AgWG discussed the draft preliminary process for establishing a BMP expert panel policy group, and reviewed recommendations for representatives to serve on a proposed policy group for the Manure Treatment Technologies Expert Panel Report.
- Saacke Blunk: These requests for policy consideration seem to be more about trading programs design questions as opposed to nutrient credit questions, because it seems the efficiencies of the panel's recommendations are final, and then it becomes how it's nuanced into the design of the trading program. So why would the AgWG provide the nominees for that?
 - Dubin: The Management Board (MB) may decide to take a different path on this. At least in the draft document, the sector workgroup is asked to coordinate

with the relevant GIT to provide a list of recommended members, and the MB is then asked to approve of that membership. We'll have to wait and see what the final decision is, though.

- Keppler: I would argue differently – this isn't really policy related to the development of trading programs. I think at least in MD, it's how to do these technologies actually contribute a water quality benefit? If we had a better understanding of that then we could include in our trading program. As it stands now, it's difficult to incorporate those efficiencies into either our WIP or trading programs. I'm not sure if that's even in the purview of this policy panel, either.
- Keppler: So who exactly is sponsoring this panel, and who approves the recommendations from the AgWG, and where does the charge come from regarding this panel?
 - Dubin: Great questions. Oversight responsibility is at the MB level, and the way it's currently drafted, the responsible GIT would have a lot of responsibility for managing this in conjunction with the sector workgroup.

ACTION: Mark Dubin will convey the AgWG's formal request that the Management Board consider the expertise within the relevant Source Sector Workgroup when allowing that workgroup to have a significant role in the development of a policy panel to resolve policy issues related to BMP expert panels.

12:00 **Adjourn**

Next meeting: Wednesday, July 20 – Thursday, July 21 Face-to-Face at USGS Offices in Baltimore, MD

Participants:

Lindsey Gordon, CRC

Mark Dubin, UMD

Ed Kee, DDA

Lindsay Thompson, DE-MD Agribusiness Assoc.

Chris Brosch, DDA

Clint Gill, DDA

Jason Keppler, MDA

Alisha Mulkey, MDA

Greg Albrecht, NYS

Steve Taglang, PA DEP

Joe Whitcomb, PA DEP

Ted Tesler, PA DEP

Bobby Long, VA DCR

Tim Sexton, VA DCR

Marel King, CBC

Kelly Shenk, EPA

Bill Angstadt, Angstadt Consulting

Bill Chain, CBF

Jeff Hill, Lancaster Co. Conservation District

Ken Staver, UMD

Marilyn Hershey, Ar Joy Farms LLC

Karl Brown, PA State Conservation Commission

Ron Ohrel, Mid-Atlantic Dairy Assoc.

Susan Marquart, NRCS

Teresa Koon, WV DEP

Samantha Wood, UMD

Matt Johnston, UMD

Fred Samadani

Robin Pellicano, MDE

Kristen Saacke Blunk, Headwaters LLC

Gene Yagow, Virginia Tech

Tom Simpson, Aqua Terra Science

Skyler Gold, UMD

Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Jack Meisinger, USDA

Bob Palmer, DNREC

Shawn Hawkins, University of Tennessee