

Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

May 18th, 2017

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Conference Call Summary

Meeting materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24789/>

Actions & Decisions:

ACTION: CBP Staff will create a catalogue of AMS/AgWG decisions related to the development of the Phase 6 model.

DECISION: The AgWG reached consensus to recommend that jurisdictions review and provide revised animal population distribution percentages by county (inside/outside Bay Watershed and permitted/non-permitted) to Matt Johnston by no later than July 15, 2017.

DECISION: The AgWG agreed to move forward with collecting industry data over the next 12-16 months, per the two proposals on swine and poultry population data.

Welcome, introductions, roll-call, review meeting minutes

Workgroup Chairs

- Minutes from the April 20th meeting were approved.

Model Review Tools

Olivia Devereux, John Wolf

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting, and John Wolf, USGS, reviewed the data and tools available online to facilitate review of the draft Phase 6 Model inputs and outputs.

-Transition to Phase 6 Website: <https://mpa.chesapeakebay.net/Phase6FAQ.html>

-Phase 6 Draft Final Input Data: <https://mpa.chesapeakebay.net/Phase6DataVisualization.html>

-Using CAST-2017 for nutrient and sediment reduction planning: <http://cast-beta.chesapeakebay.net/>

Discussion:

- Dave Montali: (*to John*) Is there a plan to display the impacts of scenarios on water quality standards attainment in the Bay?
 - John Wolf: This is preliminary information from Lew Linker, and I don't know if this will immediately be included.
 - Dave Montali: It would be nice to have those ranging scenarios, but I know the estuary model won't be calibrated until July 1.
 - Olivia Devereux: We will add those to CAST, so people can see reports and graphs there. We can have that shown on the map visualization too.
- James Davis-Martin: (*to John*) On loads and yields – are we looking at delivered loads and yields? Or EOS?
 - John Wolf: At this point, it's delivered. But we got a request to break it out to edge of stream, river, or tide.

Partnership Review of Phase 6 Model

Dave Montali

Dave Montali, Modeling Workgroup Co-Chair, [briefed](#) the workgroup on recent revisions to the Partnership-wide review guide of the Phase 6 modeling tools by the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT).

Discussion:

- Bill Angstadt: The fatal flaw definition includes the model not following documented final decisions of the Partnership – is there a document containing these decisions?
 - Lindsey Gordon: I've typed up a catalogue of AMS/AgWG decisions and recommendations, and can provide that to you.
 - Bill Angstadt: Regarding BMPs, the expectation is that SB/the model will accept 100% of the BMPs that we submit – is that a documented decision?
 - Matt Johnston: The rules for how BMPs are credited – that is a chapter within the documentation, and also available on the CAST website. It has to do with the land use its reported on, the county its reported on, and those decisions rest with the WTWG.

ACTION: CBP Staff will create a catalogue of AMS/AgWG decisions related to the development of the Phase 6 model.

AMS Update

Curt Dell, Matt Johnston, Mark Dubin

Curtis and Matt summarized [comments](#) received as part of the Phase 6 model input review. They also described a request to incorporate new animal data, which could be locally or state specific, into the Phase 6 model. Following the presentation, workgroup members were asked to provide feedback about the possibility of incorporating new data into the model past the December 31, 2016 data collection deadline.

Discussion:

- Tim Sexton: We have finite population numbers for the entire VA turkey and hog industry. We could look at that information and determine if the NASS or ag census data to determine if they are comparable.
- Matt Johnston: The biggest concern here is the unknown – the December 31 deadline was actually pushed back from a September 2015 deadline. If we recall the Poultry Litter Subcommittee, one of the things we tried to do was use new datasets to set new populations. It's a very complex process to work through methods to fill in gaps in these datasets – and it was a 2-3 year process with the PLS. The concern from some of us is that there is an unknown – we could get to August 2017, and realize that the data is not what we expected.
 - Jeff Sweeney: Adding to that, all of these delays that we're having translates into less time to develop implementation plans, which is the primary purpose of this tool. So you should weigh that on the other side of how important this information is.
 - James Davis-Martin: That assumes you wouldn't let the rest of the Partnership move to slide the entire schedule back.
- Bill Angstadt: Historically, we've had problems with NASS data before. So if there's a problem with NASS data, then let's just fix the NASS data. Another issue was raised with local sourcing of animals inside/outside the watershed – I don't remember this being raised to the WQGIT though. So I would reiterate what I said at the WQGIT – to start at this point to change individual data inputs, and then try to figure out how that impacts everything else in the model, would be too much. I would recommend we follow the rule with new BMPs – that we won't approve any new BMPs until 2 years after the mid-point assessment. If states want to start entering new data inputs here for Phase 6, then we might want to have some moratorium on that until Phase 6 calibration.

- Dave Montali: I would say that maybe there's a distinction between using locally available information to inform the inside/outside values by percentages. Maybe you wouldn't seek an entirely new data source, but perhaps we could use locally available information.
 - James Davis-Martin: I think that's a good approach – allowing a new dataset to be used to at least redistribute the existing NASS numbers. The main desire to modify this data is our number of non-disclosure counties; it's not providing good results to make an even distribution among those D-counties.
 - Matt Johnston: The AMS and myself agree with you and Dave that these are two separate issues. One issue is that we have always accepted percentage of animals permitted/non-permitted, and have worked with states in the past for percentage of animals inside/outside the watershed on our border counties. That's not an issue; it there's a recalibration in August, we can collect that information from states and make that happen. The second issue about D-counties is that it's not an even distribution – it's based on number of farms by animal type. The problem exists that one farm is not equal to another farm. We've certainly come a long way from Phase 5's distribution method. And just to echo what everyone's been saying – this distribution is different than saying that we have 50% of the swine population we think we should have. That would probably blow the schedule. But moving swing around would not.
- Ed Kee: James – I know where you're coming from and I respect it. It's disconcerting that it's popping up at the eleventh hour though. I would guess that most of the states at this point are relatively happy after two years of working on this with the NASS/ag census. And I don't think it's realistic to go to the PSC and EC to ask for a year's delay over this issue. In addition, we've worked so hard to have consistent acquisition and analysis of data across the watershed. I don't want this to be perceived as a special accommodation for one state. Having said that, if it's a matter of adjusting numbers then I think that's fair if VA wants to do that. But I think we have to be sensitive to the work that other states have done over the last 2 years, and not open the door for special treatment. If we can get to a place similar to what Tim Sexton suggested, then that would be fair if they can do it in time. But other than that, I think that's as far as we could go.
- James Davis-Martin: Regarding the 11th hour aspect – I don't feel like this is an appropriate time to do this, when we've been reviewing the animal numbers. And I agree that I don't want the schedule to slide either.
- Ed Kee: Maybe what we want to do is figure out, relative to Matt and Tim's suggestion, if VA can look at the data and suggest a possible redistribution in a timely manner that would not dramatically affect the process.
 - Tim Sexton: Bobby and I have the information, and we can get that to the CBP. We don't have any issues with the total population numbers, but I kind of agree with James in that it's the distribution. Just a general redistribution I don't think is the answer, but I think we can provide the numbers as to exactly what's inside the Bay on a county-by-county basis. If James prefers, we can do it by river basin. And it wouldn't take long at all.
- Ed Kee: Would other states be trying to pursue this option too?
 - Dave Montali: WV has one county with no animals, and we might want to pursue something similar.
 - Delaware: I don't have a strong feeling about the apportionment across the Bay boundary. I think the current assumptions are working for us, and in terms of populations – if something continues to evolve in a way that's easily assimilated into the model, then that would be fine.

- Maryland: We don't have the same set of issues, and benefitted from the work of the PLS. So we don't have a strong opinion, but I have had concerns about the other animal populations, like the D-reported counties.
- Pennsylvania: No comment.
- New York: We agree with Delaware's sentiments, and have a system set up for our animal data.
- Ed Kee: It seems we have a consensus that other states would not have any other impacts, and a consensus that VA and WVA can go ahead and review this and provide it back to the CBP.

DECISION: The AgWG reached consensus to recommend that jurisdictions review and provide revised animal population distribution percentages by county (inside/outside Bay Watershed and permitted/non-permitted) to Matt Johnston by no later than July 15, 2017.

- Mark Dubin: We posted two AgWG proposals to the meeting page, and these were presented to the WQGIT last Monday. I'd like to get some decision or resolution based off what we just decided, if there is an interest for those proposals to be moved forward with the industry for collecting data for poultry and swine populations across the states, or not.
 - Dave Montali: Does VA need this additional work?
 - Mark Dubin: We already have this information for swine and turkeys, but we don't have updated information for the other types of poultry.
 - Curt Dell: It seems like even if it doesn't meet the timeline now, it would be good to have this data for the future.
 - Mark Dubin: Right – and it would be easier and more comprehensive data if we had a longer time period to address this.
 - Ed Kee: So do we have agreement to work on this industry data over the next year?
 - James Davis-Martin: So we can use this to inform animal projections moving forward then, and it wouldn't be implemented by August.

DECISION: The AgWG agreed to move forward with collecting industry data over the next 12-16 months, per the two proposals on swine and poultry population data.

- James Davis-Martin: When will the spreadsheets be shared?
 - Matt Johnston: Following the conversation today, it goes along with what we have here: % in/out and % permitted/non-permitted. It's been posted on the AgWG calendar page for downloading.

Review of Action and Decision Items

Lindsey Gordon

Lindsey will review the action and decision items from the meeting.

- The Wetlands Workgroup will be considering a charge for a Phase 6 Wetlands Expert Panel to look at wetland creation.
- Jeremy Hanson is working to develop BMP Quick Reference Guides, and will present to the AgWG at a later date. Email Jeremy with feedback or questions.
- Jason Keppler: We've been asked by our department to provide a report comparing the size, roles, and responsibilities of our departments NM and compliance enforcement to neighboring states. I'm putting a request out to the other jurisdictions, if they could work with us in gathering that information.

Next meeting: Wednesday June 28th – Thursday June 29th Quarterly Face-to-Face Meeting at the University of Maryland's Wye Research and Education Center in Queenstown, MD.

Participants:

Name	Affiliation
Ed Kee	AgWG Chair
Mark Dubin	UMD
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Chris Brosch	DDA
Clint Gill	DDA
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Greg Albrecht	NYS
Emily Dekar	USC
Frank Schneider	PA SCC
Jill Whitcomb	PA DEP
Tim Sexton	VA DCR
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Marel King	CBC
Kelly Shenk	EPA
Joel Blanco	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Bill Angstadt	Angstadt Consulting
Jennifer Reed-Harry	Penn Ag Industries Assoc.
Peter Hughes	Red Barn Consulting Inc.
Jeremy Daubert	VT
Matt Johnston	UMD
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
John Wolf	USGS
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Ron Ohrel	American Dairy Assoc. NE
Robin Pellicano	MDE
James Davis-Martin	VA DEQ