

# Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

October 19th, 2017

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

## AgWG Meeting Minutes

Meeting materials: [http://www.chesapeakebay.net/groups/group/agriculture\\_workgroup](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/groups/group/agriculture_workgroup)

### **Actions & Decisions:**

Decision: The AgWG approved the recommended NEIEN representation of the interim BMP for Agricultural Stormwater Management at a 1 inch stormwater treatment curve standard.

Decision: The AgWG approved the CBPO recommended interim BMP definitions and effectiveness values for nursery capture and reuse practices for future planning purposes only.

Decision: The AgWG approved the recommended nominations for the animal mortality management EPEG.

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

Workgroup Chair

- The AgWG approved the meeting minutes from the Sept 20th Face-to-Face Meeting.

### **Phase 6.0 Update**

Loretta Collins

Loretta Collins reviewed the current status of the Phase 6 model review, including outcomes from the September 21st Management Board meeting regarding incorporating soil P into the Phase 6 model and the recommended path forward, as well as a brief update on the Suite of Phase 6 modeling tools.

#### *Discussion:*

- Jeremy Hanson: There was a decision to change the MPA scheduled – the draft phase III Planning targets will now be released on December 22<sup>nd</sup> instead of October 31<sup>st</sup>, as was in the original timeline.

### **Interim BMP Update**

Matt Johnston

Matt Johnston, UMD, discussed how the Agricultural Stormwater Management interim BMP, approved by the Workgroup at the September 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, can be represented in NEIEN for upcoming Phase III WIP planning.

#### *Discussion:*

- Matt Johnston noted that the workgroup could add interim BMPs at the request of states and the workgroup moving forward over the next 6 months.
- Greg Sandi asked if any areas other than feed space could be treated by this. Matt Johnston replied that no, ag stormwater would only be applied to feeding spaces.
- Barry Frantz: If there's different state standards, would the assumption be that within a given state, they'd all be meeting a higher standard? Or would there be a way to differentiate different levels of practices?
  - Matt Johnston: For an interim BMP, we typically go with a default approach. But, what the USWG recommended was providing total volume treated by a pond along with total acres – that would allow you to calculate reductions on a site by site basis. That won't go into the interim BMP, but could be incorporated into the future.

- Tim Sexton motioned to approve the recommendation; Clint Gill seconded.

Decision: The AgWG approved the recommended NEIEN representation of the interim BMP for Agricultural Stormwater Management at a 1 inch stormwater treatment curve standard.

### **Interim BMP Approval**

Loretta Collins

Following a request from jurisdictional members at the September 20<sup>th</sup> Face-to-Face Meeting, the representation of nursery capture and reuse management practices as an interim BMP for the purpose of Phase III WIP development were brought to the Workgroup for consideration.

#### *Discussion:*

- Tim Sexton supported the recommendations.
- Matt Johnston: It looks like the literature is pointing towards these systems acting like detention ponds, we want to make sure states, moving forward, understand not to double report this practice as small-water detention ponds. The same goes for ag stormwater practices too.
- Frank Schneider motioned to approve the recommendation; seconded by Tim Sexton.

Decision: The AgWG approved the CBPO recommended interim BMP definitions and effectiveness values for nursery capture and reuse practices for future planning purposes only.

### **Animal Mortality EPEG Panel**

Loretta Collins, Matt Johnston

Nominations for the Animal Mortality Management Practices Expert Panel Establishment Group (EPEG) were requested following the June AgWG Face-to-Face meeting. Matt Johnston, UMD, addressed representation of animal mortality management practices in the Phase 6 model.

#### *Discussion:*

- Clint Gill: We don't do any burial – that's actually illegal in DE. So we primarily do composting, and incineration is also an accepted practice. Burial is only OK in a catastrophic event.
- Gary Felton noted that MD is almost identical to DE in terms of burial.
- Greg Albrecht: I'd be more in favor of the first option to maintain the current population from ag statistics, and then apply a BMP efficiency.
  - Matt Johnston: So we could do a more transport-type approach.
- Ken Staver: Has someone taken the mortality, and assumed that 100% of nutrients were lost? How big would that number be relative to what's already there? It seems like a lot of effort for a very small impact, from a water quality standpoint.
  - Matt Johnston: I don't think that analysis has been done, but it would certainly be useful to know.
  - Ken Staver recommended doing these calculations before too much is invested in the EPEG or panel.
- Mark Dubin noted that he has been collecting mortality information from the industry through other data collection efforts, and that could help refine estimates.
- Tim Sexton: I think we're accounting for manure from the time animals are born/poultry that's received to the time it leaves. This includes the animals that have died, and from what I've seen, mortality has been very consistent over time.
  - Matt Johnston: So maybe we could define the benefit of properly treating that mortality in Option 1 – and if that benefit is 5% less loss for example, then we would take 5% less loss from the feeding space land use if the proper mortality compost is there.

- Tim Sexton supported this suggestion, as opposed to trying to change manure production.
- Jeremy Hanson: I think we need to consider whether the EPEG/panel should consider routine mortality management practices, or routine practices in concert with mass mortality practices.
  - Frank Schneider: I would add mass mortality as hopefully a 2-3 month issue, and in that case – does it even need to be addressed? That would be a good question for the EPEG to discuss.
- Jason Keppler: I agree with Frank - I don't know if there's even an accounting mechanism in the model to account for mass mortality in terms of number. I also agree with Ken – is the juice worth the squeeze at the end of the day? I would be more supportive of Option 1 all things considered.
- Mark Dubin: We could account for mass mortality when calculating change in population at the end of the year.
- Gary Felton noted that mass mortality due to heat is not reported or accounted for anywhere, and that it happens fairly frequently.
- Motion to approve the proposed membership by Frank Coale; seconded by Tim Sexton.

Decision: The AgWG approved the recommended nominations for the animal mortality management EPEG.

#### **Review of Action and Decision Items**

Lindsey Gordon

Lindsey reviewed the action and decision items from the meeting.

- Jeremy Hanson asked what information for reporting is needed for the interim BMP practices.
  - Matt Johnston: It will be acres treated, and I will work with the WTWG to make sure that information is communicated.

**Next meeting: November 16<sup>th</sup>**

#### Participants:

Clint Gill	DDA
Jason Keppler	MDA
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Greg Albrecht	NYSDEC
Frank Schneider	PA SCC
Jill Whitcomb	PA DEP
Tim Sexton	VA DCR
Bobby Long	VA DCR
Marel King	CBC
Bobby Grisso	VT
Jeremy Daubert	VT
Barry Frantz	USDA
Emily Dekar	USC
Ron Ohrel	American Dairy Assoc. NE

Gary Felton	UMD
Frank Coale	UMD
Ken Staver	UMD
Mark Dubin	UMD
Loretta Collins	UMD
Matt Johnston	UMD
Barry Frantz	USDA
Joel Blanco	EPA
Greg Sandi	MDE
Amir Sharifi	DC DOEE