

Draft Meeting Notes

Agriculture Workgroup Meeting

August 8, 2013

Log Lodge

Beltsville, MD

AgWG Action Items and Decisions

DECISION: AgWG Approved July AgWG minutes

DECISION: BMP Expert Panel reports will be reviewed at the next AgWG meeting on September 26th

ACTION: Nominations for subgroup members to address Management Plans BMPs requested by 8/15/13

AgWG Action Items and Decisions

DECISION: AgWG decided to move forward with formation of a Manure Treatment Technology Panel.

ACTION: Mark will send a request to AgWG for *Manure Treatment Technology Preliminary Advisory Group* nominations by 8/15/13.

AgWG Notes

- Meeting convened at 9:30
- Welcome and introductions
- Meeting Notes
 - AgWG July meeting summary was reviewed for member approval. VA motioned to approve, second by UD, all yea.
 - **DECISION: Approve July AgWG minutes**

AgWG Notes

- **Expert Review Panel Update**

- Mark Dubin, Agriculture Workgroup Coordinator, provided an update on the schedule for the development and review of the Phase 5.3.2 panel recommendation reports.

DECISION: BMP Expert Panel reports will be reviewed at the next AgWG meeting on September 26th

AgWG Notes

- **Poultry Production Data Panel**
 - Jim Glancey, Poultry Litter Subcommittee Chair, led a panel discussion on poultry production data sources being evaluated by the subcommittee to represent poultry populations and associated litter nutrients including the opportunities and limitations of various data federal, state and private industry sources.
 - Joining the panel discussion was Mark Dubin, Steve Taglang with PADEP, and Paul Bredwell with US Poultry and Egg.
 - NASS has recommended using production numbers to most accurately estimate population

AgWG Notes

- **Poultry Production Data Panel**

- Poultry Litter Subcommittee will be reviewing the data and methods presented today, comments and recommendations welcomed from the workgroup.
- Glancey clarified that the data is based on number of flocks per year.
- NRCS: Request to see how manure, bird weight, and flocks per year all fit together in the panel recommendations.
 - Glancey: Panel will consider volume, concentration and population.

AgWG Notes

- **Poultry Production Data Panel**
 - USDA: How does this data set compare to industry data?
 - Coordinator: NASS confirmed some surveys are returned with a “0”, representing time between flocks
 - Taglang: Described process of collecting CAFO and other manure data with limited success.
 - Bredwell: Discussed the poultry industry’s interest to assist the partnership with more accurately representing commercial poultry production through better data.
 - NGO: VA population data presented by the subcommittee does match NASS reported data.
 - Glancey presented the corrected version of VA data, which will replace the current posted version.

AgWG Notes

- **Nutrient Management Panel Update**

- Chris Brosch, Nutrient Management Panel Chair, gave an overview of the panel approved three-tiered definition of nutrient application management BMPs.
- Panel will be concentrating on effectiveness estimates at their next call.
- NRCS: Noted that tier 1 and 2 are consistent with NRCS standards, tier 3 differs only slightly. NRCS supports the definition.
- MDA: Request keeping in mind where the jurisdictions get their data, existing work is consistent with those considerations.

AgWG Notes

- **Cover Crops Panel Update**

- Jack Meisinger, Cover Crops Panel Chair, provided an update on the panel's development of new cover crop species definitions and effectiveness values for the Phase 5.3.2 models.
- MDA: Will phosphorus and sediment numbers be available for 5.3.2 update?
 - Meisinger: If data is available could be included. Not likely to be available in time.
 - Meisinger: Unspecified species will be given default values (definition will be provided by Mark and CBPO modelers).

AgWG Notes

- **Conservation Tillage Panel Update**
 - Mark provided an update on behalf of Wade Thomason, Conservation Tillage Panel Chair, on the panel's continuing work on reevaluating the Continuous No-Till (CNT) BMP for the Phase 5.3.2 models.
 - Panel concentrating on redefining CNT to broaden its application and allow stacking of NM and cover crops .
 - Reviewing relevant literature and RUSLE2 modeling runs to assist in developing effectiveness values.
 - USDA: Recommended obtaining assistance from NRCS national RUSLE2 experts in addition to NRCS state agronomists.

AgWG Notes

- **LUNCH**

AgWG Notes

- **Maryland Agricultural BMP Assessment Update**
 - Dana York, Green Earth Connection, LLC, presented next steps in the technical review of Maryland Department of Agriculture's functional equivalents as introduced during the July meeting.
 - NGO: Will functional equivalents have the same protections in terms of verification?
 - MDA: Yes.
 - Coordinator: Recommend a clear definition for FE.
 - NGO: Is VA considering a similar approach?
 - VA: Pilot program in a few districts, data not reported to the models as of yet.

AgWG Notes

- **Maryland Agricultural BMP Assessment Update**
 - Chair asked for recommendations from the workgroup.
 - USDA: Will there be any management practices in addition to structures?
 - MDA: Some have management suggestions.
 - PA: Is the functional equivalent documentation available?
 - MDA: Yes.
 - VA clarified that most of their assessment of FE was in structural practices, and their documentation is also available.
 - NGO: Do maintenance considerations factor into these definitions?
 - MDA: Yes.

AgWG Notes

- **Draft Chesapeake Bay Agreement**

- Mark and Dana provided an update on the agricultural outcome proposed for the draft Chesapeake Bay Agreement under development by the Management Board. A previous draft contained language that was adapted from the Chesapeake Bay Executive Order, and committed to implementing new conservation practices on 4 million high priority agricultural acres by 2025. The Workgroup has continued to recommend excluding the proposed outcome.
- NGO: Note that the language is not an actual outcome.

AgWG Notes

- **Draft Chesapeake Bay Agreement**
 - AgWG continues to support their previous recommendation to not include the federal agricultural outcome in the new Bay Agreement.
 - Public comment period on the draft Bay Agreement closes August 15th (Emma will provide the link to submit comments).

AgWG Notes

- **Proposed Toxics Contamination Outcome**
 - Scott Phillips, USGS Chesapeake Bay Coordinator, presented several proposed options on including an outcome statement in the draft Chesapeake Bay Agreement addressing toxic contaminants. Scott briefly reviewed the toxics contaminants report, focusing on the four outcome options currently being reviewed.
 - Chair asked for any initial comments from the workgroup.
 - NGO: Note that toxics have not been addressed by the partnership yet, and that the problem is not going to go away. Note that Agriculture is only one part of the toxics problem. Support a combination of options 1 and 2.
 - USDA: Past Agriculture practices have concentrated toxics.

AgWG Notes

- **Proposed Toxics Contamination Outcome**
 - PA: Relationship to toxics in pesticides
 - NGO: Option 1 alone is insufficient; recommend option 2 or 3. Option 4 rules out the toxics that are the most identifiable.
 - NGO: Note that the AgWG will be responsible for the management strategies associated with these options, recommend option 1 or 3.
 - Coordinator: Recommend option 3, because defines a scope of work.

AgWG Notes

- **Proposed Toxics Contamination Outcome**
 - VA: Recommend a multi-phase project because each chemical acts differently in the environment.
 - Phillips will provide a timeline for recommendations from the workgroup.
 - CBC: IRC scheduled to address this next week.
 - Chair noted that a blend of options will be required to approach this issue.
 - NGO: Recommend narrowing down the targeted contaminants by those that are causing the largest problems.
 - Chair: If decisions from IRC are delayed, AgWG can provide a more formal recommendation.

AgWG Notes

- **Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee Update**
 - Curtis Dell, USDA-ARS Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee Chair, provided a report on the activities of the new subcommittee. The members are currently reviewing and prioritizing the Phase 6.0 model recommendations developed during the Building a Better Bay Model workshop in May of this year.
 - NGO: Are the recommendations from the workshop being used to direct the work of this group?
 - Dell: Yes
 - Coordinator noted that AMS is addressing some of the workshop recommendations, however other panels or subgroups under the AgWG will be addressing recommendations as well.

AgWG Notes

- **Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee Update**
 - NGO: Recommend addressing a few of the top concerns from the workshop recommendations soon.
 - Coordinator: Will take these comments back to AMS.
 - NGO: Recommend sub topics beneath the top 3 tasks, so that the specific workshop recommendations are not missed.
 - MDA: Note that AMS is working on the new Scenario Builder as well as addressing the workshop recommendations.
 - Coordinator: Some of the tasks are being addressed by PLS, or other panels.

AgWG Notes

- **BMP Transparency Update**
 - Frank and Mark provided an update on the development of a definition for transparency by the BMP Verification Committee's Transparency Subgroup.
 - Two distinct versions of a draft definition have been developed and the committee is currently at an impasse to approve either version.
 - Both drafts have been provided to the BMP Verification Committee and will be discussed by the BMP Verification Review Panel. The partnership will make the final decision.

AgWG Notes

- **BMP Verification Management BMP Subgroup**
 - Frank will introduce the formation of an Agriculture Workgroup subgroup to begin developing BMP verification protocols for the management plans BMP category included in the Verification Matrix. The workgroup voted to adopt the draft version of the matrix presented during the July 11th meeting, which does not currently provide information on management plan type BMPs. Suggestions for 5-6 candidates to serve on the subgroup will be requested.

AgWG Notes

- **BMP Verification Management BMP Subgroup**
 - NGO: Are there additional criteria for subcommittee members?
 - Coordinator: Will provide written version in email to the workgroup requesting nominations
 - Kim Snell-Zarcone volunteered

ACTION: Nominations for subgroup members to address Management Plans BMPs requested by 8/15/13

AgWG Notes

- **Manure Treatment Technology Panel**
 - According to the current workgroup prioritized list of BMP evaluations, the new BMP representing manure treatment technologies is next in line to be evaluated through an expert review panel. Frank will entertain interest from the workgroup in potentially moving forward to solicit candidates for forming a panel to address this BMP. If recommended by the workgroup, the new BMP panel will be seated upon the conclusion of one of the existing four expert review panels.

AgWG Notes

- **Manure Treatment Technology Panel**
 - Chair asked for topic suggestions for panel focus.
 - Coordinator clarified that this would be a new BMP, or category of new BMPs. Some proposed language from several jurisdiction's WIPs is available.
 - UD: Does the model recognize composters/digesters?
 - Coordinator: Mortality composters are modeled, digesters are not.
 - MDA: How was this panel topic chosen to be next in line?
 - Coordinator: List was prioritized previously by the AgWG .
 - MDA: Other lower priority BMPs on this list would be a higher priority for MD.
 - PA: This BMP will be important for PA.

AgWG Notes

- **Manure Treatment Technology Panel**
 - NGO: Manure technologies would benefit other jurisdictions as well.
 - MDA: What type of recommendations would come from the panel?
 - Chair: Removal and transformation of nutrients.
 - CBC: Multiple products, separation of liquids and solids.
 - MDA: Could this BMP be included in Phase 5.3.2?
 - Coordinator: It is possible to include in Phase 5.3.2 as a new BMP.
 - USDA: Recommend referencing previous partnership groups that have addressed this issue.

AgWG

- **Manure Treatment Technology Panel**

- NRCS has seen varied results, may be difficult to define in an efficiency value.
- NGO: Recommend first defining the framework before involving the experts.
- Chair: Does the workgroup support moving forward with this subgroup?
- NGO moved, UD second to form a manure treatment technology panel.

DECISION: AgWG decided to move forward with formation of a manure treatment technology panel. Recommend that a preliminary scope of work be developed through a steering committee.

ACTION: Mark will send a request to AgWG for Manure Treatment Technology preliminary steering committee nominations.

AgWG Notes

- Adjourned at
- Next meeting: Thursday, **September 26th**,
9:30-3:30

AgWG Notes

- Participants
 - Chris Brosch, VT VA-DEQ
 - John Rhoderick, MD
 - Dana York, MDA
 - Jim Glancey, UD
 - Marel Raub, CBC
 - Sally Kepfer, NRCS
 - Jen Neslon, NRCS
 - Jack Meisinger, USDA-ARS
 - Glenn Carpenter, NRCS
 - Steve Taglang, PA
 - Ted Tesler, PA
 - Frank Coale, UMD
 - Connie Musgrove, UMCES
 - Mark Dubin, UMD
 - Emma Giese, CRC
 - Paul Bredwell, US Poultry and Egg
 - Robert Baldwin, DE
 - Beth Horsey, MDA

AgWG Notes

- Participants
 - Jenn Volk, UD
 - Curt Dell, ARS
 - Tim Sexton, VA
 - Allison Fairbrother, Public Trust Project
 - Greg Albrecht, NY
 - Hobey Bauhan, VA Poultry
 - Kim Snell-Zarcone, Conservation PA
 - Susan Marquart, NRCS
 - Bill Angstadt, DMAA
 - Jim Baird, AFT
 - Amy Jacobs, Nature Conservancy
 - Kelly Shenk, EPA
 - Jeff Sweeney, EPA
 - Pat Stunz, Campbell Foundation
 - Karl Blankenship, Bay Journal
 - Don Meals, TetraTech
 - Hank Zygmunt, Resource Dynamics
 - Roy Hoagland, Hope Impacts