



Agriculture Workgroup

August 20, 2026
10:00AM-12:00PM

[Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.](#)

Purpose: To discuss and vote on the process for changing AgWG membership under the new Governance and Management Framework, vote on the E3 Scenario for the Agricultural Sector, and discuss management strategy development for the Clean Water Goal.

Summary of Actions & Decisions

Decision: The AgWG approved the June and July meeting minutes.

Decision: The AgWG approved the following process for conforming to the 15 (9 signatory/ 6 at-large) Partnership voting member structure:

- Signatory members will be asked to participate in a ranked-choice vote to fill the 6 at-large positions based on the at-large membership categories that have been identified (academia; agri-business and industry; conservation districts; technical assistance providers; conservation NGOs; and USDA).
- Within each category, the candidate receiving the strongest support through the ranked-choice vote will serve as the primary voting member and the candidate receiving the second greatest support will serve as the alternate. Any ties would be broken through a second vote on tied candidates.

Action: A call for nominations for at-large members will be temporarily re-opened, with a deadline of two weeks after distribution, in order to solicit additional nominations for the defined membership categories.

Decision: The AgWG approved the [Phase 7 Ag E3 Scenario assumptions](#) for recommendation to the Clean Water Goal Team.

Meeting Minutes

I. Welcome, Roll Call, Review Meeting Minutes

Lead: Caitlin Grady, AgWG Chair

Caitlin opened the meeting, thanking the group for their continued engagement in these discussions, and requested participants share their name and affiliation using the meeting “Chat” function. Caitlin then asked Workgroup members to approve the June and July AgWG meeting

minutes. Given quorum was not present at the start of the meeting, the approval of the minutes was moved to later in the meeting, once quorum was reached.

Decisions:

1. The AgWG approved the June and July meeting minutes.

Note: Vote on meeting minutes was moved to later in the meeting, once quorum had been reached.

II. AgWG Membership Under New Partnership Structure

Lead: Caitlin Grady, AgWG Chair; Eric Hughes, AgWG Coordinator

The new Chesapeake Bay Program Governance and Management Framework allows for the designation of up to 15 voting members (9 signatory, 6 at-large). The AgWG currently maintains a voting roster of 21 members (9 signatory, 12 at-large), all of whom have historically been eligible to participate in the partnership's past consensus-based decision-making process. At the last AgWG meeting, the group discussed potential paths forward for conforming to the partnership's new structure, and time was made for members to share their feedback on the 15 voting member structure. Given concerns raised by multiple AgWG members, we revisited this topic to determine the best path forward for satisfying the new voting membership requirement. Workgroup members were asked to vote on the process for conforming to the new structure; voting to approve at-large members did not happen at this meeting.

Decisions:

1. The AgWG approved the following process for conforming to the 15 (9 signatory/ 6 at-large) Partnership voting member structure:
 - Signatory members will be asked to participate in a ranked-choice vote to fill the 6 at-large positions based on the at-large membership categories that have been identified (academia; agri-business and industry; conservation districts; technical assistance providers; conservation NGOs; and USDA).
 - Within each category, the candidate receiving the strongest support through the ranked-choice vote will serve as the primary voting member and the candidate receiving the second greatest support will serve as the alternate. Any ties would be broken through a second vote on tied candidates.

Actions:

1. A call for nominations for at-large members will be temporarily re-opened, with a deadline of two weeks after distribution, in order to solicit additional nominations for the defined membership categories.

Discussion Notes:

Hunter Landis (in chat): Is there a cap on alternates? Sorry, if that was answered earlier.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): It feels very important to prioritize representation across multiple jurisdictions in a single category. Between voting and alternate.

Tyler Groh (in chat): From the academia side, I truly think it is ok to have the primary and alternate from different organizations. We are not promoting anything from an institutional perspective anyway.

Eric Hughes: So, there is nothing that explicitly states that there is a cap on alternates. So, I can't say, no, it is not allowed. However, we have to keep in mind that membership is approved in

coordination with the Clean Water Goal Team co-chairs. So, in conversations that I've had with Clean Water Goal Team leadership, it does not sound like there would be support for that. Now, that doesn't mean that it's not something that can be put forward. The other thing I would mention on that point is, for the primary and alternate, we are more than welcome to slot in different voices. If we get notice ahead of time and Paul say I'm not going to be able to make it, I think Zach would be better for this discussion to speak to our perspective, then that's certainly something that we could entertain. So, it wouldn't be necessarily explicitly listed there as a third alternate. But we have the opportunity to pull other folks in as needed. To Elizabeth's comment in the chat, I completely agree. I think our perspective on this is for the folks who are doing the nominating, geographic diversity is something that should be kept in mind. If that's each jurisdiction making sure that they have nominees for these different groups, then maybe that's a solution. If that's something that we want to try to work in somewhat more explicitly, then perhaps we could explore that.

[Elizabeth Hoffman](#): I think there's two things happening. To clarify, part of discussing this is thinking about the future of how we would receive incoming new members and, obviously, we're also trying to sort our current members. So, just adding that of thinking ahead to when people might move away from the group and we are bringing new folks in. That's really what I mean by that- how would we would prioritize?

[Eric Hughes](#): I like that point a lot. It is critical. If, for example, we have a member representing Maryland who's cycling off, I think it makes all the sense in the world for Maryland to put forward a new name the group collectively to consider representation, not just your part of the watershed, but also if there is a balance. So, point well taken. [In response to Tyler's comment in the chat], I think that's great, Tyler. I really appreciate you saying that. In thinking about this, recognizing that it can be challenging to coordinate outside of one's own institution, but if we're truly representing academia, it is critical that that coordination happens. I think it elevates the responsibility and the role of a Workgroup member to really speak not just on behalf of their own organization, but more broadly. So the fact that you're saying that that's doable, it's possible, is really encouraging to hear. So, thank you for weighing in with that.

[Laine Cidlowski \(in chat\)](#): A process question, rather than a system of alternatives question. Have we already defined or would we anticipate defining or creating a new application process for what sort of credentials/expertise within each of these categories the group would be seeking? Or is it intended to be more in relation to the existing expertise of the group?

[Eric Hughes](#): Laine, it's a great question. What we've built here absolutely builds on what we've had historically. That's not to say that needs may change over time. I think each year it'll be incumbent on us to reflect on the hot topics. Getting to a point we'll touch on very briefly later, with the work plan development, hopefully we will have a better idea of what is to come over the next several years. I think that's really going to inform our ability to nominate and then select the right people to the group to help serve in that voting capacity when decisions need to be made and votes need to be taken. To the point of defining or creating a new application process, I don't know that we would define that new process at this point, but I see that as potentially being something that we could grapple with in the future.

[Elizabeth Hoffman \(in chat\)](#): Just saying that we are currently trying to re-organize existing members but in future consideration of at-large members being approved, we as AgWG should prioritize those factors. But that was based on there potentially being a cap on alternates.

[Caitlin Grady](#): I would just agree with you. I think in the short term, our main goal is to report back within the program that we are working on a solution to conform with the Governance and Management Framework. I think in the long term, if the Workgroup wanted to get more specific about how we fill these roles, we could certainly put that on the agenda for future meetings. We could even put on the agenda things like writing bylaws for our group and things like that. But I think in the short term, our goal is to agree to a path forward with conforming to the request for

15 members. If the group wants to put additional agenda items on for the future, particularly as we look to have terms expire, we could do that.

Jenn Fetter: I would just reiterate what Eric was saying earlier about people attending and being able to provide their expertise to the meetings, even if they're not voting members. So, if we're identifying areas of weakness in the conversation, especially around a specific topic, we can still identify expertise to bring to the meeting and to the table for the conversation to help inform the vote.

Marel King: I think it is important that we look across the whole group for what the mix of expertise is, but that the categories have to do with the perspective that those folks bring in the experience. But, I think we can look across the whole group as far as making sure our diverse agriculture is represented. I am also just wondering, are we intending to stagger membership terms of the at-large members? If so, I think that will also help us to adapt over time as far as diversity of experience and expertise.

Eric Hughes: To your question about staggering, under what was initially proposed a week ago, which is different than what you're seeing here, a staggering was going to be much more straightforward. With this system, it becomes a little bit more challenging, but I think the way we address it is just randomly select three of the six categories we have. Three are randomly picked as being two years, three are randomly picked as being one year, and then that's just the cycle that we operate on. I don't know how we'd be able to select it better beyond that, unless others have thoughts.

Caitlin Grady: Eric, you meant one year for this initial voting and then we would do two years staggered for everybody after that?

Eric Hughes: I'm sorry, thank you. Yes, that is absolutely what I mean. I appreciate that, Caitlin.

Caitlin Grady: Yeah, so everyone would have the same term eventually, but this first time around, we would stagger the three and three to be on different terms, so that we were only voting on three members every year and only three would be swapping.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): Sorry, I missed the answer -- is there a cap on alternates?

Eric Hughes: Not officially. I would say, with several of the directions we've received, there isn't necessarily a written rule in the Governance and Management Framework. However, with the leadership of the Clean Water Goal Team having influence over approval of membership at the workgroup level, I think we can expect only a primary and alternate to be entertained. So, I would say functionally there is a cap, yes. What we'll do is take a look at the slide on the membership adjustment process. Caroline, do you have this in a way that you could live edit the this?

Caroline Kleis: Yes.

Eric described the proposed membership adjustment process. Live edits were made to the slide to be in line with the process described in the presentation.

Hunter Landis: I had a thought based on somebody else's comment. Thinking about the first alternate, part of the goal would be to encourage diversity within those. For example, if the first alternate is from the same company and organization as the primary, or potentially from the same state, should we consider some sort of effort to say the second seat goes to the person with the next highest votes from a slightly different background?

Eric Hughes: I think that's a really interesting idea, Hunter. So let's think about that. Thoughts on restricting that to be just the same institution? What would the threshold be for saying, no, it's too close? Even thinking about Robb and Matt, while y'all are at Penn State, there's not immediate overlap in the work. It's not like you're sitting in exactly the same space, and you obviously bring unique perspectives to the table. That being said, maybe it's easier for folks within the same institution to coordinate and, therefore, that should be the level at which we block things. So, if it's two from the same organization, then it would go to #1 as the as the as the

primary, and then the alternate would become the nominee with the next greatest support from a different institution.

Elizabeth Hoffman: Before we resort to random draw, I think we should take into consideration attendance. I know you said participation, those are different. I think the attendance matters more before random draw.

Eric Hughes: Ok, I will circle back to that. So, that's another point we need to address. On Hunter's question, how would folks feel about writing something in that says we need to have different organizations represented? Does that seem like it would make sense? Any additional thoughts on that?

Ken Staver: Well, the problem with that is if the point of the alternate is to give you a different viewpoint, and the person who is the number one is always at the meeting, you never get the alternate viewpoint anyway. It doesn't really solve a problem of different viewpoints. The way alternates have always been handled in anything I've ever been on is you represent the position that the first person would have taken. So, it's kind of weird to have the alternate be something you want represented, except the only way they get represented is if the other person doesn't show up. Is that how these alternates work?

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): We should encourage representation across organizations. I think we're assuming alternates are still present. You're sharing the responsibility for voting for that category.

Eric Hughes: Maybe I can reframe this a little bit, Ken, because I think it's a good point. The thought is if you are an alternate at-large member, there's still a stake. So to your point, if the primary can't make it, then the alternate is there to share that perspective. The thought would be the primary and alternate are collaborating. They'd be from different institutions, they'd be from different parts of the watershed. You'd be collaborating and sharing those different opinions to come to a collective. Maybe it's not exactly what you would have said, but it's sort of that shared perspective. Yeah, we'd be relying on the primary to be the one who's delivering that message in most cases, but there's still a vested interest or a stake, because the intent here is to have that collaboration through the decision making process. Does that get at what you're saying?

Ken Staver: It could work. It's quite a different model of an alternate than other things I've been involved in. It's almost more like a team, but it's hard for people to collaborate if they're from different organizations. What really comes to mind for me are the different categories of livestock. I guess the three big things in the watershed are poultry, dairy and beef. I guess you could break poultry down into egg laying and meat birds, but you have those three groups. My sense is on a day-to-day basis, they are not in very close communication. They're different industries that are in different parts of the watershed. It is what it is. If we are restricted to those number of positions, you're stuck. You got to pick one. I think it's asking a lot for, say, poultry to represent dairy or vice versa. That's a tough one to do in between meetings. It's just a tough one to do on the fly and to expect that collaboration to be very effective when they aren't in the same sort of organization or institution. It is what it is. If you only can have six, you got to deal with it, but it seems like there's a lot of categories left to have there in that six.

Eric Hughes: I hear you, Ken, and I think you make a really good point. It gets back to that fundamental concern that I think someone raised last month that even 12 at-large members is not enough. That's a position that we heard, and I understand where folks are coming from. With this reality of needing to shift to this smaller structure, what's the best we can do? It is a big responsibility. We are asking more of each individual person on this group in this structure, in this new format. Let's just say poultry ends up being our primary agribusiness and industry slot. Say there's a discussion that's happening, there's a decision is coming up, and it's going to go to a vote that would have an impact on their industry. The agribusiness and industry rep, I think of that role as sort of like a liaison. So, it would be whoever's in that role going out and communicating with their counterparts at whatever the most appropriate association might be to get that viewpoint and

bring that back. So, it's really rethinking, for better or worse, how we've done things. Is that something that could fly or is that a non-starter? All food for thought.

Mark Dubin (in chat): Perhaps in replacement of random draw as the criteria, the group could identify a list of priorities such as diversity and attendance as a way to determine. Thanks.

Matt Kowalski (in chat): If the onus to represent the category is on the representative, then it should not matter whether the alternate is from the same org. Their responsibilities are to communicate and come to a consensus for their categorical vote.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): The same way jurisdictions coordinate internally between our primary and alternate.

Marel King: I think we're pretty much redefining what an alternate member means compared to our historical practice, and I don't think that's a problem. I think we just have to be clear about what we're expecting of the primaries and the alternates. In the scenario you laid out there, Eric, I think if the alternate has experience with dairy or more relevant expertise, then the primary in that case would defer to the alternate for that particular discussion item or vote. But I think that also gets to this issue of the tiebreaker and why I'm concerned about basing it on historical participation or attendance because, potentially the person in the tie was previously an alternate where that level of participation was sort of not expected and therefore did not attend unless the primary could not. So, I think that gets to be a little troublesome. But I think going forward, what I'm hearing is that the expectations would be both the primary and the alternate would be expected to participate regularly, at least as far as attendance and potentially participating in the discussion. The distinction really comes when there is an actual vote.

Eric Hughes: Yeah, all great points, Marel. Yes to the point that they would all be expected, or certainly encouraged, to participate as often as possible. So, to that point, Elizabeth, I'm wondering do you want to flesh out your point here and talk us through how we get at a tiebreaker with attendance? I'm going through the chat here to make sure I'm wrapping my head around it.

Paul Bredwell (in chat): I think that is a good callout and I agree Eric.

Elizabeth Hoffman: You make a good point, Marel. I feel like we are trying to abandon perfectly fine for perfect, and we're never going to have perfect. To Ken's point, even if we had 12 seats again, we never had full representation across industry as well. So, I don't think grouping them should be the challenge we're seeing it as. It should actually be a refocusing of how you're contributing to the decision making process and the lens through which you're voting. I think by grouping these categories, we remove any kind of possible perception of disproportionate representation, actually. To the attendance, I guess maybe it's more what Mark said. I just don't like the idea of a random draw. I think it should be based on some other merit. So, I hear the idea of why previously people were not attending. Again, I think this is where we're getting stuck between trying to make it work for current folks versus like a future decision making process. So I guess if we roll that back up and it's not attendance, it's still based on some kind of merit beyond a random draw. That would be what we would suggest.

Caitlin Grady: In ranked choice voting, you can end up with ties more commonly because of the way you're ranking all the candidates and you're accumulating points. There could be a version where, if you have a slate of four candidates and two tie, you just revote on those two. That in many in many times breaks ties if you revote on just the tied candidates.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): That sounds great.

Amanda Barber (in chat): That could work!

Amanda Barber (in chat): We would always need to be sure we had multiple candidates for each category.

Eric Hughes: Looks like that has enthusiastic support from Elizabeth and Amanda.

Caitlin Grady: Ok, I think some language we could do is that ties would be broken through a second vote on just the tied candidates.

Eric Hughes: Ok. Working through the chat here. So, Matt says, if the onus to represent the category is on the representative, then it should not matter whether the alternate is from the same org. Their responsibilities are to communicate and come to consensus for their categorical vote. So, with that being the case, then really it would be up to the folks who are voting to essentially set their priorities for themselves through their votes. So, is it more important that these two folks who may be from the same institution bring different perspectives to the table or that there is a diversity of organizational representation? How restrictive do we want to be with that? It does sound like there's a split there. Probably the default would just be to leave it up to the members to select. You all have the ability to say actually, no, it is important to us that we have a split here, and we just leave it to that and just trust our members to vote accordingly the same way jurisdictions coordinate internally between our primary and alternate. I think it's a good point, Elizabeth, and worth mentioning, too, that there are some kind of very clear examples of that when different agencies are represented. I know New York has an even more unique structure there for how they do their primary and alternate between Greg and Amanda, with Amanda being at the district. So, that's a clear example of coordination from across institutions that clearly works well. I know we were talking about the role of the agribusiness and industry rep. Paul, I don't want to put you on the spot here, but I have a tremendous amount of respect for the amount of time that you've served on this group and the perspective that you bring to the table. I know as the agribusiness and industry rep who is most familiar with the group and most frequently participates, you're sort of seeing and feeling the effects of this. If you have anything else that you want to share about what you're hearing here, I think we'd all benefit.

Mark Dubin (in chat): I would suggest that the process of transition for the new structure could also be applied to future member selection, so perhaps the group should look at this in that longer perspective as well.

Paul Bredwell: Thanks, Eric. I've been listening intently. Number one, I appreciate those who went back and thought through this process of how, while we're losing at-large members, we would continue to have as many voices involved in the process as possible. So, thank you for that. As I've listened today, if we are forced to go down this road where we lose at-large members, I think it would be wise for those individuals that do retain that at-large membership to put more effort into that position by making sure that they reach out and collaborate with the alternate, who may or may not be in the same organization, so that all those viewpoints are brought to the table by the named at-large member. So, I think any at-large member moving forward needs to hopefully make that commitment that they're going to do a little bit more work moving forward, to make sure that that everyone has some voice in the process.

Eric Hughes: I think that's great, Paul. One of the key points that I heard there is that it does elevate the importance in a way of what it means to be a member of the group. So, that's just a key take away of this. One of the things we heard last time is that it is important to the signatories to collaborate and listen to folks within the ag sector and having those perspectives inform their decisions as well. Ultimately, they are the signatory members and they have that very important role. But that's not to say that the offline collaboration and communication can't happen. So, I think it places an emphasis on what it means to be a member of the group and will hopefully encourage more communication across the board under this new structure. But thank you, Paul, for weighing in. I really appreciate that. [In response to Amanda's comment in the chat], Amanda says we will always need to be sure we had multiple candidates for each category. Yes, I would say that would be the goal. If everybody nominated the one person who they thought was going to be best suited for that role, we'd end up with a long list of people to pick from. And, yes, in order to have an alternate, we would absolutely want multiple candidates. That's ultimately going to come down to the folks who are doing the nominating. So, if you see that it's looking a little light in one particular category, then find that person in your network that you think would really fit the bill for that role and put them forward to make sure that we're full. [In response to Mark's comment in the chat], Mark says, I would suggest that the process of transition to the new

structure could also be applied to future member selection. So perhaps the group should look at this in that longer perspective as well. It's a good point, Mark. So, the distinction for this time around is it's a little unique in that we're dissolving at-large membership and it's going to the signatories as the folks who remain to do the voting. That will obviously be expanded to, just as we've historically done, at-large members who are mid-term. They will also have the ability to vote and select in the future. So, I see this as being something that persists and we have the opportunity to flex over time what categories get represented. Also, if it's not working right, if there are clear gaps, then it's absolutely something, in the spirit of adaptation, that we can consider changing in the future. But to get us over that hump, something like this seems to be the best solution.

Amanda Barber (in chat): in order to have an alternate That's what I was intimating - in the future we would actually be seeking candidates for a member and alternate.

Eric Hughes: Amanda, I may ask you to come off mute here and explain. So, you're saying we would specifically say this is the person? You wouldn't just be nominating for a category, you would be specifying I want this person to be primary, I want this person to be alternate?

Amanda Barber: That's what I guess I was just trying to clarify, Eric, that we're actually seeking at least two candidates for each position so that we have the voting rep and an alternate. Just thinking long term, because we would always want to have an alternate.

Eric Hughes: I think that would be great, yes. Caitlin, Jenn, and I aren't in a position to say we must do this. But I think the goal would be to have as diverse a representation as possible. For example, one of the categories that we didn't have two nominees for was conservation NGOs. I think it's very reasonable to have Jenna and Matt or, if somebody from TNC were to be nominated, that's also a consideration. For USDA, we're very fortunate to have Vivian from NRCS. Could we also have somebody from an FSA or an ARS nominated? I think the more the merrier, so it is something that I would encourage.

Mark Dubin (in chat): In the past, the primary often chose their alternative. In this new process, the alternative will be determined by the group.

Amanda Barber: To Mark's point, that's what I was trying to clarify. If there is no second candidate suggested, then would the selected voting member identify their own alternate?

Eric Hughes: I will say it's something that the group can discuss. I will weigh in with my take and Caitlin and Jenn can as well. I think it gets messy if somebody gets approved and then they say, I've been approved, now I'm going to appoint the number two. I think to the greatest extent possible, we should be encouraging broad nominations and then letting the group truly decide who fills in there. For the person who gets selected for a position, if they want to, for a particular meeting or several months, shift the responsibility, that that's sort of the selection that I think can happen within that single position. But, no, we'd hopefully have multiple nominees and then let the group decide.

Jenn Fetter: I would agree with that, Eric. We've defined a process here where we're voting members into these positions. So, I think if there's a lack of a candidate, it's not just an appointment. It would still be somebody voted into the alternate role.

Amanda Barber: I just thought it was worth discussing that since past practice has been different.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): You're just putting forward all candidates and the ranking voting would determine alternate.

Ken Staver (in chat): Seems like just open nominations and see what the lists look like

Amanda Barber (in chat): I would agree with that as well

Eric Hughes: So, these are the nominees we have. So, I guess that begs the question. I know other groups have reopened nominations for a set period of time. Because there's such a dramatic change here, does it make sense to temporarily reopen nominations because we see that we only have one nominee for a couple of these categories?

Caitlin Grady: I would just encourage those of you who are signatories to speak to that versus Jenn and I making that determination.

Ken Staver: Eric, I thought there was going to be an open nomination. I'm sorry. That's not actually happening? I thought I saw that earlier in your presentation that there was going to be an open nomination period now.

Eric Hughes: No, hopefully I didn't have that in there. Our open nomination period was actually in December of last year, and it was so far back that I called up the folks who were new nominees, and asked if they were still interested. Luckily, everybody said yes.

Ken Staver: My comment was based on a misunderstanding I had. So, I wasn't suggesting opening a nomination period if you didn't have it planned. I just thought we were going to do that anyway. So, I figured we could just do it and see what we get. So, I guess I retract my statement.

Eric Hughes: Ok, sorry for any confusion that my slides my slides caused, Ken.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): It feels like previously alternates were geared more towards coverage of the meeting and moving forward we are utilizing alternates to allow more voices to be engaged.

Tom Butler (in chat): To clarify, we have redefined what an alternate means from our historical perspectives and are essentially condensing our voting roster to retain voting members but name them alternates to get around the group size constraint?

Amanda Barber (in chat): How will resignations/vacancies be handled?

Eric Hughes: So, to Tom's point and the framing of this as get around, all we are doing is capturing as many of those diverse perspectives as possible. The key thing to keep in mind is that we're not saying that there are going to be still 12 votes. I don't think there's any size constraint to get around. It's maintaining that representation and saying we have a primary, we have an alternate, they're going to collaborate, but ultimately there are still only going to be 6 votes coming from at-large. So, I think it's a good check on us here, but not getting around anything.

Ken Staver: To be clear, I have never been in anything in the Bay Program where the alternate position was like this. So, I think it is a correct statement, what Tom is saying. Workaround is always a little tricky language, but you could always just say both people identified get a vote, but they only count as six votes. If they're both a four, it's a four. If they're both against, it's against. If they disagree, it's an abstain. So, I don't know what to do with the one to five thing. That gets more complicated, but for just up and down votes.

Tom Butler (in chat): Thanks for the clarification, that sounds perfectly reasonable

Amanda Barber (in chat): And accomplish both in the process

Elizabeth Hoffman: The alternative is that we have 6 categories and there's a primary and no alternate. I don't know what our other solutions are. So, I get that there's nuance to get around, but what are our other options, if not to utilize the categories and then build that out to hopefully engage multiple voices within them? I don't actually think it is get around. Even within jurisdictions, we have representation across different agencies and it brings multiple viewpoints to the table to inform a decision. At the end of the day, everyone can come to a meeting and talk. So, if you're formally an alternate or not, you're still going to be present. I just feel like we're squabbling over things that don't matter, quite frankly. We need to figure out how to fit the mold. They're only going to let us have six. I think this is a good suggestion, and I encourage us to just give it a whirl. The alternative, as I understand it, is we only get 6 votes and we don't try to make sure we're encouraging diversity of voices within the category. So, unless there's an alternative solution, I'm just kind of confused what we're spinning about, quite frankly.

Tom Butler: In no way am I trying to imply anyone is getting around anything. I was asking for clarification. So, I appreciate getting that. I'm not attacking anyone's perspective or trying to poo poo it. So I appreciate that, Elizabeth. Thank you for the clarification in the chat. Again, I think it's fine. I don't have any problems with it. I was just asking for clarification.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): Understand, Tom. Not aimed at you. Just hopeful we can get to E3 in this meeting.

Marel King (in chat): I appreciate the thought and time folks have put into this over the last few weeks.

Eric Hughes: With the membership adjustment process that we have, do we take a shot at voting by consent?

Caitlin Grady: Yeah, I think we do. I am hearing a lot of support for what's on the screen right now. Thank you, Caroline, for making those edits throughout the discussion. I think we at least gauge where the room is with a potential call to vote. If we get there, we get there. If we don't, we don't, if that works for folks. Caroline, do we have quorum?

Caroline Kleis: I will double check. We had quorum, but I will count again now.

Caitlin Grady: Okay, so we have quorum. So, I will ask that any workgroup members who would like to register a stop or a hold on this decision please raise your hand, and we will call on you to articulate your concerns on the proposal.

Eric Hughes: If that is that you need more time to talk it over, that is understandable.

Paul Bredwell: I raised my hand with great reservation, but I guess I'll ask the question. There was some talk of asking for the ability to not move in this direction. We talked about that during the last meeting. So, I raised my hand to ask that question. I also raised my hand because I would like to have conversations with those individuals in the poultry industry that have been involved as at-large members so that I can gain a better understanding of. For instance, Zach's not on the call today. So I'd like to get Zach's perspective. So, I'll pause there, Eric, if you can respond to the first question.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): That is fair, Paul. Maryland does not wish to push this forward without at-large members having the ability to discuss. But to your first questions, it is our understanding that we will be forced to narrow to 6.

Eric Hughes: I'm glad you raised it, Paul. For the folks who feel strongly about not moving in this direction, I think the best that we are able to offer is including that along with comments from several other folks saying they have concerns about this. That is absolutely something that we can relay. I won't say that it's the perspective of the Ag Workgroup, but we have however many people who want to share those reservations, and those will be relayed. Now, I think the question is, does that change where we get a month from now? If I thought there was opportunity to get more flexibility, it's a path that we would go down to satisfy our diverse membership. With the conversations that have been had, they are standing firm on this. So, we can prolong it. We can continue the discussion and maybe it changes, but if there's a compromise that we think can satisfy those of us here, we should take that path and let people know that these are our concerns. To your second point though on communicating and talking, these proposals have been developed and changed dramatically over the last month. We are operating quickly. We're getting information to you as quickly as we can, but that's not always enough time to consult with your folks. So if you're thinking, we're close, I think it could work, and you want to go back and consult with the folks that you work most closely with to get their perspective, I don't think there's a challenge to that. Maybe if everybody else is feeling good about this, maybe we can follow up offline. If that's not an option, then we can just bring it back to the September meeting with the understanding that we're right there. We're almost there and we just need to check a few more of those boxes.

Caitlin Grady: For the past three months now, we have been given no indication that there's an alternative path to conforming. We've basically been told over and over again that we have to conform to 15 members. We have to do it. So, if we do push this to the September meeting, it has to be under the idea that we have to move forward with conforming somehow, however the Workgroup wants to best conform. I see a couple of comments from Elizabeth appreciating Paul's reservations and also affirming what I just spoke to, which is that we are being forced to narrow to six at large members.

Marel King: Elizabeth also mentioned it in the chat, but there really is no path for us to get more than six voting at-large members. I think the only potential other option is to get some additional non-voting members. But my question to the group, and we can have further discussions offline in the next few days, is is that really a better situation than the proposal that's on the table? As I

said in the chat, I really appreciate the folks who have put a lot of time and thought into getting us to this point. I think it's been extremely helpful.

Caitlin Grady: Paul, if you want to respond to that, then I'm going to turn over the process question to Eric.

Paul Bredwell: Marel, I agree entirely with you. I appreciate the effort that's been put into thinking through this. I'll withdraw any reservation. Well, not my reservation, but I'll withdraw the stop or hold. Knowing that, over the years, the collaborative nature of this group and what we talked about today will move forward with a reduced number of at-large positions makes me feel more comfortable in losing or reducing the number of at-large people. So, thanks for a great discussion today.

Eric Hughes: Okay, so if I'm hearing you right, Paul, that's to say the hold is no longer. So, barring any other stops or holds, we've achieved consent is what I'm hearing. Now I just want to make sure I'm hearing that correctly before I go on,

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): Eric, if we propose this is how we accomplish the 6 - can we not navigate the nuance of this within AgWG to support all at-large members feeling comfortable?

Caitlin Grady: Yes is the answer, Elizabeth. Like I mentioned earlier, we could have a couple of agenda items in the coming months to discuss more about changes to this or, in the future, how we vote on new people in a year from now. If we want to make those adjustments, we could discuss that as a workgroup to make sure everyone's feeling comfortable. If we want to move this forward as our path for now to conform based on what's being requested of us and continue to iterate on it and adjust it over time, we have the flexibility to do that. In terms of flexibility to adjust, say, if we want to go from ranked choice voting to some other voting method, we could choose to do that, but we're still conforming to the six.

Matt Kowalski (in chat): My question is procedural. The GMF says "Workgroup members will be recruited by workgroup chairs and coordinators. Members may also be self-nominated or recommended by participating agencies and organizations. Members are approved by workgroup chairs in consultation with goal team chairs." how does this signatory vote relate to the language above?

Eric Hughes: Matt, it's a very good question. The GMF is, I think, intentionally broad. It's not a perfect document, Matt. I'm just going to come out and say that. I think, ultimately, the members are approved by the workgroup chairs, meaning Caitlin and Jenn are the last line of refusal. I think that's kind of what the Clean Water Goal Team chairs are exercising in their non-voting member decision and in a potential cap that we would have on alternates. So, we sort of know going in based on the position of the Clean Water Goal Team chairs if they aren't going to be in support of something. That clause in the GMF kind of gives them the opportunity to say, no. Now, the signatory vote would be a member vote. So, in this case, the signatory vote is being taken because we have 6 at-large members already, but we would be cutting 6 arbitrarily. There would be not necessarily this kind of systematic approach to adjusting membership. This hopefully feels like a more thoughtful and appropriate way to get down to that 15 member structure. So, it's not specifically prescribed in the GMF, but it seems like the best way that we can take next steps. I don't know if that was helpful at all, but that's the best answer I have for you.

Matt Kowalski: Yeah, I want to make clear too that I don't have a problem with this process. I think it's inclusive. I appreciate that what it seems like is happening is that you guys are putting it back to the workgroup to say what is the best way that we can adapt to the situation where we've got a nine and six structure. You are leaving it to the workgroup to kind of work through it, and then you guys will say this is the list we came up with. We can show you how, but this is the list that we would like to put forward when you carry this list up to the Goal Team for approval. Do I kind of understand that correctly?

Eric Hughes: I would say that's spot on.

Matt Kowalski: Gotcha. I suppose the question that I asked in the chat was simply because I want to make sure that whatever we're doing here is going to be something that, when it gets carried

forward to the decision makers, given that the GMF says “will be decided in consultation with Goal Team chairs”, they're going to say that was an acceptable methodology.

Eric Hughes: Based on conversations we've had with the Goal Team leadership, they are absolutely in favor of this being the process that we use. We've sort of pre-vetted the signatory vote, and they are in support of that.

Matt Kowalski: Just so that I'm clear, this process is going to be the 9 signatories voting using ranked choice vote on the six at-large positions. So the current 6 at-large positions do not get a vote?

Caitlin Grady: That's right. Because we would have to dissolve all the at-large members first, and that would leave the 9 signatories remaining, and then we'd have the ranked choice voting.

Amanda Barber (in chat): I think we need to also give further consideration to our governance document with these changes. Non-participation and vacancies become more critical with less members.

Caitlin Grady (in chat): Yes, it sounds to me that we should put governance documents of our own workgroup on our workplan for the upcoming year if we want time to think about these changes with more detail

Eric Hughes: It's an important point, Amanda. There's been some communication from the Goal Team that there's maybe not a desire for workgroups to have their own sets of bylaws or governance documents. I think with some of the gaps that may exist within the Governance and Management Framework, there at least needs to be further guidance at that level saying here's how work groups will function. It'll get into some of the weeds that the GMF really doesn't wade into. In the absence of anything like that from the Clean Water Goal team, I think we absolutely need to have some sort of record of this and how we do things. So, it's something that we can absolutely revisit even if it's only a sort of an informal document. But I think the need is absolutely there.

Amanda Barber: I think from a jurisdiction perspective, we value the input from the at-large members. Since we are going to be reducing the formal input of the at-large members, making sure that we have all six of those votes at every meeting is going to be important. So, contemplating vacancies and the alternates and making sure we have an alternate, I think is going to be really important. I know that that's important from my perspective of making sure that the ag community feels like they are equally represented at these meetings as the jurisdictions themselves.

Amanda Barber (in chat): Can we approve the concept of 6 from the 6 categories and spend the next few weeks dealing with the nuances of nominations, alternates and voting?

Eric Hughes: Amanda, can you speak a little bit more to that comment and what you had in mind there?

Amanda Barber: I had read through the governance document and now I don't know whether that's going to exist for us or what that's going to look like for us. If that's going to be standardized among work groups, then maybe we won't have a say in that. But, one the things I was talking about was if there was a vacancy, depending on whether it was within six months prior to the next election cycle, would determine whether we were going to replace someone or not. To me, there's no question we need to have 6 voting reps period all the time. If there's a vacancy, we need to fill it immediately. But our documents don't say that. So I just want to make sure that we have a governance document that addresses how the nominations are occurring. Are there going to always be alternates so that, if a voting member is absent, there is an alternate at every meeting to vote for that person, for that category? What does the actual voting process for selecting the at-large members look like?

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): Amanda, agree, good point.

Caitlin Grady: I think those are all really good points and really important things for us to do and to clarify. To Eric's point, what we've been hearing from the management is not necessarily that all these work groups will have their own sets of bylaws. I think we should absolutely say we are

going to prepare a document for our records that indicates how we're going to do these things, even if we don't call it bylaws. We can call it something else. I think we should do that. I think we should put that on the agenda going forward. I think those types of details about replacing vacancies and stuff like that, I'm curious what folks think about the amount of time we would need to put that together, write it, vet it, and get it agreed on. To me, that seems like it might take more than a couple of weeks to do that. So, I just want to see if anyone else wants to respond to Amanda's point about what we could agree on today versus what we could have on several months of agenda items going forward to help clarify these decisions and changes.

Eric Hughes: Yeah, I guess the question that I would have is, do those lingering questions preclude us from moving forward in this iteration of the vote, knowing that, in a year, we're going to be revisiting this anyway? It's almost like a year trial period.

Amanda Barber (in chat): If we make sure we have an alternate we have more time to fill vacancies.

Caitlin Grady: If we have consent on what is in front of us, we could move forward with this. Then to Amanda's point, we could put on the next month's agenda or the one after that, the need to nominate alternates just for the couple of categories that only had one person, or we could reserve voting on those categories until we have multiple candidates. Would that help address the concern regarding to making sure we have alternates for everybody? Or we could agree to this and we could do a period of nominations for a week or two if we wanted to, to make sure we have multiple candidates and then do the rank voting. Amanda?

Amanda Barber: I was sort of just speaking to the concern about do we open this back up for more nominations or not. To me, you would need to, because I really think you need to have an alternate for every category.

Mark Dubin (in chat): Historically, the AgWG has been a leader in developing operational procedures that fit the needs of the sector, so I would encourage that type of leadership moving forward that is within the new partnership governance structure.

Tom Butler (in chat): Would it be possible to retain the existing members and place the at large members as primary vs alternate based on their current term status so that they were already staggered?

Matt Kowalski (in chat): CBF already considers me Jenna's official Proxy. so I'm in if you'll have me

Eric Hughes: Maybe that's something we could react to fairly quickly. If you could vet within your networks some potential candidates for the categories where it looks like we're not going to get that alternate and reach out, check with them, and then let us know within just 2 weeks. Does that sound reasonable? Is that fair? Not hearing any concerns with that, that's what we'll plan to do. We can open that up that up again and then from the time it goes out, we'll have two weeks to field some additional candidates. Caitlin/Jenn, does that sound good?

Caitlin Grady: So, we're going to make that change. We're going to reopen the nominations for maybe 2 weeks and see if we can make sure we get multiple candidates for each of the positions. But I would like to make a call for consent. Caroline, can you again confirm we still have quorum?

Caroline Kleis: I will keep counting, but when I looked five minutes ago we did. I will double check and let you know.

Caitlin Grady: So, I'm going to ask again if any workgroup members would like to register a stop or a hold on this decision to please raise their hand. With no stops or holds raised, we will consider this membership adjustment process to be approved by consent with all of the changes made today during the meeting.

Caroline Kleis: And just confirming with some alternates present, we do have the quorum.

Eric Hughes: Can we do our minutes while we have quorum?

Caitlin Grady: Yes. Now I'm going to make a call for consent on the June and the July meeting minutes, which we failed to approve last month. And we have quorum present. So I will ask if

there are any workgroup members who would like to register a stop or a hold on the decision. This is now the second decision, the decision to approve The June and July meeting minutes. Please raise your hand, and we will call on you to articulate your concerns with the proposal. I'm assuming nobody ever raises hands about meeting minutes, though it could happen. With no concerns raised, we will consider the June and the July meeting minutes to be approved by consent.

Amanda Barber (in chat): Are there any members that could serve multiple roles?

Eric Hughes (in chat): Like a signatory-alternate serving as an at-large?

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): Maryland would not support that. Could that not be seen as a signatory then getting two votes? Amanda, do you mean a single member would possibly cross multiple at-large categories? So they would then need to identify which one?

Amanda Barber (in chat): I was thinking more of an existing ag-business/Industry rep also having a relationship/role that would allow them to be considered as an ag NGO rep

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): Makes sense.

III. Approval of Ag E3 Scenario Assumptions and Discussion of Scenario Base Year

Lead: Eric Hughes, AgWG Coordinator

At the July AgWG meeting, the group reviewed the Draft Final Phase 7 Ag E3 Scenario Assumptions Spreadsheet, which included the latest input on P7 Ag E3 assumptions from AgWG members (communicated through AgWG meetings and meetings of the Ag E3 Small Group). Further discussion of the E3 assumptions and scenario base year took place during this time, and the AgWG was asked to approve the final set of E3 assumptions for Clean Water Goal Team review. It was determined that additional time was needed to answer remaining questions on assumptions for a limited number of BMPs. This month, Eric provided additional information on remaining questions/concerns, and the group was asked to approve the final set of assumptions.

Decisions:

1. The AgWG approved the [Phase 7 Ag E3 Scenario assumptions](#) for recommendation to the Clean Water Goal Team.

Discussion Notes:

Kristen Saacke Blunk (in chat): low order =?? 1st and 2nd only?

Eric Hughes: Kristen has a question in the chat. This is the challenge. Right now, we can't set the domain for low-order streams, and this is important for setting the E3 assumption for this BMP. For that reason, we're just going with what the partnership agreed to previously so there aren't any questions about the implications for what folks are committing to in Phase 7. If we agreed to a percentage for Phase 7 at this point, would that mean we are committing to a lot more than what we said would be feasible in Phase 6? So, we are going with the number of miles agreed to in Phase 6.

Kristen Saacke Blunk (in chat): So what order DID the Pship agree to? This matters.

Eric Hughes: You're right, Kristen – we don't have that defined for Phase 6 because the metadata [documentation] doesn't clearly define it, so I can't go back and tell you, 'this is the exact definition' and reconstruct the values step-by-step. But, we know that with the partnership's '15% of low order ag stream miles' assumption for this practice in Phase 6, this was the implication, in miles, in each state. That is what the reality is, and we can only do better moving forward.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): If we are still waiting on Ph7 CAST stream scale, to inform non-urban stream restoration, does that also not change our assumptions made for other stream related practices like exclusion fencing?

Eric Hughes: To Elizabeth's question on the impacts on other practices, I think the way that the model works is it is not a one-to-one. Stream miles isn't affecting what we do for the buffers. Essentially the analysis that was done previously is set in stone. So, what we had provided previously isn't going to change. I don't know that I can necessarily explain the mechanisms behind the scenes that led that to be the case, but I know that was discussion that we had had.

Jess Rigelman: I think it's a good question, but the analysis was done to determine the acres. So, we have stream miles in the model, but we don't have the location of those streams. CAST is a tabular system. It's not a GIS system. So we know how many stream miles we have in a particular land-river segment, but there's not a picture of where those streams are. So that analysis was just done to determine where streams are and whether or not they are buffered or still could be buffered. So that data goes in as acres, not as stream miles. Because that analysis was done in the result product was acres, I think we're fine with that. But if you want to discuss that, do you have further questions on that?

Elizabeth Hoffman: I think I followed that, Jess. We may reach out to you offline just to make extra sure we're tracking.

Eric Hughes: What I'm talking about with forestry, just for the sake of time, we have the opportunity to revisit the implications of what forestry is going to put forward. It's not something we need to change immediately. I think it's a much bigger discussion. We're not going to get anywhere with that today. So, I think that's something we pivot to if we need to bring it back up again. But for our purposes, getting what we need to get for Monday's Clean Water Goal Team meeting, I think we go to see if we can get consent.

Caitlin Grady: Ok, I will make a call for consent. With quorum present, I would like to ask if any of the workgroup members would like to register a stop or a hold to this decision to please raise your hands, and we'll call on you to articulate your concerns.

Ken Staver: Yes, sorry, I'm still unclear what you have on the screen here about the poultry litter amendments. What are we agreeing to on this?

Eric Hughes: So, there are no changes to PLA, Ken.

Ken Staver: So basically what we're saying is poultry litter amendments are a zero and we are going to leave it at that?

Eric Hughes: The PLA assumption that we have in the latest iteration of the spreadsheet is 100%. So, the questions from the last meeting were just, how is the practice defined? There was going to be some concern if it wasn't just alum. We're going to need to revisit that and basically rethink that 100%. But I think the comment that we heard from several folks was, if it is, then no need to change. We're comfortable with this. The question was asked if this is already captured in our nutrient inputs, but the answer is no, unless somebody can provide us with information to kind of prove the contrary, in which case PLA should no longer be a BMP.

Ken Staver: A lot of the presentations we've heard about the nutrient composition of litter is based on litter sampling. It doesn't really specify whether it's treated or not. It's just this is what the litter looks like. We use these sort of grand averages. It may not be explicitly identified as being in the mix, but it seems like we would be capturing it. I guess I'm a little unclear on that.

Eric Hughes: So, I think that question is what we would need evidence to address. How we're operating now is the thought is no, it is not captured in there. Maybe it actually is. That would need to be something that gets investigated. That would need to be shared with us. We would need to go through that process. With what we have available to us now, we have to stick with the idea that, no, it's not captured unless proven otherwise.

Ken Staver: In going to E3 scenario, it's going to be 100% treated now. What's the projection for how that changes our litter nutrient content? What's the effect of that in E3?

Eric Hughes: I don't know that I can answer that question. Jess, I may call you in to see what the implication is of 100% PLA on litter on a nutrient content in litter., I don't know what the implications for E3 would be.

Jess Rigelman: Well, poultry litter amendments in general are used to keep ammonia from volatilizing. So, what it means is there's the more nitrogen in the litter, therefore, applicable to be applied to crops. Therefore, it should show a reduction in fertilizer if we're using the poultry litter. If we're using the poultry litter amendments, then it would be less fertilizer, more ammonia and plant available nitrogen in the manure.

Ken Staver: Right. So, it would increase the nitrogen content of litter?

Jess Rigelman: Correct.

Ken Staver: I know we don't need to get in the weeds that far right now. It doesn't get rid of nutrients from the system, it keeps them in the litter instead of going into the atmosphere.

Jess Rigelman: Yeah, so you'd see more nitrogen available for crops, therefore less nitrogen in the air, which gets subtracted off your feed space load at edge of tide. But then you have less fertilizer applied because more of your nitrogen came from manure. It's just more manure, less fertilizer, and then a reduction of feed space load.

Ken Staver: Right, on the places that get manure, but since we have the fertilizer bucket...

Jess Rigelman: We don't have the buckets. We're in scenario mode now. So, we use that fraction of historical crop needs. So, it actually is a reduction in fertilizer.

Ken Staver: Ok. I thought we were constrained on the fertilizer thing, so it had to go somewhere. It sounds a little complicated. I don't want to impede progress here, if we're trying to move forward. I'm not sure what exactly it means, but anyway, but I guess I'm ok with it.

Seth Mullins (in chat): I think Ken is right, litter sampling likely takes place after PLAs are applied

Clint Gill (in chat): We would account for it in the sampling data logically, if it behaves differently than untreated litter during field application, it might make a difference, but I don't think there's any research on that

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): But so doesn't that become a modeling question vs the E3 question of can this practice be implemented at 100%, which it likely is? Sorry if I'm simplifying or not following the question.

Eric Hughes: My take is that you've distilled it accurately, Elizabeth. There are two different conversations happening and I think two different venues. So, for purpose of E3 with what we have available to us now, your point about can this practice be implemented 100% is what we're grappling with. If there are other things that we need to address with this, then that happens outside of E3.

Ken Staver: The problem, Eric, is it's already being widely done, which I thought the industry folks said it was. Isn't that what I heard on the last call?

Paul Bredwell: Yes, Ken, you did hear that on the last call, and it is being widely used, I would say it's being used 100% across the industry. It's the volatilization because they only keep the environment inside the house the best it can be for the birds. They want to keep the litter to the point where it's not creating lesions on their feet. I'm not sure who made the comment, but it is right. There is going to be more nitrogen available in the litter, and I would assume then that that would require less inorganic nitrogen needed to fertilize crops. The modeling question then becomes what effect does it have on ammonia deposition on the landscape if it's reducing, and it is reducing the amount of ammonia that's volatilize, and released from the house.

Ken Staver: I guess my question is about the E3 scenario. Is it looking like this is a big deal because it's not really being captured now, even though it's being done and it's affecting litter composition. Anything we've been sampling recently, it's all captured already in our nutrient sampling. So, are we proposing E3 is going to do something significant by doing this across the board when in fact it's already being done across the board?

Jess Rigelman: Yeah, well, that's kind of the question, Ken. If it's being done across the board, just like feed additives, then we shouldn't even have this BMP. But, it is a BMP, and we have no data that has been given to us, it's not on the poultry litter subcommittee report that says this is being done at 100%. We can investigate that, and then it can be done, and then it can be taken out

of the model and it can be taken out of the E3. But to me, this is similar to feed additives. There was an investigation. It is being done across the board. It is captured, and a decision was made that there's no need for that BMP, but that discussion hasn't happened with poultry litter amendments. We can't tell you what the load implications are because we don't have a calibrated model yet. I can tell you how much more nitrogen is available in the manure and how much less fertilizer is applied because of it, but that's all I can tell you at this point.

Ken Staver: Well, thanks. It would be good to look at that stuff. I don't have a path to suggest here. It just seems like it wouldn't be bad to know some of those things, but maybe that isn't needed for this decision. I don't know.

Eric Hughes: It sounds like what needs to happen is that we have this as an item for this group to consider down the line- taking a closer look at that. To Jess's point, if we determine that it is implemented essentially at 100% and it's already being picked up, then do we make the change to eliminate PLA as a BMP right now? It is a practice, and we can go off of what we have available to us now. That's not to say that can't change. But, based on what we have now, what should that assumption be?

Ken Staver: It sounds like we don't have any information to do anything else than what we already have in front of us. Is that what you're saying?

Eric Hughes: That's where I'm at. Based on conversations we've had, that seems to be where we're landing, yes.

Ken Staver: So, it's for future consideration, I guess. Sometimes that's a dangerous thing to do, to just kick it down the road, but maybe that's the choice.

Paul Bredwell: Eric, I can poll the industry. I don't know if that gives you a data set that is acceptable to the modelers, but I'll be happy to poll the industry.

Eric Hughes: Yeah, so in terms of process and timing, if the thought is data exists, it's out there, I don't know what timeline we'd be working on to take the steps to eliminate it. So, for the purposes of E3, if we're not feeling comfortable with 100%, then we won't go forward with 100% for this.

Elizabeth Hoffman: I probably am really going to oversimplify this. But isn't it 100% anyways? It's just how it's being accounted for in the model. So, it is 100% if it's captured not through a BMP being reported but just how it's modeled, we can figure that part out. But either way, we believe as a sector it's 100%. So, shouldn't that just remain? It's just going to be how we account for it later, like how we clarify the data points, right?

Eric Hughes: Yeah, and that was my interpretation of Jess's points as well. It sounds like you're channeling Jess there. So, that would be where I would go with it. Then in model world, Paul, we get input and can take the formal steps to change how that's recognized and potentially go down that formal path in the future. Tom, I know you'll be able to speak to this much better than I can.

Mark Dubin (in chat): In the development of poultry nutrient generation by VT for turkeys, we did identify the use of PLAs by producers as part of that data collection effort. Thus, its impact would be ubiquitous to that nutrient data.

Tom Butler: Yeah, so there are two distinct parts to this. One you're talking about the E3 scenario and what level of implementation you should have, and you all agree it's 100%? Okay, it should be 100%. The current framework of the model does not account for that alum or poultry litter amendment except as a BMP. So, the data stream does not have it backed out. What this would mean for you, Paul, in your effort is we'd have to have information saying, yep, it's 100%. So we don't need to do anything like that. We don't need to back out the impact of it so that we would know what this would be for the BMP. So from that perspective, if it's 100%, then it's going to be 100%. If we need to adjust the nutrient concentrations after that, that would be kind of where I think Eric and everyone else has indicated we would have to get more information. Jess said we need that report. So it's kind of two separate things. I think what Eric was doing was clarifying poultry litter amendments account for this. The second point, I think is something that is kind of not necessarily related to E3. If we want to talk about that, I think there's a lot of room to, but it's more of a nutrient concentration question. We can bring in some people we've already worked on

with that. We can look at the historic data from the poultry litter subcommittee, as well as some information we got from DLLC. So, those are kind of different steps for the future. For this one, I think it's a little bit different, and I would kind of advocate going in the route that Elizabeth said.

Eric Hughes: This is why we need Tom. Thank you for communicating that much better than I could.

Amanda Barber (in chat): This comment is in general and not specific to today's questions... I do not think it is feasible to have an E3 scenario of 100% for anything.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): E3 is speaking to controllable load and in theory this could be 100% controlled.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): Thanks, Tom.

Robb Meinen: I think that decision to use the treatment often would come down to an integrator decision and the contracted grower for an integrator may not use it or pay for it if the integrator doesn't promote it with them, either through contract or through their service within the network of their growers. So, I'm not convinced it's 100% utilization until you survey some integrators and get some information on this.

Elizabeth Hoffman: I put it in the chat, noted, heard, there's an accounting exercise, but E3 is speaking to what the controllable load is. In theory, this could be 100% controlled, in theory. Then BMP implementation levels would be set through WIP planning, but I think we keep going back and forth about what E3 is versus a development of a WIP and real feasibility to actually get practices on the ground. I hear the concern, but I think it's holding us up in this exercise.

Eric Hughes: Well said. With all of that in mind, knowing that there are two separate conversations happening here, I did not help the situation by conflating the two, so I apologize. Can we move forward with what we had and recognize that there's still an opportunity to have these discussions in the future outside of the E3 context? Seems like this is the last practice that we need to kind of get at to get over the hump. Caitlin, do you want to give it another shot?

Caitlin Grady: Alright, let's give it a shot. I do need to check since we're at over time now. I'm sorry, Caroline, I've asked so many times. Do we still have quorum?

Caroline Kleis: Yes, I just I just counted and we do with our some alternates present. But, yes, we do.

Caitlin Grady: Ok, we still have quorum. Because quorum is present, I will ask that any workgroup members who would like to register a stop or a hold on this decision, please raise your hands. With no concerns raised, we will consider the Phase 7 Ag E3 scenario assumptions to be approved by consent.

Eric Hughes: Quickly on next steps- Forestry Work Group is going to propose a set of assumptions for practices that we have in our court as well, the ones that we may share with them. That's all been spelled out in the information that I've sent to the members and also is included on this slide here for your review. Essentially what the implications of that change are, other than getting us away from what we had decided in our small group discussions and then on the workgroup meetings, you know, is that the cumulative land use change that we had capped at 15% brings us up to a land use change of about 18%. So the question that we're going to probably need to at least consider over the next month is where do we stand on any of this? Are we line drawn in the sand, we are not crossing, we like what we have and we're staying to that? Or is there an opportunity to get creative and compromise to make sure that there's consistency across what the groups are proposing? On Monday, I'm going to be presenting to the Clean Water Goal Team our set of assumptions. More presentations are going to be given on the rest of the BMPs. I'm not going to be advocating for specific positions. I'm going to say here are our phase 7 assumptions. This is what the group said. Here's our justification. What we are going to see is the Forestry Workgroup and the Ag Workgroup proposal for several of these BMPs will not align. We don't know how the Clean Water Goal Team's going to handle that. Potentially, they're going to say, forestry and ag, talk. See if you can reconcile your differences here and come to some sort of agreement. It doesn't change what we put forward to them because this is what we decided, but

there is going to be that difference, and they may ask us to see if we can compromise. Something to consider, and that's going to come forward in September. So, I just wanted to put this on everybody's radar as something that's going to happen. It's going to be out there. We got this from them. This is actually a reduction from what they had initially proposed. They brought their numbers down and sort of said maybe we can work toward that. So that was what we wanted to put forward in front of you this month.

Mark Dubin (in chat): In addition to the PLS report, which was limited in data for some livestock production areas, the partnership also approved the use of additional reports, such as the Commercial Turkey Nutrient Generation Report by VT.

IV. Management Strategy Development for the Clean Water Goal

Lead: Eric Hughes, AgWG Coordinator

At the July Clean Water Goal Team meeting, the Goal Team received an update on the Clean Water Management Strategy and expectations were outlined for Management Strategy and Workplan development. At the July meeting, an initial strawman of draft Management Approaches and potential challenges was also shared. Eric will review this update with the group and discuss how this will impact the AgWG in the coming months. This will serve as an initial discussion around drafting a workplan to submit to the Clean Water Goal Team.

***Note: To allow adequate time for discussion, this agenda topic was not covered in the August meeting and will be addressed in the September meeting instead.**

V. Wrap-Up

Lead: Eric Hughes, EPA

Eric provided final updates before the meeting adjourns.

VI. Adjourn

Next Meeting: September 17, 2026, 10:00AM-12:00PM

Attendees:

Caitlin Grady, GWU
Jenn Fetter, PSU
Eric Hughes, EPA
Caroline Kleis, CRC
Emily Dekar, USC
Krista Crone, PA DEP
Tom Butler, EPA
Cindy Shreve, WVCA
Mark Dubin, VT Cooperative Extension
Tyler Trostle, PA DEP
Denise Uzupis, PDA
Matt Monroe, WVDA
Paul Bredwell, US Poultry & Egg Association
Tyler Groh, PSU
Dylan Burgevin, MDE
Ashley Hullinger, PA DEP
Grant Gulibon, PA Farm Bureau

Cass Klingaman, NYSDEC
Amanda Barber, NY Cortland County SWCD
Seth Mullins, VA DCR
Nick Hepfl, HRG
Natasha Rathlev, Sustainable Chesapeake
Matt Kowalski, CBF
Clint Gill, DDA
Jenna Schueler, CBF
Laine Cidlowski, DOEE
Suzanne Trevena, EPA
Kristen Hughes Evans, Sustainable Chesapeake
Jeremy Hanson, CRC
Alex Echols, Campbell Foundation
Marel King, CBC
Caroline Harper, Campbell Foundation
Vivian Dickson, USDA NRCS
Erin Sonnenburg, CRC

Emily Heller, EPA
Brady Seeley, PA SCC
Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA
Efeturi Oghenekaro, DOEE
Ken Staver, UMD Wye
Robb Meinen, PSU
Hunter Landis, VA DCR
Pat Thompson, Energy Works
Jen Nelson, AAC Coordinator
Kristen Saacke Blunk, Headwaters LLC
Bill Keeling, VA DEQ
Jess Rigelman, J7 LLC/CBPO Contractor
Kate Bresaw, PA DEP