

Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

March 17th, 2016

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Call Summary

Meeting materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/23292/>

Actions & Decisions:

DECISION: The AgWG agreed to revise their 2016 calendar of meetings to reflect an every-other-month face-to-face meeting schedule.

ACTION: The AgWG BMP Expert Panels will develop a preliminary report ('white paper') of the structure for their BMP as represented in the Phase 6.0 model. These will be presented to the AgWG during the April 2016 face-to-face meeting for interim approval.

10:00 **Welcome, introductions, roll-call, review meeting minutes** Workgroup Chairs

- Meeting minutes from the February 2016 quarterly meeting were approved.
- Kristen asked if attributing certain comments to individual members was still necessary in the meeting minutes.

10:05 **AgWG BMP Panel Roadmap** Mark Dubin, Lindsey Gordon

- Mark and Lindsey presented the roadmap chart that was developed out of a request from the AgWG during the February 2016 quarterly meeting. Dubin also explained that the panels will be producing one-page 'white papers' detailing the broad structure of their BMP, to be presented to the AgWG for interim approval and to begin incorporation into the Phase 6 model.
- Rhoderick: This is a double edged sword – it's a way for the AgWG to see what's coming up, but it's also for these expert panels an indication of what the expectations are. Has this been shared with those chairs at this time?
 - Dubin: I've been talking with each of the chairs directly, but haven't gotten a chance to speak with everyone yet. I think they appreciate having a better understanding of the timelines.
- Keppler: How often will you update it?
 - Dubin: I was thinking after every panel meeting we could update it.
- Angstadt: For the July run, Gary has asked for any changes 30 days in advance of that. If the October run will be mid-October, we might have to have these BMP panels finished by mid-September. And some of these BMPs, the MB has asked to review (Nutrient Mgmt and Manure Treatment Technologies).
 - Suggested having a joint AgWG-WTWG meeting when panel reports are released, and noted that when panel reports are presented to meetings for approval, that this should be clearly communicated well in advance of that meeting.
- Brosch: At the PSC, there were 3 BMPs that were requested to be specifically covered at that level, Nutrient Management being one of them.

- Saacke Blunk suggested that as it continues to be updated, to show the activities that were completed or missed in the month coming and the month previous.
- Marel King suggested that the panels should be very candid about what they feel they can accomplish by the deadlines laid out, and whether or not they need to pare down their work to get something in by the deadline.
- Keppler suggested putting the milestones or dates that the modeling team has committed to into this calendar as well, so we know how it fits into the development of the model.
- Angstadt: The model team has a development timeline, but none of these BMPs are listed currently on the modeling team's development timeline to be included in any of the beta runs. So we need to have those dates included and approved by the modeling team that they will be included. Regarding the white papers – what is the goal of diverting attention of these expert panels to writing white papers?
 - Dubin: The goal is to help out with the state historic data reporting, and if we were to wait until the panel report was completely finalized, that wouldn't give the states enough time. I have resources with Tetra Tech that will provide the main assistance in developing these white papers.
 - Meisinger: On the white paper issue – I've been on a few white paper writings and they eat up your time, and this was not in the original charge. I just want to remind everyone that panel members are not getting paid for all of this work. The main thing I would like to see is enough advance notice from the modelers for any deadlines that they have for us.
- AgWG expressed concern regarding the proposed 'white papers', because the preliminary rules of historic data reporting may get changed later on in the panel process. Furthermore, the AgWG was concerned that the development of a white-paper would further slow down panel progress.
- Bill Angstadt suggested adding in the Tetrattech/white paper work into the roadmap calendar.
- Marel King asked if a white paper would be required for every BMP, and if states would have to go back to 1985 for their historic data reporting.
 - Dubin: It depends, but certainly not for every panel.
- Rhoderick: These panels need to be able to review these white papers that are being developed by Tetra Tech and approve them, which should be incorporated into this calendar as well.

ACTION: The AgWG BMP Expert Panels will develop a preliminary report ('white paper') of the structure for their BMP as represented in the Phase 6.0 model. These will be presented to the AgWG during the April 2016 face-to-face meeting for interim approval.

10:30 **Phase 6 Panel Memberships Update**

Chris Brosch, Clint Gill, Mark Dubin

- Chris and Clint provided an update on the proposed membership for the Phase 6 Drainage Ditch BMP panel.
- Ted Tesler: Is this just looking at tidal drainage systems? Is that part of this panel?
 - Saacke Blunk: This panel has to look at all things related to P removal in the soil. While the eastern shore has high P, it should include P-removal structures.
- Dirk Axe: Some of the gypsum work was to impact P runoff – surface and sub-surface – so will that be considered?
 - Rhoderick: That's within the scope of the panel, and some of these proposed panelists have experience in this.
 - Keppler: This panel is also considering N, so let's not just focus on P here.

- Mark Dubin updated the AgWG on the proposed membership for the Phase 6 Cropland Irrigation and Agricultural Stillwater BMP Panels.
- Rhoderick: Do you have CVs collected for the irrigation and stormwater panels?
 - Dubin: Not yet – we are still working on this.

10:40 **Discussion on Interim BMPs in the Phase 6 Model**

Mark Dubin

- Mark discussed the process for incorporating interim BMPs into the Phase 6 model. This process is expected to be codified into the revised BMP protocol later this year. Mark also discussed how this process will impact milestone reporting and progress.

11:00 **Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee Update**

Matt Johnston, Curt Dell

- Matt and Curt updated the AgWG on the status of the AMS Phase 6 review of the Scenario Builder documentation and provided an overview of the comments received from the partnership. Matt also discussed the AMS recommendations on SB nutrient assumptions.
- Angstadt: So you're changing from 5.3.2, that only did N mineralization for the first year, you're now going to do 3 years?
 - Dell: Correct. With 100% bioavailable in the first year, you're assuming it's still there in the following years.
 - Angstadt: So P is available in the first year only?
 - Dell: Isn't that the way most of the land grants are doing it? That's my understanding.
- Angstadt: Why does the inorganic fertilizer distribution account for all BMPs?
 - Johnston: Because even some BMPs like forest buffers can affect the acres of corn.
- Dirk Axe brought up some points regarding the decay rate and mineralization rates of Phosphorous.
- Meisinger: The P goes on as 100% available the first year, and the majority isn't used by the crop if it's put on by crop need. So the second year, the LGs take that into effect by way of the soil test, and the model doesn't. The model still resets that Phosphorous to 0 in the second year. That's still an issue that we have to deal with on the modeling side.
- Brosch: The effort to build the algorithm and acres through time can be done concurrently, so hopefully we can make an effort to do that.
- Rhoderick: Going back to the application of fertilizer for turf grass (which was punted to the USWG) – the start-up is on the agricultural side. How are you differentiating, because the sod is grown on ag land?
 - Johnston: There is a crop from the ag census called sod, and it has an application rate and would receive inorganic fertilizer based on our methods for all crops receiving inorganic fertilizer. Then we're talking about the lawns, which are assumed to be planted already, and there's some assumption for fertilizer on lawns, which is what the USWG is looking at – just fertilization on lawns.
- Angstadt: Last month the AgWG asked for an algorithm for P-based nutrient management. I don't see that on this list – has it been done?
 - Dell: The algorithm is there, and the method and capacity is done. We just need some reasonable estimates of what land base to use.
- Axe: Is there any consideration for Sulphur here, because that can be a very important part in this whole equation?
 - Dell: That's important, but Sulphur really hasn't come into the equation yet. If it impacts N fate and transport in the bay, we could think about it in the future.

- Tom Simpson: As with secondary or micronutrients, we don't look at them directly, but indirectly they will impact yield. So should yield estimates reflect that, or are we not applying adequate fertilizer to address it?
 - Johnston: The uptake of crop removal is tied to actual yield data for all for the major crops. So if you see a deficient area, we should see that in the yield data from NASS.
 - Dell: The question is whether or not application rates are impacted by that, and I would think that they wouldn't be. We'd still keep at the higher rate, not considering we'd have lower uptake.
- The AMS will present any major changes to the AgWG next month, during the April meeting.
- Keppler: I want to see this in the BMP panel roadmap as well. That way, we can be a little more definitive when discussing the schedule.
- Angstadt: We also want to remember that this is a communication tool for all of the relevant groups. You might also want to add to this timeline the STAC science review of Scenario Builder. I would suggest that after the July beta-calibration run, that might be the point where we can have a SB no-BMP run reviewed by STAC.

11:30 **AgWG Co-Chairs Sign-Off**

Workgroup Co-Chairs

- John and Kristen announced the end of their chair-ship, and welcome the new chair, Sec. Ed Kee, and vice-chair, Lindsay Thompson.

11:40 **April 2016 Face-to-Face Meeting**

Lindsay Thompson

- Lindsay discussed proposed revisions to the 2016 calendar of Agriculture Workgroup meetings, and proposed that the April 2016 meeting be a one-day face-to-face meeting at the Chesapeake Bay Program Offices in Annapolis, MD.

DECISION: The AgWG agreed to revise their 2016 calendar of meetings to reflect an every-other-month face-to-face meeting schedule.

11:55 **Wrap-Up/Review of Action and Decision Items/Announcements**

Workgroup

Chairs/Mark Dubin/Lindsey Gordon

- Jeremy Hanson noted that an announcement for the AWMS panel's open stakeholder meeting will be distributed to the AgWG soon.
- Lindsey will review the actions and decisions from the meeting, and will update the AgWG on the process of approving and recommending interim BMP efficiencies.

12:00 **Adjourn**

Agenda items for April 2016 meeting:

- Update on the AgWG BMP timeline, with revisions based on suggestions from AgWG participants.
- The AMS will provide an update for the Phase 6 July beta calibration, and this will initiate a 30 day comment period before the final beta run.

Participants:

Lindsey Gordon, CRC

Dirk Axe, Granco Minerals

Jennifer Reed-Harry, PennAg Industries Assoc.
Kelly Shenk, EPA
Mark Dubin, UMD
Tim Sexton, VA DEQ
Ron Ohrel, Mid-Atlantic Dairy Association
Kristen Saacke Blunk, Headwaters LLC
John Rhoderick, MDA
Robin Pellicano, MDE
Karl Brown, PA DEP
Bill Angstadt, Angstadt Consulting
Chris Brosch, DDA
Clint Gill, DDA
Jason Keppler, MDA
Rachel Rhodes, MDA
Marcia Fox, DNREC
Matt Monroe, WVDEP
Marilyn Hershey, Ar Joy Farms LLC
Susan Marquart, USDA NRCS

Ted Tesler, PA DEP
Tim Garcia, NRCS
Matt Johnston, UMD
Jeremy Hanson, VT
Marel King, CBC
Bill Chain, CBF
Jeff Hill, Lancaster County Conservation District
Lindsay Thompson, DE/MD Agribusiness
Association
Paul Bredwell, U.S. Poultry & Egg Association
Roland Owens, VA DCR
Curt Dell, USDA
Jack Meisinger, USDA
Tom Simpson, Aqua Terra Science
Gene Yagow, VT
Seung Ah Byun, Brandywine Conservancy
Amanda Barber, NY Soil and Water
Conservation District