AgWG Conference Call

February 23, 2012

- 1/12/12 Minutes
 - PA moves to approve, approved
- Website review
- Verification Process
 - Presentation
 - Requests
 - Develop protocols for agriculture
 - Management of verification data
 - Address from an agricultural perspective
 - Accounting for federal c/s BMPs
 - Prevent double counting of BMPs
 - Historical data verification
 - Life spans of BMPs

- WV: locally based abilities to manage data is best
- WV: do not have the capacity to meet verification levels being implemented by other states
- PA: need for balancing limited resources between verification and implementation
- PA: concern with level of commitment to address verification of historical data, information may not be available in all cases
- PA: would recommend the ability to refer to the NACD project report, it is not available at this time
- WV: could use draft report posted on the Howard County Conservation District website in the interim
- PA: the final NACD report has not been made available or vetted by the original project workgroup
- EPA: will continue to work with NACD and NRCS to have the final report released
- EPA: open to modifying proposed schedule based on partnership input

- PA: would recommend the states be informed of historic data being potentially deleted, or major process changes prior to action to allow for input
- EPA: WQGIT steering workgroup will be available to assist the process development and implementation; welcome nominations from AgWG
- VA: recommends that the AgWG active a subgroup to address the verification protocol and develop recommendations for the AgWG, use the NACD workgroup as the core

NM Panel Update

- Presentation
- VA: believes that the panel is making positive progress forward on a difficult subject
- PA: concerned that panel should take into account the scale of the models which do not recognize individual fields or farms
- NGO: the panel should address the short term needs for the Phase 2 WIP as well as the long term

NM Analysis

- Presentation
- WV: if already satisfied with existing scenario, does the state have to adopt the new proposed- no

- NM Analysis cont.
 - WV: states can request the CBPO run the alternative scenarios
 - VA: initial request for proposal was based on communication concerns; requesting review by expert panel
 - UM: concerned that new proposed method has its own issues, will require the panel to move forward with recommendations
- CT and CC Panels
 - Endorsement of CT panel, VA, PA
 - Endorsement of CC panel, VA, NGO
 - Update from Tt
 - Science articles researched and posted
 - Draft questions for interviews being developed
- PLS Update
 - Mark provided update