

# Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016

8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

## Conference Call Summary

Meeting materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24635/>

---

### **Actions & Decisions:**

DECISION: The AgWG approved the proposed amendment to the Manure Incorporation/Injection panel report that would shift the reduction credit from 0% to 12% for P loss reduction in high disturbance incorporation in upland areas.

DECISION: The AgWG approved the Swine Manure Characterization Pilot Project final report.

DECISION: The AgWG approved the Layer Characterization project's findings and data for updating the layer manure nutrient generation data previously developed as part of the AgWG approved Poultry Litter Subcommittee report for the representation of layer manure nutrient generation in Phase 6 modeling tools by December, 2016.

ACTION: During the January meeting, Matt Johnston will present the proposed table of simplified efficiency values and accompanying Technical Appendix for the Cover Crops BMP reporting in NEIEN.

DECISION: The AgWG approved the Cover Crops expert panel report, but will be asked to approve the Technical Appendix during their January meeting.

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

Workgroup Chairs

### **Manure Incorporation and Injection Panel Amendment**

C. Dell

Curt Dell, MII Panel Chair, presented the Panel's response to a request by the workgroup in consideration of a proposed Panel report amendment from New York. The proposed amendment would revise the Panel's recommendations for a neutral (0%) P effectiveness value for high disturbance manure incorporation on upland soils.

- Curt noted that of the Manure Incorporation/Injection panelists that were contacted, they were supportive of NY's proposed change for the P loss reduction credit for high disturbance incorporation on upland areas from 0% to 12%.
- Ed Kee asked the workgroup if anyone disagreed with supporting the proposed amendment, which would be included in the final report in the form of an appendix added by the workgroup. No dissenting opinions were voiced.

DECISION: The AgWG approved the proposed amendment to the Manure Incorporation/Injection panel report that would shift the reduction credit from 0% to 12% for P loss reduction in high disturbance incorporation in upland areas.

### **Swine Characterization Pilot Project Final Report**

M. Estienne, R. Meinen, T. Sexton

Dr. Mark Estienne, VT, Robb Meinen, PSU, and Tim Sexton, VADCR presented on the joint PSU/VT Swine Characterization Pilot Project's draft report which was released for Partnership review and comment. All comments were due to Mark Dubin and Lindsey Gordon by December 5<sup>th</sup>.

- Jill Whitcomb: We commented asking why manure nutrient content levels are so different between PA and VA, and the response is that all operations in VA are on lagoon systems. That's a reasonable response, but certain sections in the report suggest variability. Can you provide further explanation?
  - Sexton: We only have 45 swine operations in VA, and the corporate-owned facilities take samples 3x/year. We average those together, but in a particular year our sample size may be very small, so we would expect some irregularity based upon that.
  - Meinen: I think you have the influence from the lagoon systems, which have very low values. So we would not expect the true nutrient content to be that different from state to state. And if we need to go back and explore that in the future, it might be a worthwhile endeavor.
- Whitcomb: Can someone explain how this information will be used, moving forward?
  - Johnston: We're just trying to approve the manure characterization study with the understanding that the questions we all still have a few questions on how it will be used. I've talked to Gary Shenk and the Modeling Team about whether we'll have time in the new year to dig into the data and decide whether we'll take an average on specific datasets. We haven't gotten to that point yet, simply because we haven't approved the reports yet. If we get there, I'll work with you and others to put together documentation on how we use this data in the Phase 6 model.
- Ed Kee asked if anyone was opposed to approving the report. No dissenting opinions were voiced.

DECISION: The AgWG approved the Swine Manure Characterization Pilot Project final report.

#### **Layer Characterization Pilot Project Report**

M. Dubin

Mark Dubin, UMD, presented on the updated PSU Layer Characterization Pilot Project findings and data. The project's initial findings and data were previously presented to the workgroup on September 7, 2016.

- Mark Dubin: We have historic data from the poultry litter subcommittee report, and that information is out of date. The latest information we had for layers was around 2012-2013. My suggestion is the AgWG consider accepting the information that PSU has, with the updates that we just presented, for incorporation into the Phase 6 model.
- Johnston: Can you give me a better sense of what the plan is moving forward with the layer study? With the 12/31 deadline, it doesn't seem like we've fully characterized the layers here.
  - Kee: This is a great refinement to the data, and I would recommend if we approve the report to this point, we can leave the latitude to make later changes. We also have a conference call on 1/19, and we could revisit this at that point.
  - Sexton: What if we added this information to the poultry litter report, so that it could be incorporated as a part of that? That could assist in making determinations as we look toward the future.
  - Dubin: This report doesn't provide the historic data we need for the model, so we still have to rely on the poultry litter subcommittee report. To better represent the industry currently, I think it would be beneficial to add this information to the historic data.
- Angstadt: Was any work done on manure transport, in addition to the characterization?
  - Erica Rogers: I have some of that information that I will be putting together.

- Johnston: From the WQGIT perspective, the deadline for BMPs (including manure transport) is 12/31. If PA finds more historic manure transport data, in 2 years they can update that in the model and we can re-run everything.

DECISION: The AgWG approved the Layer Characterization project's findings and data for updating the layer manure nutrient generation data previously developed as part of the AgWG approved Poultry Litter Subcommittee report for the representation of layer manure nutrient generation in Phase 6 modeling tools by December, 2016.

### **Cover Crops Panel Final Report**

K. Staver

Ken Staver, UMD panel chair, presented the Phase 6 Cover Crop Panel's final report and recommendations, which was released for Partnership review and comment on November 18<sup>th</sup>. All comments were due to Mark Dubin and Lindsey Gordon by December 16<sup>th</sup>.

- Jill Whitcomb: Are we to be reporting both cover crop and conservation tillage for the same acre? How does this work as far as reporting goes?
  - Johnston: Phase 6, with all of our BMPs, allows you to report multiple BMPs on the same acre of land. The nice thing here is that Ken's panel worked with Wade's panel offline, and compared the science they were using. They agreed that a cover crop is necessarily going to mean that your acre will qualify under some residue component of conservation tillage. Since that has a reduction efficiency of P built in, we won't double count. So I recommend you report actual acres of implementation on the ground.
- Ed Kee asked if anyone objected to approving the expert panel's final report. No dissenting opinions were voiced.
- Johnston: Ken did have a slide up that the panel did not create new BMPs, and that's correct. Unfortunately, in model world, the semantics are that we will have a second suite of BMPs. So we now have 3 categories: commodity, traditional, and traditional with fall manure application.
- Johnston: To everyone from the WTWG, I'd like to get input on whether you'd like to consolidate identical efficiencies, without altering the panel's report. Without doing this, we'll have at least 94 unique practices. If we consolidated based on planting, type, and timing, we could consolidate to around 25 reporting options.
  - NY expressed support for this approach.

ACTION: During the January meeting, Matt Johnston will present the proposed table of simplified efficiency values and accompanying Technical Appendix for the Cover Crops BMP reporting in NEIEN.

DECISION: The AgWG approved the Cover Crops expert panel report, but will be asked to approve the Technical Appendix during their January meeting.

**Next meeting: Thursday, January 19<sup>th</sup> 10:00 – 12:00 PM Conference Call**

### **Participants:**

Ed Kee	DDA
Lindsay Thompson	DE-MD Agribusiness Associates
Mark Dubin	UMD
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Matt Johnston	UMD

Chris Brosch	DDA
Jason Keppler	MDA
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Greg Albrecht	NYS
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Frank Schneider	PA SCC
Jill Whitcomb	PA DEP
Karl Brown	PA SCC
Tim Sexton	VA DCR
Marel King	CBC
Rich Batiuk	EPA
Bill Angstadt	Angstadt Consulting
Frank Coale	UMD
Ken Staver	UMD
Paul Bredwell	US Poultry and Egg Assoc.
Don Meals	Tetra Tech
Curt Dell	USDA
Robb Meinen	Penn State
Ron Ohrel	American Dairy Assoc. NE
Robin Pellicano	MDE
Matt Johnston	UMD