

Evaluation of Nutrient Management Practices- Dublin

See presentation

- Looking for recommendations for members of panel, chair will be chosen from the workgroup
- Just getting started, looking at quantitative but also input on evaluation process that needs to be addressed, panel should not feel hands are tied
- Fred Samandani- time frame?
- Looking at starting today and estimating product in Dec for beginning review, finalized early next yr
- Keeling- panel needs to be able to weigh in on model simulation of nm, will need modeling expertise. Recommend nm summit, work w other sectors so things don't need to be rectified down the road
- Hank- fast track, asking for suggestions today. Is there a detailed scope of work available? Are there criteria for selecting panelists?
- Going to be tough, hoping to set up straw man, open today for suggestions
- Don't want to get so large that we cannot get consensus
- Tetrattech could be group to reach out to experts for information they may have without including them on the panel
- NM summit- Charge is ag issues, if we want to address short grass issues we don't want to step on others toes
- No we can work in harmony w USWG
- Current directive is in Ag only, there may be other paths
- SW is putting together a panel in 2012
- Not much overlap in urban and Ag nm, there would be little overlap
- Need to get groups talking to each other, but time 0 may not be the best timing
- Have a time to share w USWG- lay out process w them, has to happen after January but needs to happen
- Summit biannually would help us have more uniformity in how we address like issues, coming up w rationale for summits is important, midpoint will involve Ag as well but is now Ag centric
- WG will make recommendation to CBP to ensure we are all on the same path, USWG and AGWG panels will work independently
- One of goals is to ensure equity between Ag and SW

State Nutrient Management Viewpoints- State Representatives

VA- need to get 5 percent we thought we were getting, need to address land use change, data input numbers are wrong sometimes, need to look at hybrids, yields and uptakes

- 40 some counties. VA show that nm is a detriment, Enhanced should only be available to cropland, not hay, pasture
- Biosolids- doesn't have storage like CAFOs and applied throughout the yr

MD- see presentation

- Do you have number for expired plan but still operating correctly?
- No, don't have evaluation at this point to get at those numbers, Could have the assumption that having gone through process once they would continue along this same path even without plan

- DE- have many of same issues, also have continuous no till
- Recognize that most acreage is under 1 yr plans but can write 3 yrs as well
- WV- working on tracking, always been voluntary, not tracking.
- Hiring plan writers, looking to improve nutrient management for bay watershed
 - Looking to improve on double counting issues P index will be seeing more p planning
- PA- most nm is not enhanced, or advanced.
- Tried yield reserve but found it is not an effective practices, reduces efficiencies, yield and vigor
 - Will be expanding nm in upcoming months in PA, expands who they deal with
- NY- see presentation

Overview of Modeling Nutrient Management- Brosch/Shenk

see presentation

- When the model sees organic fertilizer goes down, some is available in the first year, some hangs around for later years. Lots of different fates, you apply more manure there are more chances for runoff
- Tracking needs to be in place in counties which produce more manure than can be applied, without tracking there is no other way to do the county balance
- Needs to be discussion of p based, everyone needs time together on the same page
- Plant genetics has reduced the amount of nutrients needed to produce corn
- Call for anything to be included not provided by states?
- Impact on water table, setback related to streams does not consider vertical aspects
- Nutrient trading, issue for tech group?
- Baseline issues, not sure if it is part of AgWG
- Discussion is not specific to nm but more broadly USDA data may be important
- Irrigated agriculture
- Cannot constrain panel based on what data states currently report, we can work on that
- Neien workgroup is working to address this
- Shenk- Increase in transparency was requested, everything is really complex and that is the real problem w this. If we did everything on this list it would become more complicated, the harder it becomes to understand. Adding rules decreases apparent transparency. We are an open book for 2017, keep this in mind so future people can understand
- Take ground approach, not water quality approach. Quantify amount taken out in harvest and all other processes we are able to quantify, wouldn't get us all the way but might get us closer and be less confusing
- People in the field managing aren't thinking of modeled units, they think in means of soybeans etc
- Going forward, major change, pilot one county in each state and see what info load this would generate. Should consider different approach to bmps
- Might need a distributed model, ability to model at field level
- Look at individual input and outputs on farm, need both to make sense of numbers and compare to model
- Nm will go into scenario builder, sb has more detail than the model, needs to be defensible number for what nm and nonnm corn difference is in a county

- Land use divisions are determined by this group, your recommendations are what we go by
- If we decide the framework is fine, we need new efficiency. If the framework is wrong, we need to fix that and then look at efficiency
- Phosphorus buildup in soils

Review of AgWG Recommendations Coale/Dubin

see presentation provided

- Pasture nm and non nm definition needs clarification, across states
- If you know where biosolids are going down, we should have it. A new land use Land use change versus bmp, is there clear reasoning?
- If it is a crop acre under nm it is still under the same land use, nm is applied on some kind of crop acre, already in production.
- To have the same land under different- nm parameters you have to define the new land use
- Precision ag should compliment nm, not be exclusive
- Big differences between state programs
- Want the environmental piece but much of our literature is on production, this is something that will affect panel
- Having model represent NY conditions may or may not challenge consistent definitions of practices. Want to ensure conditions are considered and included

*****Send out email to wg for recommendations to panel, send out recommendation slides as well
Can be active if not on panel, will be reaching out to others for info

BMP Evaluation Update

See presentation

Other Updates

- WTWG nursery land BMPs need to consider which can be applied
- NY- proposed passive hay practices, interim bmp is no longer necessary based on changes made. Check it off as done

Attending in Person

Blaine Delaney- USDA VA

Tim Sexton- DCR

Sam Spencer- WVDA

Jack Meisinger- USDA-ARS

Jason Dalrymple- WVDA

Kelly Shenk- EPA CBPO

Jim Glancey- U Del

Hank Zygmunt- Resources Dynamics

Glenn Carpenter- NRCS

Eric Hines- NRCS MD

Paul Bredwell- US Poultry and Egg

Beth McGee- CBF

Mark Dubin- UMD

Frank Coale-UMD

Chris Brosch- UMD
Ken Staver- UMD
Gary Shenk- EPA CBPO
Royden Powell- MDA
Tom Juengst- PA DEP
Susan Marquet- NRCS PA
Doug Goodson- PA Conservation Commission
Kenn Pattison- PA DEP
Larry Towle- DE DA
Rob Baldwin- DE DA
Fred Samadani- Consultant

On the Phone:

Bill Keeling
Steve Dressings
Micaela Fisher
Les Vough
Russ Brinsfield
Quirine
Karl ??? (NY)
Aaron Ristow
Tom ???
Sarah Lane
Joe Mercer
Hank Zygmunt