

AGWG Meeting Minutes 5.10.12

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18253/>

Announcement

- MB approved formation of social science action team, already some efforts thru NRCS
- Swanson- at the meeting when this came up, will look into this further

Minutes Review

- Motion to approve minutes- Sexton.
- Second by Brosch
- All approve

BMP Verification Process- Coale

- Making recommendation of what WG thinks of principles and concepts specific to agriculture

BMP Verification Principles- Batiuk

See [principles](#)

- Timeline reviewed by MB, will be considered by PSC
- Verification committee meeting in July, would like to have workgroups thinking by then
- In September bring everything together, brought through verification committee, WQ, in place to have it worked up through PSC by end of year
- Keeling- what is governing body of committee?
- Folks who make final decisions are PSC members, committee sits under water quality but decisions made at PSC
- Batiuk- looking to get all info up on the web
- Zygmunt- when does expert panel forms and what timeframe do they start reviewing draft program
- Looking to get ok in July, and move forward
- Getting feedback from those not usually around workgroup table, getting expertise needed
- Zygmunt- would be good to finalize deadline for panel nominations
- Batiuk- May 25 deadline
- Gathering folks in carbon markets, air folks, ISO folks, local government folks, going across the board
- Opportunity to have a briefing w panel to help set the scene, where the bar is set
- Raub- level of rigor is important point, be sure to be clear that we do not want to be at the mercy of the weakest link.
- Batiuk -have looked at this and it is considered and included in principles, working to clean up historic data, used to calibrate important to understand trends and predict into the future
- Taglang- when you speak of credits, do you mean trading credits or credit in the model?
- Not trading credit, progress toward reductions, rewording to credit for model inclusion
- Angstadt- will need to consider structural practices as well as annual practices.
- Sweeney- we need new information and correct historic information
- York- year is very important, consider voluntary practices

- Angstadt- also need to consider review of functional equivalent and percent of current efficiencies and how we review practices. Are we going to burden the system by reviewing percentage of efficiencies in workgroup or is there a better way
- Rhoderick- cannot have it done at the state level
- Swanson- need to take a hard stand and this needs to be a interstate effort w efficiencies across the board
- Keeling- do no harm if you have a functioning system
- Batiuk- looking to see what the state has rolling, not looking to steamroll what is already in place
- Angstadt- need to look at what the states are doing today and find consistency and equity versus top down from global efforts
- York- will there be an approval process, each of the states will be a little different, who will look at if it checks out
- Batiuk- panel will look at program and provide feedback, and approval, consistent with bump efforts etc
- Samandani- bump implementation better title than bump alone

NACD Non-Cost Shared Project Meeting- Shenk

See [presentation](#)

- Meeting looking to wrap up efforts
- Expect CEAP to be at a finer level of detail; plan to push for most definitive data possible.
- Completed surveys to get at HUC 8 level and plan to compute to HUC 12 level, the level of detail we use
- Think report should be out by end of fall
- Marquart- some concern of sharing data and how that might affect future participation of farmers, this is what is being considered before sharing more info than farmers thought would be shared
- Ristow- having someone go out to the farm without any appointment or notification can be problematic. This should be avoided because it may deter future participation, farmer may become weary and we should not use their time, coordinating w people already on the ground would be much more efficient
- Simpson- Preliminary costs- is it just per acre, consider per animal head.
- York- keep in mind just considering time paid for assessment does not include overhead of office etc
- Baseline is where farmer is now, not the best term to use, current accounting better term
- If you are sending trained professional can help farmer save money in the same breath

Agricultural BMP Verification Comments- State discussion

- VA- what meets NRCS standard is easy to inventory, baseline is specs but must consider things that do not match them. Have well est. system used for years and don't want one size fits all that doesn't work for us
- MD- has protocol in place, different levels of inspection based on practice. Train third party to assist w tracking and accountably through spot checking of certifier. Thinking in terms of getting to every farm, voluntary for non cost share
- DE- concerned about cost effectiveness- is the juice worth the squeeze concept. Impact on model output considered, not necessarily on the ground practices

- WV- keep it voluntary, hard to get farmers to do this when they don't know who will get this info. Only one person out in field for time being, looking to hire. Hard to get interstate, everyone will be a bit different
- PA- cost effectiveness an issue. Too many farms, too many acres, not enough money, not enough people. Model feeding effort. Cost share vs non, have very rigorous verification of cost share, not necessarily data verification. Non cost share should be different process from cost share. Different standard for different practices, ie field versus structural. Benefits are all model based, dollars spent tracking are dollars not going to practices on the ground. Doing survey for conservation tillage in lower portion of watershed, hope we can assess ct through watershed and can be used in the model. Active effort of survey technique
- NY- agricultural environmental management program in place, verification and rating system Data protected under NY state law. Reliance on fed or state support. Proper credit and representation in model for state- animal to plant ratio in good range, not as out of whack as others. Field by field, farm by farm process and it is expensive. Need 3rd party involvement. Voluntary, except CAFOs, assessment required to receive funding. Farmers perception of value added is very important

Agricultural BMP Verification Comments- Partners Discussion

- CBC- don't be constrained by current issues, go from good to better using possible additional resources- let us know of needs
- Shenk- EPA is part of the partnership and working to move the partnership forward. Don't want to come down from on high, want to build on what each state has in place and add to it
- York- efficiency quantification/ assignment
- Simpson- existing year 1 basis
- Engage private sector
- Development of continuous improvement
- Watershed stewardship- quantitative estimate of WIP load, reductions achieved Issue of double counting
- Hoot- nutrient trading tools, verification process Performance of farmer installed practices into model, credits Better accounting of all practices Different purposes of accounting methods

After lunch discussion

- Angstadt- need to identify the 'what' before the 'how', may limit work. Plans are different from BMPs and verifying plans does not insure practices in place.
- Zygmunt- there is a verification piece in each state, but the question to the group is if it is good enough.
- Taglang- additional verification on practices installed to NRCS specs by professionals seems like this is a lot of work for little pay off.
- Nutrient management in the model is not nutrient management in the field, only includes application rates, not all of the other practices often associated w NM. There is a data management issue.
- Also need to go out and verify practices, cost share, out of contract and therefore can be torn out w no ramifications. Some practices defined as only functional for 10 years, it is taken out after 10 years even if it is still currently functional. Documentation of what is on the ground fit now will help the public understand the verification that is going on right now, as well as help us tweak internally, but vital to good communication point

- Samadani- Same standards across the board for cost and non cost share, Not auditing voluntary practices can be a convoluted mess
- Raub- think I hear that approach will be dependent in type of practices. Intend to address this independently or draft on protocol?
- Plan to document means of verifying the practices to be verified and what appropriate approach is for set practices. If a state submits non cost shared practices for model it has to have every field audited, (or whatever had been determined). If I do not audit, I cannot report.
- Getting things into the model results in increased implementation can lose programs through this. If a practice isn't counted, because there is too much to do to verify, than it will not be counted
- Keeling- strongly recommend one approval process, having so many process in place is scary

Agricultural Verification Concept Dubin

See [protocol concept](#)

- Number of options illustrated, all different cost, info gain etc
- Could be applied to non cost share and cost share, some can apply to a practice and some may not
- A number of these practices can work in a state, a combination would work best, state to state this combination may change
- Shenk- great approach, gives states flexibility, doesn't penalize state for wanting to do more or those that cannot afford to. If we decide to punt this efforts, recognize that these practices get no credit
- Baird- these things have been done before, is there literature
- Dubin- it would help, go out to showcase watersheds and found level of confidence
- York- always looking to correlate survey results to something else you have results from
- Verification will be addressed in bmp panels, unlike before
- Need to huddle up w other regulators back home to page through proposed and get better feeling for it before providing approval
- Taking table an putting in numbers may help determine where work is done
- Want feedback from workgroup before next meeting, prior to 14 June.
- Will draft request to send to group

Chesapeake Commons- Dawes

See [presentation](#)

- May be a good option for moving forward
- May be able to have an NGO receive this data, who would be exempt to FOIA, but states would still have access to info
- Looking to see if there is a way for private sector to help us maintain information

Updates

- Timeline on nm panel report?
- Originally due in Sept, has been delayed but not sure where it stands at this point

Review of AgWG Recommendations Dubin

See [presentation](#)

Participants

Fred Samadani- Environment and Water Resource Management Consulting
Tim Sexton- VA DCR
Jim Baird- American Farmland Trust
Ann Swanson- Chesapeake Bay Commission
Kelly Shenk- CBPO/EPA
Dana York- MDA
Gerald Talbert- MASCD
Lynne Hoot- MASCD
Sally Saydlowski- WSI
Glenn Carpenter- NRCS
Anne Marsh- Heinz Center
John Dawes- Chesapeake Common
Chris Brosch- WSI
Bill Angstadt- DMAA
Mark Dubin- UMD/MAWP/CBPO
Rich Batiuk- CBPO/EPA
Frank Coale- UMD
Hank Zygmunt
Beth Horsey- MDA
John Rhoderick- MDA
Susan Marquart- NRCS
Kenn Pattison- PA DEP
Jeff Sweeney- CBPO
Molly Harrington- CBPO
Victoria Kilbert- CBPO
Steve Taglang- PA
Ruth Izraeli- EPA R2
Jen Nelson
Pat Buckley- PA DEP
Robert Baldwin- DE
Jack Fry
Aaron Ristow
Mark Goodson
John Berger
Jason Dalrymple
Alana Hartman
Bob Ensor
Bill Keeling- VA
Roy Hoagland
Marel Raub- Chesapeake Bay Commission