

Moving Forward:
Chesapeake Bay Program
Agriculture Workgroup
Priorities 2018-2019

The charge of the Agriculture Workgroup:

**to provide expertise and leadership on development and implementation of
policies, programs, and research**

**to reduce pollutant loads delivered from agricultural lands and animal
operations to upstream waters and the Chesapeake Bay**

Focus Area: Implementation

Taking state and county watershed implementation plans from theory to on-the-ground practices.

What does this mean for the AgWG?

1. Communication with Ag community:

Scope:

Why a Priority?

Resources:

Barriers/Challenges:

Connections:

Workgroup Lead(s):

Proposed Next Steps (ACTION):

2. Barriers to Implementation:

Scope:

Why a Priority?

Resources:

Barriers/Challenges:

Connections:

Workgroup Lead(s):

Proposed Next Steps (ACTION):

3. Technical Assistance:

Scope:

Why a Priority?

Resources:

Barriers/Challenges:

Connections:

Workgroup Lead(s):

Proposed Next Steps (ACTION):

Focus Area: Verification

Ensuring that Best Management Practices are accurately reported to the Chesapeake Bay Program for credit towards water quality goals.

1. Communications (NRCS-JURIDICTIONS-PRODUCERS)

Scope:

- Full accounting of implementation: cost-shared and non-cost shared
 - Crosswalk of NRCS, state and CBP practices: which fully match, which are supporting practices...¹
 - Help us understand how much we might be missing out on, or not
 - Activities that may be missing from reporting/tracking/CBP practices, but provide WQ benefits
 - If we compare USDA cost-share to state data, how does it compare? How much being implemented not getting into model? Double-counting? Can we (or the states) do this analysis for all states or only states with 1619 agreements?
 - **BMPs nearing end of credit duration en masse: best handled at state level? Is this a discussion for the AgWG.**
 - Ways to ensure private firm/consultants-supported projects and practices are credited while respecting privacy?
 - Front end (getting reported into model accurately): crosswalk etc., back-end, how to deal with practices nearing end of lifespan (CBWI-funded practices, etc.)
 - **Other means of verification, not solely relying on state/county/district staff**
- Communication products/services? Checklists (e.g., RI visual indicators?)
 - Identify universal needs for watershed, get AgWG to play a role--**webinars in short term**. What do state/district/private community need to know from AgWG
- Focus areas for sharing/crediting/considering practices
 - E.g. **Soil quality in PA and soil health by NRCS**, how to connect partners' efforts and approach
- Data aggregation agreements w/ USGS in place until December 2020

Why a Priority?

- Want ag community to have confidence they “get credit” for what they’ve done and are doing; need to meet TMDL goals

Resources:

- Federal and state partners

Barriers/Challenges:

- Expense
- What works in each state; what does not
- Personal relationships b/w state agency staff, private producers/consultants, conservation offices; importance of these relationships for data-sharing and trust

Connections:

- Everything (?)
- Verification

Workgroup Lead(s):

Proposed Next Steps (ACTION):

- **¹NRCS-CBPO practice cross walk analysis – prioritize need (impact): 9/2018 report to AgWG**
 - **Mark Dubin, UMD, and Barry Frantz, NRCS**
- **1619 Privacy Agreement: Ongoing**
 - **Future progress updated from NRCS**

Focus Area: Phase 6.0 Model Updates

Ensuring that the agricultural sector is represented in the most accurate terms available in the Phase 6.0 Watershed Model.

1. Fertilizer Data

Scope: Improve the data collection methods for fertilizer sales to create consistency among Bay states.

Why a Priority:

- County level distribution is not realistic
- Major drive of N loads to Bay

Resources:

- Fertilizer manufacturer and trade association
- IPNI, Fertilizer Institute
- State reporting authority
- CBP Facilitation
- STAC 2007 report – Revisit with Norm G/Tom S., state chemists, distributors

Barriers/Challenges:

- Standardizing reporting
- Data quality
- Data sharing agreement

Connections: P6 Input

Workgroup Lead(s):

Proposed Next Steps (ACTION):

- **Planning for collaboration (Workgroup leads and Coordinator)**

- Meeting with stakeholders by Quarter 1, 2019

2. Animal Data

Scope: Dairy is a long-term, critical animal data need. Poultry and swine litter/manure data to be updated on a regular basis by states per [December 2017 EPA grant guidance](#)

Reporting [templates](#) for poultry and swine litter/manure data are available on the CBP AgWG website.

Why a Priority?

- Accurate representation of animal sectors in the model

Resources:

- Land Grant Universities
- Trade associations

Barriers/Challenges:

- Finances (RFP)
- Time
- Communication

Connections:

- Fertilizer
- Implementation
- Feed Additive

Workgroup Lead(s):

Proposed Next Steps (ACTION):

- **Deadline for new data submission: April 2019**
- **Individual states communicate data needs with Workgroup Lead ASAP**
- **Adhoc group to address data collection needs and logistics in the dairy sector**

3. Artificial Drainage

Scope: Mapping artificial drainage for both tile and ditch

Why a Priority?

- They convey nutrients differently than natural or each other.

Resources:

- They convey nutrients differently than natural or each other.

Barriers/Challenges:

- Data acquisition listed under resources.

Connections:

- Drainage management BMPs
- NRCS practice codes

Workgroup Lead(s):

Proposed Next Steps (ACTION):

- **Outreach to Public Drainage Associations (PDAs)**
- **Report back to AgWG: Quarter 2-3 2019**

4. Soil Phosphorus Data

Scope: See CBP Management Board documentation

Why a Priority?

Resources:

Barriers/Challenges:

Connections:

Workgroup Lead(s):

Proposed Next Steps (ACTION):

- **Address CBP Management Board *Recommended Path Forward***
- **Timeline necessary to address 7 steps from Management Board- Report back to WQGIT and MB regarding proposed action.**

Focus Area: Innovations

Keeping up-to-date on and incorporating, when appropriate, new practices and approaches that have been proven effective in addressing the challenges to water quality improvement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

1. Soil Health

Scope:

Why a Priority?

Resources:

Barriers/Challenges:

Connections:

Workgroup Lead(s):

Next Steps (ACTION):

- **Forthcoming Presentation: State Approaches to Soil Health. Quarter 3-4, 2018**

2. ???

Focus Area: Climate Change

Addressing the key components of the agriculture sector's role in adaptation to, and mitigation of, climate change.

Suggested Revision: *Addressing the projected impacts of climate change on pollutant load reduction goals within the agriculture sector.*

1. BMP Resiliency

Scope: See CBP Principals' Staff Committee (PSC) Decision

Why a Priority?

Resources:

Barriers/Challenges:

Connections:

Workgroup Lead(s):

Next Steps (ACTION):

- **Identify AgWG role in CBP PSC *Accounting for Climate Change* March 2018 decision**

DRAFT