Draft Meeting Notes

Agriculture Workgroup Meeting
March 21, 2013
Chesapeake Bay Program Office
Annapolis, MD

- Meeting convened at 9:30
- Welcome and introductions
- Meeting Notes
 - AgWG February meeting summary was reviewed for member approval. VA motioned to approve, second by USDA, all yea.
 - DECISION: Approve February AgWG minutes

- Urban NM and Stream Restoration Panel Updates
 - Mark Dubin provided a brief update on the USWG's panel recommendations for UNM and requested comments from AgWG members on the final draft of Urban/Non-Urban Stream restoration panel recommendations
 - WQGIT decided on 3/11 to change UNM language and remove credit for alternate outreach
 - DECISION: Table discussion of Stream Restoration until report is more formalized

- Poultry Litter Subcommittee update
 - Jim Glancey, PLS Chair, provided an update of panel progress, and overview of state level data from Delmarva, VA and WV on nutrient concentrations and litter production volumes
 - ACTION: Consistency of units needed (TP vs. P205; Wet Wt. vs. Dry Wt.)
 - EPA: Recommend clarifying the differences between data sets in order to have meaningful comparisons

- Poultry Litter Subcommittee update
 - EPA: noted that, in some cases, historical data that states have submitted independently over many years is significantly different than what's being presented here for similar time periods.
 - MD: How are manure projections calculated?
 - CBPO: standardized; volume per animal
 - Chair clarified that the PLS was currently tasked with determining nutrients not population

- Poultry Litter Subcommittee update
 - EPA: In terms of the model, statistically significant trend data is most useful
 - Chair clarified that the PLS update today is not their final recommendation
 - CBPO: Purpose of model is for managers to plan into the future.
 Given the range in the data, may be difficult to manage load reductions moving forward.
 - MD: noted the unique characteristics of poultry (significant recent changes in Phytase, number of birds, management)
 - Coordinator clarified that slides are snapshots of detailed excel sheets, with at least 10 years of historical data included
 - DECISION: PLS will be on the April agenda for final recommendations to AgWG

- Conservation Tillage Panel update
 - Wade Thomason, Panel Chair, provided an update on panel progress, and overview of proposals.
 - Conservation Technology Information Center (CTIC)
 - Primarily using them for historic data
 - Why were nutrient mgmt and cover crops incorporated into Continuous No-Till (CNT)?
 - Chair: Panel considering CNT definition and allowing future stacking of BMPs with a revised efficiency
 - MD: how would states report other forms of Conservation Tillage (CT)?
 - Chair: Panel considering the sources of data how the data will be incorporated into the model
 - NGO: Will each definition be a BMP with an efficiency?

- Conservation Tillage Panel update
 - CBPO: recommend thinking about N benefits in addition to Sed.
 and P
 - NGO: Likely to increase N with Conservation Tillage
 - VA: Question about range of Ag lands eligible for these practices. Does this panel also consider practices on specialty crop land?
 - Chair: Panel has discussed, have not come to a decision yet
 - VA: Recommend making some of these improvements in current model
 - NGO: How are panels aware of overall verification schedule?
 - Chair clarified that panels are charged with making recommendations to AgWG, not held to any kind of verification schedule (up to AgWG to address this issue)
 - Panel meets next on 3/28

- Nutrient Management Panel update
 - Chris Brosch, new NM Panel Chair, provided an update on the status of the panel
 - Two new members: Rory Maguire, Kim Snell-Zarcone
 - Panel meets next on 3/27, agenda will be to determine the charge of the group, short and long term goals
 - Emma will post NM membership

- Nutrient Management Panel update
 - NGO: How narrowly focused will this panel be?
 - Panel is intended to have a broad focus, and address all three BMPs.
 - NGO: Recommend first determining what is actually being done, and defining a clearer charge for the panel
 - Chair asked NM panel to discuss their charge and report back at April AgWG (list of next steps)
 - ACTION: NM Panel will report back to AgWG on their decided next steps in April

- Agricultural modeling subcommittee
 - Mark Dubin and Matt Johnston reviewed draft organizational structure, objectives and purpose for Ag Modeling Subcommittee (approved at AgWG February meeting) under AgWG oversight. Subcommittee will provide technical modeling assistance to the AgWG panels and workgroup.
 - Goals for the subcommittee
 - State feedback on Scenario Builder
 - Collaboration with other models

- Agricultural modeling subcommittee
 - Curtis Dell will Chair the subcommittee, Matt Johnston will coordinate, other members currently being identified
 - Expected outcome of the upcoming workshop to be the first set of priorities for the group to work on
 - NGO questioned the need for creating an additional group
 - CBPO: AgWG can recommend a subcommittee be formed
 - Coordinator clarified that the need for the subcommittee was decided by AgWG in February
 - NGO: concerned if the subcommittee would be a barrier between experts and modeling decisions
 - Chair clarified purpose; a group that understands modeling and reports back to the AgWG

- Cover Crops Panel update
 - Jack Meisinger, CC Panel Chair, provided an update on the progress of the panel, and an overview of the panel discussions
 - CC interview summary report will be available at the next AgWG meeting
 - Panelists are collecting data in the 12 growth regions
 - Rye will be used in all growth regions as an External Quality Control
 - MD: given CC timeline, could the recommendations be incorporated in the next year's progress run?
 - CBPO: Will check WTWG's decision about the cutoff date [December 1]

- Cover Crops Panel update
 - PA: Panel looking at different data collection methods such as satellite imagery?
 - Yes,
 - MD: Wheat is the default cover crop in the model?
 - Yes
 - Coordinator clarified there might be multiple phases of recommendations to address the Phase 5 model recommendations by the timeline stipulated by the WTWG
 - NGO: Suggest a priority for Ag modeling group to determine timelines for expert panels recommendations
 - CBPO: this issue may not be handled by the Ag modeling group, but all issues definitely need to be figured out before going before WQGIT
 - CBPO: recommend bringing it to the WQGIT to ask them what timeline they recommend

- Break for lunch
 - CBPO director thanked the Ag Workgroup for their work

AgWG

- MPA Ag Modeling Workshop
 - Mark and Matt provided updates on the workshop supporting the implementation of AgWG's top two priority lead MPA topics.
 - The workshop will be held May 22-23, 2013 at the Marriott Inn and Conference Center in College Park, MD
 - Breakout sessions will focus on agronomics, livestock and agricultural forecasting
 - Planning group is identifying speakers, facilitators and note-takers for the workshop and breakout discussions.
 - Planning group will be finalizing invitation list following decisions on the breakout session objectives

AgWG

- MPA Ag Modeling Workshop
 - MD: Will the workshop focus on model Phase 6.0?
 - CBPO: Anticipating that Scenario Builder will look very similar, watershed model is what will change entirely
 - Coordinator: PLS will attend the workshop, face to face discussion with poultry industry representatives
 - Will there be specific questions for each session so participants can come prepared?
 - NGO: Questions will come from Scenario Builder, and each breakout group will offer recommendations to the AgWG
 - Coordinator clarified that these topics would go out with invitations
 - NGO: Also addressing BMPs?
 - NGO: Not the focus of this conference

AgWG

- MPA Ag Modeling Workshop
 - Coordinator welcomed invitation list suggestions, and other workshop recommendations
 - Next planning meeting tomorrow 3/22
 - Peter Claggett provided an overview of the workshop forecasting track
 - Short term, interpolation and extrapolation in trends
 - Long term forecasting
 - ACTION: send any participant recommendations to Emma (<u>egiese@chesapeakebay.net</u>)

- Phase 6.0 Land Uses
 - Workgroup reviewed additional details on the USDA-NRCS CDSI system (potential Ag land use option recommended for further review during the February meeting)
 - Coordinator recommended AgWG use a simplified version of CDSI excel document
 - CBPO: looking for a base loading rate for crops
 - Coordinator: possible bring this before new modeling subcommittee

- Phase 6.0 Land uses
 - MD: support this approach, because it has a simple foundation (with option of adding more layers of detail)
 - DE: if using this platform, will NRCS data points be used?
 - CBPO: clarified that these land uses would be used in 2017
 - Coordinator: possibly bring this to modeling workshop as well

- Agricultural projection methods
- In response to a Milestones Workgroup request, Matt presented a new short-term agricultural projection method proposal out to 2015. If approved, it will support the next round of jurisdictional Two-Year Milestones development.
 - DE: Is it possible to use state annual data to calibrate projections?
 - Using this method because it allows USDA-NASS Agricultural Census data to be used

- Agricultural projection methods
 - CBPO: modeling deadline this spring/summer
 - DE: how much does the slope change between 0.6,0.7,
 0.8?
 - CBPO: 0.7 consistently brought the projection to the last known date
 - CBPO: Have you tried a past calculation? (Use 1982-2002 to predict 2007)
 - NGO: this method would be used to predict everything?
 - CBPO: Each animal type and each crop type at the county scale
 - Expect that animal trend lines would be less volatile
 - Intend to use consistent ranges across all types?
 - CBPO: AgWG can recommend

- Agricultural Projection Methods
 - MD: how does the projection handle a decrease?
 - CBPO: It currently goes to zero (using the regression)
 - Chair: This would give more weight to most recent data points
 - DE: Use more frequent data to inform the weight of the line?
 - CBPO: as long as the weight is between 0.6-0.8 doesn't greatly affect the outcome
 - VA: What is the data actually representing? What is cropland changing to?
 - CBPO: If a change occurs in Ag (it becomes forest or leftover)
 - VA: should 2007 be held constant out to 2017?
 - VA: Except for urbanization

- Agricultural projection methods
 - MD: Unable to make a recommendation at this point
 - Chair: Members can provide any data sets they would like to see this analysis on to Matt, who will bring back to the next AgWG meeting
 - ACTION: Provide data sets to Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net) by COB 3/25/13

- USDA data request
 - By BMP Verification Committee request, AgWG will develop a comprehensive list to identify exactly what USDA-NRCS and FSA Conservation Practice implementation data and database fields are not currently being collected and/or reported by NRCS and FSA, which the jurisdictions need in order to report and obtain verified credit for implementation.
 - Mark reviewed the draft list to meet a March 26th response deadline in preparation for a USDA meeting, and requested comments/suggestions from AgWG members

- USDA data request
 - ACTION: Send supplemental items to Mark by Noon Tuesday (<u>mdubin@chesapeakebay.net</u>)

- Review meeting notes
- Adjourned at 3:00
- Next meeting April 11th at USFWS:
 - U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Field Office
 177 Admiral Cochrane Drive
 Annapolis, MD 21401

http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19182/