

WQGIT NM Report Review

Chris Brosch

VT/VADCR

9/14/15

Tier 1 Non-Visual Assessment

1. Plan is available in electronic or paper format.
2. Plan is developed cooperatively by a trained professional and the farmer.
3. Plan expiration date is no longer than three years after written.
4. Plan uses soil lab analysis from farm samples to inform application rates of nutrients.
5. Plan is implemented and followed according to the CGNAM definition and the intent where:
 - Crop yields are estimated based on records or soil productivity estimates for the entire farm;
 - Nutrient applications adhere to contemporary LGU specifications for N rate;
 - P fertilizers are applied at a rate consistent with the contemporary LGU recommendations; and
 - Nutrient application timing is considered to further reduce N and P losses.

Tier 2 Non-Visual Assessment

Tier 2 includes all elements of a Tier 1 plan, and the enhancements bolded below.

1. Plan uses soil lab analysis from farm samples to inform application rates of nutrients.
 - If soil test levels of P warrant a **P risk assessment (or P-index)**, one is performed and the recommendations to reduce losses are followed for the entirety of the plan.
2. Plan is implemented and followed according to the FLNAM definition and the intent where:
 - Crop yields are estimated based on records or soil productivity estimates for **each field** using **contemporary guidelines from state programs**;
 - Nutrient application rates **do not exceed** contemporary LGU specifications for N and **P (including manure)**; and
 - Fertilizer and manure applications are **timed** and placed (e.g., lower risk times for runoff and leaching, setbacks, incorporation, etc.) to reduce risk of N and P loss.

Tier 3 Non-Visual Assessment

Tier 3 includes all elements of a Tier 2 plan, and supplementary records showing either:

1. Variable rate applications of N on each field were performed resulting in a net change in N rates for the field; or
2. An Illinois Soil Nitrogen Test (ISNT), Corn Stalk Nitrate Test (CSNT), Pre-side dress Nitrate Test (PSNT), or Fall Soil Nitrate Test (FSNT) was performed resulting in a net change in N rates for the field.

Row Crop efficiencies:

- 46% of ag

Practice Tier	Stand-Alone Efficiencies	Initial Load	Pass-Through Load	Combined Efficiencies
1N	0.0925	100	90.75	9.25%
1P	0.1	100	90	10.00%
2N	0.044	90.75	86.757	13.24%
2P	0.066	90	84.06	15.94%
3N	0.028	86.757	84.3278	15.67%

Hay land efficiencies:

- 24% of ag
- 2N & 3N Ineligible for alfalfa (1/2 of hay)

Practice Tier	Stand-Alone Efficiencies	Initial Load	Pass-Through Load	Combined Efficiencies
1N	0.05	100	95	5.00%
1P	0.08	100	92	8.00%
2N (no alf)	0.028	95	92.34	7.66%
2P	0.066	92	85.928	14.07%

Recommended & final efficiency values

		High-Till with Manure	Low-Till with Manure	High-Till without Manure	Pasture	Hay with Nutrients	Alfalfa	Nursery
Tier 1 Reduction from no NMP	TN	9.25	9.25	5	5	5	5	5
	TP	10	10	8	8	8	8	8
Tier 2 Reduction from no BMP	TN	13.24	13.24	N/A	N/A	7.66	N/A	N/A
	TP	15.94	15.94	N/A	N/A	14.07	14.07	N/A
Tier 3 Reduction from no BMP	TN	15.67	15.67	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Applicable land uses by Tier

Tier 1 92% Ag max

- Row w/ manure
 - HWM
 - LWM
- Specialty row crops (HOM)
- Pasture (PAS)
- Nursery (NUR)
- Hay w/ nutrients (HYW)
- Alfalfa (ALF)

Tier 2N – 58% Ag max

- Row w/ manure
 - HWM
 - LWM
- Hay w/ nutrients (HYW)

Tier 2P – 66% Ag max

- Row w/ manure
 - HWM
 - LWM
- Hay w/ nutrients (HYW)
- Alfalfa (ALF)

Tier 3N – 41% Ag max

- Row w/ manure
 - HWM
 - LWM

Overarching questions and concerns



- Does the combined Tier 1 + Tier 2 Phosphorus recommended efficiencies OVER credit for nutrient management?
 - Is the Phase 6.0 Expert Panel confined or limited by the recommendations of the Phase 5.3.2 Panel?
 - How will the States interpret the definitions and report their respective programs?
- Tier 2 benefits will apply to a SUBSET of acres that are eligible under Tier 1.
 - The Phase 6.0 Nutrient Management Panel will benefit from the work of the 5.3.2 Panel – but will be working with an entirely different set of assumptions related to ag land uses and model considerations. No constraints or limitations, but definitely advantages from the work of the 5.3.2. Panel.
 - The AgWG will work with the states in the months ahead to hear how their programs are being interpreted in respect to the Tiers. The NM EP suggests this be done in a subcommittee.