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Meeting materials: link

**Actions & Decisions:**

**DECISION:** The AgWG approved the EPEG’s initial recommendation for enabling the group to focus on the development of a report specifically for agricultural stormwater management practices associated with agricultural livestock production areas. The AgWG agreed to separately convene an EPEG for nursery capture and reuse management practices associated with nursery production acres.

**DECISION:** The AgWG approved the CBPO recommended interim BMP definitions and effectiveness values for agricultural stormwater practices for future planning purposes only.

**ACTION:** The AgWG will work to develop an interim BMP reporting mechanism for tracking nursery capture and reuse practices in Phase 6.

**ACTION:** AgWG members should submit comments on the BMP verification standards for producer surveys draft report to Mark Dubin (mdubin@chesapeakebay.net) by the end of October.

**DECISION:** The AgWG approved a proposal to temporarily place the AMS on hiatus, but retain a placeholder structure for the subcommittee for reactivation by the Workgroup for future Phase 6 model updates.

**Welcome, introductions, roll-call, review meeting minutes**

- Meeting minutes from the August 17th Face-to-Face Meeting and Aug 24th Conference Calls were approved.

**EPEG Update**

Tom Schueler, Chesapeake Stormwater Network, updated the Workgroup on the progress of the Agricultural Stormwater and Nursery Capture and Reuse Expert Panel Establishment Group (EPEG), established at the August 17 Face-to-Face Meeting. Decisions below are requested based on recommendations of the EPEG members.

**Discussion:**

- Frank Schneider made a motion to create separate EPEGs for agricultural stormwater and nursery capture and reuse practices. Frank Coale seconded.
- Jason Keppeler: So a separate EPEG will be formed for nursery practices?
  - Ed Kee: Correct.
- Tom Schueler: Sarah White from Clemson University has done some extensive research on nursery runoff, and served briefly on the Floating Treatment Wetlands panel. I would recommend you contact her.
• Frank Coale suggested Andrew Ristvey from UMD Extension and John Lea Cox from UMD College Park.
• Ed Kee suggested Dr. Amy Shober.
• Barry Frantz: Who is the contact for the Ag Stormwater BMP?
  o Loretta Collins: Feel free to contact either myself or Tom Scheuler.

DECISION: The AgWG approved the EPEG’s initial recommendation for enabling the group to focus on the development of a report specifically for agricultural stormwater management practices associated with agricultural livestock production areas. The AgWG agreed to separately convene an EPEG for nursery capture and reuse management practices associated with nursery production acreages.

Interim BMP Approval

Following a request from a signatory member, the representation of agricultural stormwater practices as interim BMPs for the purpose of Phase III WIP development were brought to the Workgroup for consideration. The CBPO recommended interim BMP definitions and effectiveness values utilize the already approved efficiencies from the Urban Stormwater Workgroup’s Stormwater BMP Panel report.

Discussion:
• Jill Whitcomb: I think it’s a good idea to post the actual expert panel report for performance standards. I also think BMP treatment categories fall under the stormwater treatment practices; so I think we talked about whether it’s RR or ST – I think this would be the ST curve.
• Greg Albrecht: Would this cover the NRCS 63S vegetated treatment practices?
  o Mark Dubin: This would be an umbrella practice that would incorporate multiple types of BMPs.
• Chris Brosch: Measurement names submitted – are those all required? I don’t think we collect things such as acres or feet.
  o Mark Dubin: These are recommendations that came out of the CBP office. NEIEN typically provides multiple attributes, and one thing we looked at was reporting types of livestock. I believe that total acres are now being reported into NEIEN.
• Jill Whitcomb: Stormwater practices constructed as a post-construction parameter have engineering parameters as acre-feet. Would we not have to report that engineering parameter of acre-feet?
  o Mark Dubin: I believe it would just be treated as acres.
  o Chris Brosch: Are we supposed to report to design specifications?
  o Jill Whitcomb: Whatever the standard is for your requirements is what you should report – for us, it’s construction-oriented.
• Chris Brosch: I need the flexibility to be able to report both types of data here.
• Jim Cropper: Are we talking about design capacity of the practice when we talk about runoff capture? I could see a lot of this not being captured that much.
• Tom Scheuler: Each practice has a stormwater treatment volume that the practice is supposed to do. So it should be applicable to all of the ag stormwater BMPs out there.
• Jason Keppler: Will we have the ability to track Nursey Capture and Reuse practices as interim BMPs?
• Barry Frantz: I agree with the other comments on reporting. With our NRCS system, we report units of the practice applied – such as acres treated.
• Tim Sexton motioned to approve the interim BMP. Chris Brosch seconded.
• Chris Brosch: There was an interim nursery capture and reuse practice in Phase 5; should the group consider adopting that again?
  o Tim Sexton noted that the values in that interim BMP were likely too high.
• Jill Whitcomb: What’s the status of the mortality management EPEG?
  o Loretta Collins: We’ve got a list of potential members to serve on this EPEG, but have not formally convened the group. We had a mild delay, but will be providing a more complete update to the AgWG during the October meeting.

DECISION: The AgWG approved the CBPO recommended interim BMP definitions and effectiveness values for agricultural stormwater practices for future planning purposes only.

ACTION: The AgWG will work to develop an interim BMP reporting mechanism for tracking nursery capture and reuse practices in Phase 6.

Land Use Workgroup Update
Peter Claggett in absentia
Peter Claggett, USGS presented a briefing on 2025 growth projections and an update on the resolution to a turf grass classification error on the September 11th Water Quality GIT Conference Call. Mechanisms used previously to identify land use acreage resulted in over-classification of turf grass in some areas that are actually pasture, crop-land or mixed-open. He is not able to present at today’s meeting due to a concurrent meeting of the Land Use Workgroup. A recording of his September 11th presentation is available directly here, and supporting materials are available online here.

BMP Expert Panel Updates
T. Sexton, R. Bryant
Chairs and coordinators of on-going AgWG BMP Expert Panels provided updates on their work: Tim Sexton, VA DCR, provided an update on the Cropland Irrigation Panel and Ray Bryant, ARS, will provide an update on the Agricultural Ditch Management Panel.

Discussion:
• Agricultural Ditch Panel: Ray Bryant volunteered to serve as chair, and the panel will continue meeting to discuss their recommendations.
• Cropland Irrigation Panel: The panel plans to invite Wade Thomason to present research on corn performance on irrigated sites versus non-irrigated sites, but has not met since their previous meeting. They will likely schedule another meeting for early October.

BMP Verification Standards
Mark Dubin
Mark Dubin, UMD, presented an update regarding the full development of the alternate BMP verification evaluation standards for producer surveys. The initial report from Tetra Tech was presented to the Workgroup earlier this year on developing an approach to creating evaluation standards for producer survey methods of BMP verification. The draft recommendation report is scheduled to be provided to the AgWG for review and approval by early 2018. This is in response to CBP partnership’s interest in developing and implementing alternative approaches for the verification of agricultural BMPs, and seeking CBP partnership approval of those alternative methods for use in the CBP Phase 6 modeling tools.
Discussion:

- Jill Whitcomb asked if the survey would be identifying standards for specific BMPs, or whether it would be more generalized. Mark Dubin replied that there will be different uncertainty factors on different BMPs.
- Jill Whitcomb noted a disconnect between the statistical confidence standards report and the results from the soil P dataset extrapolation. She added that the request had been made in previous AgWG meetings for PA’s existing programs to be grandfathered into new statistical standards, and reiterated the request with regard to the current report.
- Matt Monroe asked how existing programs and reporting would fit in with this report. Mark Dubin replied that, similar to previous statistical confidence standards reports, jurisdictions would have the option of presenting their verification methods to the AgWG, to determine if they align with already-adopted standards.

AMS Status Update

Mark Dubin, UMD, led a discussion on the future of the Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee following a tabled request to sunset the subcommittee during the August 24th Conference Call.

Discussion:

- Curt and Mark thanked the members of the AMS who have participated over the last years, and asked the AgWG to consider placing the group on hiatus.
- Frank Coale made a motion to put the AMS on hiatus until it needs to be reconvened. Tim Sexton seconded.

DECISION: The AgWG approved a proposal to temporarily place the AMS on hiatus, but retain a placeholder structure for the subcommittee for reactivation by the Workgroup for future Phase 6 model updates.

Phase 6 Review Update

Loretta Collins reviewed the status of the Phase 6 model review comments, and what changes were implemented by the WQGIT based on the Agriculture Workgroup recommendations.

Discussion:

- Alisha Mulkey: I’ve asked the modeling team to present to us everyone’s revised soil P data, so we can all see where we are relative to one another. They haven’t committed a specific time, but I would still like to see that information.
- Ed Kee asked about the CBP timeline for developing WIP planning targets. Alisha Mulkey replied that a deadline of October 30th had been communicated for release of the draft Phase III WIP planning targets, after which the Partnership would have four months to review and finalize the draft targets.

Phase 6 Scenarios

The Phase 6 model scenarios will be presented during the September Water Quality GIT Face-to-Face Meeting on September 25-26. For those AgWG members that would like to learn more, they are invited to participate in the WQGIT remotely. Information is available online here.

Meeting planning and housekeeping
• The October meeting will be a conference call. Topics include the animal mortality management EPEG, nursery capture and reuse interim BMP and EPEG, potential swine and turkey producer data, and potentially revisiting the Tetra Tech survey evaluations report.

• Proposed topics for the November face-to-face include a debrief on the Phase 6 model by Gary Shenk, follow-up discussions on how to handle existing producer survey verification methods in relation to the new Tetra Tech report.

• Ed Kee proposed cancelling the December meeting. No concerns were raised.

• Ed Kee noted that he will not be seeking a second term to serve as AgWG chair.

Review of Action and Decision Items
Lindsey Gordon
Lindsey reviewed the action and decision items from the meeting.

Next meeting: October 19th Conference Call
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