

*\*This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes\**



**Chesapeake Bay Program**

**Chesapeake Bay Program  
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)**

**Webex Chat Summary\***

Thursday, July 1, 2021

10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Calendar Page: [Link](#)

*\*Chat messages were edited to provide clarity and correct grammatical errors. Messages that were irrelevant to preserving the questions and discussion below were removed (ex. reminding people to mute phones, letting participants know of call interference, etc.). There may be overlap between the chat and the WTWG Meeting Minutes. Refer the WTWG July 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting Minutes for more details and any Action and Decisions.*

### **Webex Chat Summary**

from ??, WV DEP 10:31 AM

so "layer" in this case means "chickens," not a GIS file? haha

Loretta Collins, UMD 10:32 AM

good one!

James Martin, VA DEQ 10:33 AM

eggcellent!

James Martin, VA DEQ 10:35 AM

Are those all in AU?

Gregorio Sandi, MDE 10:35 AM

Don't they burn the manure from this facility anyway? Isn't that the manure to energy project for PA?

James Martin, VA DEQ 10:37 AM

I think so Greg. But I am not sure when that was implemented.

Loretta Collins, UMD 10:37 AM

When the energy facility is operational- that is a major fate for the manure. Not sure if the facility is operating at the moment.

Gregorio Sandi, MDE 10:39 AM

Gotcha...

Loretta Collins, UMD 10:45 AM

Ag Census "D" counties clarification. Animal counts for "d" counties are included in state total, rather than county to protect privacy of respondents. If the operation does NOT report to the Ag Census, having the animal counts at the county or the state-level is a challenge.

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting 10:46 AM

*\*This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes\**

The Hillandale Corporation has stated that they do not comply with reporting to the Ag Census. So, the data in that county are not "D" to protect Hillandale.

James Martin, V ADEQ 10:49 AM

Is Hillendale in the statewide layer number in either NASS or Ag Census?

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting 10:50 AM

NASS cannot comment on any one facility without violating confidentiality. However, they suggested that the annual survey was the best count of animals. The 5-yr Census was the best count of producers/farmers.

Loretta Collins, UMD 10:51 AM

@James, for 5-year Ag Census the numbers tell the story and the answer appears to be "no", but NASS can't comment on specifics- per Olivia's comments.

Gregorio Sandi, MDE 10:55 AM

In my past experience with Ag Census is that animal numbers are inflated or deflated dependent on what funding was available to or regulations that affect growers. NASS was much more reliable on head counts. I thought MD broiler counts/projections were readjusted based on a combined NASS/census scenario. Could we do that for this as well?

Bill Keeling, VA DEQ 10:57 AM

Are these 2 counties in the Susquehanna, Potomac, or both basins?

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting 10:58 AM

@Greg, that is what NASS suggested. I spoke with Travis Averill at NASS. He is the Livestock Branch Chief.

@Bill, these two counties are in Susquehanna, PA. The inclusion will affect the entire Chesapeake Bay Watershed because of how fertilizer is distributed. It is not just a PA issue.

Bill Keeling, VA DEQ 10:58 AM

What is the disposition of the manure from these facilities?

Gregorio Sandi, MDE 10:59 AM

So we're talking about a redistribution of chemical fertilizer? at what scale?

Norm Goulet, NRVA 11:01 AM

Fair distance in or out of watershed?

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting 11:01 AM

The inorganic fertilizer is from a watershed wide "bucket" and will be redistributed based on manure.

Dave Montali, Tetra Tech 11:05 AM

Why are we doing this in P6? Seems to me we've been wrong but wrong for such a long time, that it should be a P7 issue

Jessica Rigelman, J7 Inc. 11:10 AM

*\*This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes\**

@Greg, you are correct, it will change the distribution of the watershed wide fertilizer bucket. and therefore affects all states. We will not know what the effect is until we can get the data and plug it in. And we don't know how big the effect will be but this is a lot of nutrients.

Sarah Lane, UMCES 11:10 AM

Will this impact the Conowingo WIP? If so, when is the time to inform that effort?

James Martin, VA DEQ 11:15 AM

@Sarah - I think the Conowingo WIP only addresses the change in loads resulting from the infill of the reservoir. So I don't think this has any effect on the Conowingo target reductions, so no impact to WIP. Though I suspect if Hillandale as added in, it may be an opportunity to make some of the reductions.

f Dave Montali, Tetra Tech 11:15 AM

Since our deadline for C21 is September 1, and this is so complex, maybe the compromise is punt to C23?

Sarah Lane, UMCES 11:17 AM

Thanks, James. So the potential impact to the Conowingo bolsters Jeff's idea to at least discuss local data incorporation so we have a process if we punt to phase 7

Loretta Collins, UMD 11:30 AM

The Ag Census numbers do not indicate that Hillandale is included, per Vanessa's slides.

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting 11:31 AM

Loretta, I understand that from Vanessa's slide, but Patrick Thompson said otherwise and he works very closely with Mark and Hillandale. I'm confused at this point.

Gregorio Sandi 11:38 AM

This is like dropping a boulder in a small pond....it's not a small issue.

Dave Montali, Tetra Tech 11:41 AM

echo

Ted Tesler, PA DEP 11:57 AM

2% in pa (referencing septic connections)