

Recap

Zach Easton, VT

8/8/2025

Disclaimer

We must respect each other

Shared goals

Technical expertise of the facts

July 2025

Inorganic Fertilizer

Land Use Loading Rate Ratios

Animal BMP Excess

Votes as of 8/6/25

- We should utilize state specific farm only fertilizer stocks that are smoothed across time.

| Role | Name | Affiliation | Vote | Notes |
|-----------|------------------|-------------|------|--|
| Signatory | Clint Gill | DE | 4 | I agree with Alisha's point about putting limits on the amount of fertilizer that can be placed on acres with Nutrient Management Planning, and the point about smoothing. |
| | Alisha Mulkey | MD | 4 | 1. MDA would recommend excluding expenditures from any smoothing methods. The phrasing and intent of that Census question have never been well suited for assuming application rates. 2. MDA wants to ensure P7 methods for fertilizer application have a ceiling where crop N need cannot be exceeded for acres under NMP. Increasing compliance with NM is an important state BMP management tool and should be reflected in application rates. We look forward to discussion here. 3. Currently, MDA does not anticipate having access to fertilizer sales data after 2021. We are working to resolve that issue internally, but in the interim the AMT should discuss methods/options to project fertilizer sales for state buckets. |
| | Cassie Davis | NY | 4 | Understanding that we would use other states trends in fertilizer since NY has not reported recently. |
| | Scott Heidel | PA | 4 | |
| | Tim Larson | VA | 4 | |
| | Dave Montali | WV | 5 | |
| | Bo Williams | EPA | 3 | |
| | Ken Staver | UMD | 4 | |
| At-Large | Tamie Veith | USDA-ARS | 5 | |
| | Candiss Williams | USDA-NRCS | 5 | |
| | Alex Soroka | USGS | 4 | |
| | Zach Easton | VT | 5 | |

We should adopt the following Land Use Loading Rate Ratios:

Managed Pasture (High Application) = 1.52

Managed Hay (High Application) = 1.56

Votes as of 8/6/25

| Role | Name | Affiliation | Vote | Notes |
|-----------|----------------|-------------|------|--|
| Signatory | Clint Gill | DE | 3 | |
| | Alisha Mulkey | MD | | No response do date |
| | Cassie Davis | NY | 4 | I agree with Tamie on the name clarification of pasture/other hay low and pasture/other hay high. |
| | | | | we believe that the proposed loading rates are too low and should be more in line with crops that receive manure. Mass balance would indicate that regular applications of manure throughout the year on managed hay/pasture would require a higher loading rate especially considering crops only receive manure periodically, yet they load at nearly three times the proposed loading rates for these new land use types. |
| | Scott Heidel | PA | 1 | |
| | Tim Larson | VA | 5 | |
| | Dave Montali | WV | 4 | |
| | Bo Williams | EPA | 3 | |
| At-Large | Ken Staver | UMD | 3 | there is a concern that this might end up increasing loads |
| | | | | One concern noted by the USDA groups (ARS and NRCS) is in the terminology of "pasture" versus "managed pasture". It seems that, as a land use type, "managed pasture" is actually nutrient amended, fertilized, or treated pasture. Perhaps terminologies of "low fertility pasture" and "high fertility pasture" or something similar would better capture the distinction. |
| | Tamie Veith | USDA-ARS | 2 | |
| | Lisa Duriancik | USDA-NRCS | 2 | NRCS, need more time for consultation |
| | Alex Soroka | USGS | 3 | |
| | Zach Easton | VT | 4 | |

Animal BMP Excess

- Animal Waste Management Systems
 - 7/24/25 meeting
- Mortality Disposal
 - 7/24/25 meeting
- Exclusion Fencing
 - Will need more discussion today

Questions?