

Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

March 18th-19th Meeting Summary

Gettysburg, PA

Meeting materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/S=0/calendar/event/22429/>

ACTIONS & DECISIONS

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members recommended that the Poultry Litter report be moved forward to the WQGIT. Communication will emphasize that the poultry litter data is just one piece of the larger Scenario Builder, which will be reviewed by the full Partnership between October 2015 and October 2016.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the AMS' Phase 6.0 land use classification, with agreement that the relative land use loading rates will still need to be finalized.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the manure spread concept presented by the AMS. AMS will continue to test and refine the approach in the coming weeks.

ACTION: CSN is soliciting feedback from the sector workgroups on the technical approach for the toxics project and to identify any specific research or monitoring studies that could support the project. Comments and resources are requested to be sent to watershedguy@hotmail.com no later than Friday, March 27. Emma will provide Tom with the recommendations offered during the meeting and recorded in the meeting summary.

ACTION: The land use loading review group will present their preliminary recommendations to the AMS in late March, and the AgWG in early April.

ACTION: Agriculture Workgroup members are asked to provide comments on the WQGIT BMP protocol to Lucinda (power.lucinda@epa.gov) by April 30th.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the panel charge to the Phase 6.0 Nutrient Management Expert Panel with the minor edits suggested during the meeting.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the panel charge to the Phase 6.0 Manure Injection/Incorporation Expert Panel with the minor edits suggested during the meeting.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the panel charge to the Phase 6.0 Conservation Tillage Expert Panel with the minor edits suggested during the meeting.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the panel charge to the Phase 6.0 Cover Crop Expert Panel with the minor edits suggested during the meeting.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the Animal Waste Management Systems and Poultry Pads panel charge as presented.

ACTION: AgWG members will provide contact information for relevant programmatic contacts (for large scale livestock manure treatment systems) to Jeremy (jchanson@vt.edu; 410-267-5753) by end of the

month (Friday, 3/27). Other input or suggestions also welcome during that time. Jeremy will work directly with those contacts to gather necessary information or details pertaining to these large scale treatment systems. Jeremy will work with expert panel based on what he finds.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the following individuals to serve as chairs of Phase 6.0 expert panels: Curt Dell (manure injection and incorporation), Ken Staver (Cover crops), Wade Thomason (Conservation Tillage) and Frank Coale (nutrient management).

ACTION: Agriculture Workgroup members will submit nominations for panel members for the Phase 6.0 cover crops, conservation tillage, manure injection/incorporation, and nutrient management Expert Panels. Nominees are due to egiese@chesapeakebay.net by COB April 3rd.

ACTION: The proposed charge and membership for each Expert Panel will be shared with the full Partnership for full review and comment. Final panel membership will be approved by the Workgroup prior to launching the Phase 6.0 Expert Panels in April and May.

ACTION: The BMP Credit Duration subgroup will have another call before the end of the month to resolve the highlighted sections of the spreadsheet. Resource Improvement BMPs will be added to the spreadsheet with durations already defined by the technical panel. Agriculture Workgroup approval of the final credit durations will be requested over email by Mar 31.

ACTION: The Agriculture Workgroup will request the Modeling Workgroup to specifically set up within the airshed model a component for near atmospheric deposition from agriculture.

Participants

Kristen Saacke Blunk (Co-Chair)	Headwaters LLC
John Rhoderick (Co-Chair)	Maryland Department of Agriculture
Mark Dubin (Coordinator)	UMD
Lauren Torres	Delaware Department of Agriculture
Larry Towle	DDA
Rachel Rhodes	Maryland Department of Agriculture
Jason Keppler	Maryland Department of Agriculture
Alisha Mulkey	Maryland Department of Agriculture
Greg Albrecht	New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets
Steve Taglang	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Kristen Wolf	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Tom Juengst	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Tim Sexton	Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
Bill Keeling	Virginia DEQ
Chris Brosch	Virginia Tech/VADCR
Marel King	Chesapeake Bay Commission
Jack Frye	Chesapeake Bay Commission
Curtis Dell	USDA Agricultural Research Service
Jack Meisinger	USDA Agricultural Research Service
Glenn Carpenter	USDA NRCS
Emma Giese, Staff	Chesapeake Research Consortium
Kelly Shenk	U.S. EPA
Matt Johnston	UMD
Jeremy Hanson	Virginia Tech

Olivia Devereux
Kim Snell-Zarcone
Bill Angstadt
Dana York
Lindsay Dodd
Sally Szydlowski
LJ Ingram
Steve Dressing
Sally Claggett
Eric Sprague
Karl Blankenship
Greg Sandi
Christian Richter
Ron Ohrel
Susan Marquart
Tom Juengst
Tom Schueler
Olivia Devereux
Frank Coale
Tom Simpson
Ted Tesler
Kristen Hughes Evans

DEC
Conservation Pennsylvania
Delaware Maryland Agribusiness Association
Green Earth Connection
Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts
Water Stewardship
CHART, LLC
TetraTech
USFS
Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay
Bay Journal
MDE
US Poultry & Egg

NRCS
PADEP
CSN
DEC
UMD
Water Stewardship
PADEP
Sustainable Chesapeake

March 18th 10:00AM-4:30PM

Welcome, introductions, review meeting minutes

- Kristen Saacke Blunk, AgWG Co-Chair, introduced the draft minutes from the February 19th conference call for workgroup approval.
 - VA motion to approve, USDA second. There were no objections to the February minutes.

Poultry litter data

- On behalf of both the Poultry Litter Subcommittee and the Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee, John Rhoderick, Matt Johnston and Curt Dell presented the final [Poultry Litter Subcommittee report](#) for Agriculture Workgroup approval.
- How are the practices that reduce storage loss and volatilization incorporated?
 - The future Animal Waste Management Systems panel will make this recommendations.
- PADEP: When is the data needed the states?
 - Coordinator: There will be an initial calibration this fall, and a second calibration in fall 2016. The way this is set up, new data can be incorporated even after calibration.
- USDA-NRCS: Note that Noel Gollehon is working on publishing an update to the 2003 manure nutrients estimations (Kellogg report). Glenn and Noel will check in to the 15-20% recoverability factors to find out where they came from.
- John Rhoderick: the PLS and AMS would like to ask for the Agriculture Workgroup's approval of the Poultry Litter Report.
- DMAA: Note that this report is just one piece of the puzzle, the other animal types will need to be reviewed. Also need to consider the other pieces of the mass balance. Will the AgWG be reviewing each piece individually, or review everything together?

- Matt Johnston: AMS is bringing the AgWG the individual pieces for approval. Then AMS will write up the full documentation for scenario builder. Between October 2015 and October 2016, the Partnership will be reviewing the entire Scenario Builder documentation together.
- DMAA: Suggest that we not approve this report today, rather agree that this is an acceptable piece to approve as a full package later.
- US P&E: Because of the challenges with perception and barriers, we should advance the pieces forward as they come to us.
- Coordinator: We will still have opportunity to review all the pieces together.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk: Each piece needs to be understood before we can move them in to the full package. Part of the challenge is to find a better way to explain it. We should say that this is a portion of a much bigger picture. It is important for us to explain it as a small piece of the full recommendations as we move forward to the other Partnership groups. Is there consensus to move the Poultry Litter report to the WQGIT, with the communication that this one piece of the larger Scenario Builder, which will be reviewed by the full Partnership?
 - There were no objections.
- US P&E: Will we have the opportunity for further discussion about the state capacity to fill current gaps?
 - Yes.
- Mark Dubin provided an update on the poultry integrator survey pilot project.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members recommended that the Poultry Litter report be moved forward to the WQGIT. Communication will emphasize that the poultry litter data is just one piece of the larger Scenario Builder, which will be reviewed by the full Partnership between October 2015 and October 2016.

AMS land use recommendations and other updates

- Curt Dell and Matt Johnston presented the [AMS recommendations for Phase 6.0 agricultural land use classification](#).
 - Does Open Area land use include easement acres? Yes.
 - USGS not able to separate out impervious and previous farmstead. May need to work on another approach to include these separately.
 - Loading rate information will need to be mapped to land uses yet.
 - Will this potential loss of separate farmstead land uses impact the Stormwater EPEG? It should not.
 - Comment: Work moves accuracy forward, but is scale supported by the states on implementation tracking for historic and new reporting?
 - PA: Concern with scale of land use for BMP reporting.
 - MD: Ability to report at finer scale but can run out of opportunities to report if modeling capacity for a land-river segment does not allow for representation.
 - VA: Concern with ability of state to manage data at that finer scale from standpoint of data analysis capacity. Like concept and more accurate than current Phase 5 version.
 - NGO: Can geographic scale be left to states to determine, and would this work for comparing state to state data?
 - Johnston: Ag Census is still the scale baseline which can be distributed to the land-river segments. Would not recommend the states report from a finer scale

- as the specific land use might change from year to year: e.g. field of corn to soybeans for a grass buffer.
 - VA: Would consider a rotation land use for BMP reporting; e.g. corn/soy rotation.
 - VA: Sounds like interest for additional discussion between the AMS and the states on how to marry BMP reporting with the suggested new land uses. For reporting, SB already includes grouping of land uses for reporting. Will need to revise those groupings based on new land uses. Value of being specific at this level and work on reporting groupings separately.
 - MD: Support idea of land use grouping for reporting.
 - NGO: Pre-BMP land use condition and loading rates is critical of this discussion.
- Kristen asked for any objections to moving forward with the questions, with the understanding that the loading rates information could influence the final list.
 - PA: Generally agree with the groupings. Concern about the data to support them.
 - There were no objections.
- Curt presented a summary of recent AMS discussions and recommendations for workgroup feedback, including the AMS' proposed methods for calculating livestock nutrients and nutrient spread.
- Curt asked members to comment on the manure spread approach, is this a good way to spread nutrients in Scenario Builder?
 - Any objections to approving this concept presented by AMS?
 - Consider the application differences on irrigated and fertigated land.
 - Johnston: DE representatives provided two sets of application rates to the AMS: one for irrigated and for non-irrigated. Ultimately AMS decided against creating a separate irrigated land use.
- Curt presented proposed livestock manure estimation methods.
- Group discussed setting up a small group to look more closely at manure estimation methods.
- DMAA: Note importance of correcting manure transport.
 - Johnston: No data yet to tell us what manure transport is, other than what the states report.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the AMS' Phase 6.0 land use classification, with agreement that the relative land use loading rates will still need to be finalized.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the manure spread concept presented by the AMS. AMS will continue to test and refine the approach in the coming weeks.

Break for lunch

Toxics Project

- The Chesapeake Stormwater Network is undertaking a project for the Toxic Contaminants Workgroup summarizing potential benefits of nutrient and sediment practices to reduce toxic contaminants in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Tom Schueler presented a draft project workplan for Workgroup feedback. The broad purpose of the study is to look at the multiple benefits of nutrient sediment BMPs on reducing toxic contaminants. If any contaminants are missing, provide that feedback to Tom.

- John Rhoderick noted that AgWG could provide list of other BMPs that potentially have trapping capacity.
 - Schueler: Request comments on the scope of work by March 27. Data sources can be submitted later this spring
- Sally Claggett: Recommend including forest buffers under agriculture.
 - Saacke Blunk: Livestock exclusion should be included under agriculture for the same reason.
- Saacke Blunk: Note that some of the practices could increase rather than decrease toxic contaminants.
 - Schueler: Same concern on the urban side about trapping, and producing contaminated sediments.
- Susan Marquart will forward some NRCS practices specifically for removal.
- Dana York: CEAP study probably has references to BMPs to reduce atrazine.
- VA has integrated pest management BMP data, which has not been reported to the Bay Program.
 - VA will send Tom an example of this data.
- USGS survey in 1982 to congress, assessment on emerging contaminants could be another source.

ACTION: CSN is soliciting feedback from the sector workgroups on the technical approach for the toxics project and to identify any specific research or monitoring studies that could support the project. Comments and resources are requested to be sent to watershedguy@hotmail.com no later than Friday, March 27.

Phase 6.0 Land use loading rates

- Sally Szydlowski updated Workgroup members on the VT unpublished loading rates literature review. Sally will be meeting with the smaller loading rate group next week, and will complete the project on March 30th.
- Olivia Devereux updated Workgroup members on the TetraTech land use loading rate review and next steps.
 - The deadline for Modeling Workgroup review is April 22 at their quarterly meeting.
- Mark updated Workgroup members on the review and development of Phase 6.0 relative loading rate recommendations for agricultural land uses. A meeting with a review panel to look at the land use loading rates is scheduled for next week. Tom Jordan, SERC, will be chairing the meeting. The review group will look closely at each of the literature sources and make recommendations about how the literature should be used. Group will release preliminary recommendations following this meeting, and present those to the AMS in late March, and AgWG in early April. Agriculture Workgroup members will be asked to review and approve draft relative export rates for land use calibration at the April 16 conference call.
- DMAA: How to determine the baseline that is accurate for 1985?
 - Devereux: Many of the studies did include BMPs. Where there were BMPs, they were backed out based on current BMP values.
- How are other sectors addressing land use loading rates?
 - Other sectors have adopted loading rates based on TetraTech literature review.

ACTION: The land use loading review group will present their preliminary recommendations to the AMS in late March, and the AgWG in early April.

Riparian forest buffer task force

- Eric Sprague and Sally Claggett presented findings from their recently released report for workgroup discussion.
 - PA is having enrollments that are dropping off (reaching end of 10-15 year contracts). Has there been research on whether the buffer stays there after the contract runs out?
 - Sprague: PSU has some research showing that buffers do tend to stay after the contract runs out. ERS has been looking at similar research questions.
- Sally provided an update on the Forestry Workgroup's Riparian Buffer Management Strategy which is currently out for public comment.
 - There will be a webinar planned for May-June on verification guidance. Invitation to the webinar will be shared with the Ag Workgroup.
 - Are the efforts that are in place now enough to increase implementation by the order of magnitude that is needed, or is it time for a course correction?
 - Extra resources will help.

BMP Protocol revisions

- The Water Quality GIT will be revising the BMP protocol based on comments received over the past six months. A tracked changes version incorporating the comments was posted on Monday, March 16th. The WQGIT will be discussing the protocol changes at their conference call on 3/23, face-to-face meeting on 4/13, and conference call on 5/11.
- Rhoderick: How will the revisions affect panels that are already convened and in the process of developing recommendations?
 - Lucinda Power: We may recommend that the revisions take effect for the stage each panel is at. The intent was not to ask panels to go back and re-do earlier work.
- Rhoderick: How would these protocol revisions affect panel membership for the panels that are already convened?
 - Power: In terms of representation, we wouldn't be asking for panels to change their membership if that has already been set.
- Mark: The Ag Workgroup could recommend to the WQGIT that we grandfather the new panels under the former protocol.
 - Lucinda will add language to summarize how the protocol will apply to panels already convened.
- Saacke Blunk: Question whether expertise affiliated with a jurisdiction can or cannot be on expert panels. We are not building panels with full jurisdictional representation. However content expert who works for a jurisdiction is not currently excluded.
 - Power: The priority is on the content experts, and the intent is to allow flexibility.
 - Saacke Blunk: Likewise a content expert who works for an NGO would not be excluded?
 - Power. Intent was to only exclude conflicts of interest, which the Partnership review would determine on a case by case basis.
- Recommend AgWG look at the verification language in the protocol.
 - Coordinator clarified that the Phase 6.0 panel charges already include verification language.

ACTION: Agriculture Workgroup members are asked to provide comments on the BMP protocol to Lucinda (power.lucinda@epa.gov) by April 30th.

Nutrient Management 5.3.2 report

- Chris Brosch presented the current Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management Panel recommendations for workgroup feedback and in preparation for requesting AgWG approval in April. Panelists are collecting information on each component for each Tier. Tiers have been split into P and N. Panel will decide which land uses the benefits will apply to. Panel will develop a checklist for the data needed to assess the presence/absence of the level of nutrient management necessary to qualify for each Tier as guidance to the jurisdictions.
- Saacke Blunk: Recommend looking at Environmental Defense Fund (contact: Suzy Friedman) data on BMPs.
- Saacke Blunk: What is your best guess on when a report would be released?
 - Brosch: Once approved by the panel, would come to the AgWG. There should be a report for the panel to vote on by the end of April.
- DMAA: Will there be another opportunity for outreach once the report comes out? Recommend clearly communicating when the review periods will be, so that everyone thoroughly understands the timelines for review and approval.
 - Yes.
- Saacke Blunk: The first webinar on April 6th is scheduled ahead of the release of the report, intended to lay the groundwork for the report release. Not about interpreting the report itself yet. Recommend using the May AgWG to publically broadcast the findings of the report.
 - Coordinator: We could ask for decision at the AgWG face-to-face in June, and consider holding a joint meeting with the WTWG. WQGIT could be asked to approve the report in July.
- Saacke Blunk: The webinar and white paper will include some basic information on nutrient management to refer back to. White paper expected to be out ahead of the webinar.
- DMAA: Who are the presenters? Note that some researchers are less familiar with what farmers are doing.
 - Saacke Blunk: On the hook to present are Chris Brosch, Mark Dubin, Jason Keppler, Kristen Saacke Blunk, and John Rhoderick. We can certainly consider adding presenters to broaden the expertise. What is nutrient management is a piece of the topic, as well as what the current state programs are.
 - Recommend nutrient management planner representation.
 - Recommend discussing what the components of nutrient management are.
 - Brosch: The components of nutrient management will be in the report. It would be premature to report out on these April 6th.
 - DMAA: The bottom line message is that nutrient management is very complex.
 - Kristen will follow up with Bill Angstadt on the content of the webinar.
 - PA: Recommend breaking the webinar into smaller pieces, to give enough time to each message.
 - Kristen thanked everyone for their input. Noted that the workgroup recommends the webinar cannot be comprehensive, and we will need to break the issues into smaller pieces.
- Kristen updated Workgroup members on a recent discussion with the Citizen's Advisory Committee on agricultural nutrient management. Have clearly outlined with Rich Batiuk what the verification requirements for the 5.3.2 panel. There was also some confusion about why we have two panels, which as you all know is because of the different timelines and land uses. The perception of conflict of interest is still present among this committee. For this particular practice is just going to be way that people see it. It's difficult to remove the perception without

crippling the panel, so we want to keep the intact panel working. We should expect comments to this effect during the review process as well as verification, and the process for reporting out on the panel at the workgroup public meetings.

- NGO: What was the definition of verification?
 - Saacke Blunk: The Agriculture Workgroup has published guidance on agricultural verification. The deadline for states to build verification programs is by this year.
 - Coordinator: There will be 2 year phase in period.
- CBPO: Will states (other than MD) submit qualifying conditions?
 - Saacke Blunk: The current panel will provide a checklist of what a state could consider to determine what type of Nutrient Management practices are on the ground. The translation into state QAPPs is not being addressed by the panel.
- Some of these questions will be included with tomorrow's discussion of the Phase 6.0 panel.

Day 1 Adjourned

March 19th 8:30AM-3:00PM

Launch BMP Expert Panels

- Representatives from the Expert Panel Establishment Groups (EPEGs, formerly known as subgroups) presented the final draft panel charges for forming the future Phase 6.0 BMP Expert Panels.
- Jason Keppler presented the Nutrient Management Phase 6.0 expert panel charge.
- VA: suggest that language should read panel will "recommend" rather than "decide" or "consider".
 - Keppler: Agree with this language change.
- EPA: Is there an opportunity to talk about some of the verification and reporting implications of the panel recommendations? Can we have regular check-ins with the Agriculture Workgroup along the way with the Expert Panel?
 - Chairs: Public input session will occur at the beginning of the panel process.
 - Coordinator: There would also be regular discussions with the Agriculture Workgroup.
- Matt Johnston: Note that states will be submitting historic data before the panel recommendations are in place.
- Anticipate a Phase 6.0 Nutrient Management kickoff meeting in April.
- VA: Clarify that the provisional report will be the Partnership's opportunity for fatal flaw review.
- Saacke Blunk: Note concern with the public perception of trying to rush the recommendations by October.
- Will there be opportunity to change recommendations between April and October, particularly if the final versions are significantly different?
 - Johnston: If there are no recommendations in October, we will use the 5.3.2 information to calibrate the model. If the panel recommends 12 varieties of nutrient management, we may not have the data from the states.
 - Coordinator: If the panel finalizes their report and approves it through the partnership, their job is done at that point. If it is not finished, or hung up in the review process, that's where the April deadline comes in.

- DMAA: Is the “avoid” piece of nutrient management really a BMP at all? Scenario Builder revisions have improved data for nutrient accounting. Concern with going down a path that is unnecessary.
 - Johnston: The AMS is setting up a nutrient balance. If nutrient use efficiency is getting better, we should see that in the data. Agree that we will already be capturing application rate in the new Scenario Builder.
 - DMAA/MASCD: Concern with not moving ahead with nutrient management panel before we know how the nutrient mass balance will work out.
 - DMAA: In the way we’re redesigning Scenario Builder, there is no 5.3.2 fallback. There will be a number of variables which we’ll not be able to verify or get the science behind the recommendations by summer. Given limited resources of people and time, let’s focus most effort on getting the nutrient balance correct.
 - VA: Concern with not having a nutrient management BMP.
 - Chair: If we follow the guidelines in the charge we would have some beta recommendations in the fall.
- NGO: Is the April timeline realistic?
 - Coordinator: The modeling timeline has always been October 2015. However, as Kristen and others brought up, the timeline for recommendations is very unrealistic.
- DMAA: Recommend adding to the charge that baseline conditions in scenario builder could make this very small.
- Chair: Aside from timeline, are there additions or changes to the scope of work?
 - Coordinator: We will adjust the timeline to remove the October 1 initial deadline.
 - VA: How will states complete their historic data cleanup without knowing how the BMP will be represented?
 - Tried to build in extra time by completing panel recommendations in April rather than October 2016.
 - DMAA: Recommend developing a visual portrayal of how all the pieces fit together for Phase 6.0.
- VA: Clarify the redundancy in #3, and simply state “soil nutrient residuals”.
- CBC: The second bullet should include how the recommendations apply to nutrient spread and mass balance in Scenario Builder.
- Chair: Are there any objections to approving the charge to the Phase 6.0 expert panel?
 - VA motion to approve, PA second.
 - There were no objections.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the panel charge to the Phase 6.0 Nutrient Management Expert Panel with the following minor edits suggested during the meeting: 1) remove October 1 deadline from the timeline 2) clarify the redundancy in bullet #3 of the scope to just read “soil nutrient residuals”, and 3) include in bullet #2 how the recommendations apply to nutrient spread and mass balance in Scenario Builder.

- Mark Dubin (on behalf of Kristen Hughes Evans) presented the [Manure Injection / Incorporation](#) expert panel charge.
 - MDA noted importance of the atmospheric component of this BMP.
- Rhoderick: Would there be a calibration requirement for this BMP because it affects the airshed model?

- CBPO: AgWG should recommend to the modeling workgroup that local air and local deposition should be accounted for in the Phase 6.0 model.
- VA: States may have some data on manure incorporation implementation.
- Workgroup recommended adding potential for a provisional paper if panel determines there could be calibration implications.
- VA motion, MDA second to approve the manure injection expert panel charge.
 - There were no objections.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the panel charge to the Phase 6.0 Manure Injection/Incorporation Expert Panel with the minor edit suggested during the meeting: add potential for the panel to submit a provisional paper if the panel determines that the practice would affect calibration.

- Tim Sexton presented the [Conservation Tillage Phase 6.0](#) expert panel charge.
- VA: The original panel was looking at tillage as a land use change, and made HR Till in relation to that land use change. In Phase 6.0 the panel will need to establish what conservation tillage is in terms of a percent efficiency. Concern that some of the charge elements are limiting what the panel will look at.
- Questions around bullet #4 – does it include N, P and sediment? Yes. Does winter vegetation cover include cover crops that receive nutrients? Yes.
- VA: Change instances of “consider” to “if possible, recommend”.
- VA: Add to #1 “using existing CTIC and other relevant literature sources as a reference”.
- PA motion, VA second to approve the charge.
 - There were no objections.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the panel charge to the Phase 6.0 Conservation Tillage Expert Panel with the following minor edits suggested during the meeting: 1) change instances of “consider” to “if possible, recommend”, 2) add to #1 “using existing CTIC and other relevant literature sources as a reference”.

- Jack Meisinger presented the [Cover Crops Phase 6.0](#) expert panel charge.
- NRCS: Don’t see any comparisons with NRCS practice codes in this charge. Consider an NRCS member on the panel, and have panel consider NRCS practice codes and standards.
 - Coordinator: There will be an NRCS member on the actual panel.
 - Meisinger: We do try to use NRCS standards when applicable.
- PADEP: Would commodity cover crops include fall application of manure?
 - Meisinger: The panel would have considered this, however this is now covered under the conservation tillage panel.
- Meisinger: Appreciate Bill’s comments on heat units. This was included as an optional charge for the panel to consider.
- VA: Is there any priority given to the optional charges?
 - Meisinger: We’ll leave that up the panel. They may end up doing pieces of the optional charges in order to complete the required pieces.
 - VA: Moving to heat units would be a major change for state and federal programs.
 - NRCS planting dates based on frost date in PA.
- NGO: Would the heat units be on a county basis?
 - Meisinger: The Scenario Builder growth regions may be better than county.

- Meisinger: Strongly recommend panel chair report to the AgWG every other month or when major decisions are made.
 - VA: Note that if heat units are considered, recommend briefing the WTWG as this would affect tracking and reporting.
- Mark asked if Workgroup recommended adjusting the timeline to remove the October deadline.
- VA motion, MDA second to approve the panel charge.
 - PADEP: An approach that does not include nutrient applications on winter cover fails the northern states.
 - Meisinger: Would expect the two panels to communicate between each other, and with the AgWG.
 - Coordinator: Explicitly include in the charge the importance of collaboration between cover crops and conservation tillage panels.
 - Johnston: Clarify that harvested winter wheat acres are taken from the ag census and simulated in the model with cover fractions and uptake. All the nutrient benefits for cover over the winter are simulated.
 - There were no objections.
- PA noted concerns about the communication around calling commodity cover crops a cover crop.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the panel charge to the Phase 6.0 Cover Crop Expert Panel with the following minor edits suggested during the meeting: 1) remove the October deadline, 2) Explicitly include in the charge the importance of collaboration between the cover crops and conservation tillage expert panels.

Animal Waste Management Systems/Poultry Pads

- Mark Dubin presented the [final draft panel charge](#) developed by the Expert Panel Establishment Group
- VA motion, PA second to approve the panel charge.
 - There were no objections.
- Jeremy reviewed status of the Virginia Tech RFP to select a panel chair and next steps for forming the panel. Proposed panel membership and scope of work will be brought to the AgWG in late April/May for approval prior to panel launch.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the Animal Waste Management Systems and Poultry Pads panel charge as presented.

Manure Treatment Technologies Panel update

- Jeremy Hanson updated Workgroup members on recent panel meetings and discussions.
- Panel continues to collect literature sources and have begun analyzing data. Panel plans to meet face-to-face this summer to finalize their report.

ACTION: AgWG members will provide contact information for relevant programmatic contacts (for large scale livestock manure treatment systems) to Jeremy (jchanson@vt.edu; 410-267-5753) by end of the month (Friday, 3/27). Other input or suggestions also welcome during that time. Jeremy will work directly with those contacts to gather necessary information or details pertaining to these large scale treatment systems. Jeremy will work with expert panel based on what he finds.

Phase 6.0 Panel Chairs and Membership

- John and Kristen presented proposed panel chairs for each of the expert panels for workgroup consideration and comment.
- Nomination of panel members will be asked for from the AgWG within two weeks after announcement of the process.
- Will the new proposed protocol requirements be implemented? No, the existing protocol will be used until replaced by the new protocol.
- Will the new chairs be consulted in the forming of the panels? Yes!
- The proposed panel membership will be provided to the AgWG for recommendation as well as STAC and WQGIT.
- WTWG and CBPO are determining their non-voting panel members already and is that appropriate?
 - Yes, they have their own process for determining their representatives that is outside the AgWG decision process.
- The proposal was motioned and seconded, and no further discussion. Approved. Abstained by Frank Coale.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the following individuals to serve as chairs of Phase 6.0 expert panels: Curt Dell (manure injection and incorporation), Ken Staver (Cover crops), Wade Thomason (Conservation Tillage) and Frank Coale (nutrient management).

ACTION: Agriculture Workgroup members will submit nominations for panel members for the Phase 6.0 cover crops, conservation tillage, manure injection/incorporation, and nutrient management Expert Panels. Nominees are due to egiese@chesapeakebay.net by COB April 3rd.

ACTION: The proposed charge and membership for each Expert Panel will be shared with the full Partnership for full review and comment. Final panel membership will be approved by the Workgroup prior to launching the Phase 6.0 Expert Panels in April and May.

Brian Sneeringer from the Adams County Conservation District

- Brian provided his perspective as an agricultural tech. with the conservation district.
- Concerns with collecting data vs. implementation of BMPs for staff time.
- Perspective of being on the “front line” of a “conflict” on nutrients and sediment losses to the environment.
- Provided example of cover crops and the need for species, planting method, time of planting, etc. which is a lot of data to gather in a survey process.
- Largest change is the reduction in tillage and the use of cover crops in Adams County.
- Winter meeting of about 75 farmers who farm about 30K who also talk with other farmers.

Break for lunch

Update from Expert Panel Establishment Groups

- Mark Dubin gave an update on the cropland irrigation and agricultural stormwater and nursery Expert Panel Establishment Groups’ draft panel charges. The draft panel charges will be submitted to the Agriculture Workgroup in early April in preparation for selecting panelists and convening the expert panels in May.

BMP credit duration: subgroup recommendations

- Mark Dubin reported back on behalf of the Agriculture Workgroup's subgroup to revise BMP credit durations for the Phase 6.0 model on their recommendations. Workgroup members were asked to review and provide feedback on the recommendations. The subgroup will have another call before the end of the month to resolve the highlighted sections.
- The subgroup decided to have the same credit duration across all states.
- Does the Forestry Workgroup have assigned credit durations for forest buffers?
 - Dubin: Will need to consult with the Forestry Workgroup and make sure this list matches their verification guidance.
- MDA: Once the credit duration is expired, do they become RI BMPs or once they are recertified is the duration renewed?
 - Dubin: If recertified, the credit duration would be renewed.
- VA and MD have concerns about a 10 year lifespan with the conservation plan credit duration.
 - Dubin: These concerns will be vetted through the subgroup.
- This project has a Mar 31 deadline; AgWG approval will be requested over email.

ACTION: The BMP Credit Duration subgroup will have another call before the end of the month to resolve the highlighted sections of the spreadsheet. Resource Improvement BMPs will be added to the spreadsheet with durations already defined by the technical panel. Agriculture Workgroup approval of the final credit durations will be requested over email by Mar 31.

2015 AgWG Workplan

- Kristen and John opened a discussion of the upcoming priorities for 2015, and timeline of needed Workgroup actions and recommendations for the Phase 6.0 modeling tool development.
- Call to go out for nominees for four panels to close 4/3. At the 4/16 conference call panel chairs will present their recommended panel make-up. AgWG will see full slate of nominees from which Panel chair is making recommendations. Proposed panel membership to go out to WQGIT, sector workgroups and other GITs following 4/16. Convene panels May 2015. June 2015: open forums.
- Land use loading rate advisory team meets the week of Mar 23, and will provide preliminary recommendations to the AMS. AMS will provide land use loading rate recommendations to AgWG at April 16 meeting. Modeling Workgroup will approve by third week of April.
 - Johnston clarified that all of this is subject to review following the initial calibration in October 2015.
- Karl Blankenship will conduct key informant interviews with AgWG and others the week of 3/23 as he develops his communication piece. The first webinar briefing on nutrient management in will be on 4/6.
 - Consider splitting webinar in to different units.
- Print communications piece will be released in April. Panel will release report in April/May. Ag Workgroup receive report at its 5/15 conference call. In May, we will host a public webinar for briefing on report. May-June would be public review period.

Status Update on EPA's Assessments of State Animal Agriculture Programs

- Kelly Shenk gave a status update on the Animal Agriculture Program Assessments and reports that EPA is conducting in each Chesapeake Bay state.
- On Monday, EPA released the first three for New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

- Review covered CAFO, AFO, regulatory and non-regulatory programs. Looked at what kind of coverage the programs have, how the communications and data are managed. Worked closely with the state agencies, regional offices, and conservation districts. Conducted interviews with the headquarters, regional and conservation districts. Need for strong state programs critical to the restoration process.
- Once states have time to digest the reports, we will discuss them in more detail. DE, MD, and WV reports will be out this summer.
- The broader themes in these reports could be good topics for future AgWG meetings, especially with opportunities to go out in the field.
- Themes include programs that are working well, such as PA CAFOs, which is a very mature program, well implemented. Look at their program and find out what made it successful. Another example is the VA certainty program. In other cases, could discuss how states are dealing with the small dairies, which are sometimes falling through the cracks.
- One size does not fit all between states, but there could be idea sharing between workgroup members. Use the reports to keep doing what is working, and to continue strengthening their programs.
- Saacke Blunk: Is there a way the Ag Workgroup could (in addition to focusing on success stories) respond to the reports in a way that would be supportive to the states.
 - Dubin: One of the opportunities with moving around the Watershed with our quarterly meetings is to have discussions with program staff and producers in each state that could benefit other states.
- DMAA: There are already venues within states to talk about solutions, the Agriculture Workgroup doesn't need to add to the discussion.
- DMAA note that we haven't communicated back to everyone from the ag modeling workshop.
 - Dubin: We have had poultry follow ups. Need to branch out to swine and other areas next.
- Dave Kindig recently hosted the first annual nutrient management certification meeting, where Kelly and Mark updated the attendees on the expert panels and other projects.
- Recommend considering STAC workshop.

2015 Workplan continued

- John recommended convening a drainage ditch management EPEG
 - Dubin: This would be a lower priority than the EPEGs already convened, based on the Agriculture Workgroup's prioritization from last year.
- Build format for communicating how each of the component parts of the AgWG collective work fit together.
- Moving away from the technical panels to improved implementation within livestock landscapes or other aspects.
- Use quarterly meeting to highlight host state/location.
- Sunset the PLS in April.
- Provide better reporting back to stakeholders to show progress over time.

Synthesis of meeting

- Kristen and John reviewed discussions and decisions made over the 2 day meeting and follow up actions.

ACTION: The Agriculture Workgroup will request the Modeling Workgroup to specifically set up within the airshed model a component for near atmospheric deposition from agriculture.

Meeting adjourned

Next Meeting: April 16th conference call 10:00-12:00

DRAFT