

# Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2017

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

## AgWG Conference Call Summary

Meeting materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24788/>

---

### Actions & Decisions:

ACTION: Staff will distribute information pertaining to the CBFN survey to the AgWG.

---

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

Workgroup Chairs

- Minutes from the March 16<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved.

### Chesapeake Bay Funders Network (CBFN) Technical Assistance Survey

Kristen Saacke-Blunk

Kristen Saacke-Blunk [provided an overview](#) of a new online survey that the CBFN is preparing to launch. The target audience includes all sectors that provide technical assistance, namely state and federal agencies, soil and water conservation districts, private sector providers, and non-governmental organizations providing technical assistance. The online survey being prepared seeks to look at the capacity across ALL providers who are currently working with producers towards addressing agriculture's CBP TMDL goals.

#### *Discussion:*

- Alisha Mulkey: Are you interested in feedback from other soil and conservation districts?
  - Kristen Saacke Blunk: We're looking for a response from each district, and our best opportunity for getting responses is to have people in the AgWG reach out to their partners.

ACTION: Staff will distribute information pertaining to the CBFN survey, as well as a link to the survey, to the AgWG.

### Partnership Review of Phase 6 Model

Mark Dubin

Mark Dubin, UMD, briefed the workgroup on recent revisions to the [Partnership-wide review](#) of the Phase 6 modeling tools by the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT). The review will now include a Phase 6 Model input data review to occur in conjunction with the previously scheduled fatal flaw model review.

#### *Discussion:*

- Bill Angstadt: Because the land use is jurisdiction-specific, is it expected for the jurisdictions to review the data, or will that be the task of the entire AMS?
  - Mark Dubin: The AMS will be looking at the detailed elements of the model input review, but the jurisdictions are encouraged to review their individual inputs.
  - Bill Angstadt: There was discussion on the purpose of this review in the WQGIT. The modeling team requested a review at the state-basin scale, because outputs will be used to establish revised planning targets for WIP III and 2025 TMDL goals. This was

somewhat counter to the local target goals. So are we reviewing just from a state-basin standpoint, or can we dig deeper to review data for local planning target purposes?

- Mark Dubin: The Modeling Workgroup may be providing this information, but I would suggest we have a conversation with them and get clarification on the types of tools that will be available and the different scales that the review will take place on.
- Bill Angstadt: If we're going to be asked by EPA to establish sub-county planning targets, then we have a lot of work to do if we're going to review every LRSEG and determine if the acres are reasonable across LRSEGs. I also think AgWG can offer an opinion here – local governments would like to have planning targets at the MS4 level, but for agriculture to drill down to local government scales, our data isn't accurate enough to do that. So we could make the recommendation that agricultural targets don't go below a certain spatial scale.
- Mark Dubin and Ed Kee recommended the workgroup revisit this discussion during their May conference call, once additional information is available.

### AMS Update

Curt Dell, Mark Dubin

Curt Dell, USDA, and Mark Dubin, UMD, [updated the workgroup](#) on the work of the Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee and the status of their review of Phase 6 Model.

#### *Discussion:*

- Frank Schneider: If one state's using NASS data, and another state is using a different form of data, would that not skew the data? Shouldn't all of the input data be from the same source?
  - Curt Dell: Our thought with the workgroup is that if you can find better data, then we should use it. Everyone has some concerns with NASS data, but it's what's available everywhere. So if any state has better data, we would encourage them to use it.
- Frank Schneider: Regarding VA's proposal, I'm not sure how permit numbers could be used – I doubt there's a sheep or beef CAFO, so I would caution against using permit numbers, as well as industry inputs to some degree.
  - Curt Dell: The idea with industry data was to collaborate with them, and we've seen that work quite well with the poultry industry.
  - Mark Dubin: The NASS information will be our default source, but in this case we made the decision to start using annual NASS information as opposed to just the 5-year ag census. Regarding the two proposals, VA is proposing something that would only apply to VA. The proposal for the industry data would look across all 6 states more holistically.
- Jim Cropper: The NASS data is another place where it would be good to tweak the numbers – by contacting the local county to discern pasture dairy cows. This would help us understand manure spread, and would provide more information than NASS.
- Bill Angstadt: There is still an issue of BMP sequencing – BMP percentages are reduced in a certain sequence by EOF. Because nutrient management and tillage weren't in Phase 5.3.2, we need to decide how those practices fit into the sequence. This is important in terms of cost-effectiveness of BMPs and funding priorities.
  - Curt Dell: I believe that's more of an issue that's under the purview of the modeling committee – where the application of the BMPs takes place.
- Jill Whitcomb: A few weeks ago, it was discussed at the LUWG how to square the mapped agriculture census data with the mapped land use data. However, this doesn't consider the animal data, so I think we need to consider if we're going to have more accurate inputs on the land use side, then perhaps NASS isn't the most accurate for animal numbers. I'd be interested

to hear about VA's proposal, to see if there is a significant difference between what NASS is reporting and what the permit data provides.

- Ed Kee requested that VA's proposal for animal data be circulated to the AgWG. Mark replied that it would be posted in advance of the next meeting.

#### **Update on Phase 6 No Action and E3 Scenarios**

Jeff Sweeney, Mark Dubin

Mark Dubin, UMD, and Jeff Sweeney, EPA, briefed the AgWG on the current draft version of the Phase 6 No Action and E-3 scenarios, and discuss the proposed process and timeline for developing final No Action and E-3 scenarios for agriculture.

##### *Discussion:*

- Mark Dubin proposed convening the jurisdictional representatives to review the current draft E3 and No Action scenarios, and reach consensus on any revisions that are necessary. The revised version would then be presented to the AgWG for full review and approval in May, for final WQGIT approval in late May/early June.
- Robin Pellicano: Is Mark asking for volunteers for this committee?
  - Mark Dubin: I typically ask the states nominate their representatives to serve on this ad hoc group.

#### **Future Meeting Planning**

- AgWG staff proposed rescheduling the June quarterly meeting to June 28-29, to be held at the Wye Research and Education Center in Queenstown MD. No objections were raised.

**Next meeting: Thursday, May 18<sup>th</sup> 10:00 – 12:00 Conference Call**

#### **Participants:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Ed Kee	Delaware Retired
Lindsay Thompson	DE-MD Agribusiness Assoc.
Mark Dubin	UMD
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Clint Gill	DDA
Robin Pellicano	MDE
Adam Lyon	MDA
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Frank Schneider	PASCC
Jill Whitcomb	PA DEP
Bobby Long	VA DCR
Joel Blanco	EPA
Bill Angstadt	Angstadt Consulting
Marilyn Hershey	Ar Joy Farms LLC
Paul Bredwell	US Poultry and Egg Assoc.
Tim Garcia	USDA
Jeff Hill	Lancaster County Conservation District
Kristen Saacke Blunk	Headwaters LLC

Ron Ohrel	ADANE
Ken Staver	UMD
Elaine Hinrichs	STAF
Jim Cropper	Northeast Pasture Consortium
Joe Montenegro	PA Farm Bureau

DRAFT