

Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

October 15th

DRAFT Call Summary

Meeting materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/22598/>

ACTIONS AND DECISIONS:

ACTION: The AgWG will be sending out a call for nominations to fill the at-large and signatory membership positions. Nominees for at-large membership should identify which of the 5 categories they represent as identified in the AgWG governance protocol, and all nominees should provide information (CV, resume) detailing their background and relevant experience. The call for nominations will be posted to the AgWG website and distributed by email to the distribution list and known contacts within the jurisdictions.

ACTION: Comments or edits regarding the Nutrient Management Task Force timeline and drafted crosswalk template should be sent to Lindsey Gordon (Gordon.lindsey@epa.gov) and Mark Dubin (mdubin@chesapeakebay.net) by no later than noon on Friday, 10/16/15. Jurisdictions should direct questions on the template to the AgWG co-chairs: Kristen Saacke Blunk (kristen@headwaters-llc.org) and John Rhoderick (john.rhoderick@maryland.gov).

DECISION: The AgWG motioned to approve the proposed membership, scope and charge, and revised timeline that will be completed by the AWMS panel. Comments on the proposed membership are due to Jeremy Hanson by no later than 10/26/15. Should significant comments on proposed membership be submitted, Jeremy Hanson will request the AgWG to discuss the comments and approve the proposed membership again.

October 15th, 10:00 – 12:00 PM

- | | | |
|-------|---|------------------|
| 10:00 | Welcome, introductions, review meeting minutes
Chris Brosch and Tim Sexton moved to approve the meeting minutes. | Workgroup Chairs |
| 10:10 | Agriculture Workgroup Governance <ul style="list-style-type: none">Kristen Saacke Blunk provided an update on the decision of the WQGIT to approve the proposed workgroup governance.Kristen Saacke Blunk suggested modifying some of the language in the paragraph explaining the decision making process in order to clarify how consensus will be reached. | Workgroup Chairs |
| 10:30 | Review of Nomination Process for Membership | Workgroup Chairs |

- Mark Dubin explained the process for the call for nominations. The AgWG will be asking signatories to provide representatives for their jurisdictions, and will be issuing a broadcast nomination request to fill the at-large membership slots.
- John Rhoderick: How long is the nomination open for and when will the AgWG be presented with the nominees?
 - Dubin: Using the 10-day postdate rule, our next conference call is on 11/19, so we should have things in hand by early November. This gives us 2-3 weeks to have the nominations take place.
- Jenn Volk explained the confirmation process used by the WQGIT for at-large membership.
- Nominees for at-large membership should identify which of the 5 categories they represent as identified in the AgWG governance protocol.
- Kristen Saacke Blunk suggested casting a large net in the distribution lists to provide the opportunity for membership to a broad audience.

ACTION: The AgWG will be sending out a call for nominations to fill the at-large and signatory membership positions. Nominees for at-large membership should identify which of the 5 categories they represent as identified in the AgWG governance protocol, and all nominees should provide information (CV, resume) detailing their background and relevant experience. The call for nominations will be posted to the AgWG website and distributed by email to the distribution list and known contacts within the jurisdictions.

10:45 **Nutrient Management Task Force**

Workgroup Chairs/Jenn Volk

- Jenn Volk introduced the Nutrient Management Phase 5.3.2 Task Force Crosswalk Template.
- Kristen Saacke Blunk walked through the template and explained each section, and the information the Task Force hopes to gather from jurisdictions.
- Bill Angstadt: What definition do we intend when we use “compliance” and “fulfillment” interchangeably? I suggest we use the term fulfillment.
 - Kelly Shenk: You raise a good point. The task force had a similar discussion yesterday, because compliance means something different to everyone, so that’s why we tried to include a definition in the preamble. Maybe there’s a way to explain that better, since we’re not necessarily talking about state regulatory or federal regulatory compliance programs.
 - Angstadt: I think using compliance is the wrong form of communication if this is sent to the farmer.
 - Shenk: This form will only be sent to the state, not the farmers, and they will be looking at this document through a programmatic lens, not an individual farmer lens. So we want to check the methods they’re using to assess whether the acres reported are indeed meeting the requirements of a specific tier.
 - Saacke Blunk: I was unaware that I was avoiding the word compliance in my presentation. I do think we get hung up on what compliance means versus fulfillment, but I think they mean the same thing. The way it’s defined in the preamble makes it clear that what we’re looking for is just the compliance on meeting the definition of the tier.
 - Jenn Volk: The Management Board decision used the terminology “compliance information”, not necessarily “compliance rate”, but they did use the word compliance.

I'm comfortable with the way it's worded now, but if this will be a hot-button issue then we can work on the language there.

- Lindsay Thompson: I would like to hear from someone from PA, because the word compliance was an issue for them if I recall correctly. I agree with Kristen to a certain extent, but if it's going to be an issue then we should address it.
 - Steve Taglang: I have not reviewed this document yet, however, I'm not sure how it meshes with what we currently do under our Nutrient Mgmt. Program or what we plan to do with our Manure Mgmt. Programs. And both of those are regulatory programs of compliance. If we're going out to assess it, then we're looking at it in terms of compliance of our regulatory programs.
 - Tom Simpson: I kind of agree with Bill – the diversity in whether it's a regulatory program or not makes it confusing, and so before you read the charge I was wondering if you could use something like "implementation assurance".
 - Angstadt: I can live with the term "compliance". I think getting the information is the important issue here, but it is a word that will give some people nervousness in the agriculture community.
 - Mark Dubin: Remember that all of the signatories are on the Management Board, so all of them had the time to voice their concerns and opinions. So from that stand point, the jurisdictions have already taken place in that discussion.
 - Marel King: And to follow up, there was a lot of discussion on the issue of compliance and what it meant at the Management Board meeting. I'm hoping that having this definition will help. The Management Board meeting discussed what compliance meant and how it would be used. It's hard for me to comment on the discussion surrounding the QAPP process though.
 - John Rhoderick: Many states are in the process of updating their QAPP, but this component here is specific to the 5.3.2 model Nutrient Management, which is for the year 2015, 2016, and 2017. So prior to the full 2018 implementation date, this is a component that fits under the current series.
 - Dubin: We're just looking at the small July 1st 2014 – June 30th, 2015 time period. So we'll be able to work with the data that is available to the jurisdictions. The Task Force wanted to make sure as jurisdictions move forward, that they have an opportunity to revise this template and add more information to it. The crosswalk will basically be a survey for that one-year period in time.
 - Thompson: So it seems like the jurisdictions have approved this language, and the Management Board wanted this language, so maybe we can go ahead and live with the use of this word "compliance" and move forward so we can get this information in for 5.3.2.
- Mark Dubin and Jenn Volk reviewed the proposed timeline for deliverables and accomplishments for the Task Force.

ACTION: Comments or edits regarding the Nutrient Management Task Force timeline and drafted crosswalk template should be sent to Lindsey Gordon (Gordon.lindsey@epa.gov) by no later than noon on Friday, 10/16/15. Jurisdictions should direct questions on the template to the AgWG co-chairs: Kristen Saacke Blunk (kristen@headwaters-llc.org) and John Rhoderick (john.rhoderick@maryland.gov).

- Bill Angstadt requested having a discussion at the December AgWG meeting about how the EPA would use an alternate approach for using data if the states are not able to provide information in the crosswalk template.

- Saacke Blunk: Is there an action that the AgWG would be expected to take during its November meeting?
 - Dubin: I think the action would be to discuss whether the Task Force has collected the appropriate information and achieved its goal, and if it's ready to be recommended to the WQGIT for their review.

11:40 AWMS BMP Panel Update

Jeremy Hanson

- Jeremy Hanson reviewed the revised proposed roster for the panel membership.
- John Rhoderick proposed a motion to approve the membership during the meeting.
- Bill Angstadt expressed concern that the panel membership did not have enough representation from the states practitioners or engineers.
 - Mark Dubin reminded the group that expert panels have the option to bring in outside consults, should they need their expertise, and that some of the panel members have experience as engineers.

DECISION: The AgWG motioned to approve the proposed membership, scope and charge, and revised timeline that will be completed by the AWMS panel. Comments on the proposed membership are due to Jeremy Hanson by no later than 10/26/15. Should significant comments on proposed membership be submitted, Jeremy Hanson will request the AgWG to discuss the comments and approve the proposed membership again.

11:50 Update on WQGIT approval of Phase 6 land use base loading ratios

Workgroup Chairs

- The WQGIT approved the proposed Phase 6 agricultural land use loading ratios.
- Kristen Saacke Blunk noted that although the WQGIT approved the loading rates, that the AgWG discussed reserving the ability to continually review the land uses and loading ratios as it moves forward.

11:55 Proposal for new Phase 6 Agriculture Land Use

Rachel Rhodes

- Rachel Rhodes presented on a proposal for including a new soybean with manure agricultural land use for the Phase 6 Model.
- Suggestion to defer on adding this category as a new land use until later, and to discuss this further during the December AgWG meeting.
- John Rhoderick suggested states attempt to provide information regarding soybean with manure, and to present any information to the AgWG during the December meeting.

12:00 Adjourn

Next conference call:

November 19th, 10:00-12:00 PM

Participants:

Tom Simpson
Mark Dubin
John Rhoderick
Lindsey Gordon
Jeremy Hanson
Tim Sexton
Gary Flory
Rachel Rhodes
Robin Pellicano
Alisha Mulkey
Jenn Volk
Kristen Saacke Blunk
Bill Angstadt
Marel King
Ron Ohrel
Chris Brosch
Fred Samadani
Beth McGee
Chris Thompson
Kelly Shenk
Kim Snell-Zarcone
Ron Korcak
Jessica Blackburn
Steve Taglang
Ann Jennings
Lindsay Thompson

Aqua Terra Science
UMD, AgWG Coordinator
MDA, AgWG Co-Chair
CRC, Staff
VT
VA DCR
VA DEQ
MDA
MDE
MDA
UD
Headwaters LLC, AgWG Co-Chair
DE/MD Agribusiness Association
CBC
Mid-Atlantic Dairy Association
VT
Environmental & Water Resource Mgmt. Consulting
CBF
LCCD
EPA
Conservation PA
USDA ARS
CBP, CAC Coordinator
PA DEP
CBC
MD Association of Soil Conservation Districts