



Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)/ Agriculture Workgroup
(AgWG) Joint Conference call minutes
Thursday, November 6, 2014
10:00 AM to 3:30 PM

ACTIONS & DECISIONS

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the HR MSD report.

DECISION: Watershed Technical Workgroup members approved the HR MSD report and technical appendix.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the Cover Crop panel report.

DECISION: Watershed Technical Workgroup members approved the Cover Crop panel report and Technical Appendix.

ACTION: The Nutrient Management Panel will respond to Partnership comments on the Nutrient Application Management Tier 2 report by COB 11/14/14 in preparation for a joint conference call November 21st.

Joint Watershed Technical and Agriculture Workgroup Summary

1. Conservation Tillage Panel Report

- Bill Keeling, panel representative, gave an overview of the expert panel recommendations for Phase 5.3.2.
- EPA: There is not an NRCS standard that matches this 60% requirement. Are states exploring options to measure the 60%?
 - DE: Mark Dubin helped develop a transect survey in DE.
- NGO: Will farmers who receive cost-share be implementing the 60% as well?
 - DE: More than 50% of observed plots in DE were at some type of conservation tillage.
- Bill Keeling had submitted a recommendation to the panel to adjust the efficiency based on the groundwater fraction. The panel has since weighed in to keep their original recommendations.
- John Rhoderick: Are there any objections from AgWG members to approving the report?
 - There were no objections.
- Matt Johnston presented the technical appendix for the HRMSD BMP.
- Alisha Mulkey: Was the recommendation to only receive credit on non manured acres?
 - Yes, in this version of this model we do not have manured and non manured land uses, so we are using the manured fractions to estimate the total reductions.
- EPA: Are states reporting all cumulative acres on the ground?
 - Yes, this shift was made last year. All states will be reporting HR as a cumulative practice.
- Ted Tesler: Are there any objections to approving the report and appendix (WTWG members)?
 - There were no objections.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the HR MSD report.

DECISION: Watershed Technical Workgroup members approved the HR MSD report and technical appendix.

2. Cover Crop Panel Report

- Jack Meisinger, panel chair, gave an overview of the expert panel recommendations for Phase 5.3.2.
- Members asked why there was not sufficient data on P and sediment.
 - Meisinger: Most data is not current (pre-1980s).
- Why were the numbers consistent across the board for the previous sediment and phosphorus reductions?
 - This was from the original cover crop report.
 - Panel did not want to recommend changes that were already in the calibration of the model. This will be a Phase 6.0 task.
- CBF: What are these species all less effective than rye?
 - Meisinger: Forage radish takes up nitrate, however it winter kills and then in the spring there is bare soil. This species will get a significant discount compared to rye. Annual legumes had higher phosphorus and sediment values than they did for nitrogen. Panel members made recommendations based on their best professional judgment of these species. Panel was conservative in their estimates.
- Jack noted that these panels were established several years ago without charge or timeline. Recommend that the AgWG help the panels align better with the new protocol.
- John Rhoderick: Are there any objections among AgWG members to approving the Cover Crop panel report?
 - There were no objections.
- Matt Johnston reviewed the cover crop technical appendix.
- EPA: Is there consideration for fertilization status?
 - The definition stayed the same, which states that traditional cover crops are not fertilized.
- Jack Meisinger: What does the AgWG want to do about membership on the older panels?
 - Chair: We will add this to the agenda for next week.
- Ted Tesler: Any objections to approving the cover crops expert panel report?
 - PA: This report doesn't account for PA's commodity cover crops.
 - Matt Johnston clarified that winter wheat is counted in the model, not as a BMP but as an application reduction.
 - There were no objections.

DECISION: Agriculture Workgroup members approved the Cover Crop panel report.

DECISION: Watershed Technical Workgroup members approved the Cover Crop panel report and Technical Appendix.

3. Nutrient Management Panel Report

- Chris Brosch, panel chair, gave an overview of the expert panel recommendations for Phase 5.3.2.
- EPA: Are the 20% Tier 2 phosphorus reductions based on the reductions expected from P indices? And did you have data on the extent of the P index or of the water quality benefits of the P index?
 - Brosch: P indices would be the driver. The other components of Tier 2 that effect P would add additional reductions. Panel recommendation was based on the knowledge that applications were previously to match N need and now match P crop need.
- Chris Brosch reviewed the comments and panel initial response. The panel will be asked to fully respond to the comments.
 - 1) Soundness of Tier 2 recommendations. Use of unpublished data was required to verify the compiled literature information.
 - 2) Real world vs. model world credit is difficult to communicate. Relates to the recommended effectiveness values for TN and TP.

- 3) Where's the verification? Nutrient Management panel was not asked how to verify the plans.
 - 4) Was the BMP protocol followed? Panel followed the process as best as possible. Some components of the attachments need to be added to complete the report. Face-to-face meeting minutes capture the panel decisions.
- CBPO: Are the Tier 2 efficiency recommendations relative to the agronomic recommendations in the model, which are based on LGU recommendations?
 - Brosch: The real world decreases for Tier 1 represent the 1985-1995 time period. Tier 2 started in about 2006.
- EPA: What is the real world baseline that the Tier 2 reductions are applied to?
 - Meisinger: Tier 1 was based on using 1.2 N lbs on corn. University recommendations went down to about 1.0 N in the 90s, which is where Tier 1 comes from.
 - Brosch: The panel used BPJ to incorporate the reductions from Tier 2 beyond Tier 1 at the edge of stream.
- WV: Will Nutrient Management acres post 2006 be credited at Tier 2 level?
 - Brosch: For acres that are planned to the Tier 2 standard.
- CBF: Acknowledge all the work done by the expert panel. CBF is concerned that there would be a large jump in benefits from Nutrient Management when CEAP data contradicts this. The CEAP report shows that the majority of farmland is not following Tier 2 for either nitrogen or phosphorus. Concern that dramatic changes to what the models says is happening (increase now, followed by decrease when verification kicks in) will increase misunderstanding. Was Tier 2 layered on top of Tier 1, or was it relative to no nutrient management? If 1985 application rates were 1.2 lbs lbs/ac, is that consistent with what the CBP model counted in 1985?
 - Brosch: Recommendations related to the charge will be addressed by the panel.
- EPA: Recommend pulling more detail from the minutes and including it in the main report. Part of the protocol is verification, and having the panel comment on how to track and verify the practice. Although it will be challenging to determine, we could use discussion from the panel. If the panel does not consider this part of their charge, we will need to address verification another way.
- EPA: Be clear about how the data led to the efficiency. Chris summarized these verbally today, and this level of detail is needed in the report.
- Rhoderick: How can we allow the panel to include additional information in to the report and still incorporate these recommendations this year?
 - EPA: The December 1 deadline cannot be moved. If the comments are addressed in November, the WQGIT could convene in late November to approve the report.
- EPA: Will the panel be able to address verification?
 - VA: The existing verification guidance is sufficient.
 - PADEP: PA verifies whether people are following their Tier 2 plans.
 - EPA: Can the AgWG chairs work with the verification committee to address the verification of Nutrient Management? If states are hoping that we can meet the deadline and report in 2014, we will need to verify Tier 2 nutrient management.
 - VA: No BMP currently has to be verified to report in 2014.
 - Chair: For the purposes of transparency and credibility, verification will help demonstrate that what is on the ground is going in to the model, even if it is not a requirement yet.
- Rhoderick: Can comments be compiled for the report by next week?
 - CBF: Address the questions about the relative credit to 1985.
 - EPA: Address the baseline for Tier 2.
- DMAA: Do we have consensus today to move forward with the report?
 - Rhoderick: There is not consensus today. We want to get the report with the comments revised for consent next week.

- Saacke Blunk: We do need the panel to provide responses to the comments. If that is not possible by the 13th, we will need to come up with an alternate timeframe. We can convene an additional AgWG online meeting.
- Rhoderick: The comment period for the report will end tomorrow (11/7). Emma will compile all comments.
 - Suggest a joint call next week with both WTWG and AgWG.
- Brosch: Are there any panelists on the call who object?
 - Meisinger: Write up the comments; distribute them with a short turnaround to the panel.
- Saacke Blunk: Include more detail in the report about the panel face to face meeting to show how the literature translated in to efficiencies.

ACTION: The Nutrient Management Panel will respond to Partnership comments on the Nutrient Application Management Tier 2 report by COB 11/14/14 in preparation for a joint conference call November 21st.

Adjourned

Participants

Kristen Saacke Blunk (Co-Chair)	Headwaters LLC
John Rhoderick (Co-Chair)	Maryland Department of Agriculture
Robert Baldwin	DNREC
Rachel Rhodes	Maryland Department of Agriculture
Alisha Mulkey	Maryland Department of Agriculture
Colin Jones	MDA
Greg Albrecht	New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets
Steve Taglang	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Ted Tesler	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Doug Goodlander	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Tim Sexton	Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
Bill Keeling	Virginia DEQ
James Davis-Martin	Virginia DEQ
Gary Flory	VADEQ
Chris Brosch	Virginia Tech/VADCR
Andy Yost	West Virginia Department of Agriculture
Alana Hartman	West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
Jack Meisinger	USDA Agricultural Research Service
Glenn Carpenter	USDA NRCS
Susan Marquart	Pennsylvania NRCS
Emma Giese, Staff	Chesapeake Research Consortium
Kelly Shenk	U.S. EPA
Beth McGee	Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Kim Snell-Zarcone	Conservation Pennsylvania
Bill Angstadt	Delaware Maryland Agribusiness Association
Dana York	Green Earth Connection
Lindsay Dodd	Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts
Jennifer Volk	University of Delaware
Ken Staver	UMD
Sally Szydlowski	Water Stewardship
Greg Sandi	MDE

Marcia Fox	DNREC
Tyler Monteith	DNREC
Lara Kling	VADEQ
Marty Hurd	DDOE
Olivia Devereux	DEC
Sally Claggett	USFS
Neely Law	CWP
Gene Yagow	VT
Steve Gladding	NYSDEC
Lucinda Power	EPA
Bryan Bloch	DNREC
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Kim Snell Zarccone	Conservation PA
Karl Berger	MWCOG
David Wood	CRC
Dave Montali	WVDEP
Larry Towle	DDA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Jessica Rigelman	J7 LLC
Don Meals	TetraTech
Robin Pellicano	MDE
Greg Busch	MDE
Lynne Hoot	MASCD
Andy Clark	USDA