

Draft AgWG Meeting Notes

Chesapeake Bay Program Office

Annapolis, MD

February 14, 2013

AgWG Notes

- Meeting convened at 9:30
- Welcome and introductions
- Meeting Notes
 - AgWG January meeting summary was reviewed for member approval. NGO motioned to approve, seconded by NGO, all yea.

AgWG Notes

- Nutrient Management Panel
 - WG Chair recommended Chris Brosch with VT to replace him as the NM Panel chair.
 - **DECISION: Chris Brosch will be taking over leadership of Nutrient Management panel**
 - Mark Dubin remains the coordinator for this panel, staffer: Emma Giese
 - NGO: Will membership of panel would be reevaluated?
 - Chair responded that panel would maintain geographic representation from each jurisdiction

AgWG Notes

- UNM recommendations
 - Coordinator provided updates on the revised final draft reports from UNM Panel
 - **ACTION: AgWG members asked to look at revised version and provide comments to Mark Dubin and Emma Giese by Tuesday 19th am**
 - A future agenda topic was recommended by NGO to discuss plan for collecting soil P data

AgWG Notes

- BMP Verification process
 - Chair provided an update on workgroup's progress on ag BMP verification protocol development
 - Today's discussion will determine which areas have full group consensus and which have differences
 - A supporting guiding document that state agencies will use to determine whether the data they submit will be accepted, is to be developed based on the finalized draft protocol matrix

AgWG Notes

- BMP Verif.
 - NGO suggestion that seeing more of the supporting document details would help with workgroup's ability to provide comments
 - Chair: the narrative document should describe the information in the matrix, it is not yet complete
 - The assessment tool would then help guide agencies in determining their methodology
 - NGO asked about having some hypothetical scenarios with the matrix; agreed

AgWG Notes

- BMP Verif.
 - Chair reviewed the BMP matrix
 - Clarification of ‘inventory’ as an assessment on site
 - NGO: Does farmer training vary on a state by state basis?
 - Chair and coordinator confirmed that background document will further define training required
 - Concern from NGO about the self-certification
 - States would have to conduct more quality checks in these cases
 - Coordinator: adding more QA/QC would address
 - Self certification currently done annually by USDA-NASS and FSA under oversight

AgWG Notes

- BMP Verif.
 - NGO: How are structural BMPs different from annual BMPs in self-certification?
 - Coordinator: annual often short term practices (cover crops, conservation tillage) rather than long term practices that are under engineered specifications
 - Need clarification for the left side of matrix that a 'yes' or 'no' does not guarantee verification, must also pass the rest of qualifications
 - VA suggested changing language from 'yes' to 'possible/feasible' to clear up misunderstanding
 - NGO suggestion to include numbered matrix lines
 - **DECISION: add numbers to matrix boxes for clarity**

AgWG

- BMP Verif.
 - Coordinator: CEAP Survey very detailed compared to NASS Survey
 - NGO: Last category (NRI Point) currently attributed to NASS, should be NRCS
 - **DECISION: Remove NASS reference, attribute to NRCS and include in parenthesis as an example**
 - **DECISION: Majority approve changing yes/no to feasible/not feasible**
 - VA and NGO disagreed

AgWG Notes

- BMP Verif.
 - Chair noted that the ‘relative cost’ column was completed as an estimation with limited information
 - Chair asked for state recommendations to retain the column, as intended to assist states to make a decision.
Roll call:
 - NY – abstain
 - PA – in favor retaining
 - WV- abstain
 - MD – in favor retaining
 - DE – abstain
 - DC – abstain
 - VA – against retaining
 - Non-Jurisdictional- majority against retaining
 - **DECISION: Will remove from matrix and include as a supporting document**

AgWG Notes

- BMP Verif.
 - Coordinator defined the relative scientific defensibility, accountability, transparency matrix values
 - NGO: Concern about the difficulty to make an evaluation with BMPs grouped together
 - **ACTION: Check with Verification Principles document to define transparency, continue discussion at next AgWG meeting**
 - **ACTION: Chair and coordinator will bring to next Thursday's BMP Verification Committee meeting**

AgWG Notes

- Agricultural Projections
 - Johnston presented on request from Milestone Workgroup to discuss recommended agricultural modeling projection methods
 - Seeking a decision from this group by summer in how to project from 2007 to 2015
 - Current projections based on a straight line regression of data from 1982-2007 Ag census
 - Investigating USDA-ERS projections and opportunity to downscale this to Chesapeake Bay region

AgWG Notes

- Agricultural Projections cont.
 - Welcome input from AgWG on this and other methods
 - Question about trend line not accurately capturing decreases
 - CBPO: Trend line recalculated when new data becomes available (2014)
 - Concern that past data has equal weight as more recent data
 - Suggestion from NGO to collect data from other sources in addition to NASS
 - NGO: What about reviewing annual data? Would a regression on this be the same?
 - Partnership works in 2 year Milestones (rationale for this timeframe)
 - UMD: How can we take into account other factors (population etc.) to project the future
 - USDA does this
 - Industries make these projections as well

AgWG Notes

- MPA Ag. Modeling Workshop
 - Mark explained the background for this workshop
 - Discussion to focus on Scenario Builder as well as the Watershed Model itself
 - **ACTION: If interested in joining the planning committee notify Mark and Emma**
 - Workshop location TBD near an airport to accommodate national and international attendees
 - Funding proposal has been approved, USDA-NIFA Mid-Atlantic Water Program is funding entire workshop

AgWG Notes

- MPA Ag. Modeling Workshop
 - Planning meeting to be held tomorrow 2/15
 - Workshop to held by May 2013
 - Attendees: national and regional ag industries, USDA NASS, land use, ARS, ERS, land grant institutions
 - NGO recommendation to record conference and create some type of product
 - NGO recommendation to bring in other sectors as well
 - Committee can consider offering a webinar for interested parties who are unable to attend the conference

AgWG Notes

- MPA Modeling Priorities
 - Coordinator described the proposal to create a sub-group to focus on Ag Modeling, which would work with CBP Modeling staff, USDA etc. and report back to the AgWG
 - Results of workshop to help shape potential group members and direction
 - **DECISION: Members agreed to move forward with formation of agricultural modeling sub group**

AgWG Notes

- Land Use
 - Coordinator reviewed the three land use category approaches
 - Chair: The approach will still be modified by AgWG
 - Chair on option #3 : Although this option addresses crop rotation, possible difficulty with data input
 - Options #1 and #2: fairly similar
 - **ACTION:** If any elements missing from “Charlie Brown Christmas Tree” NRCS approach send comments to Mark and Emma before Feb 25th Land Use Workgroup meeting

AgWG Notes

- P Index Tool
 - Chair presented U Maryland's P Management Tool (PMT)
 - Objective: to assess risk of P transport across diverse landscapes
 - All recommendations now based on P mgmt
- Review meeting notes
- Adjourned at 2:55

AgWG Notes

- Next meeting March 14th