

Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

September 15th, 2016

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Conference Call Summary

Meeting materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/23303/>

Actions & Decisions:

DECISION: The AgWG agreed to hold an all-day face-to-face meeting at the Bay Program Offices in Annapolis, MD in lieu of their regularly scheduled conference call on October 20th.

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

- Meeting minutes from September 7th were approved with a motion from Tim Sexton and a second from Steve Taglang.
- No announcements this week.

Animal Waste Management Systems Preliminary Report

Jeremy Hanson, VT Panel Coordinator, presented an update on the AWMS panel's proposed [manure recoverability factors](#).

Discussion:

- Question from Doug Goodlander on what the term recoverability means. Response: It's the amount of manure from your non-pasture portion that you recover, and that's the amount of manure you have available to either spread on fields or transport off-farm.
 - Mark Dubin: NRCS looked at total livestock production cycle, and their numbers also reflected the non-confinement time in addition to confinement time. In the Bay model, we've already separated that out, so we don't want to use a lower value than NRCS suggests because it's already considered non-confinement time.
- The AgWG will be asked to provide a formal recommendation on the AWMS panel's preliminary report, which will be presented and posted for the next meeting on Thursday, September 22. The panel expects to have the preliminary report available for review on Monday, September 19.

Phase 6 Nutrient Management Panel Draft Report Update

Mark Dubin, UMD Panel Coordinator, presented the [comments received](#) on the Phase 6 draft Nutrient Management BMP Expert Panel report. A full presentation will be given to the AgWG during their meeting on September 22nd.

Discussion:

- The panel is currently reviewing the comments and proposed changes to their final report, and will release their revised final report to the Partnership before the next AgWG meeting on September 22. The AgWG and WTWG will be asked to approve the report at their October 20th

meeting, and the WQGIT will be asked to approve the report during their two-day face-to-face meeting on October 24-25.

- Alisha Mulkey: For NM, is the guidance to the states to still submit core NM acres to NEIEN by Sept. 30?
 - Response: Yes – the preliminary report provided the CBP Modeling Team with information to incorporate the reporting structure of the proposed NM BMP into NEIEN, so states will be able to submit acres before September 30th.
 - Matt Johnston: I think states still need some guidance on the Core P piece. I've also talked to a number of states in the WTWG, and made them aware that they can report the 6 supplemental BMPs, with the understanding that the report and efficiencies are preliminary.
- Chris Brosch asked what the format is going to be for the October 20th AgWG meeting.
- Johnston: Beta 4 NM currently looks a lot like Beta 3 NM. We need to determine if the WQGIT will accept any changes to NM for an early run in 2017, but we still have to iron out that schedule.

DECISION: The AgWG agreed to hold an all-day face-to-face meeting at the Bay Program Offices in Annapolis, MD in lieu of their regularly scheduled conference call on October 20th.

Discussion of E3 Scenarios

Mark Dubin, UMD, provided an [update](#) to the workgroup on the Phase 6 E3 Scenarios. The workgroup will need to review previous E3 scenarios used in the Bay Program Partnership's suite of modeling tools, and review any new BMPs that will be incorporated into the Phase 6 model.

Discussion:

- Alisha Mulkey: Are individual states going to get what was submitted for their E3s during the last round?
 - Jeff Sweeney: We take a definition and apply it across the states, so the only difference is the number of acres in each state. Once we're done, we'll let you know the numbers in terms of acres.
- Karl Brown: I know you said there's no cost limitations, but it might be valuable for the states to know what the cost would be for these scenarios.
 - Sweeney: It's possible to calculate, and we can estimate that cost so you can compare to the cost of a progress run. Waste treatment control costs are a bit more difficult, but we can do it.
- Ted Tesler: The decision rules for the 2009 effort – that's an important part because there are instances where BMPs can't be applied over top of each other. Understanding what those limitations are will be important in developing that scenario, and I want to make sure we have documentation from the prior effort available.

Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee Update

Curt Dell, USDA, and Matt Johnston, UMD, provided [updates](#) on the Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee's (AMS) recommended changes to Phase 6 Scenario Builder. Topics included crediting nutrient management acres beyond 2012, and manure transport representation.

Discussion:

- Chris Brosch: The projections you used for crops that suggest some counties would be sent to 0 – how were those formed?
 - Johnston: Those were based on an algorithm approved 2-3 years ago by the AgWG.
- Greg Albrecht noted that the changes being proposed are a significant improvement to better characterizing what's happening on farms.
- Johnston: At some point periodically in the future, we would need to check our assumptions with use/sales data, just as we do with nutrient concentrations for poultry litter.
- Jim Cropper: I have some issue when we say that in 2013, with more NM, that would reduce the use of N, especially on corn. If you anticipate the plant population increasing, you'd be applying more N even though you're still doing the NM plan. I'm not sure if we want to use the term 'crop goal'.
 - Johnston: This slide holds the yields and acres constant, so an additional acre of NM would mean less fertilizer applied.
- Brosch: Folks are having issues with representation here. One suggests an increase in crop goal with less NM. Including or not-including NM on an acre wouldn't make the amount of fertilizer change. The way we consider modeling NM acres has more to do with efficiency and placement of manure.
- Tim Sexton noted that he also did not agree with using the term 'crop goal', and pledged to work with other jurisdictional representatives to suggest an alternative.
 - Greg Albrecht suggested using the term 'rate'.
- Johnston: Right now, we're using yields that represent the best 3/5 for the last 5 years.
- Brosch: I thought the yield data came from NASS? Not sure why there's averaging from the best 3/5 – that seems like a NMP decision.
 - Johnston: To set application rate, we needed a yield. Just like a NM planner, we used the best 3/5 for the last 5 years. So we take annual yield data from NASS, and then the best 3/5, and that helps to determine the yield goal.
 - Brosch: Is it a moving average?
 - Johnston: Yes – and it's one that should theoretically always go up.
- Lindsay Thompson: We went to using fertilizer sales, to basically eliminate the issue of this limitless bucket of commercial fertilizer, to meet the crop application goals based on LGU recommendations. I understand the limitations of the data, but it seems like we're not backfilling based on LGU recommendations, but potentially on NM verified implementation. So how far behind are we for getting good data from AAPFCO? Could this be updated?
 - Johnston: We're hoping that improved data coming down the line would help us to refine and improve our assumptions. I recommend every 2 years to include fertilizer sales data in the future.
- Brosch: I'm concerned that an increase in NM implementation essentially reduced the amount of fertilizer applied, because I think it shifts the application of manure. I know we chose fertilizer sales because we had no better alternative. For that reason, I think we should continue to project P fertilizer sales data into the future. Otherwise, it stagnates our P-progress into the future.
- Johnston: If you project fertilizer sales, and NM doesn't impact that, then the impact of NM will only be seen when we look at fertilizer sales. Core NM won't be seen in a progress run. That's one thing to consider.
- Matt Johnston noted that the CBP Modeling Team will need ample time to incorporate any changes suggested by the AgWG or AMS into the final model.

- The state representatives agreed to work together to develop a proposal for modeling NM in future scenarios.
- Jim Cropper: I'm concerned about how we track the transported manure that is applied at a NM rate.
 - Dubin: If manure is transported to another county, it still counts as a nutrient input. So you're still tracking it as part of the total. Some states track it very closely. It really comes back to the acres of NM within the county it's going to, and adding it as a source of nutrients.
- Johnston: The plan is to test this after Beta 4 is released. We need the states and AMS's help to develop a set of questions that everyone needs answered, and scoping runs that can answer those questions.

Next meeting: Thursday, September 22nd 10:00 – 3:00 PM Face-to-Face meeting @ University of Maryland Western Maryland Research & Education Center in Hagerstown, MD

Participants:

Name	Affiliation
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Mark Dubin	UMD
Ed Kee	DDA
Lindsay Thompson	DE-MD Agribusiness Associates
Matt Johnston	UMD
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Chris Brosch	DDA
Clint Gill	DDA
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Greg Albrecht	NYS
Amanda Barber	Cortland Co. SWCD
Steve Taglang	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Doug Goodlander	PA DEP
Karl Brown	PA State Conservation Commission
Matt Monroe	WV DEP
Jason Dalrymple	WV DA
Mark Headrick	WV DA
Tim Sexton	VA DCR
Roland Owens	VA DEQ
Scott Ambler	VA DEQ
Ann Jennings	CBC
Kelly Shenk	U.S. EPA
Marilyn Hershey	Ar Joy Farms LLC
Beth McGee	Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Emily Dekar	USC
Ron Ohrel	Mid-Atlantic Dairy Association
Fred Samadani	Environmental & Water Resources Mgmt. Consulting

Jim Cropper	Northeast Pasture Consortium
Steve Dressing	Tetra Tech