

Nutrient Management Task Force (NMTF)

Process & Product
Agriculture Workgroup Quarterly
Meeting
February 17th, 2016

Charge to the NM TF

- "The Chesapeake Bay Program's Management Board approved the Tier 2 efficiencies for phosphorus and concurred that acres being credited are conditional on the pending Agriculture Workgroup Nutrient Management Task Force's crosswalk and on the states providing adequate compliance documentation for Tier 2 phosphorus."

CBP Management Board Request-

- Develop a "cross walk" between states' nutrient management programs and the adopted Ph5.3.2 NM tier definitions.
- Identify program information/documentation states will use to determine reported acres to NEIEN for the 2014-2015 implementation reporting.
- Provide links to supporting federal/state program documentation.
- Provide compliance information for each program.
 - Compliance defined as an acre fully meeting the definition and required elements of the NM tier (p. 61-62 of NM Panel report).

What we learned

- “Crosswalk” template, as a tool, successfully consolidated information sought by the Partnership.
- Crosswalk allows the partnership to see the clear differences in federal/state programs across six states.
- Overarching comments
 - Clarification requested of NRCS 590 alignment with state NM programs and CBP BMP definitions [Addressed with all states]
 - Clarification on level of confidence with federal/state compliance activities – field vs. paper assessment [Addressed with most states]
 - Tier 1 and 2 requiring ALL elements
 - Identification for continued improvements
- State specific comments

Quick look at current crosswalk

- All states: Identified their ag programs and the NM Tier they equate to.
- All states: Reporting Tier 2 acres for the first time.
- A few states: Reporting Tier 3 acres for the first time.
- Several states: Identified plans to report additional programs in future, but not this progress year (2015).
- The new state compliance acreage spreadsheets supplement the crosswalks by providing the acres eligible under each state's programs in comparison with the total domain of potential NM acres. Two types of NM implementation emerged:
 - A high implementation compliance rate may be cited, but for a small percentage of the total domain of potentially eligible acres; e.g. voluntary, permit or contractual programs.
 - A lower compliance rate cited may correspond to a higher percentage of the total domain of potentially eligible acres; e.g. statewide NM regulatory programs.

Final Comments Regarding Tier 2 Phosphorous

- **Available State Data:** Nearly all states were unable to separately provide compliance levels for the subset of acres where the P Index was run and recommendations to reduce phosphorus use were followed.
 - State and Federal programs typically track compliance levels of the full nutrient management plan, which includes compliance with P Index recommendations as one of many components.
- **Nutrient Management Panel:** The Nutrient Management Panel was fully aware of the limitations of state program data. The panel was also aware that the P index is run only on a subset of cropland acres that could be eligible for Tier 2 phosphorus credit.
 - To account for the data limitations, the panel used an “adjustment factor” to significantly reduce the efficiency for Tier 2 phosphorus from a literature value of 35% to a final value of 6.6%.
 - The Panel also clearly defined the subset of cropland that is eligible for Tier 2 P credit. Only the following lands are eligible for Tier 2 P credit: high-till with manure, low-till with manure, alfalfa, and hay with nutrients.

Final Comments Regarding Tier 2 Phosphorous

- **Task Force Response:** The panel's approach to develop an efficiency for Tier 2 phosphorus precludes the need for states to report a the sub-set of high P soils where the P index resulted in a reduction in phosphorus use below plant uptake rates.
 - The greatest risk of over-crediting phosphorus reductions from Tier 2 phosphorus is addressed through the over-all compliance levels the states report for the relevant nutrient management programs.

Line 1: Compliance Rate (number of acres in compliance based on jurisdiction review)

Line 2: Number of acres that are expected to be reported for 2015 of the TOTAL eligible ag acres (percentage in parenthesis)

State	Program	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
DE	NMP – By Agriculture Use	19 to 85 % (by ag land use)	65%	
		123,700 of 466,066 acres (<27%)	272,456 of 412,812 acres (66%)	
MD	NM on Pasture, Vegetable, or Container Nursery	69%		
		78,288 of 116,132 available acres (67%)		
MD	NM on Cropland		69%	
			669,863 of 970,816 available acres (67%)	
MD	NM on Hayland and Alfalfa		69%	
			72,053 of 106,883 available acres (67%)	
MD	Enhanced Decision Ag on Cropland			69%
				108,955 of 161,623 available acres (67%)
NY	CAFO/AEM/NRCS		95%	
			108,117 of 1,352,579 available acres (8%)	
PA	1 - Chpt 92A CAFO		100%	
			158,397 of 2,820,500 available acres (5.6%)	
PA	2 - Act 38 NM CAO		100%	
			293,408 of 2,820,500 available acres (10.4%)	
PA	5 - NRCS 590		100%	
			22,173 of 2,820,500 available acres (<1%)	
PA	6 - Nutrient Balance Sheet	95%		
		122,707 of 2,366,500 available acres (5.2%)		
VA	1 - Ag NMP	89%	62.5 to 80%	95%
		235,858 of 1,000,000 acres (<24%)	549,787 of 1,500,000 acres (<37%)	127,016 of 500,000 available acres (<26%)
WV	CAFO		100%	
			240 of 240 available acres	
WV	State/federal vol., CNMP, 590	100%	100%	
		33,242 of 357,539 available acres (<10%)	32,940 of 240,000 available acres (<14%)	