



Agriculture Workgroup

July 16, 2026
10:00AM-12:00PM

[Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.](#)

Purpose: To discuss the new partnership decision-making process as outlined in the Chesapeake Bay Program Governance and Management Framework, seek a decision on approval of the Phase 7 E3 Scenario assumptions for agricultural BMPs, and determine a path forward for AgWG membership under the new partnership structure.

Summary of Actions & Decisions

Action: The AgWG will move the approval of the June meeting minutes to the August AgWG meeting, given that a quorum of voting members was not present at the beginning of the meeting.

Action: AgWG leadership and staff will seek additional clarity on outstanding questions related to the decision making process as outlined in the recently approved Governance and Management Framework.

Action: Eric Hughes, AgWG Coordinator, will make necessary formatting changes to the agricultural E3 Scenario spreadsheet.

Decision: Given concerns related to the E3 scenario assumptions for the non-urban stream restoration and poultry litter amendment BMPs, the approval of the Scenario will be deferred to the August AgWG meeting. Additional clarity will be sought on outstanding questions.

Action: AgWG Staff, in consultation with other CBPO staff, will work to answer remaining questions on the assumptions for the poultry litter amendment BMP.

Action: Bill Keeling, VA DEQ, will analyze available stream mile and shoreline data to provide a better understanding of what 15% of low order streams translates to in terms of linear miles.

Action: AgWG staff will inform the CWGT leadership of the timeline for conforming to the 15-voting member structure and the concerns shared by AgWG members and participants. Discussions will continue, and voting membership will be the first agenda item on the August AgWG meeting agenda.

Meeting Minutes

I. Welcome, Roll Call, Review Meeting Minutes

Lead: Caitlin Grady, AgWG Chair

Caitlin opened the meeting and requested participants share their name and affiliation using the meeting "Chat" function. Caitlin then transitioned to the approval of the June AgWG meeting minutes. Given that a quorum was not present at the start of the call, the AgWG did not approve the June meeting minutes. Approval of the June meeting minutes will take place at the August AgWG meeting.

Actions:

1. The AgWG will move the approval of the June meeting minutes to the August AgWG meeting, given that a quorum of voting members was not present at the beginning of the meeting.

II. Review of New Chesapeake Bay Program Decision-Making Process

Lead: Eric Hughes, AgWG Coordinator

Eric reviewed the section of the new Chesapeake Bay Program Governance and Management Framework, approved by the PSC on June 30, dedicated to decision rules. While consensus (unanimous full support for a decision) is still what the partnership strives to achieve for all decisions, the partnership now employs a consent-based decision-making approach. The implications of this change were explained.

Actions:

1. AgWG leadership and staff will seek additional clarity on outstanding questions related to the decision making process as outlined in the recently approved Governance and Management Framework.

Discussion Notes:

Clint Gill (in chat): So we no longer have non-voting members, but we can still have participants in discussion that are non-members correct?

Eric Hughes: Great question, Clint. We never had non-voting members. So that was not something we recognize anywhere in our membership list or anything like that. We can absolutely still have participation and discussions with non-members. That is a priority of AgWG leadership and staff to ensure public participation in these discussions. So the change with the Clean Water Goal Team saying we can't have non voting members doesn't affect how we worked. The big change is going from 21 voting members to 15. Again, we will address that a little bit later, but I think that's a really good point that you made.

Clint Gill (in chat): Thank you, just wanted to clarify that anyone can contribute!

Eric Hughes: Yes, everybody will still be asked and hopefully will contribute.

Hunter Landis (in chat): Is there a requirement for justification or counter proposal from "stop/hold"?

Eric Hughes: Hunter, it's a great question. Are you saying that if a member votes as a one or a two that there is a requirement for the person who is raising that to provide justification for why they are raising that one or two? Is that what you're asking?

Hunter Landis (in chat): Yes.

Eric Hughes: Yes, ok. That is expected. When we're going through the consent process and you have a stop or hold that you want to register, the expectation is that you propose an alternative or you say why. Just as we do now, we want to make sure that we capture exactly why you feel the way that you do. We want to make sure that everybody knows it's on the record. This is the position that you hold specifically, not just stop, not just a hold, we have this very good reason why we're saying this. So, to your question, it is not to my knowledge specifically requested for a vote in the Governance and Management Framework. But, we can pull from what it says about the consensus process and essentially assume that that is what the expectation is for a vote.

Greg Albrecht (in chat): Would, "We really need to think about this further," be acceptable?

Eric Hughes: Any justification for a stop or a hold would be acceptable. I don't think that's necessarily on us to dictate, but what I will say is encouraging all members to, if you think that it is serious enough to warrant a stop or hold, to articulate as clearly as possible why we really need to think about this further. What specifically do we need to think about in this discussion and, to what end? What would we be hoping that further consideration would lead to? So, I would say,

yes, it is acceptable, but I would just ask that any member who goes that route is as specific as possible. Does that answer your question, Greg?

Greg Albrecht: It's fair, and it makes sense. There are times among us where, with other schedules, maybe a topic gets a little bit away from them and you have a really salient view on it and would like the group to consider more. But, it takes a little more research to bring to substantiate the alternative approach. That was all. I understand how you described it; Here's why I'm reluctant at this point, but I need to think about that and talk about it more with folks to be able to offer a better alternative. Maybe not right on the spot.

Eric Hughes: Yeah, I really appreciate that, Greg. I think the point that I really want to reinforce here is that we recognize that if we do this all in one shot, if we say we're going to give one opportunity to revise a decision and then we're going to go to a vote, and however it lands, you're all just going to have to deal with it. I fully recognize that that is not going to sit well with the partnership. So, when we're looking at how to present this, there is not going to be a strong desire to ever do this all in one shot. Where it will become critical is if there is, for example, some trickle-down ask from the Clean Water Goal Team or the Policy Steering Committee and they say you need to act on this now. Then we may need to implement that. But, for most of our decisions, they are not going to be so incredibly time-bound that we need to take action all in one month. So, we want to make sure that people have multiple months, multiple meetings, to think this through and address what needs to be addressed. At a certain point, I think rather than having decisions that could drag on for months, this puts a little bit of a clearer time bound on it. So, maybe we only give it two, three, or four months if necessary. But, we're not going to just hold indefinitely. So, we still absolutely want to be fair with how we do this, and we recognize that you all have a tremendous amount on your plate outside of Bay Program work.

Greg Albrecht (in chat): Thanks, Eric. Makes sense.

Jenn Fetter (in chat): Eric - can you clarify if it is 2/3rds of members or 2/3rds of members present when there is a quorum?

Eric Hughes: Jenn has a fantastic question in the chat. This question is still outstanding, and it's one that we've posed to management. The language is specifically two-thirds of the workgroup voting members must support a decision for it to be approved. So, to me, that's not two-thirds of voting members present. It's that you need to have two-thirds of your members to make a decision. If you do have that, then all 10 of them have to approve that position. If we are in a situation where it's two-thirds of members present and say we have 10 members, then we'd be looking at partnership decisions being made with seven voting members. Which, if that's the direction that we receive, then that's the direction we receive. But that is the question. You got to the question that we're hoping to get clarity on as soon as possible, but we did not hear anything before the start of this meeting. So unfortunately, I cannot address that definitively.

Jim Riddell (in chat): So--- with recent changes-- partnership 4 primary committees CB structure, etc..where does the Ag WG fall-located ? in the hierarchy of the overall organization--structure--currently- NOW going forward?

Caroline Kleis (in chat): Hi Jim, here is the organizational chart for the partnership. We fall under the Clean Water Goal Team as a workgroup [Organizational Chart](#)

Eric Hughes: Jim, there are no changes that we have to worry about there in terms of where we sit. We were previously under the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team. The Water Quality Goal Implementation Team was renamed to the Clean Water Goal Team. We are nested under the Clean Water Goal Team. So, functionally, nothing changes for us. There are very few implications there in terms of where we're slotted in. But that's a really good question.

Paul Bredwell (in chat): Are the concerns of the individual(s) not voting 3,4 or 5 conveyed to the CWGT for consideration if 2/3's bar is not achieved?

Eric Hughes: Absolutely, yes. That's why it's so important that we go through the process and actually register those because we want to be inclusive of as many voices as we possibly can be. We want to make sure that at the very least, those concerns are registered. Then when the Clean

Water Goal Team gets to consider what decision was or wasn't made, they can see exactly why and, in the future, we can look back and see why a decision was made. So, absolutely yes to your question. That will be captured, and that will be elevated to the Clean Water Goal Team.

Greg Albrecht (in chat): Regarding quorum, are alternates for both signatory and at-large voting members able to vote on behalf of their primary rep within the new Framework?

Eric Hughes: That's another absolute yes. I'm trying to think if there's actually provisions for this in the GMF. I can check back on this, but in addition to the primary and alternate, I believe in advance of the meeting as long as we're aware, you can designate a proxy. So, Greg, if neither you nor Amanda can attend a meeting, but you really want to participate in this decision, then you can assign somebody from your team/another trusted representative. If you make that delegation, then my understanding is that we would accept that, and then they could vote on behalf of New York, as long as we have written confirmation of that from the member. We would, of course, want to note that in whatever tracking we do of the decision that was made on a given day. So again, trying to make sure that we can keep things moving, and we want to be as accommodating as possible of the very busy schedules that we know our members have.

Greg Albrecht (in chat): Thank you....appreciate you chasing down these clarifications and documenting them!

III. Approval of Ag E3 Scenario Assumptions and Discussion of Scenario Base Year

Lead: Eric Hughes, AgWG Coordinator

Eric presented the Draft Final Phase 7 Ag E3 Scenario Assumptions Spreadsheet, which includes the latest input on P7 Ag E3 assumptions from AgWG members (communicated through AgWG meetings and meetings of the Ag E3 Small Group). Further discussion of the E3 assumptions and scenario base year took place during this time, and the AgWG was asked to approve the final set of E3 assumptions for Clean Water Goal Team review. It was determined, after walking through the new Partnership decision process, that additional time was needed to answer remaining questions on certain BMPs.

Decisions:

1. Given concerns related to the E3 scenario assumptions for the non-urban stream restoration and poultry litter amendment BMPs, the approval of the Scenario will be deferred to the August AgWG meeting. Additional clarity will be sought on outstanding questions.

Actions:

1. AgWG Staff, in consultation with other CBPO staff, will work to answer remaining questions on the assumptions for the poultry litter amendment BMP.
2. Bill Keeling, VA DEQ, will analyze available stream mile and shoreline data to provide a better understanding of what 15% of low order streams translates to in terms of linear miles.

Discussion Notes:

Caroline Kleis (in chat): The draft scenario spreadsheet is accessible on today's calendar page. These slides will be posted as soon as possible following this meeting. [Agriculture Workgroup Meeting- July 2026](#)

Hunter Landis: I have a general question on the big picture. I know you've gone over it fairly well, but I am just kind of clarifying and thinking out loud. Looking back at the previous 100% for nutrient management, to me, 100% of a goal is optimistic, but I live in reality and don't see it as realistic either. I think we know not everybody's going to hit the goal or some people aren't

going to report to us that they did just because of the mechanisms we have in place. I just kind of want to hear from you- how much reality are we supposed to consider in using 100% versus something slightly more real world, real life, realistic?

Eric Hughes: Sure. It's a good question. I know it's one that's come up consistently throughout this exercise. This is not an exercise in reality. If we are looking at a constraint, we are looking for physical constraints. We are looking for physical constraints that exist if money, manpower, time is not an issue. If we can spend as much money on incentives, theoretically, as possible, what can we get in place? For what we've done for something like buffers, if we have ag land, I think the argument that's been made is, 'well, if we have buffers that are a certain width, then there is the physical constraint of whether a pasture is really going to be able to exist if it's below a certain size and if there's a buffer that's a certain width.' That seems to be a physical constraint that would prevent food production right from happening, and so that could be an example of a physical constraint. We recognize that it is not crystal clear. What is theoretical? Keeping in mind that time, effort, and energy are all infinite, this should be really as ambitious as possible. So, that's probably not a great or fully satisfactory answer to your question, but unfortunately that is the best I'm going to be able to do for this.

Hunter Landis: No, that helps. I'll repeat what I thought you said verbatim in the beginning of your comment; this is not an exercise in reality. If you're nodding your head to that, I can kind of understand that and that makes it just a little more clear. So, I appreciate it.

Eric Hughes: Absolutely. Thank you for the question, Hunter.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): To Hunter's note -- E3 is an exercise in representing the maximum controllable load and so we do have to consider the realities of our sector specifics. The word controllable is baked into this discussion.

Ken Staver: I'm still processing the supplemental. So, you get supplemental nutrient management if you do one of the three supplementals, is that right? So that means 80% will do one of the three rate, placement, and timing?

Hunter Landis: It's technically one of six.

Eric Hughes: So, it's N&P, placement, rate, and timing, in addition to core. So, core of course has to be in place. So, nutrient management is on 100% of all available land uses and then supplemental.

Ken Staver: So, you count N and P as two and that's how you get six. In the realm of no constraints on time, money, or anything else, that's not a that's not a very high bar for supplemental.

Eric Hughes: Elizabeth, I don't know if you wanted to chime in there. That was something that I know Maryland had suggested for that reduction.

Elizabeth Hoffman: 80% of the land use is implementing one of those six practices. We could say if you were to expand this category out, some of those could be closer to 100% for a specific of precision nutrient management but also considering that that is on top of them having core nutrient management in place. So, these two lines are coordinated as a practice. So, I guess if you consider 80% is sort of an average across the six categories, we are not saying that there couldn't be a higher percentage of coverage for some of those rate, timing, placement practices. You're not wrong, Ken. To Hunter's note and Eric's comment, it's not as easy as saying it's [assuming all money is available, etc.]. E3 is an exercise in representing the maximum controllable load. So, I think for our sector specifically, that matters, that word controllable. So, some of this is baked into these justifications and decisions. The model could say that we would convert all ag land to trees, but that's not what the scenario is. So, I think there needs to be a little bit of a caveat to that. Of course, this is best scenario possible, but within the construct of what the sector also needs to accomplish. So, that was not related specific to precision nutrient management, but I'll say it for the others down the line. So Ken, did that help on the precision nutrient management or what are your other concerns?

Ken Staver: I never liked the idea of them being lumped because they're all important. They all can be done independently, especially placement. I'm a big on placement, and it's one that can be done independently. I'm not trying to open up a whole can of worms right now. If you have core nutrient management, which like for a state like Maryland, by law everybody's supposed to have. So that's 100%. That's pretty easy if everybody's following the rules. I know it's not that way in all states.

Elizabeth Hoffman: Ken, that brings up a good point. This is watershed-wide. This is not state specific. Also, this brings another point up that I think is going to matter later. If E3 is representing maximum theoretical controllable load reduction that is achievable by fully implementing the control technologies, our sector has a longer list of technologies in the form of BMPs. So, let's consider that too. In other sectors, there's a shorter list, more of a one-to-one per land use. There are many means to managing land use and loads associated. So again, let's consider that these two are paired. 100% of land use is getting nutrient management core. Then on top of that, 80% are getting some form on average of the other six categories. So, I hope that is justification enough.

Ken Staver: I'm okay with it. I'm actually just sort of going back to an old fight a bit about it. This is not the place for it, but I'm okay with it. I think the core part is huge basin wide. I think once you get that one in there, having one thing that gets you in supplemental in either N and P is not hard. But, for this exercise, I'm totally okay with it. So, we don't need to take any more time for me on this one.

Elizabeth Hoffman: I appreciate your comments. I'll say we've had this conversation ourselves. This is sort of setting the bar and then WIP planning will set the course of how we achieve that. So, it's challenging to mix and muddy them.

Eric Hughes: Thank you both. So, the line that I walk in the coordination role is that the default will be for me that we always set 100%. Now the role is to articulate when members feel that 100% is not where it should be set. So that's the point in really making sure that these justifications are as fleshed out and you're as comfortable with them as possible. So that is what will be elevated. So, if you don't feel like 100% is feasible, then it's the will of the partnership and that's what the Clean Water Goal Team will be asked to consider.

Non Urban Stream Restoration

Eric Hughes: The question that was brought forward here was from Bill/Virginia. Bill, I know you were going to sit in on the Modeling Workgroup meeting. I guess the question that I wanted to ask you here is, do you feel as though your questions have been answered? Are you in a position where you feel comfortable with this assumption for non-urban stream restoration? If we were to seek consent, is this something that would warrant a stop or a hold?

Bill Keeling: I did attend the Modeling Workgroup. From what I understand, Phase 7 will have more linear miles. It has a newer or more intense stream network represented. So, I am going to be downloading it. I haven't done it yet; I got a bunch of things going on. I will pull the actual GIS file down that has the stream arcs or the schematic representation of the stream network for Phase 7. I think it said low order streams or something like that. For the stream restoration part, I just didn't understand what that meant in this Model. So, I can't use the Phase 6 shoreline or stream lengths. I need to get the new arc data to try to get at that. My concern is what is 15% of the low orders? Is that 100 miles, is that 10,000 miles? I mean, I'm just trying to get at what that really means. Just saying X percent of low order ag streams is not very descriptive in terms of what we're really talking about implementing, even if that's possible. That's where I was coming at with that. Sorry I haven't been able to crunch the numbers and give you a definitive explanation of what that would mean. But, it can be done.

Eric Hughes: Sure. I guess my follow up to that would be when we come to a call for consent, is this something that Virginia will be a hold on? Or is it that we recognize that 15% is going to look different from what the Phase 6, 15% was, but we feel as though it is not going to be so radically

different that it would prevent us from standing aside or supporting this Scenario. So, we don't need to answer that now, but that'll, I guess, be the question once we come to consent for Virginia to consider when you're going to potentially raise your hand to register that stop or hold.

Bill Keeling: Well, what I propose is let me run the numbers and send them to you, and you can distribute to all the actual members so they have a clear understanding of what that percentage means in terms of either linear feet or miles of framework needed. Then they can compare it to what they currently have. Then I think people can make a better decision of if that is theoretically possible or if we are shooting for mars. So that's all.

Eric Hughes: Ok, well, we will memorialize that in your vote when we call for consent. I appreciate you weighing in with that, Bill. Next on the list, we need to talk about ag stormwater management.

Ag Stormwater Management

Eric Hughes: So, this was set at 100% available feed space acres, just as barnyard runoff control and loafing lot management was. There has since been discussion about this not necessarily being the best assumption. So, I want to provide members with the opportunity to provide alternatives to what is included here.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): Maryland proposes -- Proposed P7 E3 Assumption: 100% permitted feed space acres

Elizabeth Hoffman: Maryland would propose that this be 100% of available permitted feed space acres. Feed space acres are fully covered by both barnyard runoff control and loafing lot management. This is a practice that stacks beyond. It was not available in Phase 6, it is available in Phase 7, but it is implemented very specifically to permitted feed space. It is also not an NRCS practice. I want to point that out as well. So again, the resource concern is being addressed by the first two, and this is sort of additional. So, we feel like we are still addressing 100% of the land use load by still having this be the permitted section only.

Eric Hughes: Ok, so just to make sure folks can see what this would look like, this would be the change. So, counters to that, does anybody have any concerns with that change? Any counterpoint to raise? Hearing none, we will move forward.

Poultry Litter Amendments

Clint Gill (in chat): The data we're using for the Delmarva peninsula is based on tested poultry litter, so it should include PLA, but I can't speak for other areas

Paul Bredwell: Thank you. I am. I just want to clarify that this is not only Alum as a PLT. There are other substances that are used as a poultry litter treatment. So, I just want to make sure it's not just only Alum as a treatment option.

Eric Hughes: Sure. I can link to our BMP quick reference guide. It's page 88. The definition that I'm looking at in here is poultry litter treatment, so not poultry litter amendments. For poultry litter treatment, it specifically says a surface application of alum, an acidifier to poultry litter, to acidify poultry litter and maintain ammonia in the non-volatile ionized form. Now, are others considered? Tom, I don't know if you have any insight into that. I'm going off of what I'm seeing in our documentation here.

Tom Butler: Yeah, I don't know that I have too much more to add to that, Eric. Obviously, that guide speaks for itself. But, I am definitely willing to follow up offline if people feel we need to do that more.

Bill Keeling (in chat): We could report phytase as a BMP in p5 and that stopped in p6.

Hunter Landis (in chat): This is also on pg 88 (back to the litter amendments note): NRCS Practice Code 591: Amendments for the treatment of agricultural waste is the treatment of manure, process wastewater, stormwater runoff from lots or other high intensity areas, and other wastes with chemical or biological additives.

Eric Hughes (in chat):

Poultry Feed Additives/Phytase:Poultry Litter Subcommittee determined affects of feed additives were captured in litter nutrient concentrations and, therefore, this was removed for Phase 6- 2015 https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/documents/recommendations_to_estimate_poultry_nutrients_for_phase_6_model_03062015.pdf

Paul Bredwell: So, point of clarification. You said “acidification like Alum”, is that what you basically read there?

Eric Hughes: I should have just pasted the definition in the chat rather than reading it. So, here is the definition as it appears in the BMP guide that we have.

Eric Hughes (in chat): https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/documents/BMP-Guide_Full.pdf - page 88 A surface application of alum, an acidifier, to poultry litter to acidify poultry litter and maintain ammonia in the non-volatile ionized form (ammonium).

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): It crosswalks from NRCS 591, just fya.

Paul Bredwell: So, to me, that reads Alum and Alum only. So that is certainly a problem in my mind.

Eric Hughes: Ok, and what we can do is we can follow up offline. We can go ahead and make sure that that is the case. Paul, if this were to include more than Alum, if this were a more general ‘poultry litter amendments’ BMP, would that be less of a concern in your mind? Is it just the fact that we're specifying Alum is the only one?

Paul Bredwell: Yes, so if it was reversed to say application of an acidifier like alum, or we could give other products, that would rectify my concern.

Eric Hughes: Ok, excellent. We will make sure we track that down for you.

Ken Staver: On the phytase, you said phytase is out now because it's reflected in the litter P content?

Eric Hughes: What I was referring to was, back in March, we presented practices that are no longer considered/practices that are no longer creditable. In that, I remembered seeing Phytase in the list of past practices that are no longer in the list.

Ken Staver: I'm following up on that with these treatments that are to reduce ammonia emissions, I think. From a bird health standpoint, Paul can weigh in on this, the point is to lower the ammonia emissions in the house to make for a healthier environment for the birds. But I think it ends up with higher N content in the litter. So, it's kind of the reverse. So, it might reduce atmospheric ammonia emissions, but is it reflected in the N content of litter for field application? I guess that's my question on this.

Paul Bredwell: Ken, I'd ask you to clarify that. Phytase is added to the to the diet simply to reduce the amount of phosphorus that is put into the diet. So, it increases the bird's ability to convert phosphorus. Therefore, you don't have to put too much into it because the bird can only intake a certain percentage without phytase inclusion.

Ken Staver: Right. From a water quality standpoint or nutrient balance perspective, the bottom line is it changes the P. It reduces the peak content of litter. These litter treatments don't affect the feeding of nutrients, it affects the volatilization of ammonia from the litter. I think that's my understanding.

Paul Bredwell: I'm not a biologist or microbiologist. Phytase is associated with the phosphorus, not necessarily the nitrogen content, so I'm not going to presume to think that it's increasing or decreasing the amount of ammonia that's generated, because that's the nitrogen phase of it, right?

Ken Staver: Right, but I'm saying the alum is targeted at reducing, even in the definition Eric read. It's about keeping the keeping the ammonia in the litter as opposed to having it in the air though.

Paul Bredwell: That's correct. The intent is that you don't convert the ammonium to ammonia.

Bill Keeling (in chat): I believe Ken is asking if the litter treated by these chemicals is part of the sampling that provides nutrient contents of litter. And thus accounted for in the data used for concentrations from the litter.

Ken Staver: So, we kind of stopped doing phytase as a BMP because we're capturing the effect of the P content of litter by looking at the composition of litter. So, my question about Alum is, it's actually maybe increasing the N content of litter. This is more of a specific question, not an E3 question so much, but it seems like if we're going to say 100% of the litter is treated, that's going to make litter have higher N content. How are we dealing with that?

Paul Bredwell: No, I would push back. You're not increasing the nitrogen by the addition of alum or the poultry litter treatment. It's mass balance, Ken. It's nitrogen in and nitrogen out. There's no increase in nitrogen.

Ken Staver: When you do nutrient management, if I understand it right from the presentations I've seen, half of the N that's excreted by the birds in a broiler house leaves the house as volatilized ammonia. So, it's a big chunk of the N that's actually coming out of the birds. We're not changing what's coming out of the bird. We're changing what's staying in the litter, which is what we deal with in our field nutrient management and our watershed budgets. So, it's shifted from a different category to being an atmospheric release, which comes down somewhere.

Paul Bredwell: I'll concede that. But, there's no increase in the amount of nitrogen. It's just in one form or the other.

Ken Staver: Right. But if I'm growing corn and I'm looking at my nutrient management plan and I have litter, if we're looking at the whole watershed that way, when we reduce volatilization whether it's from poultry or any animal system, we have more N to deal with for field applications.

Paul Bredwell: I will concede that, yes.

Ken Staver: So, I was just curious how that's being handled with all this focus on litter nutrients.

Tom Butler: I think the important thing to realize when we talk about things like litter and manure and all these sources is when we get it, we're trying to have it with a "no-BMP" state. Obviously, phytase is ubiquitous within the data, so we don't have the BMP because it's assumed to be fed pretty much everywhere all the time. But for a lot of these other things like what Ken is talking about with these amendments and alum in particular here is what we've mentioned, that would then be applied to kind of our stored nitrogen. So, that would have the impact of what you're talking about with plant availability on the field. So, when we start out with it, we don't have an impact of it. We have to have it reported for that impact to be seen. So that would, in a way, filter down to the field application, the plant available amount that you're talking about. But I think it also leaves room here for what Paul has talked about for not affecting the overall amount. If that makes any sense.

Ken Staver: I guess our problem is the fertilizer N numbers weigh into this and the whole N bucket that we have to apply on our crop land is a big part of managing ag nutrients. This to me, is a house BMP. It's an animal husbandry BMP. If we're already looking at having more N than we know where to put it all because of fertilizer, this gives us even more N to field apply. Again, this may not be an E3 thing, but it's sitting in front of us and I'm just thinking that this actually gives us more N to deal with on our cropland.

Paul Bredwell: These poultry litter treatments have been occurring for decades. So, the litter samples that you see now and you see 5, 10 years ago, it's the same nitrogen content. It's not as though now that this nitrogen content in the litter should go up because this BMP is being considered or accepted or approved. The litter treatments are not new.

Ken Staver: So, I guess what I'm saying is it's already being captured. I guess my point is the effect of treatments that keep the ammonia in the litter are essentially being captured by our litter analysis that we're putting in the Model. I guess that's the bottom line on this.

Paul Bredwell: And I wouldn't with argue that comment either.

Clint Gill (in chat): This is going back to basic model function, but does the model differentiate between NH_4 and NO_3 ?

Greg Albrecht (in chat): Seems like alum use should be reflected in average poultry manure NH_4 values used in the model.

Eric Hughes: So, if that is indeed the case, then we'd be looking at 0% and then the assumption would be what we had initially put forward for Phase 6. Now, I certainly can't put words in Jess's mouth, and she's out this week. But, there was maybe some disagreement with the Phase 6 premise. So, this is another topic that would be great for offline follow-up. We can address that there. Tom, to Greg's point in the chat gets at sort of the crux of this. I don't know if you have an opinion or have a take, or if it's just something that we follow up with offline, but it's seeming like alum should be reflected in average values in the model.

Tom Butler: To that end, I think it goes back to what I said before. When we get a lot of these nutrient concentrations, and we've just updated for Phase 7 a lot for the Delmarva, we have to back out things like that. That required finding out where in the process BMPs might have been applied or might not have been. If there is an implicit accounting for it, then we would have removed that. So, we would not be accounting for alum in the initial manure stream. We would then have it applied at its place as a BMP. When it comes to the differentiation that Clint's talking about, we really talk more about the total nitrogen. I don't know enough about the specifics of where and when we would have the speciation, and I'd rely on Jess more for that one.

Elizabeth Hoffman (in chat): So we think this is a controllable load that we can implement a control technology (PLA BMPS) against? To discuss the PLA practice in future - efficiency, how modeled, ability to capture and report beyond alum.

Eric Hughes: So, we have two points of follow up. We need some questions answered on poultry litter amendments and we need questions answered on non-urban stream restoration. But, it sounds like with the exception of those two points, we are okay with everything in this document. Procedurally, I want to turn it over to Caitlin to call for consent. Now, what we would do is, if you all have these concerns, I think we only need it to be captured once. We don't need to go through and have everybody express the same concerns. So, Caitlin, I'll turn it to you.

Caitlin Grady: First, before I call for consent, Caroline, can you check in and confirm that quorum is present?

Caroline Kleis: Yes, confirming that we do have a quorum and Tyler is here on Matt Royer's behalf as the alternate.

Caitlin Grady: Ok, great. Since we have quorum, I will ask if any Workgroup members would like to register a stop or hold to please raise your hand. Or, Eric, have you already sort of captured this?

Eric Hughes: So, here's what I'm thinking we do. We put Virginia as a hold until we get information on non-urban stream restoration. Then I'm just going to pick Ken as our hold for poultry litter amendments just to make sure that we capture those two BMPs. If others want to register that, if feel free to put that in the chat or raise your hand and if you feel strongly about one of those, but we're going to make sure that both those two BMPs are captured here.

Bill Keeling (in chat): The dynamic watershed model will have to provide N and P speciation as an input to the EM.

Clint Gill (in chat): Delaware would like to register a hold until we get the PLA follow up

Seth Mullins (in chat): Do litter amendments get reported as specific products or are the P7s and PLT products just lumped in as Alum?

Caitlin Grady: Okay, would anyone else like to register any concerns we can notate and register? Ok, so since we don't have to finalize this decision until the August meeting, we will register these concerns raised today to be addressed, and we will table this decision until August.

Eric Hughes: Excellent. That sounds great to me, Caitlin. What will happen is we'll bring this back at the August meeting. But I just want to give everybody a heads up, at the August meeting, because we have that deadline that's looming, we will go to a vote. So of course, we fully expect to have everybody's concerns addressed. We're going to follow up as soon as Jess is back. We'll follow up on the items that I think she will probably be able to clarify for us, and you will get the information that hopefully you need to feel comfortable moving forward with this. If we can't go by consent in August, then we're going to get our first shot at a vote. Auston, I want to make sure

we touch on membership and I know we're looking short on time, but can you just do a quick overview of what to expect for scenario base here?

Auston provided a brief overview of the considerations for the Scenario Base Year and the ongoing discussion taking place at the Clean Water Goal Team meeting.

Base Year

Eric Hughes: I appreciate that, Auston. The decision for E3 is associated with ag BMPs, and therefore very much an AgWG decision that we make and we put forward. The Clean Water Goal Team says our ag experts have weighed in and this is informing our decision. The way I understand it, we don't really have much say in what is done with the scenario base year. They're not saying, AgWG, we need you to decide on this and then elevate that. It's a little bit of a different thing. I think it's more straightforward, the role that we play and the authority that we have in putting forward assumptions for the E3 scenario. As far as scenario base year goes, that's sort of like a management decision that's going to be made. So, it feels almost like more of a formality. So, my recommendation would be if that's something that it sounds like you care about and you're interested in learning more, the Clean Water Goal Team would be the place to really sink your teeth in. So, this is not an effort to be dismissive of that in any way, shape, or form. Again, if we really need to talk about more, if people are like, hey, no, we want to hear more about it, then just let us know and we can do that. But those discussions are being held at the Clean Water Goal Team. So has anybody been in a situation or in a different meeting where you've heard about it and there are some things that you wanted to raise here, or if you really are passionate, are you comfortable with participating at the Clean Water Goal Team?

Bill Keeling (in chat): The WIP 3 planning scenarios was a 2025 land use condition. Is the base year being proposed going to be the starting place for WIP 4?

Auston Smith (in chat): Bill, the proposed (not finalized) future land use year for WIP planning could be 2040. This is the assumption our team is working on for Nov/Dec scenario reviews.

Bill Keeling (in chat): Will EPA require the states to account for growth if it is 2010?

IV. AgWG Membership Under New Partnership Structure

Lead: Eric Hughes, AgWG Coordinator

The new Chesapeake Bay Program Governance and Management Framework allows for the designation of up to 15 voting members (9 signatory, 6 at-large). The AgWG currently maintains a voting roster of 21 members (9 signatory, 12 at-large), all of whom have historically been eligible to participate in the past consensus-based decision-making process. The Clean Water Goal Team is requesting its workgroups provide feedback on how they will adhere to this new structure. The AgWG discussed initial feedback and potential paths forward for conforming to the partnership's new structure. AgWG leadership team will draft a membership plan and a vote to approve that plan will be held at a later date. Eric presented the context for this topic from the Governance and Management Framework and Clean Water Goal Team request.

Actions:

1. AgWG staff will inform the CWGT leadership of the timeline for conforming to the 15-voting member structure and the concerns shared by AgWG members and participants. Discussions will continue, and voting membership will be the first agenda item on the August AgWG meeting agenda.

Discussion Notes:

Clint Gill (in chat): AgWG has not traditionally had representation from D.C., is that changing or do we have a potential for 7 at large members

Clint Gill (in chat): If we're counting on quorum, we REALLY need participants to show up

Greg Albrecht (in chat): If we're going to be limited to 15, NY would prefer more Ag industry and SWCD reps (i.e., Ag conservation practitioners) as voting members, so would like to explore if existing signatory members like DOE and EPA might yield to Ag practitioners.

Eric Hughes: Clint, I think another question is, a jurisdiction may tell us that right now we don't want to exercise our right to have a voting member serving on the AgWG. Now, what happens when folks at the top change and maybe say, hang on a second, why did we make that decision? A question I have that hasn't been answered yet is, well, who gets to say at what point an at-large member gets kicked out? When do we reconstitute a workgroup if a signatory has relegated its role to a non-signatory in that regard, right? If a jurisdiction comes back one day and says, actually, no, we want to be represented here, it sounds to me like we're kicking somebody off. I want to make sure we have clarity on that point, too. So that's something that I'm going to ask about is what that would look like. But, the start is going to be asking jurisdictions if they would still like a spot and then going from there. I think that was part of the motivation, Clint, too. If we're counting on quorum, we really need participants to show up. If you are saying that you are going to serve on a Workgroup, then yes. So. I think this was almost viewed as a push to make sure that there's engagement. If people don't want to be engaged, then the question needs to be asked either what needs to change in coordination, which is a very fair question, or if it's just maybe there's not enough support for this group to exist. Maybe it's not something that should be taking resources, which is also something that's helpful. Now, I don't think the latter is going to be the case for ag. Greg, you are also getting exactly to my question here, and that is, how prescriptive should we be in identifying sectors to be represented as Ag work group at large members? In our existing governance, we suggest the Ag Workgroup maintains one member from each of the following groups. Those groups are academia, agribusiness and industry, conservation districts and technical assistance providers, conservation environmental NGOs, and USDA. So that's only five. Of course, we have 6 I think one thing that's maybe missing there that we could absolutely slot in is like a producer. That kind of makes sense. But, to your point, Greg, that New York would prefer more ag industry and soil water conservation district reps as voting members DOE and EPA might yield to ag practitioners, I think the question is how do we want to build out our voting for at large? There's nothing that prevents us from saying we have these categories and for our six at-large members, we want these slots to be filled by folks from these groups. I wanted to gauge the appetite of the folks here. Do we want to leave it as a suggestion? Like say you can pick whichever 6 you want to pick, but in your selection, really be mindful of making sure that these folks are represented. Or is there some way that we would want to codify that? Now, I don't know if that's something that we would need to consult with the Clean Water Goal Team on or if that's a decision we could actually make. To me, it seems like that would be a fair thing for a Workgroup to be able to set. But again, that's not something that GMF actually prescribes. I need to be able to take something back to folks and say, hey, this is really what people are pushing for. Is this something that we can do? So, what are your thoughts? So, in a space where we have 6 at-large members, my question for the group is, who gets a vote?

Eric Hughes (in chat):

- Academia (e.g. regional colleges and land grant institutions)
- Agri-Business and Industry (e.g. regional commodity, fruits and nuts, livestock and poultry, and nursery representatives or associations)
- Conservation Districts and Technical Assistance Providers (e.g. District staff; consultants and engineers)
- Conservation/Environmental NGOs (e.g. regional agricultural and conservation NGOs)
- USDA (e.g., ARS, NRCS)

Ken Staver: The comment that came to my mind when we talk about producers is that when we look at the watershed, we have main sectors of land use. In the end, water quality comes back to managing the watershed, which is managing the land. We have dairy. Dairy is big in the more in the northern part of the watershed. They have forages and silage, which are totally different from the poultry cash grain operation. So, having one producer still is really limiting in terms of representing the watershed. So it's almost like there needs to be a grain person, a dairy person, and a poultry person. You can have a great person from any sector, and they can be in some way represent the ag voice. So, it feels very limiting in terms of what we're dealing with with this watershed and the breadth of agricultural production, and you're going to say one sector is going to be represented by a producer who happens to be in that sector.

Jim Riddell (in chat): The ag industry- watershed producers--and the largest land users, livestock (beef cattle) across entire CB

Greg Albrecht (in chat): This is all in the context I imagine of the problem with reducing the number of at-large members, because the AgWG has functioned well with a larger slate of at-large, that we feel is necessary to represent the diversity of Ag in the Watershed (dairy/forage, broilers, layers, beef/forage, swine, grains, and specialty crops all across a range of farm sizes). Note, the 2022 GMF allowed specified a 9 / 6 structure, but allowed the AgWG to use a more responsible and representative 9 / 12 structure. It's important to explore an exemption for the AgWG. 9/6 is not adequate for the Watershed.

Greg Albrecht: I just sort of wrote our thought in the chat too to memorialize it. I agree, Ken, and there were concerns from the Ag Advisory Committee about this. I realize the time to act was probably during the spring when the new GMF was in draft form. But, it's really frustrating. I think we're all similarly frustrated that we're taking a backwards step by reducing the ability to represent the ag practitioners across the watershed, like Ken articulated. I guess, if there is any way to explore the structure that we had under the 2022 GMF, which did specify a 9-6 structure, to allow at least our current 9-12 structure, and frankly it should probably be larger, than we'd like to participate in that.

Jim Riddell (in chat): We need more ag producer involvement than 1

Kate Bresaw (in chat): I wonder if you're getting that input at the Ag Advisory Committee level, Ken?

Ken Staver (in chat): It isn't clear to me yet what the role of the ag advisory committee is.

Eric Hughes: Yeah, thank you, Greg. I am interested in getting Marel's take here because I know she's been intimately involved in the Clean Water Goal Team discussions. Yes, the exemption was made previously. I will say that what we have been told very clearly is under the new leadership and with what has been approved, we can tell them that AgWG membership really wants an exemption. But, we know for a fact that they will tell us that you have to conform. These conversations have been happening, frankly, for several weeks just recognizing that this is going to be a challenge, particularly with this group, because of who we are and what we represent and how substantial this piece of the pie is.

Marel King: Do we know that for a fact? I thought there was some opening for a petition or formal request to be made for an exception. I know I've raised it with our PSC member and GO team member because of the nature of the AgWG, and the diversity represented there would be sort of my justification for that.

Eric Hughes: The latest communication that we had from this was Friday, July 10th, when The Clean Water Goal Team leadership sent this message to members and work group chairs: "We are confirming that all work groups should conform to the 15 voting member structure as outlined in the GMF". They corrected their action item to not include any note about exemptions from this. So, the direction that we've received is no non-voting members at the work groups and no exemptions. Marel, you are the CBC member of the Clean Water Goal Team, right?

Marel King: Correct, yes.

Eric Hughes: So, if you feel that, as a Clean Water Goal Team member, that is still not decided, then that certainly makes me question this.

Marel King: Well, I thought that's how we left it at our last meeting, at the June face-to-face meeting.

Eric Hughes: Right, at the last meeting that was how it was left, and then this e-mail came through. So, if there are questions from membership as to whether or not this is what is to be followed, then that's helpful.

Hunter Landis (in chat): What are the guidelines for who represents a jurisdiction? Could an Ag producer be the voting member for a jurisdiction?

Elizabeth Hoffman: I want to talk to Hunter specifically about guidelines of who represents a jurisdiction. I'll back up and say we value producers, but I do think we're sort of getting a little beyond our scope and the idea that some of that lift to incorporate producer input should happen at the jurisdictional level. Like MDA is responsible for some of that coordination. To the point about an ag producer being the voting member, given the purview of this group to provide technical expertise and input and address federal and state technical and financial resources that contribute to WIP progress, I'm not saying they couldn't do that, but that's challenging from an agency perspective when MDA is responsible for coordinating at the state level for achievement of WIP progress. I guess my point is I'm not ever going to push back that we couldn't have more producer voices. I think there are other existing formats where that is more preferable, like the Ag Advisory Committee. I also think that the AgWG should not replace some of that exercise which is done at the jurisdictional level. I would just have a little bit of heartburn with that, to be pretty frank. Maybe we're just talking apples to oranges, but there is a history of who represents jurisdictions/signatories in these spaces, and that is connected to policy and programming at a state level. So, I just want to say that if that is not documented it anywhere.

Clint Gill (in chat): Agree with Elizabeth on that point. I'm 10 years into this and there are parts of the model that I still don't understand.

Hunter Landis: And I'm not necessarily proposing that. So, thanks for the information. I was just kind of raising that as a question for my understanding. So, thank you.

Ken Staver: Eric, I agree with Elizabeth overall. I guess I was going to say, if you're going to pick one...

Eric Hughes: We don't have to pick one. I just put one out there. It does not have to be one. The question is, if we have 6 slots to fill, who fills those slots?

Ken Staver: Right. I fall more into camp of what Elizabeth said- given what the mission of this group is, a lot of producer input should be represented by the signatories, I would think. So, I really wasn't advocating for more individual producers being on the list. But, I don't like the idea of having one, because then you only have one sector represented. I thought Elizabeth said it very well what I thought should be the case.

Jim Riddell (in chat): Agree with E and Ken.

Eric Hughes: Ok. We are at time. I'm not going to stifle discussion because there are no decisions to be made here. So, I think we can keep going with the folks who can remain online. Paul, if you're able, please share your perspective.

Paul Bredwell: Thank you, Eric, and thank you everyone else. To say I'm frustrated would be an understatement to see that these decisions have been made by individuals that really haven't been a part of these discussions for any length of time. I've been a part of this AgWG for close to 20 years now. I've witnessed incredible collaboration over the time that I've been involved in this. Regardless of ideology, I've seen those ideologies set aside and work performed to better the quality of the Chesapeake Bay and make sure that this model has the best information available. I think producers should be involved. I talk with producers all the time. I'm not sure producers, individual producers of poultry, have the technical subject matter expertise to be involved in some of these high-level discussions. So, I'll state that. Yes, the state should represent their interest, but quite frankly, and I don't want to sound harsh here, the fact that I had to bring up the fact that

Alum is not the only poultry litter treatment that is used out there, I feel like the state should know that. So, these at-large members, I think, are essential in making sure that this is a collaborative, validated, vetted effort to make sure that the data that's going into this model is the best that it can be. If there's a way to apply for an exemption, I would highly support that. Eric, I'm just going to be fully transparent. You and I have talked about this. I've seen this whole process somewhat for the AgWG at least, somewhat neutered. This just continues that movement in my mind. So, I'm highly disappointed and highly frustrated. If there's a way to apply for an exemption, at least for the AgWG, I would be all behind that. So, thanks for the time and thanks to everyone on this call for the great work that's taken place over decades now. I'd hate to see that diminished by the reduction of at-large members that can participate.

Caitlin Grady: I just want to appreciate everybody's comments. I think Eric and I have been talking to several of you as these decisions have been discussed at higher levels. I appreciate and I hear the frustration, and I think a lot of people share that this work group has worked well with its membership structure over the last little bit. I will say, regardless of what Eric and I get told, whether or not we have an exemption process, we intend to keep the spirit of open participation and feedback going alive and well in this group, regardless of if the membership numbers themselves change. So, we will do what we can. We have been trying to do what we can in terms of clarity on exemptions. But, we intend to keep functioning the way this very collaborative group functions, even if the numbers end up changing based on other higher orders of management within the Bay Program.

Kristen Saacke Blunk (in chat): There are a number of ag scientists too who are working within environmental organizations (AND higher ed) - e.g. TNC, CBF, SusChes, ACB, and others - that this cap will eliminate as a voting member.

Greg Albrecht (in chat): Paul, agreed. The 12 at-large AgWG members have generally been the most engaged, relevant participants for the last 15+ years.

Kristen Saacke Blunk (in chat): Thank you Paul B for this input

Jim Riddell: I haven't been on this that long (a couple of years now), and I've been listening, and you've all been doing some great work. But I agree with Paul and Ken and Elizabeth. To discount the producers here, my goodness, we're going in the wrong direction. I'm not focused on our industry, the beef cattle industry, but the largest land use in the Chesapeake Bay watershed is pasture and hay and livestock along those lines. We've all been listening, Eric, over the last month, and we can tell there's a lot going on behind the scenes. But I think that the organization needs to take a hard look. If you're planning to do voluntary conservation for the future, and in most of our states that's what we're doing, and with resources and money and incentives for producers, if this is going to minimize that involvement...I've been involved in agriculture all my life, and that's definitely the wrong direction. So, I think anybody that's a producer or out there with industry groups would feel very strongly, I'm sure. Thank you very much.

Marel King: I've gotten some clarification that the GMF is actually very firm on the number of voting members. I think the key word is voting members there. That said, I don't think there's any harm in registering our concerns with this and raising that. I think it's fair. What ultimately comes out of that, I think that keyword is voting, and regardless of how many at-large voting members there are, I think this Workgroup, as has been stated before, needs to continue to be very broad and inclusive as far as participants at our meeting, with the ample opportunity to be part of the discussion as we've been doing. Thanks.

Greg Albrecht (in chat): Caitlin, thank you. Well said and appreciated. We're also concerned that a reduction in voting roles will reduce the commitment that key stakeholders will be able to prioritize toward the AgWG. Voting roles help with engagement and commitment. Just registering as our comments today are elevated. Thank you.

Eric Hughes: I appreciate that, Marel, and you are right. The GMF is very specific in what it prescribes for Workgroup membership. I think some of the confusion was when the Clean Water Goal Team had initially opened the door to exemptions. Prior to last Friday, one of the things that

outlined in the agenda was we have multiple options to consider. When this was sent out, that was one of the options on the table. If that was the guidance that we received, then we've heard you loud and clear, and that was certainly one of the things that we were going to put forward as something to consider for the group. With this in mind, we will absolutely register all of these concerns in what is ultimately put forward. There is nothing saying that we can't still put forward that we know that we have to conform to this, however, we have these very real concerns. We want to make sure that that is on the record, captured, and that that was the position. I would still encourage, even if you lose that voting power, I would still want as many folks who represent the agriculture industry to participate in these meetings and make your voice heard when there is opportunity for weighing in in that capacity. Members make decisions, but members are not the only voices that are considered by this partnership. If this is the world that we have to live in, we want to be very mindful of who gets to fill those six positions. So, I would encourage all of you to think about who you want to have nominated. When you're voting to approve, who do we want to be represented there? So there's not a satisfactory resolution here. I recognize that, and we will log all of the feedback that we've received today and in follow-up conversations..

Greg Albrecht: Eric, I thought I saw that they wanted an answer by for how we were going to manage the six at-larges by July 31st. I really appreciate you and Caitlin elevating the concerns that we've discussed today. At least it seems like we will need more time than July 31st. I'm wondering if you have a sense of their flexibility for that.

Kate Bresaw (in chat): I see an opportunity here to have very inclusive jurisdiction level conversations that inform decisions that voting members make, and I encourage us to have those conversations if the 15 voting member structure is adopted.

Eric Hughes: Sure. The revised action item states that if it is not possible to submit that recommendation by the 31st, to please discuss at your next work group meeting and update the Clean Water Goal Team leadership by July 31st on an expected timeline for your work group to transition membership.

Greg Albrecht: Ok.

Eric Hughes: So, we would need to update with timeline by the 31st. So for timeline, we can tell them that we plan to have a follow-up discussion at the next meeting. I don't see a reason why this couldn't be the first item on our next agenda. If that would be satisfactory to folks, we can just tell the Clean Water Goal Team that that's what we plan to do and expect to have resolution after that time Greg, noting that you as a signatory are asking for that. So, I know that would impact the decision that would be made. You're saying that you need to have more time. That is that is something that that will be relayed. Kate, I'm wondering if you would be willing to come off and speak to this point that you've made.

Kate Bresaw: I don't know that there's anything more to elaborate on. I don't know that any of the conversations are going to stop, but I think that the conversations can be organized maybe differently and those conversations can happen ahead of a vote. At the jurisdictional level, we can encourage those conversations to happen. I understand the spirit of where this is coming from, though I do definitely see the consternation of the group. So, I just encourage us to look for opportunities to continue the work that we're doing with the structure that we've been given. That's all.

Eric Hughes: I appreciate that, Kate. Ultimately, I think that's where we will land, but we can talk this out a little bit more. So, I completely agree. I don't think it'll prevent us from doing the work. If we need to conform, then we will conform, and we'll figure out how to operate best in that environment. So, with the July 31st deadline, we will let them know that it was expressed by some of our signatory members that we wanted some additional time to discuss the plan. Then after the August meeting, where this will be the first item on the agenda, we can share with them how we plan to proceed. So, any heartburn? That is where I will leave it.

Caitlin Grady: Thank you everybody for your thoughts and sharing freely today. I don't know if we've lost people because I had to switch to my phone. We've never voted on the minutes at the top of the meeting.

Eric Hughes: If we lost any of our signatories or any of our voting members, then we'll put it up for the next meeting.

Caitlin Grady: Or we can just vote on both sets of minutes. Maybe Caroline, you can remind Eric and I of that for the next meeting to vote on both sets. But other than that, then we move to adjourn. Thanks everybody for your participation today.

V. Wrap-Up

Lead: Eric Hughes, AgWG Coordinator

VI. Adjourn

Next Meeting: August 20, 2026, 10:00 AM-12:00 PM

Attendees:

Caitlin Grady, GWU
Jenn Fetter, PSU
Eric Hughes, EPA
Caroline Kleis, CRC
Jenna Talbot, DNREC
Tom Butler, EPA
Brady Seeley, PA SCC
Greg Albrecht, NY Dept of Ag & Markets
Cindy Shreve, WVCA
Jim Riddell, VA Cattlemen's Association
Jennifer Bratthauar, Team Ag
Jenna Schueler, CBF
Auston Smith, EPA
Cassie Davis, NYSDEC
Erin Sonnenburg, CRC
Paul Bredwell, US Poultry & Egg Association
Alex Soroka, USGS
Mark Dubin, VT Cooperative Extension
Tyler Trostle, PA DEP
Clint Gill, DDA
Cass Klingaman, NYS DEC
Denise Uzupis, PDA

Nick Hepfl, HRG
Grant Gulibon, PA Farm Bureau
Kristen Saacke Blunk, Headwaters LLC
Seth Mullins, VA DCR
Caroline Harper, Campbell Foundation
Emily Heller, EPA
Ashley Hullinger, PA DEP
Bill Keeling, VA DEQ
Hunter Landis, VA DCR
Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA
Dylan Burgevin, MDE
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
Marel King, CBC
Kate Bresaw, PA DEP
Tyler Groh, PSU
Ken Staver, UMD Wye
Leah Martino, EPA
Bo Williams, EPA
Bella Konchar
Pat Thompson, EnergyWorks
Suzanne Trevena, EPA