Agriculture Workgroup Meeting Minutes

April 16, 2026
10:00-11:45 AM

Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.

Purpose: Continuing discussions on the development of the E3 Scenario; the review of agricultural BMPs for updates, new editions, and remote sensing suitability; and to learn about the USDA Regenerative Pilot Program. Relevant partnership updates will be shared with the group for situational awareness.

Summary of Actions & Decisions

Decision: The AgWG approved the March 2026 meeting minutes.
Action: Eric Hughes, EPA, will follow up offline with those interested in helping to draft an initial E3 Scenario definition for the AgWG's consideration at a subsequent meeting. If you are interested in contributing to the draft E3 Scenario or you have additional feedback or suggestions you would like to share, please reach out to Eric Hughes (Hughes.Eric@epa.gov) and Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov).
Action: AgWG participants with additional feedback on the Ag BMP Spreadsheet summarizing BMPs and the last time they were evaluated for credit, as well as a breakout of potential opportunities for remote sensing of agricultural BMPs are encouraged to reach out to Eric Hughes (Hughes.Eric@epa.gov) and Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov).
Action: The AgWG will continue to be informed of any updates or progress once the USGS cover crop/tillage remote sensing project work begins in June of 2026.
Action: Please reach out to NRCS Chesapeake Bay Coordinator, Vivian Dickson (vivian.dickson@usda.gov), with any remaining questions on the NRCS Regenerative Pilot Program.
Action: Please reach out to Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov) with any requested edits or improvements to the Agriculture Workgroup webpage, such as additional links to external partner webpages or other useful resources.
Action: The AMT has concluded decision-making meetings for ag inputs to the Phase 7 model. The AMT will continue to meet for non-decisional items and the review of source, input, and output data, bi-monthly through February 2027. Those who would like to receive the AMT bi-monthly calendar invites and be included on the AMT distribution list should contact Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov).

Meeting Minutes

I. Welcome, Roll Call, Review Meeting Minutes
Lead: Caitlin Grady, AgWG Chair

Caitlin opened the meeting with a roll call of the workgroup members and meeting participants. Virtual participants were asked to share their name and affiliation using the meeting "Chat" function. Caitlin then asked workgroup members to approve the March AgWG meeting minutes.

Decisions:

1. The AgWG approved the March 2026 meeting minutes.

II. Deeper Dive into the E3 Scenario

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

Auston Smith, EPA, presented a 15-minute introduction to this topic at the January AgWG meeting. Auston returned to the group this month to provide additional detail on the AgWG's role in E3 Scenario development and fielded questions from workgroup members related to past E3 decisions. As a reminder, the E3 scenario is the "Everything, Everywhere, (by) Everyone" scenario in the Chesapeake Bay watershed model and represents the best possibility of the watershed's ability to control pollutant loads. It is essential to determining the overall controllable loads within the Bay to inform planning target development.

Auston also walked the group through the Urban Stormwater Workgroup's DRAFT recommendations for the developed sector E3 Scenario, linked here.

Actions:

1. Eric Hughes, EPA, will follow up offline with those interested in helping to draft an initial E3 Scenario definition for the AgWG's consideration at a subsequent meeting. If you are interested in contributing to the draft E3 Scenario or you have additional feedback or suggestions you would like to share, please reach out to Eric Hughes (Hughes.Eric@epa.gov) and Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov).

Discussion Notes:

Robb Meinen (in chat): There are a lot of 100% items. Would E3 scenario theoretically be the same as background/natural levels?
Auston Smith: That's a great question. We try and draw a distinction between what is possible with humans being around, and we also have something called the All Forest scenario. That's kind of the scenario where we're not around anymore, and the whole watershed is forest, just to set a true natural/background level of what loads could be. So, the E3 Scenario is, with human considerations, what could the loads reaching the Bay be reduced by.
Amanda Barber (in chat): I am very surprised that the levels are so low for some of the urban BMPs.
Auston Smith: It is a draft version. I welcome continued collaboration between workgroups on where some consistency between assumptions can be made. There certainly should be so everyone's going about this in the same way. They are the experts. I don't want to comment necessarily on what they included in that draft. But, I hear that comment, Amanda. Compared to what I was demonstrating in the Phase 6 AgWG assumptions, there are fewer 100% items, I agree.
Olivia Martin (in chat): Perhaps urban is looking at new vs. existing development.
Mark Dubin (in chat): It might be useful to note that the E3 implementation levels for P6 were developed by the AgWG through an extensive series of discussions and workgroup decisions at the time. Thanks!
Caitlin Grady (in chat): Thanks for the reminder of the P6 process!

Ken Staver: The first one you had on your list was nutrient management. Do we have an assessment of where we are? I am familiar with Maryland, and Maryland is regulatory. So, it's not at 100%, but the legal requirement is to be at 100%. So, when we look around the Watershed, do we start off from a point of saying this is where we are on all of these percentages? Do we have that?
Auston Smith: Certainly in CAST across each watershed jurisdiction, you can determine level of compliance.
Ken Staver: We have the percentage of potential? We've done the E3 exercise before, haven't we?
Auston Smith: Yes.
Ken Staver: So, what about our goals? Do we have all the numbers on the percent of our goals and whether or not we will get it? I am trying to understand why we are worried about it. I understand the arrow, but we already have our WIP goal. We have a TMDL that says this is how far we have to get. That's our goal. Am I understanding that right?
Auston Smith: The controllable loads have to be reset with this new Phase of the model because of all of these underlying assumptions- new BMPs, new land use, new assumptions about ag, new wastewater, etc. So, that changes what the possible realm of controllable loads can be. So, the considerations that go into E3 are directly responsible for the upper end of that realm. So, it does need to be at least reconfirmed. I don't think it's necessarily incorrect with the exception of any practices that maybe aren't there anymore that the AgWG could say this looks good from Phase 6, we think that this should maybe be in the Phase 7 version too. I don't necessarily see that being the case.
Ken Staver: I understand that the land use changes and we don't have as much cropland anymore. So, obviously what's possible changes. It goes to development. So, I understand those kind of changes changing potential reductions. It just seems to me that we could put a lot of effort into coming up with and agreeing on this abstraction of what is possible, and we get bogged down in those kinds of things. I don't see it being that relevant. What's relevant is here's our goals for the Bay to be restored according to the water quality model. What do we need to do to get there? I guess we need to establish up front if it is possible, right? I thought we were past that point.
Auston Smith: My understanding is it is not a given that what is determined by the workgroups as No Action and E3 scenario, whatever is in that controllable loads realm, that the planning targets will be within that. So, it does have to be reconfirmed.
Ken Staver: Alright. I am just worried about getting into this large effort on E3.
Auston Smith: We hope that it will not turn into something too granular. So, yes, we want to provide supportive analyses to make overarching assumptions without getting into too nitty gritty weeds of the matters. But that is a very good reminder, Ken.
Amanda Barber (in chat): I have always felt the ag E3 assumptions were very high. We can't control weather, which in any given year is going to reduce implementation of many BMPs below 100%.
Matt Kowalski (in chat): So the E3 scenario sets the modeled "ceiling" of what's possible?
Alisha Mulkey (in chat): Mark is correct, but Amanda raises an important point. Parity on assumptions across sectors is important. Thank you Austin/Eric for collaboration with USWG.
Caitlin Grady: That's a great reminder, and I think it also relates to a couple of comments and questions in the chat. Amanda is commenting that the E3 assumptions were very high, given that we can't control the weather, which is going to reduce implementation of many BMPs below 100%. Then Matt has a follow up question, which I think relates strongly to Ken's point about how much we get into the weeds here. Are we sort of developing the E3 scenarios as the modeling "ceiling" of what is possible?
Auston Smith: That's a pretty good way of looking at it. Yes, the modeled ceiling of what people can do to reduce loads.
Caitlin Grady: Mark, thank you for providing the context of how the Phase 6 E3 implementation levels were derived after an extensive series of discussions in this very workgroup, and there is a

comment that Amanda raises an important point about parity on assumptions across sectors. So, this is our opportunity to start this conversation process. To Eric's point at the beginning of the conversation, we might use several meetings or several percentages of our next few meetings to have the discussions we need to have to come together on what we want to continue with regarding these scenarios.
Clint Gill (in chat): Yes, how ideal is this ideal scenario we're looking at?
Mark Dubin (in chat): In addition to setting the E3, the recommendations on the recommended levels of implementation by the AgWG was ensuring that those levels were collectively below E3, which is actually the more important metric. That view may address the comments from Amanda and Alisha.
Auston Smith: I think I saw one comment in the chat from Olivia about what the Urban sector was considering in these assumptions. I don't want to speak for what was included, but I think that the distinction between whether they were talking about existing development or new development starting from the scenario base year is an important point. I'm sure that there is some nuance there. That may be in their note at the very bottom. But, clarity there should also be something that we strive to provide to the Clean Water Goal Team by the August-ish timeframe. But, Olivia, maybe I misrepresented that.
Olivia Martin: You are right, Auston. I don't know exactly what the Urban Stormwater Workgroup thinking was, but that has been the thinking in the past. I haven't talked to them in the last couple of months. I also wanted to mention that this is looking at the controllable loads. It is totally hypothetical and there's not been a use attainability analysis, getting at Ken Staver's point. But, it is looking at what is controllable so that when the targets are set, those are realistic. This is solely to inform what the controllable load is, and that is what is the target going to be for the new Bay TMDL targets. So, that's the point. It's not that this is going to be a plan that anybody implements. It is not possible. There's not enough money. There's not landowner agreement. But, this is looking at the hypothetical so that the divvying up of the controllable loads is equitable, using the three principles. I just wanted to remind people that that's the thinking on this. I know Auston has gone over that, but I wanted to reiterate what he has said. Ken, if you are concerned about the achievability, then you can talk to the EPA about a use attainability analysis. But, I don't think that applies in this case. I am certainly not a TMDL expert or an expert on the regulatory process. So, that would be a conversation for EPA and you.
Amanda Barber (in chat): This discussion reaffirms potential benefits of more cross-sector dialogue and collaboration moving forward. We need to get out of our silos.
Ken Staver: I am not concerned about the attainability. I am just concerned about spending a lot of time on something when I'm not sure what it's going to yield us. I know we've got an explanation of it in a reasonable way. I am not arguing with that. But, this is 40 years in. Why didn't we make it this time? Let's look at where we fell short on which practices. Presumably the original WIPs for this goal were adequate to make it. So, why didn't we make it? What is it we have to do more of? What else do we have to do in addition? Because the things that we didn't get done are not doable. It just seems to me that we are at the level of not backing up. I am tired of backing up. I don't want to wade into another reorganization when we have people here that work on getting practices out on the ground. Let's figure out what those practices are that need to be on the ground. Is it cost? What is it? Why isn't it happening? I'm a little worried about backing up.
Eric Hughes: I think you make a valuable point, and I think it is a "yes, and". What I mean by that is the E3 request is something that has been assigned to us from the management levels of the partnership. So, this is something that is, by necessity, on our plate, and we can certainly relay those comments. But, that's not to say that we can't talk about those other things you mention too. I think that's a critical part of what will be on our plate moving forward as well. So, maybe it's not ideal, but luckily it's a finite amount of time that we will be talking about this. It's not going

to be indefinite, but it will require some time for us. Then we can also take a stab at the questions that you've just raised, which I think are very important and warrant answering.
Amanda Barber (in chat): Maybe it's not happening Ken because it's not really feasible or achievable? Maybe ag is taking on too much.

Eric walked the group through E3-related slides on the Coordinator Update presentation.

Eric Hughes: Who do we have on the call who was around for Phase 6 who would be interested in participating in these discussions for Phase 7? This would be not only on the calls, which I assume you will join and provide your feedback on, but offline as well. I will ask for a show of hands if you would be willing to self-identify. *[Hands were raised from Greg Albrecht and Alisha Mulkey]* I think, again, maintaining some continuity across Phases would be great. So, we will follow up and, in terms of the timeline, and this may be overly ambitious, we are going to try and present a preliminary draft at the May meeting. Then, between and July, we can sort of bat around any changes that might need to be made, and then we would be seeking final approval at the July meeting.
Mark Dubin (in chat): I was around for P6 of course....
Alisha Mulkey (in chat): Why did USWG get a jump start on this?
Eric Hughes: Alisha, to your question in the chat, it's a great question. This was introduced at the January meeting and then we had our March meeting in-person. Auston, you can correct me if I am wrong, but the Urban Stormwater Workgroup talked about this in February. I know David and Norm [Urban Stormwater Workgroup Coordinator and Chair] worked together to put a draft forward because Norm, at least, has done this before. So, I think they were able to tackle that as a leadership team, if I am not mistaken. Urban Stormwater has been able to move more quickly on this because of the institutional knowledge that their leadership team has that, unfortunately, we don't. I am looking forward to working with those of you who have that knowledge to get a good product for the Clean Water Goal Team in the coming months.
Auston Smith: We've gone to the Urban Stormwater Workgroup a couple of times, so one more than the AgWG prior to today. Offline, their leadership was able to produce a draft version of it. Norm, David, and KC's expertise in the matter lent itself well to producing a draft version. Their Workgroup still has to talk through all of that and iron it out. But, they have some overarching questions that they reached out on early on.

III. BMP Review Update

Lead: Eric Hughes, EPA

At the March hybrid meeting, Eric Hughes, EPA, provided the AgWG with an overview of a spreadsheet summarizing BMPs and the last time they were evaluated for credit, as well as a breakout of potential opportunities for remote sensing of agricultural BMPs. Members received a subsequent request to review this document and provide their feedback by Thursday, April 9th. Eric gave the group an overview of the feedback received so far, provided the group with an update on ongoing discussions and collaboration since the March meeting, and informed the AgWG of next steps.

Actions:

1. AgWG participants with additional feedback on the Ag BMP Spreadsheet summarizing BMPs and the last time they were evaluated for credit, as well as a breakout of potential opportunities for remote sensing of agricultural BMPs are encouraged to reach out to Eric Hughes (Hughes.Eric@epa.gov) and Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov).

2. The AgWG will continue to be informed of any updates or progress once the USGS cover crop/tillage remote sensing project work begins in June of 2026.

Discussion Notes:

BMP Crediting

Amanda Barber: I just wanted to speak on behalf of the Ag Advisory Committee and really sort of reiterate some of the points that we made in our recommendations and letters to the Executive Council and to lend our support to the AgWG on some initiatives. We hope that you'll utilize all your resources to work on some of these initiatives that are going to help agriculture, and we also hope that you'll collaborate with other sectors as well to move ahead some of these goals. We just wanted to reiterate the importance of soil health. We've been spending a lot of time exploring soil health, soil health from the perspective of a possible BMP or benchmarking, and how we can find connections between soil health and water quality. So, thank you, Eric, for including that in your list. A number of our members have expressed some concerns related to avoided conversions, thinking beyond easements and BMPs like that, and looking at the forestry/ag intersect and continuing to look at ways that forestry and forest management impact water quality and how pasture management and agroforestry/silvopasturing plays a role in that. So, we hope that those practices will continue to be explored and obviously crediting is what's most important.
We're concerned with workforce development. I know that's not something that we would normally think about on this Committee, but I think that there's some intersect based on some of the conversations at the Bay in the Balance conference- concerns about training for technical assistance providers to make sure that we have adequate resources to assist our farmers, as well as making sure that we have future farmers. We also wanted to just bring up the concept of continuing to think creatively, embracing technology, looking at some of the industry-led programming, and making sure that we're finding ways to credit those programs that may not be kind of our traditional BMPs, but may meet some of the same standards or definitions of some of our Bay practices. I also wanted to bring up the idea of synchronization and standardization across state lines. We have a lot of differences in NRCS standards or state standards for practices, and then obviously there's the Bay standards and definitions for practices. We have differences in land grant university recommendations. We have differences in USDA priorities and program priorities. We have differences in the way verification is done. We have differences in program delivery. From a farmer perspective, that's a problem. I know that we can't solve all those, and I know that political boundaries will still have an impact on the way we do business, but we think that there are ways that we can overcome some of those and bring us a little bit closer together.
Nick Hepfl (in chat): Thank you for the great work that you all do on this. I have to head to another meeting today, but I will follow up with the information after the meeting. I have some additional thoughts on BMP crediting.
Eric Hughes: Thank you, Amanda, and I'm sure that covers some of what you'll touch on at the end with the AAC update. So, I'm glad that there's some overlap here with our discussions and what you all are considering at your committee. We appreciate you weighing in with your valuable perspective.
Robb Meinen: I'm not sure if this falls into this BMP list, Eric, but just thinking of the manure shed concept and the areas where we have large animal densities and a surplus of nutrients for the cropland in that region. Can we find ways to encourage the transport of those nutrients to areas where they could be used and replace commercial fertilizers? So, if that's a BMP that can fall into this list and that manure shed nutrient transfer idea, I would like to see included in future thoughts.
Eric Hughes: I appreciate that, and I think it's a good blend of what we're getting at here and also sort of these higher-level concepts that maybe we haven't broached before. I don't know how much we've taken a look at the manureshed concepts. But, it's certainly something that we've

heard from other partners as well as something that would be of interest. So, it's something that we can explore here as well. I appreciate you weighing in with that.
Ken Staver: This sort of follows what Robert was talking about- what are the primary practices? You were talking earlier about the soil conservation plans, having things embedded in them, soil health, etc. So, we sort of have these primary practices that are mechanistic practices. Say it's the nutrient balance at the field level. That's the primary thing that's linked to nutrient losses. But then a lot of our practices we have as BMPs are secondary. They are ways to affect what's applied to fields, but they themselves aren't that practice. So, you talk about manure treatment technology/manure transport, those are ways to address the primary practice, right? It almost feels like we ought to break things into practices that are things that directly affect the movement of nutrients, and then there's this whole suite of practices behind that that affects whether or not we can actually carry out that primary practice. So, if we have a surplus of nutrients in a watershed that we can't figure out a way to deal with, then our field loading rates are going to be high. The manure has to move, it has to be treated, you have to have denitrification, and you have to have these other things. But those things themselves are not are not the driver of nutrient loss directly. It's the field practice. So, I've always talked about proxy. We spend a lot of time looking at these secondary things, but we almost ought to tier it. Like with soil health, the first thing you see when you see soil health is cover crops and tillage. Well, we already deal with cover crops and tillage. So, soil health helps support cover crops and tillage if we have that as a goal, but soil health in itself is not something we do on a field. It involves all these other practices we do. So, I was just thinking about organizing it in a way that we keep a focus on the practices that are actually having the effect and then all these other practices help us get those practices actually where we'd like them to be. So, I don't know if that's too much, but it just seems like all these group things like conservation plans, CSP enhancements, manure transport, and the feeding BMPs that were on the earlier slide are all secondary things that help us deal with the primary things. So, I don't know if that would be a helpful way to look at some of this stuff or not.
Mark Dubin (in chat): In follow-up to Robb's question, the manure shed storage and in-house storage for confined livestock have been credited, as well as the transport of manure nutrients. However, the available data on nutrient needs on an effective management level continue to be a data gap.
Eric Hughes: I appreciate that, Ken. That may be a good thing for us to chat a little bit more about so I can better wrap my head around that. It's interesting, certainly, and I appreciate you sharing that here.
Mark Dubin: We did some work here, especially for confined livestock like poultry to credit the storage in the housing and not just the manure storage sheds. So, I think that was a huge step forward and really reflected what actual production is on that on the landscape. Of course, if we have records where the manure transport is occurring, that's available for your state's report. But, sometimes obtaining that information about what got transported and where it went is a little bit more difficult. I think one of the other areas is that we have sort of holistic data on nutrient concentrations but getting it to a point where it is effective at the management level is another story in my belief. So, you could have a facility or a farm tract that hasn't historically received manure and doesn't have a phosphorus issue that's in an area that does have phosphorus issues. So, how do we represent that. Putting those manure nutrients in the right place at the right time, that gets a little bit more difficult, and that's some of the things I hear back from folks is that there are opportunities there but, unless we know what that background is and we have the information, it's kind of hard at times to give it the full credit.
Marel King (in chat): I think Robb and Mark are referring to two different "sheds"? It is probably a good reason to have the "manureshed" concept as a future meeting topic. Regardless, Mark's point about data is correct. You can't credit something you don't have good data for.
Mark Dubin (in chat): Thank you for the clarification and reference Marel!

Remote Sensing
Ken Staver (in chat): Is Dean Hively running the cover crop project?
Eric Hughes: Ken, yes. We have time from Dean Hively and Brian Lamb with USGS. With Dean being really the preeminent expert in this, we feel very fortunate to be able to tap into his services here. Again, I think that will go a long way in making sure that we have really a really top tier product for the watershed. Basically, if we can do it, I think Dean's the person to make it happen.

IV. Overview of the NRCS Regenerative Pilot Program

Lead: Vivian Dickson, NRCS

In December 2025, NRCS launched the Regenerative Pilot Program, a farmer first, outcomes based approach to conservation designed to return the agency to its core mission – helping people help the land. NRCS is investing $700 million to specifically support regenerative agriculture, including:

- $400 million through the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP); and
- $300 million through the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)

In this session, Eric introduced NRCS Chesapeake Bay Coordinator Vivian Dickson, and Vivian provided a brief, high level overview of this novel funding initiative.

Actions:

1. Please reach out to NRCS Chesapeake Bay Coordinator, Vivian Dickson (vivian.dickson@usda.gov), with any remaining questions on the NRCS Regenerative Pilot Program.

Discussion Notes:

Caroline Kleis (in chat): More info on the RPP, including fact sheets and training materials can be found here! https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs-initiatives/regenerative-pilot-program
Eric Hughes: Thanks so much, Vivian. Would you be able to put your email address in the chat just in case folks want to reach out directly? I think this serves as a good kickoff for discussing other NRCS programs moving forward. Certainly, that's something that would be of interest to the group. We don't want to spend time on it if it's not something that folks feel would be beneficial. But, it seems like there is some great opportunity there. Now that we have Vivian in the fold, I think there will be more opportunities to have a targeted effort to make that happen. So, thank you again, Vivian, and looking forward to working with you.
Vivian Dickson (in chat): vivian.dickson@usda.gov
Alex Echols (in chat): Given the reorg at NRCS, when will these become operational?
Matt Kowalski (in chat): Do we know how much of the Regen Ag Pilot program is going into the Chesapeake Bay Watershed? How much of the $700M?
Vivian Dickson (in chat): That dollar amount has not been determined to date.
Marel King (in chat): One component of RPP is the participation of private industry/supply chain in funding. Are any companies participating or exploring?
Vivian Dickson (in chat): can't really expand on this ask, How this will unfold will be forthcoming at a later date.
Marel King (in chat): Thank you, Vivian. Welcome to the Bay Program! Glad to have you on board.

V. Wrap-Up

Lead: Workgroup/Advisory Committee Representatives

- Eric Hughes, EPA, informed the group of a current effort to update Chesapeake Bay Program webpages. In particular, Eric noted that the Agricultural BMP Expert Panels are now listed and summarized under the following project page. Meeting participants were asked to provide feedback on opportunities to improve the AgWG webpage through the reorganization of existing information, addition of new information, and more.
- The latest updates from the Agricultural Modeling Team (AMT) and Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) were shared with the group.
    - Tom Butler, AMT Coordinator, provided a recap of the work of the Agricultural Modeling Team and noted next steps for the group. In particular, Tom noted ag data inputs for Phase 7, highlighted key decisions that the AMT have engaged in, and described the path forward for the AMT. The AMT has concluded their decision making and have begun to meet bi-monthly to review specific aspects of the data that will be processed for Phase 7. Through February 2027, the group will continue to be engaged in the review of source data, input data, and output data.
    - Amanda Barber, AAC Member, provided the group with an overview of primary discussion points and priority areas for the AAC. In particular, Amanda noted the AAC's interest in revisiting CSP enhancements and practice definitions to ensure that all ag activities are being captured in the counting/reporting and continue to be reverified. Relatedly, AAC members have also had some discussion around increasing reporting of practices implemented on farms. Additionally, Amanda noted key AAC recommendations to the Executive Council, such as the importance of strengthening farm viability as a foundation for conservation and the connection between economic viability and environmental sustainability. The AAC recommends a celebration of wins and an acknowledgement of the work done by the agricultural community. Supporting land preservation was noted as another key discussion point for the AAC, along with the cultivation of the farm and technical assistance workforce.
- Eric Hughes, EPA provided information related to the Chesapeake Bay Program's Structure and Governance changes, along with the anticipated timeline for the finalization and approval of the Governance and Management Framework (expected June 30). Additionally, Eric noted ongoing discussions at the Management Board meeting (April 16th) and the Clean Water Goal Team (April 27th). The group will continue to be informed, should the ongoing governance and structure recommendations result in any changes to AgWG structure or directives.

Actions:

1. Please reach out to Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov) with any requested edits or improvements to the Agriculture Workgroup webpage, such as additional links to external partner webpages or other useful resources.
2. The AMT has concluded decision-making meetings for ag inputs to the Phase 7 model. The AMT will continue to meet for non-decisional items and the review of source, input, and output data, bi-monthly through February 2027. Those who would like to receive the AMT bi-monthly calendar invites and be included on the AMT distribution list should contact Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov).

Discussion Notes:

Website Updates

Mark Dubin (in chat): The addition of ag related publications funded by STAC would be of value as well.

Caroline Kleis (in chat): Thanks, Mark! I will work those in.

AMT Update

Caroline Kleis (in chat): All AMT info can be found here! https://www.chesapeakebay.net/who/group/agricultural-modeling-team. A complete log of AMT actions and decisions is available here: https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/documents/AMT-Action-and-Decision-Log.pdf

AAC Update

Eric Hughes: Thank you, Amanda, and I just want to elaborate on a point you made earlier about soil health. I think that was something that came up at the AAC Technical Subcommittee, so it probably warrants discussion by the full committee. But, something that stood out to me was that there was an idea floated about putting a charge or a request out there for a soil health team or task force that would be a charge to the AgWG. I think, in some discussions that we've had, with all the changes to the structure and governance, it sounds like there won't necessarily be opportunities for charges to come from the Advisory Committee to the Workgroup, but we can probably expect charges from the AAC to go to the PSC, who will be the body in charge of prioritization for partnership decision-making groups that will be funneled down to the Clean Water Goal Team and, ultimately, to us if the Policy Steering Committee members decide that's something that staff should take the time to address. It's obviously not just a priority for the Advisory Committee, but many of our jurisdictional partners and non-jurisdictional partners alike. So, certainly something that would be worth the time, and I am looking forward to seeing how that unfolds.
Amanda Barber: I should also offer that we have a meeting tomorrow from 9-11, and we're going to have three presentations tomorrow from Virginia, Maryland, and the Stroud Water Research Center will be there as well talking about their soil health programs. We had two presentations a few weeks ago. So, Eric if you could maybe forward that, anyone is welcome to sit in on those presentations if you like.
Eric Hughes: We will take a look to see where those are posted. If they are not posted, I will explore options and possibilities with Jen [Nelson; AAC Coordinator] for making those Subcommittee meetings accessible.
Caitlin Grady (in chat): Thanks for the update Amanda
Alisha Mulkey (in chat): [Link to tomorrow's AAC meeting (9-11)] meet.google.com/yer-ifqa-ord

VI. Adjourn

Next Meeting: May 21, 2026, 10:00 AM- 12:00 PM

Attendees:

Caitlin Grady, GWU
Jenn Fetter, PSU
Eric Hughes, EPA
Caroline Kleis, CRC
Chris Sigmund, Team Ag
Auston Smith, EPA
Krista Crone, PA DEP
Tom Butler, EPA
Tyler Groh, PSU
Mark Dubin, VA Cooperative Extension
Cindy Shreve, WVCA
Emily Dekar, USC
Jennifer Bratthauar, Team Ag
Clint Gill, DDA
Matt Monroe, WVDA
Matt Royer, PSU
Cass Klingaman, NY DEC
Ashley Hullinger, PA DEP
Robb Meinen, PSU
Natasha Rathlev, Sustainable Chesapeake
Megan Porta, PA DEP
Karl Blankenship, Bay Journal

Amanda Barber, NY Cortland County SWCD
Vivian Dickson, NRCS
Alisha Mulkey, MDA
Kate Bresaw, PA DEP
Greg Albrecht, NY Department of Agriculture and Markets
Olivia Martin, Devereux Consulting
Caroline Harper, Campbell Foundation
Paul Bredwell, U.S. Poultry & Egg Association
Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA
Nick Hepfl, HRG
Matt Kowalksi, CBF
Alex Soroka, USGS
Jim Riddell, VA Cattlemen Association
Hunter Landis, VA DCR
Jenna Schueler, CBF
Ken Staver, UMD/Wye
Denise Uzupis, PDA
Eric Rosenbaum, Rosetree Consulting
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
Ashley Lenig, NRCS
Alex Echols, Campbell Foundation
Marel King, CBF
Leah Martino, EPA
Bo Williams, EPA
Rachel Owrutsky, DNREC
Patrick Thompson, Energy Works
Lisa Duriancik, NRCS
Emily Heller, EPA