



**Chesapeake Bay Program**  
*Science. Restoration. Partnership.*

# **Agriculture Workgroup**

August 2026

# Agenda

---

---

---

**1** AgWG Membership Under New Partnership Structure

**2** Ag E3 Scenario

**3** Management Strategy and Workplan Development

# **AgWG Membership Under New Partnership Structure**

---

---

---

## Recap

- The revised Chesapeake Bay Program Governance and Management Framework limits number of voting members on workgroups to 15.
- In July, the Clean Water Goal Team issued a request for their workgroups to share the steps they would take to conform to the 15-voting member structure by 7/31. CWGT leadership also provided the following guidance:
  - Workgroups may deviate from the 9 signatory : 6 at-large Goal Team ratio if a signatory member declines filling their reserved membership spot.
  - Workgroups may not have non-voting members.

---

---

## Recap (continued)

- The AgWG has historically maintained 21 voting members (9 signatory, 12 at-large)
  - Shift will require at-large membership to be reduced from 12 to 6
- We have been charged to conform to this new partnership structure
  - Concerns with this change will be elevated; however, we must demonstrate how we will conform to the 15-voting member requirement
  - The workgroup can determine *how* we reach that number
- Robust discussion at July AgWG; more time for discussion – and to formulate path forward – needed

---

---

# Key Concept

Voting is not primary decision-making process; discussion to support every decision will be prioritized, and this discussion will remain open to all.

---

## Best path forward?

- Identify key stakeholder groups from which potential at-large members can be nominated, forming at-large membership “categories”
- Signatories execute ranked choice vote to select “primary” and one “alternate” at-large member for each at-large member category
  - No more than one alternate
- Primary and alternate at-large members do not need to represent the same organization; primary vs alternate determined by results of vote (primary = nominee with most support within each category)

---

---

---

# Proposed At-Large Member Categories

- Academia – land grant universities; regional colleges
- Agri-Business & Industry – commodity, specialty, livestock/poultry (etc.) associations
- Conservation Districts – county/regional district representatives
- Technical Assistance Providers – consultants; engineers
- Conservation NGOs
- USDA – NRCS; FSA; ARS



| At-Large Member Category       | Nominee 1                                 | Nominee 2                      | Nominee 3                     | Nominee 4                           |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Academia                       | Robb Meinen<br>PSU                        | Matt Royer<br>PSU              | Ken Staver<br>UMD             |                                     |
| Agri-Business/Industry         | Paul Bredwell<br>US Poultry and Egg Assn. | R.O. Britt<br>Smithfield Foods | Zach Evans<br>Mountaire Farms | Jim Riddell<br>VA Cattlemen's Assn. |
| Conservation Districts         | Emily Dekar<br>USC                        | Jeff Hill<br>YCCD              |                               |                                     |
| Technical Assistance Providers | Jennifer Bratthauar<br>TeamAg             | Nick Hepfl<br>HRG              | Eric Rosenbaum<br>Rosetree    |                                     |
| Conservation NGOs              | Jenna Schueler<br>CBF                     |                                |                               |                                     |
| USDA                           | Vivian Dickson<br>NRCS                    |                                |                               |                                     |

---

---

---

## **Discussion**

Considerations for further modification of this proposal?

---

---

# Membership Adjustment Process

- Signatories will appoint their voting members.
  - Note: All 9 positions designated for signatory voting members have been filled.
- Current AgWG at-large membership will be dissolved.
- Candidates for 6 at-large positions will be existing at-large members and nominees received during the winter 2025-2026 call for nominations.
- The list of candidates will be provided at the August AgWG meeting.
- After the August AgWG meeting, signatory members will be asked to participate in a ranked-choice vote to fill the 6 at-large positions from the pool of candidates.
- The three candidates receiving the strongest support through the ranked-choice vote will serve a 2-year term; candidates ranked 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> will serve a 1-year term. Any ties would be broken by random draw.
- Selected members will be announced at the September AgWG meeting.

# **Phase 7 Ag E3 Scenario Update**

---

---

## Updates/follow-up since July AgWG meeting

- Assumptions for two BMPs (Non-Urban Stream Restoration; Shoreline Management) have been updated since last meeting
- Questions answered for one BMP (Poultry Litter Amendments)
- [Forestry Workgroup proposal](#) for buffers; tree planting – discussing for awareness; edits haven't been made to the ag E3 scenario

# Non-Urban Stream Restoration – Updated

- To define Phase 7 domain, need Phase 7 CAST stream scale
  - Modeling Workgroup decision; meeting to discuss and potentially decide on [9/15](#)
- Number of stream miles associated with the “15% of low-order ag stream miles” assumption would have varied depending on the stream scale ultimately used
  - New proposal: keep number of stream miles for each jurisdiction used in Phase 6

DE: 37.299 mi

MD: 250.722 mi

NY: 238.749 mi

PA: 793.672 mi

VA: 632.944 mi

WV: 131.881 mi

# Shoreline Management – Updated

- On 8/3, USWG distribution list received an update to developed sector Shoreline Management E3 assumption: 80% → 70%
  - Revising ag E3 assumption for this practice to support parity across sectors
  - Less than what we had previously proposed
- Reviewed VIMS analysis on proportion of shorelines actively eroding based on assessment of 250 miles of shoreline across VA
  - 80% of shoreline eroding >0ft/yr
  - 35% of shoreline eroding >1ft/yr
  - Reconciled by reducing assumption from 80% to 70%

# Poultry Litter Amendments – Addressing Questions

- How is the practice defined? Only alum?
  - “For this report, ammonia emissions reduction techniques are defined as litter treatment (alum, etc.)...” ([Simpson and Weammert Report](#), p.35)
  - “Litter treatment: a surface application of an acidifier to poultry litter to acidify poultry litter and maintain ammonia in the non-volatile ionized form (ammonium). One approach is to incorporate acidifying agents such as aluminum sulfate (alum), sodium bisulfate, acidified clay, calcium chloride, calcium sulfate...” (Simpson and Weammert Report, p.35)
  - Alum was specifically reviewed for the purposes of the report
- Is the impact of PLA already captured through nutrient inputs?
  - PLS report did not address this; more data would need to be provided to determine ubiquity



# Forestry Workgroup Proposal – For Awareness Only

- Forest Buffer
  - Ag: 70% of cropland within 20m of all unbuffered streams/rivers
  - Forestry: 80% of cropland within 100ft (30m) of all unbuffered streams/rivers
- Forest Buffer on Fenced Pasture Corridor
  - Ag: 85% of pasture within 20m of all unbuffered streams/rivers
  - Forestry: 80% of pasture within 100ft (30m) of all unbuffered streams/rivers
- Grass Buffer
  - Ag: 30% of cropland within 20m of all unbuffered streams/rivers
  - Forestry: 20% of cropland within 100ft (30m) of all unbuffered streams/rivers
- Grass Buffer on Fenced Pasture Corridor
  - Ag: 15% of cropland within 20m of all unbuffered streams/rivers
  - Forestry: 20% of pasture within 100ft (30m) of all unbuffered streams/rivers
- Tree Planting
  - Ag: 1% of available ag land uses, excluding ag open space
  - Forestry: 3% of available ag land uses [excluding ag open space]
- Alley Cropping; Silvopasture
  - Ag: N/A; Forestry: 10% of cropland (alley cropping); 10% of pasture (silvopasture)

# Forestry Workgroup Proposal (continued)

- Cumulative land use change increased from ~15% to ~18%
- Pulse check: appetite for any further changes, pending input from CWGT?
  - Non-starters?
  - Example of potential change: to accommodate increase in tree planting, reduce land retirement to ag open space?
  - Can run numbers to determine reduction in land retirement, alt crops, necessary to adopt FWG proposed compromise while bringing us under 15% land use change threshold

---

---

## Next Steps

- E3 assumptions for all sectors will be introduced at August 24 Clean Water Goal Team meeting
  - AgWG Coordinator will present ag E3 assumptions, sharing the AgWG's justification for assumptions that differ from Phase 6 – relaying what we've heard from the group, *not* advocating
- CWGT will vote to approve final assumptions for E3 scenario at September 28-29 meeting
- Where different groups have proposed different assumptions, CWGT may encourage compromise between disagreeing groups; will ultimately make final decision



# **Call for Consent-based Decision**

**Approval of the P7 Ag E3 Scenario Assumptions (as amended)**



# **Management Strategy and Workplan Development**

---

---

---

# Discussion shifting to next month

- We will revisit this topic in September

---

---

## Anything else?

- Send to Caroline Kleis ([Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov](mailto:Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov)) for inclusion in “Recap” email

---

---

---

# Thank you!

Any questions?

You can contact me at [Hughes.Eric@epa.gov](mailto:Hughes.Eric@epa.gov)



**Chesapeake Bay Program**

*Science. Restoration. Partnership.*