

Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

June 20- June 21, 2018

AgWG Face-to-Face Meeting Agenda

Lancaster PA, 17601

Meeting materials: https://www.chesapeakebay.net/who/group/agriculture_workgroup

Wednesday June 20th 10:00AM-5:00PM

Welcome, introductions, roll-call, review meeting minutes

Workgroup Chairs

- The meeting minutes from the May conference call were approved.

Technical Service in the Public Sector

Jeff Hill

Jeff Hill, Lancaster County Conservation District, spoke about technical service for farm operations in Lancaster County and PA as a state.

Discussion:

- Jeff Hill noted that the district started the Practice Keeper software on their own. They worked with the county to get as much data as possible. They use a different system than NRCS and can run into obstacles with “right to know” policies.
 - Jason Kepler: Are you able to protect that data?
 - Jeff Hill: The privacy is for Act 38. We don’t have queries developed and have not compiled the information into a readily available request, so it is not a problem.
- Denise Coleman: Our producers are protected with the 1619 provision. If they want to go into Practice Keeper, they can do so with a signed disclosure form. There is no incorporation of an EQIP plan without producer consent. We also run into a double counting situation when there are practices in both Practice Keeper and NEIEN.
 - Jeff Hill: Our office reports to DEP only what is paid for through state or local programs, separate from NRCS.
 - Frank Schneider: It all goes to the BMP data warehouse. As far as “right to know,” PA is one of the most open states, which has pros and cons. Right now, we are deploying state-wide Practice Keeper and information in it is all public.
- Jeremy Hanson: Is Practice Keeper for your own internal purposes, or do you use it manage data that also goes to NEIEN?
 - Frank Schneider: DEP can query data from the states in a variety of ways now that we are deploying state-wide Practice Keeper.
- Chris Thompson: Ultimately with Practice Keeper, we should be able to view individual watersheds, see planned BMPs to report to our funders, to help us strategically target watersheds and get things done.

Lancaster Clean Water Partners

Chris Thompson

Lancaster County faces a perfect storm with respect to water quality challenges. This region constitutes the urban/rural interface of southcentral PA, a highly impacted landscape where historic and intensive agriculture, urban and suburban communities, and a high vulnerability to future development all

converge. Consequently the county finds 50% of its local streams impaired and contributes PA's highest nutrient loadings to the Bay. There are many efforts and many partners working on the ground in Lancaster County. The Lancaster Clean Water Partners is a county-wide collaborative to coordinate and enhance those efforts making them more impactful.

Discussion:

- Jeremy Hanson: How long did the common agenda you walked us through take to develop?
 - Chris Thompson: It was about a 9-month process from finding funding to completion. We hired Due East, a consultant firm out of Annapolis, to help craft the common agenda. It is still a work in progress, and the partnership is open to anyone who wants to help out in the Bay.

Pennsylvania's Local Water Quality Stories: Lancaster County

Emily Trentacoste

Emily Trentacoste, Chesapeake Bay Program, discussed how to identify opportunities for water quality improvement in Pennsylvania's watersheds using Lancaster County as an example.

Discussion:

- Peter Hughes: Is the assumption that all of the manure from animals in Lancaster is spread on acres within Lancaster County?
 - Emily Trentacoste: Yes, unless we get reported manure transport out of the county, it is assumed that manure is being utilized inside the county.
 - Peter Hughes: When you have it broken down by species, do you know geographically where those species are located?
 - Emily Trentacoste: That is generalized for the county.

Riparian Forest Buffer Progress in PA

Teddi Stark

Teddi Stark, Riparian Forest Buffer Coordinator, PA Dept of Conservation and Natural Resources, discussed issues regarding riparian forest buffer implementation across PA, including innovative approaches and lessons learned.

Prioritization Preparation

Kristen Saacke Blunk

Kristen Saacke Blunk, Headwaters, LLC, agreed to function as facilitator of Thursday's Prioritization Workshop, temporarily stepping out of her role as At-Large member. She discussed logistics and discussion topics for Thursday's workshop with the Workgroup.

Field Tour

Participants boarded a charter bus for a field tour of agricultural areas in the Lancaster area with special focus on successes, challenges, and opportunities related to BMP implementation. Invited speakers were incorporated throughout the morning and afternoon, including:

- Peter Hughes, Red Barn Consulting: Technical Service in the Private Sector
 - Jeff Swineheart, Deputy Director of the [Lancaster Farmland Trust](#): Plain Sect adoption of agricultural BMPs at the municipal level.
 - Lamonte Garber, Watershed Restoration Coordinator, Stroud Water Research Center
- **Stop 1: [Big Spring Run](#)** (BSR Restoration Site)
Jeff Hartranft, DEP, led a tour of farmland that has become part of an ongoing novel, multi-year valley bottom restoration experiment. Under the auspices of researchers at Franklin and Marshall College, [The Water Science Institute](#) (WSI) is engaged in documenting the efficacy and efficiency of the BSR design for improving aquatic and riparian habitats, ecosystem services and functions, water quality, nutrient and sediment load reductions, and stormwater retention,

among other objectives. WSI was formed in 2016 as an outgrowth of research that began in 2003 by Drs. Dorothy Merritts and Robert Walter, Franklin and Marshall College, on the farm of Joseph and Linda Sweeney. A webinar on June 8th discussed much of the background of this project. Contact Allie Wagner, CRC, to receive the link to this webinar.

- **Stops 2/3:** Old Order Amish dairy farms in the Strasburg, PA vicinity: one with broad-level BMP implementation; one that is facing barriers to BMP implementation characteristic of agricultural operations in the area. In exchange for welcoming the Workgroup onto their farms, the farm operators request that that identifying information is limited. PLEASE- No photos of the family members. Any photos of the operation may only be used internally, should not include identifying information and should -NOT be published.

Thursday, June 21st 9:00 AM-3:00 PM

Action and Decisions:

DECISION: The AgWG approved the nominations Chris Brosch and John Cargill to represent the Agriculture Workgroup on the Steering Committee of the upcoming STAC Workshop: Integrating Science and Developing Approaches to Inform Management for Contaminants of Concern in Agricultural Settings.

ACTION: Loretta Collins will come back to the AgWG with more information about climate change from the CBPO PSC decision mentioned.

ACTION: The AgWG will address the CBP Management Board's [*INCORPORATING SOIL PHOSPHORUS IN THE PHASE 6 MODEL Recommended Path Forward*](#) as a follow-up item on the AgWG July 19th Conference Call.

Welcome, introductions, roll-call, review meeting minutes

Workgroup Chairs

Legume Nitrogen Fixation Update

Matt Johnston

Matt Johnston, UMD, presented an abridged version of the [*presentation provided to the WQGIT on its June 18th Conference Call*](#), reviewing the representation and potential corrections of legume nitrogen fixation in the Phase 6 modeling tools. A summary of the corrections will be presented to the CBP PSC on July 9th.

Discussion:

- Jason Keppler: Although we all benefit from this, I am concerned if there are other hidden land mines that have not been found. What is the quality control process for the model?
 - Matt Johnston: We do the best we can with resources we have. We will continue to find errors, that is the nature of computer modeling. We are asking the PSC to agree to a stopping rule with no changes to the model until October 2019 to give consistency to jurisdictions for Phase III WIP planning.
- Paul Bredwell: Does this mean these reductions will be assigned to other sources?
 - Matt Johnston: No. This is an update to our numbers across all sectors, so this will not be reassigned, it is the benefit of 2017 progress. The PSC will debate if they want to bring these into planning targets as well.
- Chris Brosch: Why does this legume fix have states landing on different sides of zero? And why is there any change to phosphorus?

- Matt Johnston: This was brought up in WQGIT, and Lucinda Power will release these details shortly. These numbers also include several other fixes not related to legume fixation, which is the reason for other changes you may see in the numbers.

BMP Expert Panel Update

Expert Panel Chairs

Agricultural Ditch Management Expert Panel:

Loretta Collins noted that the Agricultural Ditch Management Panel, chaired by Ray Bryant, is currently working on two interim BMPs that will hopefully be submitted before the CBPO deadline. The panel is getting close to having a report out, and is working toward a goal of a draft report in August. There is an expert panel meeting scheduled for next Thursday morning.

Discussion:

- Jason Keppler: When is the deadline for submission to CBPO for interim BMPs?
 - Jeremy Hanson: August 31st, 2018.
 - Loretta Collins: It is important to emphasize that interim BMPs still need to be backed by science and research, not only “best professional judgement.” The interim BMP efficiencies must be conservatively and ideally in-line with what the [Expert] panel will eventually recommend.

Cropland Irrigation Expert Panel:

Tim Sexton noted that the Cropland Irrigation Panel has reviewed as much research as possible, and is now waiting for several reports to be published. A draft report is in the works, we will have a report possibly by July, dependent upon publication of research.

Discussion:

- Jason Keppler: There already is an interim BMP efficiency for this practice, so we have that available for planning purposes.

Mortality Expert Panel:

Jeremy Hanson noted that the RFP proposal deadline was Monday. One proposal was received, and that proposal is currently in the evaluation process. We will bring that proposal as well as the proposed membership to the AgWG and WQGIT for feedback in July.

STAC Workshop Nominations

Workgroup Chairs

Scott Phillips, USGS, briefly discussed the partnership-approved upcoming Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Workshop: Integrating Science and Developing Approaches to Inform Management for Contaminants of Concern in Agricultural Settings on the May 17th conference call. The workshop is in the preliminary planning stages and will occur between Fall 2018 and early Spring 2019. Representation from the AgWG on the Workshop Steering Committee was requested on the May 17th AgWG Conference Call.

- Frank Schneider made a motion to nominate Chris Brosch and John Cargill as well as Lindsay Thompson, if a third representative is needed.
- Alisha Mulkey seconded the motion.
- No objections were made to the motion on the table.

DECISION: The AgWG approved the nominations Chris Brosch and John Cargill to represent the Agriculture Workgroup on the Steering Committee of the upcoming STAC Workshop: Integrating Science and Developing Approaches to Inform Management for Contaminants of Concern in Agricultural Settings.

Prioritization Workshop

Kristen Saacke-Blunk

In order to foster AgWG productivity over the next two years, the AgWG leadership has requested a review of previous decisions and topics relevant to the Workgroup's [Scope and Purpose](#).

Setting the Stage:

- Kristen Saacke-Blunk introduced the plan of prioritization for the day and areas of focus.
- The group went around the room and described their purpose for being here:
 - Responses included: conservation, sustainability, numbers, agronomy, collaboration, manure, science, policy, data, industry, viability, service, and regulations.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk introduced the proposed value of the work group as “Ag viability and sustainability + improving water quality across our shared region” and introduced the proposed goal of the workgroup as “balance science and data collection + improved and increased implementation.”
 - Ken Staver: I don't think that value is worded in a way that reflects the Bay Program's goals. We exist as this workgroup to meet the water quality goals of the Bay restoration effort for agriculture, and that is our main priority. The value could be “improving water quality across our shared region while maintaining Ag viability and sustainability.”
 - The group agreed that viability and sustainability includes economics in their definitions.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk led a discussion diving into the AgWG Scope and Purpose.
 - Barry Frantz commented on the function bullet point “Provide recommendations on the prioritization of federal and state technical and financial resources on specific practices in priority watersheds.” Each state has their own state technical committees, where states develop their WIPS, committee meetings. NRCS shares our progress publicly each year, if recommendations want to be made we can discuss further.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk: Does the AgWG affect cost share programs at the state level?
 - Frank Schneider: DEP is the biggest player in addition to REAP and PennVest.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk: Where do expert panels fit in to these functions?
 - The group agreed the last two bullet points fit expert panels.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk: Are these from the time when the program was set up?
 - Mark Dubin: These are from the development of the GIT structure divided into the workgroups. The defined scope and purpose is in the context of the WQGIT. The scope and purpose can be modified with an updated perspective that we can present back to the WQGIT for approval.
- Bill Chain commented that there could be improvements with communication between the states, those who are most impacted by decisions (farmers), conservation districts, and the workgroup moving forward. As we get further from the Bay, I hear discussions of people stumbling over and degrading BMPs and conservation practices that this group works to very hard to quantify.
- Barry Frantz commented that this committee may not be the place to recommend practices and locations at this level when it is more of a state level decision referring to the second function bullet point. He recommended that this group could look further into new technology and new BMPs in the future. He also noted that there needs to be a crosswalk between new and old BMPs.
- Mark Dubin noted that the second bullet point was created at a time when we were providing a lot of information to USDA, which was a bigger part of what we were doing back then, not so much anymore.
- Marel King noted that the third bullet point says, “to support.” Our role is a support role to the development rather than the development itself.

Refine Areas and Topics:

- Kristen Saacke-Blunk outlined the refining focus portion of the discussion including focus areas and topics for the group to discuss.
- Barry Frantz noted that some areas we are spending time and energy on may take 20+ years to address simply because of the nature of the problems, such as legacy sediment or soil P.
- The group agreed that the verification area of focus could be taken off the table, recognizing that the jurisdictions are required to come back to the AgWG if they have an alternate that is not in the current verification manual.
- The group agreed that climate change should be taken out of the prioritization for today, recognizing that this is an area that will have to be discussed as information comes forward.
- Jeremy Hanson noted that WIP development should also be included in the topics. Do the states need anything from this workgroup regarding that?
 - Frank Schneider: I think PA would rather work on it themselves without input from other states.
 - Jason Keppler noted that regarding implementation, is this more of just informational sharing? Implementation decisions will be made at the state level, not the workgroup level.
 - Chris Brosch: The review of implementation plans is EPA's decision, not the workgroup as well.
 - Mark Dubin: The role of the AgWG in the past has been a support group as the states develop their WIPs, and following up with thoughts from the state during the development.
- Chris Brosch noted that TetraTech should not be included in the cooperative agreements section, it is included in EPA funding sources.
- Marel King noted that a PSC decision was made to get more information regarding climate change and BMP resiliency before 2021.
 - Ken Staver: It seems like the slide on climate change does not address the comment that was just made. I would think our interest in climate change would be regarding our Ag water quality goals, not the general climate change issue.

ACTION: Loretta Collins will come back to the AgWG with more information about climate change from the CBPO PSC decision mentioned.

- Kristen Saacke-Blunk asked for feedback about verification being on an as needed basis
 - Alisha Mulkey: There is a lot of value in the state approach and idea sharing between states for methods. I think collaboration would be useful for brainstorming outside of the AgWG. As EPA is quality assuring level of verification, there should be a fairness.
 - Jeremy Hanson: 2018 is the first-year verification kicks in, maybe this is something that can hold off until we have results from 2018 progress and see what EPA and the jurisdictions learned or new ideas they may have.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk outlined Phase 6 model inputs topics.
- It was noted that PA and MD still use the resource improvement checklist regularly and one could be helpful to use for conservation cover.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk noted that non-cost share BMPs are a verification issue mostly for the states and CBPO instead of the entire workgroup regarding RIs.

- Mark Dubin: We would have to go through a BMP Panel process to add BMPs to the RI list if existing BMP protocol does not cover that.
- Barry Frantz: Why are CBP credit cycles different than BMP life spans?
 - Tim Sexton: In some cases, life spans and credit cycles within CBP differ, or vice-versa.
 - Jeremy Hanson: Credit duration is the term for the model.
 - Mark Dubin: It can vary between states, CBP, and program contracts.
 - The group noted that there is variation between certain practices, sometimes the criteria just don't match up between different groups and their standards.
 - Dave Graybill: It comes down to how close we are with the Ag community, verification needs strong connections.
 - Jeff Hill: This district would like to see an RI check outside of the NRCS standards because there are many BMPs out there past the life span that are still functioning.
 - Barry Frantz: This could be a topic of discussion for the workgroup because we are focusing so much on new BMPs, but also need to be checking on the old.
 - The group agreed that this issue belongs under the verification and implementation umbrella before model inputs.
- The group agreed that remote sensing is more of a verification topic than model inputs.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk polled group members for the topic of highest priority to them.
 - Paul Bredwell: Phase 6 model inputs, specifically data collection to ensure we have the most accurate data in the model.
 - Frank Schneider: I will echo that opinion for PA. Although all are very important, my role on this committee focuses the most on the data.
 - Alisha Mulkey: I will echo that too, including the fertilizer sub-topic especially. We have questions regarding the accuracy of the tonnage data as well as model accuracy at the county level.
 - Bobby Long: Data inputs for the model. Those projects to legitimize what is in the model is huge for us so we can apply correct efficiencies. With the turkey and swine data collection, we saw the differences between what is in the model and what should be. Other important things include manure analysis, soil P and soil analysis. We need to get it right and keep it up to date.
 - Chris Brosch: DE agrees with every word Bobby said.
 - Greg Albrecht: Phase 6 model inputs are very important for New York as well.
- Jason Keppler: Regarding data projects and USDA implementation, I'm assuming we are discussing an inventory of all USDA practices not currently credited?
 - Mark Dubin: That is part of it. It is making sure practices from NRCS and FSA are correctly represented in the Bay BMP crosswalks, and that information is transferred over at the highest level possible in the model.
 - Jason Keppler: I also want to expand that beyond just NRCS practices, realizing that some states have their own standards as well as the importance of an inventory of resource improvements. While data inputs are important, it is equally important to ensure that farmers are given credit for what is on the landscape.
 - Tim Sexton: Instead of USDA implementation it should be state cost share and implementation which varies state to state. There must be verification of implementation, and have a checklist where you grab things that were not cost shared while you're there. Maybe we need to all come up with a uniform plan.
- Dave Graybill: For the Ag community, we like to see something move on the yard stick. You need to do a better job communicating with farmers and technicians about when the model is open to verify these things for credit.

- Jeff Hill: There has been a fundamental shift, at least in PA that conservation practices were being put on the ground because farmers wanted to volunteer to do them. Nothing was based on credit or the model, it was based on local water quality improvements. We have shifted internally to focus on making strides in the model, and that needs to be relayed out to the community, so when verification happens, farmers want credit for what they've done.
- Tim Sexton: We worked hard on the model to get credit for BMPs that have been around for a long time. We need a way to get the information to them that they are getting the credit they deserve.
- The group agreed that collaboration and communication are important to keep in mind. A better, more collaborative dialogue between the group and farmers would be helpful.
- Marel King noted that there is a disconnect between local watersheds and the Bay as far as goals. Specifically for PA, their goals aren't for the Bay, it's for local water quality benefits.
- Chris Brosch brought up the topic of artificial drainage (tile and ditch) as a data set that is not included in the list we currently have. This is a priority because artificial drainage effects nutrient management plans. The hydrology between surface or subsurface drainage is important and is not currently captured which could be holding us back.
 - Denise Coleman: I think we will be considering these tile lines more at NRCS and see these as priorities to demo and institutionalize. The other thing in PA is adding removal of legacy sediment to the pay schedule.
 - Chris Brosch: We need model data to scope the area, we can discuss how it effects climate resiliency, and effectiveness that artificial drainage BMPs bring.
- Kristen Saacke-Blunk brought up the topic of soil P as a potential breakout session.
 - Loretta Collins: This is a soil phosphorus directive coming from the CBPO management board outlining steps to take regarding this issue. We need to start addressing that directive as a workgroup, it is a priority no matter what.

ACTION: The AgWG will address the CBP Management Board's [*INCORPORATING SOIL PHOSPHORUS IN THE PHASE 6 MODEL Recommended Path Forward*](#) as a follow-up item on the AgWG July 19th Conference Call.

Breakout Discussions

Topics:

1. Artificial Drainage
2. Data Collection: Commercial fertilizer
3. Data Collection: Commercial swine, commercial dairy, commercial poultry
4. NRCS, state and producer; implementation, checklists, and communication

Topic 1: Artificial Drainage (Jason Keppler, Clint Gill)

- Define Scope
 - Mapping both tile and ditch artificial drainage.
- Why is it a priority?
 - Tile drains and ditches convey nutrients differently. You could probably get a short circuit of nitrate through a tile drain faster than a ditch. In places with high levels of soil P, we could potentially get dissolved P running through these tile lines. If that happens, we will look at different loads captured in the sampling without the ability to attribute them properly.

- What/ who are the resources?
 - Public drainage associations, spatial data of tax ditches in DE and MD, conservation districts, MD and DE annual reports.
- Barriers/ challenges
 - The resources discussed are also barriers. Getting everyone on the same page, getting annual reports, time constraints.
- Connect to other areas
 - Drainage management BMP Expert Panel, NRCS practice codes, urban stormwater workgroup.

Topic 2: Data Collection: Commercial fertilizer (Frank Schneider, Alisha Mulkey, Tim Sexton)

- Define Scope
 - Improving the data collection methods for fertilizer sales to create consistency among Bay states,
- Why is it a priority?
 - It is a major driver of N loads to the Bay, county level distribution not representative of reality.
- What/ who are the resources?
 - Fertilizer manufacturers, trade associations, Fertilizer Institute, IPNI, state reporting authority, CBP facilitation, state chemists, distributors.
- Barriers/ challenges
 - Standardizing reporting, data quality, data sharing agreement
- Connect to other areas
 - Phase 6 model inputs

Topic 3: Data Collection: Commercial swine, commercial dairy, commercial poultry (Chris Brosch, Jeremy Daubert, Britney Vasquez, Paul Bredwell, Bobby Long)

- Define Scope
 - Scope is long term to Phase 7, agreement that this data collection is necessary, dairy sector should be a priority focus.
- Why is it a priority?
 - We need to give the model the most accurate data for accurate representation of all animal sectors.
- What/ who are the resources?
 - Trade associations, land grant universities, industry.
- Barriers/ challenges
 - Financial (RFP), time frame (2-year milestones), communication
- Connect to other areas
 - Fertilizer, implementation, feed additions.

5. Topic 4: NRCS, state and producer; implementation, checklists, and communication (Jeremy Hanson, Barry Frantz)

- Define Scope
 - Full accounting of cost-shared and non-cost shared implementation with a full crosswalk of state, NRCS, CBP practices that match up, using communication services such as checklists.
- Why is it a priority?

- We want the Ag community to have confidence they “get credit” for implemented practices, TMDL goals.
- What/ who are the resources?
 - Federal and state partners.
- Barriers/ challenges
 - Financial, differences between states, forming trusting personal relationships between state agencies, consultants, producers, and conservation offices, privacy 1619.
- Connect to other areas
 - Verification.

Next meeting: July 19th, 10AM- 1PM Conference Call

Meeting Participants: Day 1 (June 20, 2018)

Jason Keppler	MDA
Matt Monroe	WV DA
Loretta Collins	UMD
Allie Wagner	CRC
Chris Brosch	DDA
Clint Gill	DDA
Adam Lyon	MDA
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Greg Albrecht	NYSDA
Frank Schneider	PA SCC
Tim Sexton	VA DCR
Bobby Long	VA DCR
Marel King	CBC
Peter Hughes	Red Barn Consulting
Ken Staver	UMD
Kelly Shenk	EPA Region 3
Bill Chain	CBF
Kelly O'Neill	CBF
Frank Coale	UMD
Paul Bredwell	U.S. Poultry & Egg Assoc.
Jennifer Reed-Harry	PennAg Industries Assoc.
Jeff Hill	LCCD
Jeremy Daubert	VT
Kristen Saacke-Blunk	Headwaters, LLC
David Graybill	PA Farm Bureau
Denise Coleman	USDA NRCS
Joe Sweeney	WSI
Jeff Swinehart	Lancaster Farmland Trust
Jeff Hartranft	PA DEP
Emily Trentacoste	EPA
Ron Ohrel	ADANE
Chris Thompson	LCCD

Kevin Lutz	LCCD
Dennis Eby	LCCD
Mark Dubin	UMD
Teddi Stark	PA DCNR
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Jim Cropper	Northeast Pasture Consortium
Marcy Dunn	USDA NRCS
Mackenzie Bodman	CRC
Kenny Polk	UMD
Candela Cerpa	UMD

Meeting Participants: Day 2 (June 21, 2018)

Jason Keppler	MDA
Matt Monroe	WV DA
Loretta Collins	UMD
Allie Wagner	CRC
Chris Brosch	DDA
Clint Gill	DDA
Adam Lyon	MDA
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Greg Albrecht	NYSDA
Frank Schneider	PA SCC
Cindy Shreve	WV DA
Tim Sexton	VA DCR
Bobby Long	VA DCR
Marel King	CBC
Peter Hughes	Red Barn Consulting
Bill Chain	CBF
Frank Coale	UMD
Paul Bredwell	U.S. Poultry & Egg Assoc.
Ken Staver	UMD
Jeff Hill	LCCD
Jeremy Daubert	VT
Bobby Grisso	VT
Kristen Saacke-Blunk	Headwaters, LLC
David Graybill	PA Farm Bureau
Barry Frantz	USDA NRCS
Denise Coleman	USDA NRCS
Lucinda Power	EPA Region 3
Greg Sandi	MDE
Ron Ohrel	ADANE
Britney Vasquez	EPA Region 3
Jeff Sweeney	EPA CBPO
Mark Dubin	UMD

Matt Johnston	UMD
Lindsay Thompson	MDAG
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Jim Cropper	Northeast Pasture Consortium
Steve Levitsky	Perdue Farms

DRAFT