

AgWG Meeting Minutes

Coale

- Goodlander moves to accept minutes as presented
- Juengst seconds motion
- All are in favor- minutes approved

Chesapeake Bay Program Website

Kilbert

- Please review and explore new Chesapeake Bay Program website- chesapeakebay.net
- A notice will be sent to members for updated contact information

BMP Verification Process

Batiuk/Coale

See [presentation](#)

- 3 requests of the workgroup- see slides 8, 9 and 10
- Coale- this has been going around for a while. We have had a consensus that cost share needs to be properly accounted for and we need a way to start including non cost share
- Spencer- We are already working on gathering information through voluntary, not mandatory, actions. Are you seeking to get approval from the WG without knowing if all of the practices we have counted will get credited or not?
- Batiuk- We are working to get a time window established so we can give you a sense of assurance. I think what you have described makes sense and although I cannot assure anything at this time, it seems it would be able to be included
- Shenk- Good point, we would all like a written protocol we all sign into
- Spencer- we do not have the staff or money to go out and re-verify practices that are being verified now, simply to conform w a protocol structured around another states standards
- Taglang- we would rather have boots on the ground putting practices in place than people behind desks digging through historic records or counting practices solely for inclusion in the model
- Shenk- there will be a sweet spot, a place of give and take. It is important to keep this group involved so we can be sure we come up w a realistic approach
- Batiuk- want to bring resources to help out efforts but we also need to find a good balance
- Taglang- there are other ways to verify without sending people out into the field
- Batiuk- These are the details we are looking for. If you have confidence in other sets of data, bring it forward and we can in turn take it to the secretary level to discuss options forward.
- Brown- innovation is necessary, considering number of farms and limited resources. Cleaning up numbers could end up being good or really bad. Going back can have some serious merit but I would rather put the boots on the ground than having staff going through 30 yr old data

- Sweeney- not going back and trying to find all past projects. Instead looking to make sure that practices on a farm that is now a development are no longer getting credited. Not looking for perfection but for collaboration to ensure historical makes sense.
- Brown- have not seen final report from NACD. If you have it to share, please do
- Shenk- we checked into it last week, they are still in the process of writing the executive summary. We informed them we would like to have it in the next week, recognizing it would be big help
- Brown- not sure report was presented to the entire group that worked on it, it does not have the sign off of all members
- Dubin- Bob and Dana are scheduled to present on this topic during our next meeting.
- Shenk- since the project was cut short; it will not be getting the full consensus of the group. We will look to wg for suggested key recommendations
- 3 asks of group- (a) take all info you have and pull together, finalize, get concerns (b) identify cause and address barriers (c) put fingerprints on double counting/historic data/ lifespan pieces
- Juengst- This it's important for the state to be notified when a practice is deleted from the model and should have the opportunity to respond. There have been times when the internal process changes, but they are overlooked when explaining to us what has changed
- Angstandt- At the PSC meeting, you said the GIT would be building out a steering committee. Is it appropriate for there to be a wg representative? I would be happy to volunteer if so
- Batiuk- we offered organizing a small steering group. I will touch base w Frank
- Dubin- a suggestion, the NACD group could reactivate and work on this outside of the wg and bring it back to us when its ready.
- Sexton- agree with everything, but with all other demands this is of very low priority

Evaluation of Nutrient Management Practices

Dubin/Dressing

See [Presentation](#)

- Pattison- looking at this, there are good ideas but we need to manage expectations. The model can only go to county level. There are no good farms or bad farms in the model, just one large lump.
- Cropper- there are errors w the model and they should be corrected
- Angstandt- thought we would be seeing something to inform WIP II, still happening?
- Dubin- we are working to get this out

Interim NM Modeling Analysis

Shenk/Sweeney

See [Presentation](#)

- Specifically speaking of reduced rates do to more efficient application. Make sure you understand the concept and start asking questions now. Can be used in March for WIP II
- Montali- if we have 2025 scenario we are happy with, will you tell us how it changes?

- Sweeney- We won't do it on our own, but we are happy to rerun whatever scenarios you ask us to.
- Montali- will adjustments have an effect on other jurisdictions?
- Sweeney- yes, we need to look further into the VA request
- Sexton- think others should know why we asked for this. It is political. This is the interim, we agree to use the NM recommendations that could out of the panel when they are available
- Staver- why replace one un-reality with another? It seems scary and we need to be cautious as to not get trapped down the road

Evaluation of Conservation Tillage Practices

Dubin/Sievers

See [Table](#)

- C notes confirmed members, n notes those that have yet to be confirmed
- Sexton- good selection, hope for unbiased opinions
- Sexton moves to accept panel as it stands
- Goodlander seconds motion
- All are in favor, panel approved

Evaluation of Cover Crop Practices

Dubin/Sievers

See [Table](#)

- More are confirmed here than on the CT panel
- Sexton moves to accept panel as it stands
- Cropper seconds motion
- All are in favor, panel accepted as presented
- Simply providing an update
- Waiting for members to be confirmed
- Literature review for NM resulted in 1000+ articles for each panel
- Taglang- what is the timeline to review 1000+ articles and progress forward?
- Sievers- Panel will decide which of the articles to consider. Interviews will also inform this process. Hoping to move forward next week
- Goodlander- from previous experience, this works much better when group is divided into subgroups. A conference all w 35 can be difficult.

Evaluation of Poultry Litter Management

Glancey/Dubin

- Brief update- next call is scheduled for Mon Feb 27th. We will work to look through information that has been gathered
- Will circle back at next meeting

Review of AgWG Recommendations

Coale/Dubin

- Workgroup Recommendations have been posted to calendar event

Meeting Adjourned 11:17 AM

Participants

Frank Coale

Beth Horsey

Jason Keppler

Royden Powell

Fred Samandani

Chris Brosch

Sarah Lane

Steve Dressing

Jason Dalrymple

Alana Hartman

Glynn Carpenter

Robert Baldwin

Bill Brown

Tom Juengst

Doug Goodlander

Karl Brown

Greg Albrecht

Aaron Ristow

Rich Batiuk

Kelly Shenk

Mark Dubin

Victoria Kilbert

Don Meals

Mike Smolen

Diana Osmond

Marel Raub

Kristen Hugh- Evans

Susan Marquet

Jim Cropper