

Eastern Shore Agriculture Collaborative Initiative

First Meeting

Salisbury

Wicomico Cooperative Extension Office

Wednesday, February 20, 2008

Welcome and Purpose

Joanne Throwe welcomed and thanked people for coming, then provided a summary of her goals for convening this group of people. Inspired by a successful collaborative effort in Virginia's Shenandoah Valley that focused on addressing excess poultry manure, water quality and farm economic viability, Joanne thought a similar collaborative effort might appeal to Maryland's agricultural community on the Eastern Shore. As she explored this idea with various stakeholders, the concept began to take shape and evolve. Should a Maryland collaborative be focused on Eastern Shore issues, or include the entire Delmarva Peninsula, or address the full Bay watershed? Should a collaborative effort focus on just poultry litter or all agricultural issues? Joanne emphasized that all of these questions are important, and will be decided by the members of the collaborative itself, not by her. The purpose of this first meeting was to: 1) bring people together to learn more about the Virginia model; 2) identify possible issues for the collaborative to address; and 3) decide whether a Maryland collaborative might be worthwhile and, if so, how might it be structured.

The Virginia Waste Solutions Forum Model

Dale Gardner, Executive Secretary of the Virginia Dairymen's Association, described the goals, successes and challenges of the Virginia Waste Solutions Forum (WSF). The backdrop for the Virginia WSF was a low trust level between environmental groups and farmers, but a growing need to find solutions to the issue of excess animal manure. A first turning point occurred with the Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF) invitation to take farmers to the Bay where they would meet with watermen and learn more about Bay ecology. Dale approached potential partners at Virginia Tech, the CBF approached Environmental Defense (ED) and other potential partners, and together the partners decided to address the issue of nutrients by convening an invitation-only Solutions Forum.

The Virginia WSF, held in April 2005, invited 80 select representatives of different interests for the purpose of exploring innovative solutions to nutrient challenges in the Shenandoah Valley, to address water quality issues balanced with interests of animal agriculture. Partners were not interested in another talk-and-feel-good workshop, but insisted that the Forum would be results oriented, producing specific projects and initiatives that could be implemented within the year. Participants were leaders from farming, environmental and regulatory interests, including representatives from the Virginia Dairymen's Association, Virginia Poultry Federation, Virginia Farm Bureau, Virginia Cooperative Extension, , Old Dominion Electric Cooperative, Virginia Agribusiness Council, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Virginia Tech, Environmental Defense, Canaan Valley Institute, and Virginia Departments of Agriculture and Consumer Services,

Environmental Quality, Conversation and Recreation, and Mines, Minerals and Energy. After three years, all of these interests are still very involved.

The first WSF resulted in identifying specific goals in the areas of Pilot Projects, Research, Education and Policy. A Planning Committee, self-selecting and open to all who desired, led the implementation effort, and project-oriented committees were formed to implement these goals and priorities. Over time, WSF goals and implementation strategies have evolved, but the committees are still very active.

Dale summarized the challenges faced by the WSF:

- Available technologies are scaled for large-scale operations, so changes are needed to meet the needs of small farmers.
- Regulatory barriers are not keeping up with the emerging technologies, and so the WSF is trying to overcome these barriers.
- Some of the initiatives are not as easy to implement as they sound.
- Staying focused and keeping momentum is not always easy.
- Recruiting new partners is important.

The WSF model has been helpful in Virginia. If Maryland decides to adopt this model, it should first decide why. Dale suggested the following lessons for a Maryland effort:

- Choose your partners carefully and be sure their motives are “pure.” The CBF and ED are good partners because they are interested in environmental improvements, while also sincerely interested in keeping farms in the business of farming.
- Be prepared to check individual agendas at the door. Everyone has separate agendas, but to make this effort work, people need to come together for common purpose.
- Be prepared to work hard.
- Stay focused, because these efforts can easily “die on the vine.”
- Consider a co-leadership model, with one environmental co-chair and one agricultural producer co-chair, as a way to ensure continued balance and trust with the different interests.

Dale ended by suggesting that we are all facing serious issues, and the need to work together and not fight each other is greater than ever. There is power in partnership that cannot be found by acting alone. To the environmentalists, he suggests: be aware that farmers’ profit margins are as tight as they’ve ever been, that farmers get demoralized by the burden of additional regulations, and that we need farmers and farmland because the option of farmland turning into development is worse. To the farmers and agriculture industry, he suggests: be aware that agriculture is under the microscope like never before, while expectations and regulations are higher than before. Working in this environment, farmers have to do all they can to become good stewards. There is no room for bad actors, as they make all farmers look bad and cause new regulations needed for the one or two percent to be applied to all, even those trying to do a good job.

Stewardship can be looked at as a cost, but now it should be looked at as an opportunity. Dale suggested that farmers could take advantage of this opportunity to solicit nontraditional partners to position themselves with nutrient trading, carbon trading, federal state programs and the potential to generate energy from animal manure. Agriculture, he suggested, could actually be entering another golden age. If Maryland decides to pursue this collaborative effort, the Virginia collaborative would be willing to provide support.

Suzie Friedman, from Environmental Defense, noted that the Virginia WSF is successful because everyone is passionate about the work. The WSF has no paid staff, but people are committed to making things happen. The key goal of the WSF is to improve water quality while promoting economic viability of farming. The power of their combined voice – environmentalists working together with the farming community – has brought in significant continuing grants of several million dollars.

Specific projects that the WSF has worked on include: lowering the amount of phosphorous in dairy cattle feed; pyrolysis; stream fencing; marketing; biomass inventory; state agency use of poultry litter as fertilizer. A new opportunity that is being explored now is the issue of carbon credits and nutrient trading. Suzie suggested a major lesson is the need to remain flexible and open to new ideas, allowing priorities and projects to respond to new technologies and opportunities.

Questions and Answers

Q: How did the group organize after the Forum event?

A: Participation in the Steering Committee was open to anyone who attended the Forum, so it was largely composed of those 15 to 20 partners who had originally planned the Forum plus some new people. It meets three times per year. Committees meet as needed, not on a set schedule. Some committees meet, finish their work and move on. Other committees are ongoing.

Q: How do state agencies respond to the Forum projects?

A. They have responded very positively, and were involved from the beginning. They have provided matching funds for many efforts. Because of the strong partnership, the Steering Committee receives a good audience and feedback from agencies.

Q. What are some success stories for environmental sustainability? What has been achieved on the ground?

A. Three projects in particular: 1) Dairy cattle management project to reduce phosphorous in the feed. 300 farmers are now participating in this project, in which they are paid to reduce the P in feed management. 2) Stream management, using educational resources and a method to move forward with stream fencing that is different from the normal methods; 3) Pilots of different technologies, where the biggest issue is trying to find a way to scale the technologies down for smaller farms, or having several farms buy the technology cooperatively.

Q. How did you define success? What recommendations would you have for us?

A. The original criterion for success was that the Forum would produce specific projects that could be implemented within the first year. There was no goal or expectation for going in to argue for different regulations. Other measures of success are now being discussed. It's not clear that whether the WSF has been "successful", per se, because numerous projects are still in process. The key to success is that improvements are made in water and air quality.

Q. Has outreach to the community been written into your project plans?

A. Extension has been very helpful in providing community outreach. It has held several field days and workshops specifically for the purpose of educating the farming community about options and technologies. Because of this outreach, there are now four to five miles of stream fenced that otherwise wouldn't have happened, largely because of the Mennonite community's refusal on principle to accept assistance from the government.

Q. Why did you say that the marketing coop didn't work, because you didn't have anything to market?

A. The marketing coop aimed to serve as a broker, in a sense, for the distribution of the energy. But the waste-to-energy hadn't actually been generated, so it could not be marketed. In the future, the opportunity for energy will probably be with methane gas, not carbon credits.

Q. What percent of your funding is public and private grants?

A. The WSF receives far larger amounts in public funding. The private sources have been helpful and are increasing as well. Obtaining funding is a serious extensive commitment of time. The WSF goal is to create projects that will sustain themselves, requiring less of a fundraising effort.

Q. Regarding regulations, what do you do if you run up against the regulations?

A. The Virginia WSF is already there! For example, efforts to get the permit needed for the pyrolysis project have been stymied. The regulations consider it "incineration," but it's not incineration. It's the creation of energy. So, having a strong partnership and collaboration really helps in addressing these barriers. The WSF philosophy is that it is not interested in *pushing* for regulations; it is simply trying to move forward with an energy-manufacturing facility and finding a way that farms can obtain this technology.

Small Group Discussions

Participants next met in small groups, facilitated by staff from the Mid-Shore Mediation Center and Salisbury Center for Conflict Resolution. Following introductions, participants were asked to discuss their greatest hopes and fears for a potential collaborative effort. They identified issues that could be appropriate topics for the collaborative to address, and spent some time refining their ideas into top priorities that would be worthy for the collaborative to undertake.

Hopes for a Collaborative (See Appendix 1 for more specifics): Participants shared their hopes for what a collaborative might be able to work on and accomplish. A number of common themes emerged from this discussion.

Goals and Scope: Participants hope that a collaborative would –

- Save agriculture, forestry, and working landscapes (keep farmers farming)
- Lead to clear identification of common problems.
- Set short and long-term goals for action.

- Focus on sustainability and profitability, with shore-wide impact.
- Develop common sense, realistic solutions.
- Lead to real, tangible results and change.

Benefits: Participants envision that a collaborative could –

- Improve communication and dialogue within and between groups.
- Increase respect between groups.
- Develop new partnerships.
- Enable collaborative action for change.
- Generate significant funding for initiatives.

Education: Participants envision that a collaborative could be pivotal in educating constituencies about the issues, including educating –

- The state legislature.
- Federal agencies, such as the EPA.
- The media.
- Environmental groups.
- The broader shore community.

Develop Solutions: Participants expressed hope that the collaborative could accomplish specific outcomes for the farming community, including –

- Expanding economic opportunities for the farming community.
- Develop a system for manure management, enabling the movement of manure in a timely and economical manner.
- Develop alternative uses for manure, such as energy generation.
- Providing incentives and assistance to people who wish to enter farming.

Concerns about a Collaborative (See Appendix 1 for more specifics): Participants shared their concerns and fears about why a collaborative might not work or might not be productive. Broad concerns were expressed about the encroachment of development along with the loss of farmers and possible collapse of agriculture on the Eastern Shore, leading to widespread economic impacts. A number of other common themes also emerged from this discussion.

Regulations: Participants expressed concern that regulations would be seen as a solution, or that more regulations would result, leading to greater inflexibility and economic burden. Some also expressed concern that innovation would be hampered by regulations not keeping pace with new technologies, as experienced in Virginia.

Stakeholders: Participant concerns reflected a sense that a collaborative can work only if the right people are at the table, and if there is sufficient trust between the parties. Relationships have been stressed, and there is a fear that one or more groups could dominate or derail the process. The use of litigation as a tactic was specifically mentioned as concern and undesirable outcome. Balanced representation is important, and concerns were expressed that small farmers and local producers were not adequately represented.

Process Failure: Participants expressed concern that the process could fall apart for a variety of different reasons – distrust, losing focus, mission creep, failure of political influence, failure to follow-through, red tape, doing nothing.

Communication: Participants also reflected the importance of honest, open communication for the success of a collaborative. They noted that the collaborative would not work if people failed to speak openly, maintained hidden agendas, misrepresented the facts, or operated out of fear.

Goals and Activities for the Collaborative (See Appendix 2 for more specific): The group reviewed the ideas and issues discussed in their small groups, and identified the following common themes that could serve as a focus for the work of the collaborative.

1. **Education:** The collaborative could focus on providing education to the public, the legislature, and the farming community about the importance of sustainable agriculture, influences on watershed health, as well as opportunities and issues. The education should be neutral, balanced, unbiased, science-based, reflecting multiple sources and sectors, and should foster dialogue. Education could be focused on point-of-purchase, as well as more frequent news articles or coverage by the media.
2. **Establish and Understand the Baseline:** The collaborative could start by researching and providing information on the current baseline. What are the current nutrient levels in local streams and the Bay, and do we know where these nutrients are coming from? How much is coming from farming, how much air deposition, how much from the Susquehanna, how much from which tributaries?
3. **Deposition of Manure:** The collaborative could identify updated quantities and inventories of all manure sources (dairy, pigs, horses, chicken, etc.). This would help the collaborative have a better understanding of the issues, and what might be done with locally generated manure. The second half of this effort would be to identify environmental and economical methods for deposition of the manure, such as field storage, covering, a transportation system to balance supply and demand, and alternatives uses such as energy and new markets.
4. **Research and Development and Market Opportunities:** The collaborative could undertake research to assist economic development and viability of farms. Research could include innovative markets for farm products, such as energy or nutrient trading, next generation incentives, funding for agriculture land programs or debt service assistance.
5. **Diversification of Income Streams (on and off farms):** The collaborative could investigate and support mechanisms for diversifying farm income streams, such as nutrient trading, waste-to-energy production and carbon trading. Activities associated with this goal could include educational outreach about these activities, opportunities to expand into these areas, costs/benefits of these activities, including environmental benefits.

6. **Land Use:** The collaborative could become involved in fostering land use policies that would enable long-term economically viable farming as an integral part of the community. Several possible activities were identified, including targeting areas appropriate for development, identifying and supporting ways to foster or ensure contiguous farmland, supporting agriculture and forestry land preservation, open space protection, and identifying local government's role in achieving these goals.
7. **Technical Resources:** The collaborative could be helpful in finding ways to provide the farming community with the technical manpower needed to meet regulatory requirements and undertake new initiatives, such as Technical Service Providers (TSPs) and Comprehensive Nutrient Management Planners (CNMPs).
8. **Trust:** The collaborative could be helpful in building trust between environmental and farming interests. It would be important for the collaborative to agree at the outset on who can and should be at the table, and to develop mutual expectations for how people will treat each other and work together in the collaborative.

Decision to Move Forward

Given the possible goals and activities of the collaborative, the facilitator asked the group for an informal “straw poll” on whether it would support and want to participate in an “agricultural solutions” collaborative. This would not be a final decision, as there was still much ground to be covered before the collaborative was fully defined. But, based on the discussion thus far, did participants feel it would be worthwhile putting more energy into exploring the possibility of a collaborative? A show of hands indicated that all but a handful of people – four or five – would support further exploration of a collaborative.

Possible Structure for a Maryland Agricultural Solutions Collaborative

Based on the strong show of interest in further pursuing the idea of a collaborative, participants were asked to outline a beginning framework for the collaborative.

Goal of the collaborative: The group tentatively agreed that it should focus on improving water quality while promoting economically viable agriculture. The collaborative should be founded on principles of 1) an open, transparent process; 2) balanced representation of different interests; and 3) continuity in representation. The collaborative effort will know it is done with its work when key players are repeatedly missing and it is no longer a true collaborative.

Scope of the collaborative: The group had an extensive discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of establishing a focus on the issues of the Eastern Shore, the Delmarva Peninsula, or the entire Bay watershed. A focus on the Delmarva Peninsula would involve too many regulations, but would include all the interests, possibly assist with continuity, and would enable people to learn from each other across state boundaries. A focus on the entire Bay-wide watershed would enable people to deal with the issue as a whole, avoid unintended consequences, demonstrate how it can be done, and inspire other groups. On considering all these factors, all but a few people agreed that the collaborative should *focus on the Eastern*

Shore, while *inviting involvement* from the full Delmarva Peninsula. A more localized effort would enable the group to stay focused, build trust, get together more easily, and build success more quickly. People from Delmarva would be invited but likely would be self-selecting, as those who were most interested in participating would participate, while others would just drop out.

Interest groups to invite: The following groups were identified as important stakeholders to invite to the table:

Farming interests

- Farmers- crops, non-livestock
- Growers – chicken and other livestock farmers
- Advocacy – e.g. Farm Bureau
- Agribusiness
- Turf management
- CNMP Planners
- Integrators

Environmental & Conservation

- Environmental groups
- Land Conservation

Local, State and Federal

- RC&D
- Extension/University
- Federal and state agencies – FSA, MDA, NRCS, MDE, EPA
- Local elected government

Financial Support

- Funders
- Lenders
- Venture Capital

Broader Community

- Average consumers (social services?)
- Wastewater Treatment
- Developers

Next Steps

The group decided to try to meet next in *early April*. All of the groups listed above should be invited, including all who came from the Delmarva region to today’s meeting. People who can’t come should be informed that there will be multiple ways to participate – through reading the minutes, attending committee meetings, observing and/ or providing input, and providing input via email.

On the agenda for the next meeting would be the following issues:

- Decide the collaborative scope and mission
- Is policy part of its goal or incidental?
- Develop expectations for participation
- Leadership: a co-leadership model like Virginia or other model?
- Committee leaders?
- Where and how should the collaborative start? Would a Forum like Virginia be helpful, or can that be by-passed?

Joanne Throwe will work to find an appropriate date and will notify everyone of the next meeting time and place. She will work with a few participants to identify people to invite from the groups listed above. Tanya Denckla Cobb will develop the meeting summary for review and distribution to participants.

APPENDIX 1
HOPES AND CONCERNS

KEY:

GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3
GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6

HOPES

HOPES: Goals / Outcomes

Specific Hopes	Group
Clear identification of problems, Common sense solutions	3,6,1
Identify common goals; Set long and short terms goals	5,1
More voluntary programs – less regulation	3
Create accessible, practical plans to implement	3
Common goal and vision: “sustainable and profitable”	3
Build community – intact farms	2
Tangible results	5
Real, creative change	3
Realistic population driven accountability	3
Good way to move forward to building trust & relationship	6

HOPES: Scope

Specific Hopes	Group
Save agriculture; Ag. Land Preservation; farmers left farming	5,4, 6
Look at all waste generators; Determine Farmer Contribution to Nutrients in Bay	3,4
Shore-wide impact; reframe the discussion, eastern shore (poultry, grain)? Upper shore?	5, 6
Save forestry, Forestry	5,4
Save working landscapes; Continued Land Conservation	5,4
Include air quality in addition to water quality, Air Quality	6,4
Come up & new ideas for increased water Q ; H2O Monitoring	6,4
Define scope and time frame; Look at smaller steps in terms of defining success	6, 1
Science-based decisions; statements made not based on science; Perspective/more accurate data (waste)	6,2
New initiatives	5
Bay is not cleaning up, further north?	6

HOPES: Collaboration

Specific Hopes	Group
Partner communication; Improved communication from all Participants; Better communication	5,4,1
Fairness to all stakeholders; increased respect on all sides; Leave egos at door	5,6,1

Penetrate the political wall w/collaborations and science	3
Collaborative prioritizing	5
New partnership	5
Build on existing programs	5
Open dialogue among groups or within each group	6
Collaborative action that will focus on actual scientific facts	1

HOPES: Funding

Specific Hopes	Group
Get great money, Funding	6,4
Federal funding	1
Implementation practices w/ideas generated by this group linked w/funding	3

HOPES: Education

Specific Hopes	Group
Educate the EPA	3
Ignorant → Informed	3
Educate community fix negative perspective	2
-*educate the policy makers of the issues- the larger group to define the scope and define the educational needs according to “geographical needs”	6
Reframe “waste” (by-products?)	3
Unbiased Media & Industry Communications -Specifically Water-Keeper: Farmer Messages	4

HOPES: Advocacy

Specific Hopes	Group
Informed Legislature, This group has a strong voice in legislature, Statewide impact on legislature; build a strong diverse group to influence legislation	3,5,6
Strong joint voice environment/farm	2
Equal treatment for farmers	2
More influence for farmers in Annapolis	2
Engage in local communities	2

HOPES: Economic

Specific Hopes	Group
Strong id of markets/buyers for manure	3
Economic opportunities	5
Reasons and drive for young people to go into farming	6
Profitability	6
Burning of manure → energy	6

Demand of manure by farmers, increased competing	6
*understanding of needs/availability of manure; how to set up contracts and manure <u>timely</u>	6

NOT INCLUDED:

- Two strong leaders/confident
- Additional (more)
- Work and set
- Boundaries

CONCERNS

CONCERNS: Regulation

Specific Concerns	Group
More regulation, Regulation (time/money), Regulation(s)	2, 3
Regulation seen as solution	5
Lack of regulatory flexibility	5
Regulations not keeping pace with technology	5

CONCERNS: Stakeholders

Specific Concerns	Group
Is everyone at the table?	3
Usual suspects	3
No room to work together	2
Not enough representation of local producer/farmer	5
Small growers overlooked	5
Individual statement or group may derail the project e.g. dominant or interest group	6
Poor Relationships	4
Looking only at Agriculture industry	3

CONCERNS: Process

Specific Concerns	Group
Distrust	6,5
Loss of momentum ; nothing changes	5
Feasibility	3
Nothing more than meeting	5
Lose focus	6
Red tape	1
Avoid Mission creep	1
Finger pointing; Conflict	1
Collaborative falling apart	3
Annapolis ignores our work	2
Hate to see this turn into an advertisement	6

Follow through and lack of commitment	1
Give this opportunity a try, do not miss out	1

CONCERNS: Communication

Specific Concerns	Group
Would not openly talk about issues	6
“elephants” in the room	6
Fear-based perception prevailing over science	3
Misrepresentation of the facts	1
Hidden agendas	1
Personal feelings vs. Profession feelings need to be assessed	1

CONCERNS: Others

Specific Concerns	Group
Residential Development	4
Transfer Tax Revenues (Insufficient)	4
Water Keeper Alliance (Litigation)	4
Farmers Leaving	4
New Not Coming In	4
[down arrow] economic effect of collapse of farms	2
Collapse of agriculture	2

A.

APPENDIX 2

CHALLENGES, OPPORTUNITIES, ISSUES, ACTIVITIES

CHALLENGES / OPPORTUNITIES

Theme: Engagement and Involvement Opportunities

Specific Opportunities	Group
Working together, Collaboration, Partnership	2
Getting buy-in from local elected officials (zoning, turn-over)	3
Improved public perception	2
Do the right thing (once identified), Better focus on areas needing attention	2,4
Continuing, Continued Dialogue	2,4

Theme: Education Opportunities

Specific Opportunities	Group
Create info sharing system that accurately identifies responsibility, gives recognition, and reports impact on bay.	3
Information for Amish (and other) farmers	5
6. Education programs -farmers-nutrient trading economies -policy makers -how to create income stream to maintain -group to create common message to different groups	6
-*education program, policy maker, farmers # to buy commercialized fertilizers	6
Point of purchase education @ sustainability, "MD or DE grown" stickers on products	5
6. Build credibility through research e.g. nutrient trading, Research	4,6

Theme: Economic Opportunities

Specific Opportunities	Group
Access to grant funds	3
2010 trust \$ is coming and it could fit w/relocation program, Encouraged by 2010 trust # to be creative and practical	3
(C) Expanded economic opportunities outside farming	2
Value added products	5

Theme: Project/Other Opportunities

Specific Opportunities	Group
ID possible pilot projects, 1. Pilot project watershed based profit oriented conservation driven geographically limited	3, 5
5. Aq-land preservation Forest land preservation	5
1. Upgrade regulations in interest of consistency (statewide) and simplicity	5
-*Implementation BMPs	4
-“Recommendations & Solutions”	4
Can be ahead of EPA	3

Theme: Engagement and Involvement Challenges

Specific Challenges	Group
Perception of agriculture, Perception of environment	2
Engaging other groups, Identify Stakeholders, Finding Common Ground, Developing Trust	2,4
Protection of land for agriculture	
Pressure from groups crying for more regulation & litigation	3
Accurate path – commitment to [ushg???] it	2
-*science based decisions, 4, 6. Use Collaborative action that will focus on actual scientific facts	1,6

Theme: Education Challenges

Specific Challenges	Group
5-The need for positive education (more frequent) and better larger amounts of news articles, and other communications	1
3-Communication pieces that present a balance	1

Theme: Economic Challenges

Specific Challenges	Group
Profitability, Run cost feasibilities, Create practical & economical solutions, -*research to make trading economically fiscal, - Strategy And practices- how to make it more economically viable, -*\$\$\$	1, 2,3,4,6
Energy alternative, how to create income stream and maintain	6
2, 7. Use better economic data on conservation	1
Creating new markets for poultry litter	1

Funding for Ag Econ develop office New profit innovation, value added and other, R + D Incentives for next generation farmers	5
Sustainability index for consumer motivation Stimulate local markets Flexible procurement procedures	5

Theme: Manure Management Challenges

Specific Challenges	Group
Lack of research on benefits, Creditable Research	4,5
-Access-fluctuating energy markets, manure management regionally? Creating energy alternatives for poultry litter	1,6
2. Region 3 EPA or any regulator visits counterproductive (agriculture education for agents)	5
-nutrient trading -credit for “green” practices in income for farmers -raise “cap” on treatment -photo developing ? tax credit for farmers, check law -lack of understanding	6
3, 8. Transportation alternatives for poultry litter	1
New nutrient inventory for manure	5

TOPICS / ISSUES

Education, Pilot Projects, Research Innovation, Market-based Opportunities (G3)

GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3
GROUP 4	GROUP 5	GROUP 6

Theme: Science

Specific Topics	Group
Decipher good science from bad science	3
Need more research	3
Balanced & accurate perspective on science & current situation	3
Include H ₂ O quantity as well as quality	3
(B) Investigate feeding strategies to reduce manure/'w'	2
(B****)Evaluate all nutrient sources together (Ag, Municipal, Private plants, Septic)	2
B. Data collection (research and use)	2
Science Action Plan: 1. Money 2. People (Scientists, People here, Municipal people, Developers) 3. Plan to Use Evaluation (Help pay for reg. compliance, Streamline reporting/paperwork)	2
-Specific Measurements of What is contributing to the pollution. Ag., Construction, Land, Loss/Conv., Homeowners	4
-Soil Quality Monitoring & H ₂ O “__” Measurement	4
2, 4. Technical resources needed to fully implement nutrient mgt. plans	1
3, 4. Identify a realistic depiction of nutrient loads per sector- loads per sector and source; New inventory (nutrient) for manure	1, 5

Theme: Education

Specific Topics	Group
Educate farmers & public about benefits of manure over sludge (Ph, impact on land) (I)	3
Educate the public w/accurate info. Re: by-products – amount, use and opportunity	3
Translating agronomic benefits of growth and research conservation to farmers	5
*Education re “nutrient trading” (doable, greatest impact, feasible partnership, -personal commitment)	6
Education needs to be an important support activity	1
Articles to enhance public understanding of	1

accomplishments/news/teach/directions and overall needs	
(lump w/O) Communicate to taxpayers, government \$ to transport manure increases quality of life, water, sustainable farms	3
-Education -Science Based for Farmers, Environmentalists, Public	4
-Assimilation of studies into an understandable document for all “Layman’s Terms”	4

Theme: Manure Management

Specific Topics	Group
Find out how much manure we produce & who needs it (III)	3
Increase manure taken to Perdue Agri-Research	3
Relocating manure to Midwest (II)	3
Develop trade lines for grain & manure – back hauling	3
Relocating manure to Upper Shore & balance between lower counties	3
Look at in-state applications for re-use of manure as organic fertilizer	3
(C) New profit opportunities – energy	2
(C) Study carbon credits/other credits	2
-Moving Nutrients Off Shore In an economical and low resource way “Red Tape”	4
Use of Poultry “In an environmentally sustainable way”	4
Implement research-based practices (i.e. poultry litter app w/no till) (II)	3
Ethanol plant	3

Theme: Economic

Specific Topics	Group
*economic viability	6
1. Tie together carbon trade of all buffers Target farming ops. As recipient for carbon trading funds	5
(C)*** Profitability (sprawl, [red. pal’n??])	
(C) New profit opportunities – energy	2
(C) Study carbon credits/other credits	2
--competitive pressure of developing states e.g. MD (increased protection programs for farm land?, new programs?, land may be protected, but the farm may not be successful)	6
-cost, *increased return on investment vs. housing development	6

Theme: Land Use

Specific Topics	Group
Ag-land preservation – easements? (III); Protect land for ag (3A ***), Open Space Protection	3,2, 4
(A) Expand Ag Preserve Fund	2
(A) Alternatives to selling farmland for development	2
(A) Incentives for developer's to build where there is concrete (build up instead of out)	2
(A) Concentrate development (contiguous)	2
(A) Contiguous farmland	2
Reduce sprawl, Sustainability	2

Theme: PR

Specific Topics	Group
2. Collaboration of PR, get the word out (about this initiative)	5
5. Innovative marketing	5
PR for Eastern Shore for whole state on Ag/Env (PSA)	2
Perception of farmers as anti environment education (esp. poultry)	5
5, 5. (combined with page 2) Have a neutral public forum to strengthen the diversity pf voices and opinion	1

Theme: Funding

Specific Topics	Group
Funding for Adequate Storage	4
Funding studies to get accurate assessments of litter/man	4
Funding studies to understand appropriate amounts to use	4
C Bay 20/10 Trust Fund \$ used to assist Perdue Agri-Recycle move processed manure out of CB region (subsidize transportation); Collaborative mgmt. of nutrients (i.e. transportation subsidies.)	3, 5
1, 4. Better tapping into the markets place to reward environment benefits	1
1. Laek Better/ More support for technical assistance for agriculture (people and funds)	5

Theme: Policy/Involvement

Specific Topics	Group
Enforce existing regulations, Moratorium on new regulations, Enforcement of Laws	2, 4
Problem of litigation as a solution	5
Ownership of Contribution to Challenges	4

Leaving Agenda at Poor (Given O/C)	4
Benchmarks	4
Look at James, Patuxent, Susquehanna & Potomac Rivers and see how they fit w/this group (III), Stakeholders from above part of this collaborative	3
Find out what groups exist that are using collaborative	3

SUMMARY / PRIORITIES

Theme:

Specific Priorities	Group
Profitability/Economics/Incentives	1,2,3,4,5,6
Research/Good Science/Localized Info	1,2,3,4,5,6
Public Education	1,3,5,6
Nutrient Management/Alternatives/Transportation	1,3,4,5
Collaboration/Trust	1,4,5
Open Space Protection/Land Use	2,4,5
Appropriate Stakeholders	3

Profitability/Economics/Incentives

- “economically sound transportation system”
- “innovative profit strategies and methods”
- “incentives for next generation farmers”
- “value added”
- “increase or diversify income stream”
- “niche market”, “new market”
- “economically friendly way”
- “profitability”

Research/Good Science/Localized Information

- “balanced and accurate perspective on science and current situation”
- “differentiate between good and bad science”
- “research and development for agricultural economic development”
- “technical resources needed to fully implement nutrient management plans”
- “identify a realistic depiction of nutrient loads per sector”
- “credible research”
- “science-based”
- “accurate, localized research”

Public Education

- “use information to educate both the public and legislature”
- “raise public awareness of importance of sustainable agriculture”
- “point of purchase education”

- “outcome/economics of nutrient trading benefits education for farmers and science-based education for citizens and policy makers”
- “information about agricultural water shed, sources/loading vs. other sources, and agricultural trending”
- “provide a neutral public forum”
- “articles to enhance understanding of accomplishments/news, teach, directions of overall needs”
- “positive education and more frequent amounts of news articles”
- “communication that represents balance”

Nutrient Management/Alternatives

- “transportation alternative uses for nutrient generators, energy”
- “establish transportation system to balance supply and demand”
- “new nutrient inventory for manure and transportation subsidy”
- “Recommendations and Solutions”

Collaboration

- “TRUST”
- “Cooperative, collaborative nutrient management”
- “use a collaborative action that will focus on scientific facts”

Open Space/Land Use

- “Ag and Forestry Land Preservation”
- “Open space protection”
- Land Use

Stakeholders

- “Stakeholders – is everyone here? Are we looking broadly enough? Look at Susquehanna, Potomac, James & Patuxent watershed. Looking at more than agriculture industry.”

APPENDIX 3
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

39 People Participated in the First Meeting

Jenn	Aiosa	Maryland Senior Scientist	Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Kenny	Bounds	Vice President, Government Affairs Officer President	MidAtlantic Farm Credit LEAD Maryland Foundation
Tom	Brinson	Corporate Environmental Manager	Allen Family Foods, Inc.
Tanya	Denckla Cobb	Senior Associate	Institute for Environmental Negotiation
Mark	Dubin	Agricultural Technical Coordinator	USDA-CSREES Mid-Atlantic Water Program College of Agriculture and Natural Resources University of Maryland
Joseph	Fehrer	Nassawango Land Manager	The Nature Conservancy (also on the Board of Assateague Coastal Trust)
Suzy	Friedman	Project Manager -- Agricultural Projects	Center for Conservation Incentives at Environmental Defense
Dale	Gardner	Executive Secretary	Virginia State Dairymen's Association
John	Groutt	Past President, Board Green Infrastructure Committee	Wicomico Environmental Trust
Danny	Holland	Dairy Farmer	
Luke	Howard	Farmer	organic grain, chicken, and vegetable producer from Queen Anne's County
E.B.	James	Executive Director	Nanticoke Watershed Alliance
L. Edward (Eddie)	Jestice, Jr.	President	Delaware Farm Bureau
Eddie	Johnson	Director, Educator	Maryland Cooperative Extension - Wicomico County
Kevin	Keenan	District Manager	Wicomico County Soil Conservation District
Pat	Langenfelder	First Vice President	Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.
Jim	Louis	Senior Agent, Agriculture & Natural Resources & County Extension Director	Caroline County Extension
George (Bud)	Malone	Extension Specialist III, Animal and Food Sciences Assoc Scientist, Agriculture Experiment Ctr	Animal and Food Sciences, University of Delaware
Jay	Martin	Farmer	
Peter	Martin	Field Ecologist	Delaware Wild Lands, Inc.

Bill	Massey		Mountaire Farms
Thomas	Miller	Vice President of Support Services	Allen Family Foods, Inc.
Connie	Musgrove	Senior Research Coordinator	UMD Center for Environmental Science
Richard	Nottingham	Agent, Agriculture & Natural Resources	Somerset County Extension
Doug	Parker	Associate Professor	UMD Agricultural and Resource Economics
Kathy	Phillips	Executive Director	Assateague Coastal Trust (also Waterkeeper Alliance)
David	Redinger	Complex Safety & Environmental Manager, Temperanceville Complex	Tyson Foods, Inc.
Lee	Richardson	Poultry Farmer	
Bill	Satterfield	Executive Director	Delmarva Poultry Industry
Kelly	Shenk	NSC Coordinator	EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office
Elizabeth	Skane	Graduate Assistant	Environmental Finance Center
Jeff	Smith	Corporate Environmental Manager	Perdue Farms Incorporated
Judith	Stribling	Associate Professor	Biological Sciences Salisbury University
Pat	Stuntz	Program Officer	Keith Campbell Foundation for the Environment
Jack	Tarburton	Representative	Perdue Farms Incorporated
Joanne	Throwe	Assistant Director	University of Maryland Environmental Finance Center
Jennifer	Timmons	Extension Specialist for Poultry	Maryland Cooperative Extension- Lower Eastern Shore
Michael	Twining	General Manager	Willard Agri-Service of Greenwood, DE
Hank	Zygmunt	EPA Mid Atlantic Agriculture Advisor	EPA Region 3