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## Nutrient Application Setbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If the watercourse is:</th>
<th>It is defined as a:</th>
<th>For crop and pasture land adjacent to the watercourse, the setbacks requirements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural and either perennial or intermittent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stream</strong></td>
<td><strong>Apply</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Channelized and perennial and:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Lies within a floodplain soil map unit, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Lies within a hydric soil map unit “mapped as a narrow, elongated feature in a fluvial (stream-like)/floodplain position, or</td>
<td><strong>Stream</strong></td>
<td><strong>Apply</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lies within a “B” slope or greater soil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Channelized and intermittent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ditch</strong></td>
<td><strong>Do Not Apply</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ephemeral (natural or channelized)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ditch</strong></td>
<td><strong>Do Not Apply</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nutrient Application Setbacks

Edge of Watercourse

- 35 feet: No broadcast application
- 10 feet: No nutrient application
- "Directed" nutrient application
Why re-visit the regulations?
Regulations were adopted in 2012
Why now?

Many dairy farmers are struggling financially
Availability of cost-share funding
Ability of adequate technical assistance

********************

Concerns of food processing facilities
Biosolids Industry
Dairy Meetings

July 11- Elkton, Cecil County

July 12- Sharpsburg, Washington County

July 14- McHenry, Garrett County
Current Nutrient Application Time Frames

• Fall Application dates
  – Sept 10 – November 1 (East of the Chesapeake Bay and the Susquehanna River)
  – Sept 10 – November 15 (West of the Chesapeake Bay and the Susquehanna River)

• Winter Application
  – November 16 – February 28
2016 Nutrient Application Extension

• This type of extension has occurred in the past under MDA authority based on weather & planting and harvesting conditions

• All Nutrient Sources allowed to be applied up to November 15th.

• Only on farm generated liquid manure are allowed to be applied up to December 3rd.
  – Does not apply to Bio-Solids
  – Does not apply to Food Processing Wastes
Winter Spreading Prohibition
Effective July 1, 2016

Nov. 1st - Winter Spreading for the Eastern Shore
Nov. 15th - Winter Spreading west of the Bay
No Emergency Spreading Provisions included
Affects farmers, biosolids, food processing

A special meeting of the NM Advisory Committee was held at MDA on July 5, 2016 to address this issue. Public comments were accepted.
After July 1, 2016, a person may not make a winter application of a nutrient source to agricultural land.

The prohibition against making a winter application after July 1, 2016 does not apply to a nutrient source that originates from:

(i) A dairy or livestock operation with less than 50 animal units; or
(ii) A municipal wastewater treatment plan with a design flow capacity of less than 0.5 million gallons per day.

This exception to the general prohibition expires after the winter application that ends on February 28, 2020.

The prohibition against making a winter application does not apply to potash, liming materials, or manure deposited directly by livestock. A person may make a winter application of certain nutrients for greenhouse production and for certain vegetable crops, small fruit crops, small grain crops, and cool season grass sod production listed in the *Maryland Nutrient Management Manual* Section I-B.
The Department is considering the following recommendations

- Remove the incorporation requirement for Spring and Fall manure spreading.

- Extend the Fall spreading dates to reflect Sept. 10<sup>th</sup>- Dec. 15<sup>th</sup> and eliminate the east and west of the Bay distinction. Winter date will be Dec. 16<sup>th</sup>- March 1.

- Add an Emergency Spreading provision under Winter application.
Remove Incorporation Spring/Fall

Since 2012 there has been much discussion that requiring incorporation is in conflict with statewide efforts to promote no-till farming.

Also since 2012 NRCS has concentrated on soil health and has presented many studies showing soil health is improved with little or no soil disturbance other than planting.
Proposed Regulations
Incorporation Spring/Fall

• Organic nutrient sources shall be injected or incorporated as soon as possible, but no later than 48 hours after application, except those farm operations that choose to manage their farms to obtain the benefits of no-till farming.

• MDA reserves the right to require incorporation of organic nutrient sources on a case by case basis.
Proposed Regulation Change
Extend the Fall Spreading Date

The Department believes the Fall spreading date should be the same on both sides of the Bay.

• Fall Application Period would be 9/10 – 12/15
• Winter dates would become December 16\textsuperscript{th} – February 28\textsuperscript{th}.

\textbf{Added-} no spreading on frozen or snow covered ground to the Spring and Fall requirements.

\textbf{Added-} \textit{Winter} must be 100’ from surface water in Winter
Emergency Spreading Provision

The current spreading ban included an emergency provision which was effective. To prevent an overflow from a storage structure, farmers called MDA and followed procedures.

Since 2012 dairy farmers constructed 58 waste storage structures and 14 are underway, but an emergency provision is still needed.

Applies to farms/facilities with some storage.
Proposed Regulation
Emergency Spreading Provision

Applications required in emergency situations due to an imminent overflow of a storage facility for operation >50 animal units

• On farm generated organic fertilizer
• Shall be managed in consultation with the MDA
• Operators shall contact their MDA regional nutrient management representative for guidance.

• Operators will be required to enter into an agreement of intent with the Soil Conservation District or private entity that is a certified Technical Service Provider approved by NRCS.
TEMPORARY FIELD STOCKPILING FOR ORGANIC NUTRIENT SOURCES

General Provisions (Abbreviated Version)

I. When other immediate use options and alternatives are not available, temporary field stockpiling (staging) of organic nutrient sources is allowed.
   - Temporary field stockpiling (staging) provides greater environmental protection than a fall or winter application of nutrients or applying nutrients too far ahead of normal planting time and crop uptake.

2. Existing storage shall be fully used prior to stockpiling material in the field.

3. Any material staged in field stockpile shall be land applied in the first spring season following the placement of the stockpile.

4. Materials shall be field stockpiled (staged) temporarily in a manner that prevents nutrient runoff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>MD State Total</th>
<th>Total AIR Acres Reported 2014</th>
<th>Total Acres submitted</th>
<th>% of County Reported</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>% of Acres</th>
<th>Soil Test P-FIV &lt;150</th>
<th>Soil Test P-FIV 150 - 499</th>
<th>Soil Test P-FIV &gt; 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>61,109.61</td>
<td>59,982.05</td>
<td>74.10%</td>
<td>55,758.65</td>
<td>93.96%</td>
<td>4,085.75</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
<td>17.61%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>80,948.17</td>
<td>80,948.17</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>80,948.17</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>51,726.39</td>
<td>55,838.89</td>
<td>107.95%</td>
<td>52,155.46</td>
<td>93.40%</td>
<td>3,549.67</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
<td>133.74%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>80,948.17</td>
<td>80,948.17</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>80,948.17</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Eastern Shore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>69,781.22</td>
<td>65,137.06</td>
<td>93.34%</td>
<td>58,145.98</td>
<td>89.27%</td>
<td>6,932.68</td>
<td>10.64%</td>
<td>58.40%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>91,353.81</td>
<td>79,506.49</td>
<td>87.03%</td>
<td>53,424.63</td>
<td>67.19%</td>
<td>25,953.67</td>
<td>32.81%</td>
<td>128.90%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>85,183.33</td>
<td>48,387.98</td>
<td>56.80%</td>
<td>36,072.42</td>
<td>74.55%</td>
<td>12,068.54</td>
<td>24.94%</td>
<td>247.02%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Eastern Shore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>35,326.72</td>
<td>35,326.72</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>35,326.72</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>62,222.45</td>
<td>31,909.51</td>
<td>51.28%</td>
<td>10,265.39</td>
<td>32.17%</td>
<td>18,445.92</td>
<td>57.81%</td>
<td>3,197.58%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Total</td>
<td>158,659.18</td>
<td>89,576.68</td>
<td>56.60%</td>
<td>84,841.29</td>
<td>52.20%</td>
<td>50,609.44</td>
<td>47.80%</td>
<td>10,126.94%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD State Total</td>
<td>1,278,132.12</td>
<td>967,744.72</td>
<td>75.72%</td>
<td>789,546.43</td>
<td>61.59%</td>
<td>166,258.25</td>
<td>17.18%</td>
<td>11,940.76%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MD State Total**

11/10/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total AIR Acres</td>
<td>1,278,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acres Submitted</td>
<td>967,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Reported</td>
<td>75.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fields Submitted</td>
<td>65,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P FIV &lt; 150</td>
<td>81.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P FIV 150-499</td>
<td>17.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P FIV &gt; 500</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data on Phosphorus Levels

- 81.6% of the acreage statewide will not be impacted by PSI/PMT.
- 81.6% represents 789,546 acres that are <150 FIV
- 18.4% represents 178,198 acres that are >150 FIV
- MDA continues to take incremental measures to obtain the remaining information.
  - Consultants
  - Farm Operators
Poultry Litter Land Application

• 312,393 Tons Poultry Litter Collected
• 312,393 acres / 2 Tons Application Rate = 156,196 acres needed for application of litter
  – Upper Shore = 245,362 ac. (90% of reported acres is below 150 FIV)
  – Mid Shore = 184,740 ac. (75% of reported acres is below 150 FIV)
  – Lower Shore = 39,664 ac. (25% of reported acres is below 150 FIV)
– Total Acres Available for Spreading = 469,767
Soils Data Update

March data was used extensively
Percentages have not changed significantly

Problems
Getting complete data
Lack of current information

Next Challenge
Establishing the Tier Groups
PMT Economic Analysis Sample

• 8 farms in study
  – 4 Poultry Operations
  – 4 Dairy Operations

• Participating acreage ranging from 58.9 to 103.6

• Each participant compensated with incentive package to reimburse costs of commercial fertilizer
PMT Economic Study Update

Second year of the study- same fields

**Early Observations**

All 4 poultry litter farms indicate commercial fertilizer nearly doubled the cost over litter use on a per bushel basis.

One of the dairy farms had 7 different strips, all FIV 150-250. None of the fields needed P or K. The fertilizer recommendation was 162-0-0 for all strips. In this case, the cost of pumping and spreading the liquid manure exceeded value.
P Loss Ratings PSI→PMT

Of the field samples included in our study:

Under **PSI:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (+)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under **PMT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P Loss Ratings PSI→PMT

Of Fields with Low Rating Under PSI:
  27.8% became Medium under PMT
  33.3% became High under PMT

Of Fields with Medium Rating Under PSI:
  66.7% became High under PMT
Interpretation of PMT Final Score

• **Low** – Total P applications should be limited to no more than a three-year crop P removal applied over a three year period

• **Medium** – P applications limited to amount expected to be removed from field by crop harvest immediately after application or soil test-based P application recommendations

• **High** – No P should be applied to this site
Case Study: Farm 2015-P-02

Costs of Fertilizer under PSI regulation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Price ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manure 68-104-136</td>
<td>15.00/ton @ 2 tons/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreading Manure</td>
<td>10.00/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-SUL-32</td>
<td>41.40/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife in N</td>
<td>10.00/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost Per Acre: $91.40
Case Study: Farm 2015-P-02

Poultry Operation
Acreage in Study: 103
Composed of two fields, A (32 acres) and B (71 acres)
Crop: Corn

P Loss Rating Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Rating Under PMI</th>
<th>Rating Under PMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field A</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field B</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study: Farm 2015-P-02

PMT Nutrient Recommendation:
Field A: 150-0-63    Field B: 145-0-59

Costs of Fertilizer under PMT regulation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Price ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-0-30</td>
<td>43.70/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreading</td>
<td>7.00/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-SUL-32</td>
<td>62.00/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife in N</td>
<td>10.00/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost Per Acre: $122.70
Case Study: Farm 2015-P-02

What was the change?
Price Per Acre: $91.40 ➞ $122.70
Change of 31.30 $/acre

What were the extra costs?
In comparison with PSI, under PMT the farmer had to purchase:
• An additional ~56 lbs/acre N
• 60 lbs/acre Potash
Discussion of Cost Change

• What is the sale value of litter?
  – Could partially offset increased costs

• Variation in cost change based on crop
  – Would expect to see less increase in costs growing soybeans (no need for extra N)
Yield Differences?

Point of Interest: Are there yield effects of using inorganic fertilizer in place of manure?

Two types of potential comparisons in data:
1. Against historic yield data from previous harvest of same field
2. Against yield data for other fields on same property in same year
Yield Differences?

What we saw:

• Highly mixed results
  – some experienced decreased yields with commercial fertilizer use, some experienced increased yields.

Examples (comparison to previous corn yield):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm ID</th>
<th>Yield Under PSI (manure)</th>
<th>Yield Under PMT (inorganic fertilizer)</th>
<th>Change in Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-P-03</td>
<td>154.89 bushels/acre</td>
<td>162.87 bushels/acre</td>
<td>+7.98 bushels/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-P-02</td>
<td>152.0 bushels/acre</td>
<td>127.88 bushels/acre</td>
<td>-24.12 bushels/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yield Differences?

How valid are these comparisons?
Not appropriate given the design of the experiment.

Why?
Too many factors affect yield that we did not account for or collect data on.

There is no valid comparison from this data to draw a conclusion on how a switch to inorganic fertilizer impacts yield.
Poultry vs. Dairy Operation

• All poultry litter operations in our study were already supplementing their crops with purchased commercial N, even when using manure. Under PMT, the required poundage to meet yield goals increased but commercial N was already a cost consideration.

• Of the dairy operations in this study, two of the four only required manure and spreading costs under PSI. Commercial fertilization was only involved under the PMT, which changes the cost differential of switching to PMT for dairy producers.
Going Forward

• Working with producers to complete data profile
• Creating a comprehensive summary of how an individual farmer can be affected by the changes implemented under the PMT
• Considering factors that may potentially offset or mitigate the cost changes
• Finalizing comparable result structure across farms to get a sense for the variation in change
Phosphorus Management Tool (PMT) Preliminary Tier Group Reporting Data

• 1,156 Operations have been reported
  – Represents 7,220 fields
  – Represents 92,378 acres

• MDA has extended the deadline for Licensed companies and certified operators to report this information by November 30, 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Farm Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of Fields ≥ 150 FIV</th>
<th>Acreage of Fields ≥ 150 FIV</th>
<th>Average FIV</th>
<th>Tier Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PMT Tier Group A

• Average soil P FIV 150-300
  – Begins Transition Management Phase 1 in 2020
  – Three year schedule (2020 - 2022)
    • 896 operations reported
    • 4,753 fields reported
    • 58,466 acres reported
    • 77.5% of reported operations
PMT Tier Group B

• Average soil P FIV 300-450
  – Begins Transition Management Phase 1 in 2019
  – Four year schedule (2019 - 2022)
    • 181 operations reported
    • 1,839 fields reported
    • 24,925 acres reported
    • 15.7 % of reported operations
PMT Tier Group C

- Average soil P FIV >450
  - Begins Transition Management Phase 1 in 2018
  - Five year schedule (2018 - 2022)
    - 79 operations reported
    - 628 fields reported
    - 8,987 acres reported
    - 6.8 % of reported operations
Phosphorus Management Tool
Overview of How it Works

RISK

** Could add time if services are not adequate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 YEAR TRANSITION SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CROP YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier C - Avg. FIV P 450 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier B - Avg. FIV P 300-450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier A - Avg. FIV P 150 - 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSI = Phosphorus Site Index

TM1 = Transition Management Phase 1

TM2 = Transition Management Phase 2

PMT = Phosphorus Management Tool
Ammonia Loss By Injection Method
October 13, 2016
DeBaugh Farms

Parts Per Million

- Veenhuis Euroject: 4.0
- Vredo: 2.0
- Yetter: 1.5
- Surface Application: 20.0
Urban Program

1,697 Certified Professional Fertilizer Applicators

1,855 Trained Employees

922 Licensed Businesses

June 30, 2016
Maryland Department of Agriculture

Dwight Dotterer
NM Program Administrator
410-841-5877