

**Assateague Coastal Trust – Chesapeake Climate Action Network –  
Environment Maryland – Maryland League of Conservation Voters –  
Senior Scientists & Policymakers for the Bay – West/Rhode Riverkeeper, Inc.**

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

February 21, 2012

Contact: Dawn Stoltzfus, 443-949-7042, 410-562-5655 cell, [dawn@thehatchergroup.com](mailto:dawn@thehatchergroup.com)

Meg Cronin, Environment Maryland, 516-318-9490

Bob Gallagher, West/Rhode Riverkeeper, Inc., 301-261-5021

Gerald Winegrad, Senior Scientists & Policymakers for the Bay, 410-280-8956

## **SUPPPORTERS DEMAND REDUCTIONS OF MANURE POLLUTION**

*Organizations Support SB 594 to Reduce Pollution from Manure, Oppose SB 330 to Stymie Regulatory Progress*

**ANNAPOLIS, MD.** At hearings in the Senate Education, Health, and Environmental Affairs Committee today, environmental organizations, senior Bay leaders, and members of the farming community will advocate for reducing manure pollution, a major contributor in the decline of the Chesapeake Bay. Speaking in favor of SB 594 (sponsored by Senators Pinsky and Frosh), proponents plan to argue for the need to place greater controls on the amount and timing of the land application of manure, poultry litter, and sewage sludge; some groups will even propose strengthening amendments. Many will also testify against SB 330, which proposes to halt the adoption of new regulations to reduce pollution from agricultural sources (like manure) until other Bay watershed states achieve certain pollution reduction levels.

According to the Maryland Department of Agriculture (MDA), farms remain Maryland's largest single source of pollution to the Chesapeake Bay.

According to BayStat, agriculture contributes 37 percent of Maryland's total nitrogen and 42 percent of its phosphorus pollution loads. In some localized regions, according to MDA, agriculture's contribution of nitrogen or phosphorus pollution skyrockets to as high as more than 70 percent (e.g., in the Eastern Shore regions).

Senators Pinsky and Frosh, responding to the delay in regulatory progress on better manure management—to regulations that have not been updated since 1997—introduced SB 594 to promote necessary changes in the current law. Among its provisions, SB 594 would require injection of manure or sewage sludge when applied during the winter; require the mixing of these fertilizers into the soil within 24 hours when applied to farm fields; and prohibit the application of manure and sludge when tests establish that a field is already saturated with phosphorus.

Senator Paul Pinsky said: "Without better management of raw animal manure, it will be extremely difficult to reach Bay clean-up goals and we will have to implement much more costly measures to meet Maryland's 'pollution diet' limits. Agriculture remains the largest polluter of the Bay and manure is a huge part of this pollution choking the Bay. It is time for us to both expect and demand greater accountability. We can both clean up our bay and nurture a strong agriculture sector in our state."

Former Congressmen Wayne Gilchrest (R-Eastern Shore) in supporting passage of SB 594 stated: "It is time for everyone polluting the Chesapeake Bay to step up and do their part in reducing their pollution. SB 594 is a step

forward in reducing the Bay-choking nutrients coming from animal manure and other sources of excess nutrients. The cost of the status quo is severe for our watermen and for our living resources.”

Bob Gallagher, Chairman of the Board of West/Rhode Riverkeeper, Inc., said: “The time for Maryland to act forthrightly to stem manure pollution is long past. The science is clear that farmers cannot continue with the practices as currently allowed. We cannot keep piling manure on farm fields at all times of the year and expect Bay water quality to improve.”

Meg Cronin, Chesapeake Bay Program Associate of Environment Maryland, said: “With SB 594, the manure has hit the fan. It says enough is enough. Maryland needs to stop allowing farmers to pollute by dumping manure and biosolids in a manner contrary to the best science available.”

In contrast to SB 594, SB 330 would stop all efforts to better manage manure until other Bay states meet certain limits for farm pollution.

Testimony presented by the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Environment Maryland, the Maryland League of Conservation Voters, and others who oppose SB 330 notes that some other states in the Bay watershed are ahead of Maryland in their overall percent reductions of pollution from agriculture. For example, Pennsylvania has reduced more total pounds of total nitrogen than any state, and New York and West Virginia’s total nitrogen reductions already exceed, by percentage, what Maryland has achieved. Similarly, New York and Delaware have already exceeded Maryland’s total phosphorus reductions.

In conclusion, former Maryland Senator and the Chair of the Senior Scientists and Policymakers for the Bay Gerald Winegrad argued, “The simple message from the Senior Scientists and Policymakers for the Bay has been: Treat raw animal manure the same as treated human sludge. SB 594 would help achieve that goal.”

Click [here](#) for more information about Maryland’s nutrient management regulations.

View a map showing localized nitrogen and phosphorus loads [here](#).

###