




Presents

3rd
"The ^ Battle for Lake Erie"

First Battle for Lake Erie

September 10, 1813



Second Battle for Lake Erie

1950s-60s: Citizen outrage builds as sewage and industrial waste create massive “dead zones”



1969: Cuyahoga River catches fire again



1970-72: Landmark Legislation



Third Battle for Lake Erie

Factory “farms” and manure



struggles for a breath in the algae-filled waters in Point Place in Toledo.

THE BLADE/ANDY MO





- **Home to more than 1,500 species of plants and animals**
- **Prime migratory bird route**
- **Drinking water for over 13 million people**
- **Economic resource for multiple states and Ontario**

Source: Ohio Environmental Council

Clean water is a right!



The lake belongs to everyone



No person or corporation has the right to impair our water

But Factory Farms (CAFOs) do that when they use Lake Erie as a free toilet and the public pays the cost

- **Toledo Water Customers pay \$millions more every year for chemicals to treat drinking water.**
- **\$50 million for ozonation, part of a \$500 million water treatment plant upgrade**
- **Planned \$100 million, billion-gallon reservoir to hold 20 days water supply**

11 years later some people are still trying to find the problem!



Nothing here? How about looking upstream?

When factory “farms” (CAFOs) use Lake Erie to get rid of animal waste




Photo: Haraz N Ghanbari/AP

Photo taken during Toledo's 2014 water crisis.
400,000 people without water for four days.


800+ factory farms Western Lake Erie Watershed

- Animals increased from 9 to 25 million
- Phosphorus from commercial fertilizer use went down



excrete Phosphorus equal to what's in all the sewage
from Ohio, Indiana, Chicago and Atlanta

And more CAFOs are Being Built !!



More than **2,500 Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations** (CAFOs) were in the Western Lake Erie Basin in 2022, housing 400,000 cows, 1.8 million hogs and nearly 24 million chickens and turkeys.

State of Ohio Nutrient Mass Balance Study

December 2024






Figure 12 — Proportion of total phosphorus and nitrogen load from different sources for the Maumee watershed, an average of five years (wy19-wy23)

Ohio Commercial Fertilizer Sales (P2O5) from 1975 - 2016



Source: American Association of Plant Food Control Officials

Ohio Department of Agriculture

Public Record Request Response


October 2025

ODA Plant Health does not keep records of fertilizer used throughout the state.

ODA also do not regulate manure used as fertilizer.

H2Ohio, the program to reduce the amount of phosphorus & nitrogen in soil, water, streams and rivers doesn't have available stats to show improvement.

Inside factory “farms”



“Cage free”


Male chicks - day 1 16




Gestation crates



Farrowing crate



Open pens




Veal calves in crates



Lake Erie's perfect storm

- Shallowest, warmest Great Lake
- Highest concentration of subsurface drains
- Annual “toxic algal blooms”



Prasanth Valayamkunnath
National Center for Atmospheric Research
www.nature.com/articles/s41597-020-00596-x

Published 8/5/2020

Harmful Algal Blooms are GREEN!!



- **Overabundance of nutrients, primarily Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus (DRP) feed the microcystis bacteria, creating the toxic microcystin**
- **88% of excess nutrients in W. Lake Erie Basin from agriculture, >50% of that via subsurface drainage.**

* OEPA: Nutrient Mass Balance Study for Ohio's Major Rivers

** USDA and Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences: Phosphorus losses from monitored fields with conservation practices in the Lake Erie Basin

How toxic is Microcystin?



Toxin	Dosage Required to Kill 50% of Lab Rats
Dioxin	0.000001 mg/kg/d
<u>Microcystin LR</u> Liver toxin. Nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, fever and death in high doses	0.000003 mg/kg/d (3 millionth mg)
PCBs	0.00002 mg/kg/d
Methylmercury	0.0001 mg/kg/d
DDT	0.0005 mg/kg/d
Cyanide	0.02 mg/kg/d
Chlorine	0.1 mg/kg/d


Treating the water makes it drinkable, but...

- Chlorination produces **carcinogens like Trihalomethanes**. Reducing it with ozonation at Toledo Collins Water Treatment Plant added \$50M to water treatment costs in 2021.
- The water treated in Toledo that goes to your faucet is now safe to drink!

Source: Water Research Center

Now let's follow the manure...

3,900 cows at Bridgewater Dairy in Williams County, generate more waste every year than Perrysburg, Sylvania, Maumee, Defiance and Fremont, combined.



From manure lagoon to fields with no treatment...



Feces, urine, viruses, antibiotic-resistant E. coli, salmonella, blood, disinfectants, hormones, methane, ammonia, hydrogen sulfide, etc.

Photo: courtesy of
ECCSCM

...through the soil, to underground drainage or surface runoff...



Photo: courtesy of
ECCSCM

...into streams that feed Lake Erie...



Photo courtesy
ECCSCM

... poisoning our Great Lake.



What we're doing doesn't work

- H2Ohio Practices reduce sediment, nitrates and TP
- Liquid manure + subsurface drainage + H2Ohio often increase DRP




And here's the proof:

Maumee River in Waterville March - July

Flow-weighted mean concentrations (mg/L)


Total Particulate Phosphorus



— 5 – year running average

— Concentration goal

Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus



* LEA note

Lake Erie Advocates recommends:

- **Recognize nature has rights**
Water is life, not property.
- **There is no fixing this industry.**
Ban factory “farms!”


This is a political fight

- **Former OEPA Deputy Chief worked 19 years as Ohio Farm Bureau lobbyist.**
- **H2Ohio Best Mgt. Practices = Good money after bad**
- **Factory “farms” receive \$\$\$billions in public support. Sustainable farms do not!**
- **Big political decision: who will pay to clean up Lake Erie?**
 - **Farmers who’ve reduced their commercial fertilizer usage?**
 - **Water and sewer ratepayers who’ve already paid billions?**
 - **Factory “farm” corporations that use Lake Erie as a free toilet?**

www.LakeErieAdvocates.org

We can win... we've done it before!

- **In the 1960's Lake Erie was considered a dead lake.**
- **Concerned citizens demanded politicians do their jobs.**
- **Lake Erie was brought back to health!**
- **This time the problem is manure.**
- **The power of democracy can save Lake Erie again!**



www.LakeErieAdvocates.org

What you can do

Think about what you eat

Get involved with environmental groups

Talk to your politicians at the Ohio state level

We will not stop until Lake Erie is healthy!

www.LakeErieAdvocates.org



“Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has.”

Margaret Mead

*DONT GIVE UP
THE LAKE*

Lake Erie Advocates



The following slides are for background and discussion



Great Lakes Watershed



**Western Lake Erie
Watershed**



Mishka Henner, "Coronado Feeders, Dalhart, Texas," 2013

A Review on Effectiveness of Best Management Practices (BMP) in Improving Hydrology and Water Quality: Needs and Opportunities

"Increasing numbers of BMPs have been studied in research projects and implemented in [watershed management](#) projects, but a gap remains in quantifying their effectiveness through time. In this paper, we review the current knowledge about BMP efficiencies, which indicates that most empirical studies have focused on short-term efficiencies, while few have explored long-term efficiencies."

Yaoze Lin, Bernard A. Engel, Dennis C. Flanagan, Margaret W. Gitau, Sara K. McMillan, Indrajeet Chaubey
engelb@purdue.edu 765.494.1162

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0048969717313207?via%3Dihub>

Literature Citation	BMP's Reviewed	Reductions by BMP's	# Studies
Hoffman Et al 2009	Buffer Strips with overland flow	Dissolved Reactive P -71% to 95%	9
Dodd & Sharpley 2016	Buffer strips/ Constructed Wetlands	DRP -72% to 94%	6
	Grass Waterways	DRP -83% to 81%	2
Kay et al 2009	Buffer strips	DP -475% to 30%	11
	Wetlands	DP -33% to 33%	11
Roberts et al 2012	Vegetated Buffer strips	DRP -64% to 42.7%	5
Dinnes et al 2004	Drainage management	TP -100% to 50%	12
Dorioz 2006	Grass Buffer Strip	DP -83% to 93%	11

Cover crop and phosphorus fertilizer management effects on phosphorus loss and nutrient cycling

Carver, Robert Elliott 2018

<https://krex.k-state.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2097/39057/RobertCarver2018.pdf?sequence=3>

Phosphorus (P) loss from non-point agricultural sources has been identified as a main contributor to degraded surface water quality throughout the United States. Excessive P inputs to surface waters can lead to eutrophication, increased water treatment costs, and negative health impacts. Therefore, agricultural best management practices (BMP) that promote water quality, through minimizing P loss, must be identified. Studies outlined in this thesis aim to determine the impacts of cover crops and P fertilizer placement on P loss in surface runoff and nutrient cycling in a no-till corn (*Zea mays*)-soybean (*Glycine max*) rotation and provide insight into how cover crop species selection and termination method affects potential P loss from crop tissue. The first study examined combined effects of cover crop and P fertilizer placement on total P, dissolved reactive P (DRP) and sediment losses in surface runoff from natural precipitation events. This large-scale field study was conducted near Manhattan, Kansas, at the Kansas Agricultural Watershed (KAW) Field Laboratory during the 2016 and 2017 cropping years. Two levels of cover crop [**no cover crop (NC) and cover crop (CC)**] and three levels of P fertilizer management [no P (CN), fall broadcast P (FB), and spring injected P (SI)] were used. Flow-weighted composite from precipitation events generating greater than 2.0 mm of surface runoff. **Results from this study found the Cover Crop treatment increased DRP losses compared to No Cover Crop in both cropping years**; however, CC reduced sediment loss by over 50% compared to NC. Application of P fertilizer increased DRP losses compared CN in both cropping years, although SI resulted in lower quantities of DRP loss compared to FB. In addition, this study found that CC reduced biomass and yield of corn compared to NC and therefore decreased nutrient uptake, removal, and deposition during the 2017 cropping year. However, no negative impacts of CC on biomass or yield were observed during the 2015 (corn) and 2016 (soybean) cropping years. Application of P fertilizer increased the concentration of Melich-3 P and total P in the top 0-5 cm of soil compared to CN; however, no differences between P fertilizer management practice were observed for concentrations of Melich-3 P at 5-15 cm. A greenhouse-based study determined the impacts of cover crop species (brassica, grass, and legume), termination method (clipping, freezing, and herbicide), and time after termination (1, 7, and 14 days) on total P and water-extractable P (WEP) release from cover crop biomass. **Freezing increased WEP concentration of crop tissue by more than 140% compared to clipping and herbicide.** Additionally, at 7 and 14 days after termination, both concentration of WEP and fraction of WEP compared total P increased compared to 1 DAT. **Findings**

from these studies suggest the use of cover crops may unintentionally result in greater DRP losses in surface runoff. However, additional cover crop can dramatically reduce erosion losses. Understanding the impacts of crop species selection may help create new BMPs which aim to reduce P loss.



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE

Swine Manure Injection with Low-Disturbance Applicator and Cover Crops Reduce Phosphorus Losses

J.L. Kovar, T.B. Moorman, J.W. Singer, C.A. Cambardella, M.D. Tomer

Journal of environmental quality 2011 v.40 no.2 pp. 329-336

<https://pubag.nal.usda.gov/catalog/2329016>

Abstract:

Injection of liquid swine manure disturbs surface soil so that runoff from treated lands can transport sediment and nutrients to surface waters.

We determined the effect of two manure application methods on P fate in a corn (*Zea mays* L.)–soybean [*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.] production system, with and without a winter rye (*Secale cereale* L.)–oat (*Avena sativa* L.) cover crop.

Treatments included: i) no manure; ii) knife injection; and iii) low-disturbance injection, each with and without the cover crop.

Simulated rainfall runoff was analyzed for **dissolved reactive P (DRP) and total P (TP)**. Rainfall was applied 8 d after manure application (early November) and again in May after emergence of the corn crop.

Manure application increased soil bioavailable P in the 20- to 30-cm layer following knife injection and in the 5- to 20-cm layer following low-disturbance injection. The low-disturbance system caused less damage to the cover crop, so that P uptake was more than threefold greater.

Losses of DRP were greater in both fall and spring following low-disturbance injection; however, In spring, DRP losses were significantly higher from plots with the recently killed cover crop. ~~but Fall TP losses not affected.~~ ~~Low-disturbance application of swine manure into a standing cover crop can minimize plant damage and P losses in surface runoff while providing optimum P availability to a subsequent agronomic crop.~~



"Phosphorus losses from monitored fields with conservation practices in the Lake Erie Basin, USA"
<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13280-014-0624-6/fulltext.html>

Authors: [Smith, Douglas](#); Francesconi, Wendy; [Livingston, Stanley](#); [Huang, Chi Hua](#)
Prepared by: United States Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service

From the Abstract:

No-tillage doubled SP loading compared to rotational tillage (e.g., tilled only before planting corn); however, no-tillage decreased TP loading by 69 % compared to rotational tillage. Similarly, **grassed waterways were shown to increase SP loads**, but not TP loads. **A corn–soybean–wheat–oat rotation reduced SP loads by 85 % and TP loads by 83 % compared to the standard corn–soybean rotation in the region.** We can potentially attain TP water quality goals using these Farm Bill practices; however, additional strategies must be employed to meet these goals for SP.

Subsurface tile

Early work with tile suggested that little P was transported via this pathway (Kladivko et al. 1991; Brady and Weil 1999). However, more recent work indicates that **significant amounts of P (40–50 %) can be transported through subsurface tile** (Schoumans and Breeuwsmma 1997; King et al. 2014). Recent work in Belgium has shown that P leaching in watersheds occurs quicker than previously recognized (de Bolle et al. 2013). In a study of transport pathway from the fields used in the current study **20–80 % of the P lost was via the tile network** (Smith et al. 2014). Hodgkinson and Withers (2007) found that **between 31 and 55 % of P loss in three English headwater catchments occurred via tile drainage**. None of the conservation practices tested made an impact on concentrations and loads of SP or TP through subsurface tile discharge. **Many conservation practices, including no-tillage, grassed waterway, and blind inlets, were primarily designed to minimize erosion from agricultural fields.**

Conclusion:

Most of the conservation practices applied to fields were developed to decrease sediment loss from fields. While sediment losses were not explored in this paper, **when these practices were developed, the common knowledge was that if you stop the sediment you will stop the P. This mindset has been disproven.** No-tillage decreased surface runoff TP loads by 223 g ha⁻¹ compared to rotational tillage, but **SP was nearly double from no-tillage.** Soluble P and TP were 34 and 52 g ha⁻¹ less in surface runoff and tile discharge from the conservation crop rotation than the corn–soybean rotation. Grassed waterways decreased SP by 67 g ha⁻¹ and TP by 42 g ha⁻¹ in surface runoff. Blind inlets decreased SP and TP loads in surface runoff by 14 and 87 mg L⁻¹, respectively, compared to the tile risers.

Between 2005 and 2013, there were 36,112 ha of conservation practices applied within the 281,232 ha St. Joseph River watershed. On the land base of applied conservation practices, we estimate that SP was decreased from 2010 to 1670 kg P per growing season and TP was decreased from 15 200 to 6400 kg per growing season. This represents a decrease of 17 and 58 % in SP and TP loads, respectively, for the treated acres. Adoption of these practices on many fields predates the 2005–2013 period when we were able to collect these records, so it is difficult to discern how many more acres would need adoption of these practices to achieve the goal of a 39 % decrease in total P loading; however, it does appear that this level could be achieved through adoption of these practices. **However, based on the relatively low impact on SP, it does not appear adoption of these practices will achieve the target of a 41 % decrease in SP loading to Lake Erie.** Thus, our results concur with other reports in that greater adoption of these practices in addition to new strategies will need to be adopted in order to achieve water quality goals.

Phosphorus Mitigation to Control River Eutrophication: Murky Waters, Inconvenient Truths, and “Postnormal” Science


[Helen P. Jarvie](#), [Andrew N. Sharpley](#), [Paul J. A. Withers](#), [J. Thad Scott](#), [Brian E. Haggard](#), [Colin Neal](#) March 2013

<https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2012.0085>

For watershed management, P is regarded as the primary limiting nutrient for nuisance algal growth in freshwaters ([Smith and Schindler, 2009](#)), and over the last 40 years, mitigating P inputs from wastewater (point) and agricultural (nonpoint) sources has been adopted as the main watershed management tool to control freshwater eutrophication ([Daniel et al., 1994](#); [Sharpley et al., 1994](#)).

However, eutrophication-control policies based solely on P are coming under increasing scrutiny as **evidence to support ecological improvements with P-based mitigation is proving elusive, especially regarding costly measures to reduce P loads from agriculture. Over the past four decades, many watershed nonpoint source projects have reported little or, in some cases, no net improvement in P loss reduction, even after extensive best management practice (BMP) implementation** ([Meals et al., 2010](#)). In some cases, reduced P concentrations, largely associated with point-source P controls, have resulted in improvements in river ecology ([Bowes et al., 2011](#); [Kelly and Wilson, 2004](#)). **In other cases, however, even after dramatic reductions in river-water P concentrations have been achieved through P source mitigation, ecological improvements have not occurred and, in some instances, nuisance algal growth has actually increased** ([Bowes et al., 2012](#)). **the successes and benefits of water resource management, river restoration, and agri-environment have proved elusive** ([Bernhardt and Palmer, 2011](#); [Harris, 2012](#); [Harris and Heathwaite, 2012](#)) widely,

Of all Earth's Water in 100 glasses, 97 are saltwater



All Earth's usable, fresh water

**Surface
water**



**Ground
water**

All Earth's usable, fresh, surface water


All other lakes
and streams
60%



→ Lake Baikal 20%

→ 5 Great Lakes 20%

Lake Erie's share of Earth's usable, fresh, surface water: 19 Drops



Your Tax Dollars At Work

Grand Lake St. Mary's



Celina Daily Standard 4-27-2018

