

News From:
Advocates for a Clean Lake Erie



Contact:
Mike Ferner 419-729-7273

Statement from Advocates for a Clean Lake Erie for immediate release December 15, 2020

**WHY DO OHIO REGULATORS, FARM BUREAU AND “ENVIRONMENTALISTS” CHEER
H2OHIO?
Lake Erie continues to worsen every year as Ohio approves more animal feeding factories**

As reported in [today's Toledo Blade](#), Ohio officials and the pseudo-environmental groups lending support are patting themselves on the back, claiming success for the H2Ohio program. They should cease and desist for the following reasons:

- No one, from farmers to state department heads to the governor can tell whether the programs funded by H2Ohio are working because systems to adequately measure the “before and after” effects do not exist.
- H2Ohio programs are all voluntary, with no accountability in place to even determine much less guarantee results.

Based on authoritative research,* ACLE has [pointed out repeatedly](#) that H2Ohio is [fraudulent](#) and wastes millions of taxpayer dollars. The most common programs it pays for – such as no-till, buffer strips, grassed waterways and manure injection – do not reduce soluble (or dissolved or reactive) phosphorus going into waterways and can actually increase it.

So why do state officials and role-playing environmentalists who want to rub shoulders with them continue to applaud this program when there is no proof it works? We've seen it before: good old, corrupt Ohio politics:

- 1) Corporate agriculture funds the Ohio Farm Bureau and the OFB controls the key players in Ohio's legislature who write laws that too often are administered by former corporate lobbyists taking their turn in state regulatory agencies.
- 2) Politicians then hope empty efforts like H2Ohio will convince the public “something” is being done to protect Lake Erie. Unfortunately, however, the only thing protected is the ability of polluters to keep using our lake as a free toilet for some [25,000,000 confined animals](#).

Lake Erie is not improving and in fact continues to get worse as more and more animal feeding factories are approved. The question is, will Ohioans demonstrate enough concern for our Great Lake to drown out corrupt politics?

-end-

* **“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 report Abstract:

No-tillage doubled SP (soluble Phosphorus) loading compared to rotational tillage (e.g., tilled only before planting corn); however, no-tillage decreased TP (total Phosphorus) 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.

From the report:

Subsurface tile

Early work with tile suggested that little P was transported via this pathway (Kladvivko 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 Breeuwsmas [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.

From the report:

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.

...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.