

BMPVAHAT Wetlands Recommendation Vote

Role	Affiliation	Member	Vote	Notes
Signatory Members	PA	Lisa Beatty	Endorse	
	VA	James Martin	Stand Aside	
	DC	Matt Gallagher	Endorse	
	DE	Clare Sevcik	Endorse	
	WV	Alana Hartman	Stand Aside	Our decision is based on the legal protection of the acreage in perpetuity and programmatic responsibility to correct deficiencies. In those cases, removing the verification requirement is fine.
	NY	Cassie Davis	Endorse	
	MD	Elizabeth Hoffman	Endorse	
	CBC	Adrienne F. Kotula	Stand Aside	
	EPA	Suzanne Trevena	Hold *	EPA offers the following proposal to the Wetlands Workgroup recommendation: EPA will support the wetlands workgroup recommendation to allow wetland creation, rehabilitation, and restoration BMPs to remain in perpetuity in the BMP record, until such time that the technology is available to use mapping tools that more accurately portray land use changes and determine wetland gains and losses in the Bay watershed. EPA would like to go on record that it has concerns with assuming any practice will remain in perpetuity without verification or data to justify the change in BMP expert panel recommendations. Given the advancements in land cover mapping of wetlands, for example the recent results published by the Chesapeake Conservancy in the journal Science of the Total Environment, EPA would support this recommendation to allow those 3 wetland BMPs to remain in the BMP record, with the commitment that the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership will explore utilization of mapping technology to track the these practices in the future, when the technology is readily available.
At Large Members	CBF	Joe Wood	Agree w Reservations	My reservation are as follows, A. that that this extension is temporary and will lead to a similar decision point at a scheduled time prior to the release of the next model, and B. that this extension applies only to credits with regulatory programs in place to provide oversight to these practices. C. There should be confirmation that the regulatory programs does in fact regularly provide oversight via inspections etc. (rather than simply having the authority to do so). Qualitative data or description of regulatory programs and how they do site checks/inspections.
	GEC	Dana York	Endorse	
	USDA	Leon Tillman	Endorse	
	DoD	Kevin Du Bois	Endorse	
	USFS	Katie Brownson	Stand Aside	
	AgWG	Jeremy Daubert	Stand Aside	
	USWG	Normand Goulet	Stand Aside	

Workgroups	FWG	Rebecca Hanmer	Agree w Reservations	<p>There are many natural and artificial reasons why healthy wetlands may not persist over time. As you may recall, I tried to start a conversation about how NRCS follow-up visits or reviews could be picked up in the Bay system, so they could also be counted as "verification" for our purposes -- but to no avail.</p> <p>Was trying to figure out a way to have a verification like that we hope will work for forest -- a credit life for a set period of time followed by use of remote sensing to assess forest gain and loss over time. I wanted to support a 30-year credit life for wetlands projects, however, I understood from the conversation that such a system was infeasible for wetlands.</p> <p>Hence, I have finally agreed to the proposal with reservations. I marked "no" for limiting the system to federally-funded projects because we want to encourage and credit non-federal conservancies.</p>
	WTWG	Ruth Cassilly	Stand Aside	
	LUWG	KC Filippino	Stand Aside	<p>My concern is always about putting any BMP in perpetuity. Regs can change at the state and fed levels. It may be good to put in a caveat that at some point in time there should be an analysis conducted to reconcile the acreage based on BMPs in the model and actual wetland acres obtained from better land use data if/when it's available. Comparing those estimates could be helpful at some point in the future, maybe during Phase 7 development, and then this decision could be re-visited.</p>
	WWG	Todd Lutte	Endorse	
CBP Advisory Committees	CAC	Matt Ehrhart	Stand Aside	
	STAC	N/A		
	LGAC	Jennifer Starr	Stand Aside	LGAC defers to experts.

* In May 2023, EPA's modification was incorporated into the proposal, and they changed their vote from a "hold" to an "agree with reservations" - meaning the decision item reached consensus in the group and got full approval from the membership.