

**Chesapeake Bay Program Water Quality Goal Implementation Team  
BMP Verification Committee's March 13, 2013 Meeting**

**Attachment B**

**Staging/Ramping up Jurisdictional Implementation of  
Their Enhanced BMP Verification Programs**

**Background**

The BMP Verification Committee as well as the BMP Verification Review Panel and the Partnership's Citizens Advisory Committee have all pointed to the need for Partnership decisions on how individual jurisdictions can stage/ramp up implementation of enhancements to their existing BMP verification programs over time. Key to initiating a more focused discussion is presentation of findings from the recent analysis of the most commonly applied BMPs and the most reduction effective BMPs.

To help structure this discussion and lead to framing out a recommend approach to staging/ramping up implementation, the following set of questions are posed for Committee discussion and consideration. A series of assumptions are also presented to confirm or clarify the thinking of the collective Committee membership.

**Questions and Assumptions**

- Are we thinking that a jurisdiction could identify a subset of practices, based on the type of information being presented by Jeff Sweeney and Matt Johnston to the Committee, which are the most commonly applied/most pollutant reduction effective and initially focus enhancement of its verification program strictly on those practices?
- Confirm the ultimate intent is to put in place verification protocols for all practices, treatment and technologies yielding nutrient and sediment load reductions (or prevention in the first place) tracked and reported for credit at some point in time.
- If not, what is the ultimate objective?
- Are we all comfortable with establishing some 'grace period' over which all the jurisdictions would stage or ramp up over time the enhancements to their existing BMP verification programs and still get credit for the full suite of BMP they are tracking and reporting?
- Who establishes the grace period? The jurisdictions through the documentation of their enhanced verification program? This Committee through its recommendations ultimately to the Principals' Staff Committee? A combination of both in the form of guidance

agreed to by the Partnership and the jurisdictions applying that guidance in formulating enhancements to their existing verification programs?

- What's our ultimate timing for having the full suite of tracked and reported practices verified using protocols approved by the Partnership through programs reviewed by the Panel and agreed to by the Principals' Staff Committee?
- At what point does the Partnership agree that if a jurisdiction tracks and reports a practice which has not be verified, the jurisdiction would not be credited for that reported practice?
- During the process of staging or ramping up the enhancements to the jurisdictions' existing BMP verification programs (aka the 'grace period'), how do we handle crediting of practices previously not reported/credited due to their non-cost shared or voluntary nature and lack any actual verification of implementation?
- So what have we all agreed as the key elements of a staged/ramped up implementation process and corresponding set of expectations we want to bring forward to the Panel and the rest of the Partnership for their review, feedback and ultimate decision-making?

### **Requested Actions by the Verification Committee**

**ACTION:** Reach agreement on the above assumptions and as many answers to the posed questions as possible.

**ACTION:** Reach agreement on the overall framework for staging/ramping up implementation of the jurisdictions' enhanced verification programs.

**ACTION:** Reach agreement on the next steps on further fleshing out and sharing this framework.