

**Chesapeake Bay Program Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
BMP Verification Committee's February 21, 2013 Meeting**

Attachment P

Verification Issues for Committee Discussion and Resolution

ISSUE: Confirmation of all the elements of a basinwide verification framework to go forward to the PSC for review and adoption on behalf of the larger partnership. [Committee Chair]

ISSUE: Addressing concerns raised about use of 'self certification' based verification procedures. [Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)]

ISSUE: The CBP's verification program doesn't address the 25-30% of nitrogen load from air deposition. This is of particular concern during a time period when the national atmospheric monitoring stations are being cut back. [Review Panel]

ISSUE: How to address the verification of practices which cross two or more source sectors and habitats. [Review Panel, Committee Members]

- Riparian forest buffers: Agriculture, Forestry and Urban Stormwater workgroups
- Tree planting: Agriculture, Forestry and Urban Stormwater workgroups
- Wetlands: Agriculture, Urban Stormwater, and Wetlands workgroups
- Other cross sector practices?

ISSUE: Addressing any remaining large inconsistencies between the workgroup's recommended draft final verification protocols as outlined in the cross-workgroup comparison matrix. [Review Panel]

ISSUE: Clarity in the BMP verification decision making processes and exact decision makers. [CAC, PSC, Committee members]

- Principals' Staff Committee (PSC) review and approval of the verification principles
- PSC review and adoption of the BMP verification framework and its components
 - Original set of six BMP verification protocols
 - Jurisdiction specific procedures for eliminating double counting
 - Basinwide agreements to ensuring full access to federal cost share practice data
 - Procedures for the clean-up of historical BMP databases
 - Partnership process for evaluating and adopting future BMP verification protocols and procedures
 - Communications strategy

- PSC approval of the jurisdictions' verification programs based on review/recommendations from the BMP Review Panel.
- EPA review and approval of the jurisdictions' quality assurance plans submitted under their CBIG and CBRAP grants.

ISSUE: Process/schedule for ramping up enhancement of jurisdictional verification programs and how to handle the crediting of verified practices during this transition period. [Committee members]

ISSUE: Partnership process for evaluating and adopting future BMP verification protocols and procedures. [CAC, Committee members]

Here's the options put forth in the recent response to the Citizen's Advisory Committee's December 17, 2012 letter addressed to Nick DiPasquale:

- Making the BMP Verification Review Panel a permanent CBP Partnership mechanism for ongoing verification protocol review.
- Enhancing the membership make-up of and charge to the existing BMP expert panels sufficiently to incorporate both verification expertise and responsibility into the ongoing and future work of these panels. Currently, these expert panels deal with development, review, and recommendation adoption of new or revised BMPs. If this is done, we recognize we will need to amend the Partnership's existing *Protocol for the Development, Review, and Approval of Loading and Effectiveness Estimates for Nutrient and Sediment Controls in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model*, adopted by the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team on March 15, 2010, to specifically address BMP verification.
- Offering some alternative valuation mechanism for review and approval of future verification protocols and procedures not yet adopted by the Partnership through the current process underway. Given the current BMP expert panels' charges for determination of BMP efficiencies and load reduction effectiveness is different from the accounting necessary to verify BMP implementation, a different document or approach may be required.

ISSUE: Long term evaluation process to ensure periodic assessment of the effectiveness of the collective verification protocols and procedures put in place. [STAC, CAC]

ISSUE: Call for heightened transparency in the verification process itself and the underlying data. [CAC]

ISSUE: The public needs to understand that costs were consideration of the development of the BMP verification protocols and that the resulted verified BMP data were used by the partnership is directly support program implementation. This will all help make case that the Partnership is are being realistic and considering costs while making decisions on verification. [Review Panel]