

BMP Verification Ad-Hoc Action Team (BMPVAHAT)

Meeting Minutes

July 9th, 2021

9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Meeting materials: [link](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The BMPVAHAT approved the meeting minutes from the [April](#), [May](#), and [June](#) meetings.

Decision: The BMP Verification Ad-Hoc Action Team voted to support* the following recommendation from the FWG: Extend the credit durations for the practices listed below from 10 to 15 years: Forest Buffers, Forest Buffers Exclusion, Forest Buffers Exclusion Narrow, Forest Buffers Narrow, Forest Buffers Urban, Tree Planting, and Urban Tree Planting. ***Note:** *There were stand aside votes and concerns raised by the group. The BMPVAHAT will brief the WQGIT on the concerns raised and the limits of our “support”.*

Action: For those with reservations towards supporting the Forestry WG recommendation, please email Vanessa Van Note (vannote.vanessa@epa.gov) a record of your concerns.

Action: Vanessa Van Note, EPA, will verify the decision made in the WTWG about the inclusion of CTA practices in the CAST model.

9:00 **Welcome, Introductions, Roll Call**, *Elliott Kellner, Chair (WVU)*

- Welcome & Roll Call of participants
- **Decision:** The BMPVAHAT approved the meeting minutes from the [April](#), [May](#), and [June](#) meetings.
- **Announcement** – Coordination with NRCS, *Elliott Kellner, Chair (WVU)*
- **Announcement** – Back-Out and Cut-Off due to Land Use Update from WTWG, *Vanessa Van Note, WTWG Coordinator*
- **Announcement** – Wetland Restoration, *Vanessa Van Note (Coordinator)*
- **Announcement** – Grass Buffers, *Vanessa Van Note (Coordinator)*
- **Announcement** – Compiling Solutions to Verification Challenges Effort, *Vanessa Van Note (Coordinator)*
- **Next Meeting: Friday, August 13th, 9:00 am to 11:00 am**

Leon Tillman: Will the “Compiling Solutions to Verification Challenges Effort” be something you can share with federal agencies to get an understanding of the various jurisdictional issues?

Vanessa Van Note: Yes, absolutely. Once the jurisdictions agree that it can be shared, the purpose is to use it as a resource.

James Martin: It might be worth sharing with the WTWG. The jurisdictional leads in the WTWG might be a better resource in filling out that information.

Vanessa Van Note: Good point, I’ll bring this to the WTWG.

9:15 **Update from the FWG on Forest and Tree Planting BMP Credit Durations**, *Sally Claggett, FWG, All (15 min).*

Sally will give a brief update on the FWG decision to extend forest and tree planting BMP credit durations. The BMPVAHAT will then vote on the decision item below.

Decision: The BMP Verification Ad-Hoc Action Team voted to support* the following recommendation from the FWG: Extend the credit durations for the practices listed below from 10 to 15 years:

- Forest Buffers
- Forest Buffers Exclusion
- Forest Buffers Exclusion Narrow
- Forest Buffers Narrow
- Forest Buffers Urban
- Tree Planting
- Urban Tree Planting

***Note:** There were stand aside votes and concerns raised by the group. The BMPVAHAT will brief the WQGIT on the concerns raised and the limits of our “support”.

Leon Tillman: I noticed there’s not a recommendation for a LU conversion credit after 15 years. Can you explain that?

Sally Claggett: After 15 years the land cover for the CAST model will be picking that up as a conversion from turf to trees, so we didn’t want to double count. It refers back to our backout discussion in previous months.

Leon Tillman: Got it, thanks.

Lisa Beatty: In your table, under Ag tree planting and the column ‘proposed’, it says ‘15 years, then modeled as land use’. In comparison to Urban forest buffer which just says “15 years”. Can you explain that?

Sally Claggett: Sure, I didn’t put that notation for the urban section because those will have the upslope credit indefinitely. We are going to go back and verify those if folks are going to get the upslope efficiency. For other ones, there’s no upslope efficiency so after 15 years it would be captured by the land cover and there would be no effort to verify.

Lisa Beatty: Can you add that in that column so it’s more clear?

Sally Claggett: Sure, I’ll add it in the summary section.

Lisa Beatty: If these new credit durations go into effect, will that capture the ones that have already dropped out of the model with credit duration? Will that retroactively work?

Sally Claggett: Honestly, I don’t know.

James Martin: My thought is yes, because this will go into a new version of CAST. When they update the new versions of CAST, they update the entire history, so the new rules would apply.

Lisa Beatty: Let’s verify with the WTWG.

Vanessa Van Note: So once this is approved, we can go back to the WTWG and ask how it will be applied, but I have the same understanding as James.

Jess Rigelman: Yes we do rerun the BMP history and all of the rules would be applied.

Norm Goulet: Sally, how are we defending the fact that the MS4 urban plantings will have to be regularly vetted on a 5 year basis versus an Ag USDA contract which is only going to be once every 15 years.

Sally Claggett: Yes, there is more stringent verification needed for MS4. For Ag, the revisits during the contract period varies. There are both NRCS and FSA that go back at different intervals, then we have our state partners to make sure they get established, through programs like CREP. This isn’t something

that is very consistent across the board. It's difficult to get a handle on that and we're continuing to work on it. For the ag buffers that have contracts, we have a lot of reason to believe that they're continuing to be in place.

Norm Goulet: But your documentation shows a half life of 50 percent, which means 50 percent are disappearing in that area.

Sally Claggett: In urban areas, yes.

Norm Goulet: It seems the same thing is occurring whether it's urban or ag, and we're setting up different rules here for different people.

Sally Claggett: Keep in mind, however, that trees are densely planted in urban areas. There's always an expectation of a certain amount of mortality as trees mature, especially for urban areas. Initially we are requiring 300 trees per acre for urban areas (it used to be 100) because that mortality is expected.

Norm Goulet: Thank you.

KC Filippino: If we're currently measuring land use change every 2 years and we see that there's change over time of tree canopy disappearing or something like that, what if that change is exceeding what is actually on the ground because the credit duration is 15 years.

Sally Claggett: I'm not as familiar with the land use change product. I'm more familiar with the 5 year land cover, the new high resolution land cover change. And I think we really need the high resolution to pick up that level of sensitivity. But that is a concern of ours. When we lose tree cover we lose it instantly, and when we gain it, we gain it gradually. So there can be a disconnect. I can't speak to the 2 year change product - is it high resolution?

KC Filippino: Currently we're using the 5 year change product but we're going to be revisiting it in two years. I can't remember if it's a two year or a five year time step.

Sally Claggett: Well it's definitely an issue that we need to keep an eye on when we get new data.

KC Filippino: We won't have an accuracy assessment until 2022 either.

Norm Goulet: From planting to full forest, I thought Peter said it would take at least 13 years.

Sally Claggett: I think that was the work that Iris did. That's a complicating factor.

Norm Goulet: I have a procedural question - why are we voting on this?

Elliott Kellner: We had the same question. Ultimately, WQGIT leadership told us that since the issue of credit duration extensions was part of the MB charge this item needed to run through our group. It will still go to the WQGIT regardless.

Bill Tharpe: So it's technically a vote of support instead of approval.

Norm Goulet: I vote no. I haven't seen the evidence.

James Martin: Are we only considering the credit duration aspect or are we also being asked to support the practice lifespan columns?

Elliott Kellner: As I understand it, we are only voting on the credit duration extensions.

KC Filippino: I'm going to object based on LU/LC and I'm just not convinced we have all of that worked out.

James Martin: Can you expand on that? Credit duration is more about when the practices drop out of the model.

KC Filippino: Right, but if this is all suggesting that it will be picked up in LU based on measured or modeled LU change data which is based on LC data, and I'm not comfortable with the LC data, or the LU change product for that matter.

James Martin: I definitely share your concerns there. But whether the model picks it up or not is less important than what the appropriate credit duration is here.

KC Filippino: But what's being proposed is that after 15 years, it will be picked up.

James Martin: Right I see your point.

Elliott Kellner: So, I share your concerns, but if the credit duration is not extended, then the jurisdictions are losing credits for the practices five years sooner than they would otherwise if those practices are not picked up as land use change by the model.

Norm Goulet: Out of verification, yes. But the whole point of this process was to assure that what we're sticking in the model was actually there. And we're taking the shortcut by saying well it's modeled land use and we're picking it up in the land cover analysis, but if it's taking 15 years for that to show up then we're not actually verifying anything.

Jill Whitcomb: I understand your concern there Norm. I think it may be partially due to different rules being applied depending upon the sector. Is that the basis of your concern?

Norm Goulet: I've seen plenty of evidence that when these contracts are in place in any sector, all you see are saplings instead of a forest being developed.

Jill Whitcomb: Is that anecdotal evidence? Or statistics?

Norm Goulet: More anecdotal.

Jill Whitcomb: I think that's part of the issue here is that we have concerns over what some of us see happening on the landscape versus what we're getting credit for as management actions in the model, knowing that neither one is perfect. I hear all the time that the model is supposed to be used as a planning tool. I see this credit duration aspect, specifically as it relates to natural practices like forest buffers, as a need to have better reliability on what we think is happening based on what has been done. It goes to the fact that we can't continue to zero out practices automatically and can't allow it in for perpetuity either, so there has to be a middle ground. Hopefully after 15 years the information will be picked up in the mapped LU/LC. But to zero them out for 5 whole years causes our BMP numbers to drastically drop, and it doesn't help jurisdictions or communities with their planning.

Norm Goulet: I agree with everything you said. But the key phrase is "what we think is happening" - and the easiest way around that is to put resources into to inspect and verify what is happening.

Jill Whitcomb: It's not so simple in the non-urban setting, though. Jurisdictions are at a disadvantage without knowing where things are located. It's really important that we're not punishing our local communities and landowners for the way things are set up policy wise or procedurally just because we don't know where these practices are. The FWG provided justification for lengthening credit durations, that is better information that we had 10 years ago. It speaks to whether or not we have better information now than before.

Elliott Kellner: To Norm's point - it seems to me that with these LU change forest buffer BMPs, we have a backstop that we don't have with our structural BMPs. Because if after 15 years we have small dead saplings, it won't be picked up by the LC model and it will drop out of the model. So we have that backstop specifically with the forest BMPs that we may not have with structural BMPs.

Norm Goulet: It's treated differently though because the credit is given immediately upon the planting, even though they take years to mature to the point where it's achieving that credit.

James Martin: It's also important to note though that a vast majority of the credit received for these practices is from taking it out of its original land use. For example, the difference in reduction from an ag grass buffer to an ag forest buffer is incrementally more, so just taking it out of ag production gets you most of the benefit. Planting a tree gets you just that much more.

Elliott Kellner: I agree. If within the context of these items, we start considering additional concerns like BMP performance or the way practices are in the model, it seems tangential to the actual decision or point we're trying to make. We can fly off the rails if we start talking generally about the effectiveness of forest BMPs and how they're being credited.

KC Filippino: I keep going back to what Sally said about the different ways Ag and urban practices are treated differently. Is it possible to keep urban at 10 and change Ag to 15? Can we revisit this after we have the LU/LC?

Bill Tharpe: Well that's not the recommendation from the forestry workgroup. I don't think we're being asked to make changes on what they've already worked on.

James Martin: Urban forest planting practice is already a 15 year credit duration.

Norm Goulet: Well that all went through the FWG. I guess I'll change my vote to stand aside. Ultimately, there is a problem with the structural integrity of the system, with USDA and forest service, and some of the other ways we implement BMPs in the watershed.

KC Filippino: I will change to a stand aside as well.

Vanessa Van Note: We will brief the WQGIT leadership on the concerns raised by the group, even though we technically came to a consensus in supporting the decision made by the FWG.

Rebecca Hanmer: As chair of the FWG I want to address Norm's concerns. The key of the issues of buffers is what's happening to those trees in 5 years. The difference between 10 and 15 years is not the key if the buffers are thriving at five years. The buffers are established where the states have any money that they're putting into the buffers or where there are NGOs involved, then we're able to do that verification aside from the NRCS where the state would not have access to the farmer because it's completely funded by NRCS or CREP. That's why we need the help of the agricultural contract system to be a part of verification. It's a little harsh to say that NRCS is continuing to pay for buffers that don't exist.

Leon Tillman: That's accurate. With these federal contracts, especially with the buffers that are implemented through CREP because those are contracts that are receiving payments multiple years, 10 or 15 years, those are checked and have reviews during that lifespan so to remove that or to reduce credit on those federal practices would be damaging to how those contracts actually manage with the ag producers.

Norm Goulet: Are the contracts 10 years or 15?

Leon Tillman: Depends on program and producer. There are some that are 10 years that can re enroll and it afterwards.

Rebecca: We were told that the normal CREP timeframe was 15 years for a contract.

Leon Tillman: I do think that's correct on the continuous CRP, but it depends on the program.

Norm Goulet: So we could run into the situation where we have a ten year contract but we're extending the credit duration to 15 years. In that five year timeframe, that farmer could have erased that buffer but they would still be getting credit.

Leon Tillman: From my experience, it's rare that producers remove an established forest buffer after it's been implemented.

Elliott Kellner: Removing a forest buffer is pretty labor intensive, compared to, say, a grass buffer.

Mark Dubin: It was the ten year contracts that were the basis for what the ag group recommended originally for the 10 year lifespan. To address the comment about the removal of forest buffers, the aspect when it comes to riparian forest buffers in pasture areas, that's where we see that potential for grazing to occur within the area, not necessarily removing trees.

Action: For those with reservations towards supporting the Forestry WG recommendation, please email Vanessa Van Note (vannote.vanessa@epa.gov) a record of your concerns.

Partial/Diminishing Credit, Vanessa Van Note, Coordinator, All (45 min).

Vanessa led a group discussion on partial/diminishing credit to gauge members' level of support for this change.

- **Mentimeter** Results: Are you in support of continuing discussion on partial/diminishing credit?
 - Yes - 16 votes

- No - 2 votes
- Need more discussion to decide - 4 votes

Emily Dekar: In NY, we don't currently use the data we get from NRCS because of the way our verification program is set up, but for those that do use that, can you distinguish between federally funded and non federally funded practices?

Bill Tharpe: In Maryland we can.

Jill Whitcomb (in chat): Yes, as part of our QAPP and our reporting framework, we need to be able to identify if practices are funded by NRCS or FSA and where they are not.

Olivia Devereux: I think the only states that use that data directly are Virginia, Delaware, and Pennsylvania.

Jill Whitcomb: In PA, it comes down to ensuring we are not duplicate reporting. That's one of the reasons we believe there are gaps, because of the threat of double counting, but over time we've been able to identify what practices are funded by USDA vs other funding sources. Some of it comes down to the CTA aspect, which can't be reported by USDA for jurisdictional reports because of the BMP Verification Framework, so those CTA practices may or may not be. But otherwise there is a way to see that. If we see that a practice is being funded even partially by NRCS then we don't report it, we only rely on the aggregate data provided to us by USGS.

Vanessa Van Note: Jill, how is PA able to distinguish between the practices?

Jill Whitcomb: We have a funding code in PracticeKeeper that we enter in.

Vanessa Van Note: What about DE and VA?

James Martin: For VA, we can distinguish between them in our VA database, but I'm not sure if that transfers into NEIEN. I think the answer is yes. Olivia, do you know?

Olivia Devereux: It only matters that you can distinguish between them so that you're not double counting.

James Martin: Well yes, but without the point specific data in both the state and federal dataset, it's difficult to precisely know if you've accounted for duplicate reporting. Also, if we were to try and apply partial credit to only our NRCS/federally funded practices, then NEIEN would have to be able to know which those are.

Olivia Devereux: NEIEN can differentiate as long as you submit that information.

James Martin: That wouldn't make it show up as a federal lands implementation, right?

Olivia Devereux: Right, it doesn't change what goes into CAST, it just means that you could enter in a funding source. It's been an optional datafield so I don't think VA has used it but it's available to us if we want.

James Martin: So if we were to move forward with the partial credit option of it only being applied to NRCS/federally funded practices, then that datafield would then have to become required.

Loretta Collins: Would you have to go in and fill that field in retroactively then?

Jess Rigelman: Yes, that's correct. We could still keep it as an optional field. If it's not filled in then partial credit wouldn't be available to it but if you wanted partial credit then that information would have to be submitted.

Jill Whitcomb: To clarify on CTA, that is not PA specific. Olivia, do states receive CTA reported practices from USGS?

Olivia Devereux: I provide all CTA data and anyone can provide it to the Bay Program if they choose to. Most states choose not to in order to avoid duplication.

Jill Whitcomb: Appendix F on page 17 in the BMP Verification Framework notes that CTA records are prohibited. It reads: *"Although the CTA records might provide a useful measure of conservation practices implemented without federal financial assistance, currently the CBP partnership has decided to prohibit the inclusion of these data in the Annual Progress review until they can confirm that the practices meet*

NRCS practice standards and specifications, and protocols are established for ensuring that the records are not double counted. The CTA practices were identified in the NRCS dataset by program name Conservation Technical Assistance General.”

Olivia Devereux: Yes, the data that USGS provides has CTA in a separate tab of the spreadsheet. Since the Framework was published, the WTWG has revisited the inclusion of CTA practices. The clause in the Appendix isn't out of date, it just notes that in order to use the CTA data, you have to prove that the practices meet NRCS standards and you have to show how you're not double counting.

James Martin: Don't you also have to have verification for the installation as well?

Leon Tillman: Yes, for CTA when we're counting that practice we do ensure that it meets our standards and specifications. Do we need to look at an update to the BMP Verification Framework?

Olivia Devereux: Well there is a clause in there that says if you can keep the CTA separate from other practices then it's fine to report.

Vanessa Van Note: I will have to go back and find the decision in the WTWG minutes. If we need to update it, then it needs to be revisited by the WTWG.

Elliott Kellner: Can we hear from those who maintain reservations about partial credit?

Loretta Collins: My understanding is that the nougat of the issue is not what was charged to this group. The driving force behind all of this is the verification process in general and what is expected from the states. I feel like the credit duration issue got caught up in all of that as a red herring.

James Martin: My interpretation of the original report that led to the development of verification was not that they thought the model was under reporting or over reporting BMPs, it was just that they couldn't tell. We didn't have enough information to know if the model was accurately representing the BMPs on the ground. The assumption was that we needed to put much stricter controls on the data that goes into the model. In my view we have less representative data in our model now than perhaps we did before. In summary, I think we need to let the pendulum slide back. One way we would do that is through partial credit, so I'm supportive.

Dana York: I would agree with partial credit if states support it.

Jill Whitcomb: This is more or less a band aid on the wound of at least trying to give us some additional time to work through the challenges we face with not knowing where practices are located. I see partial credit as a step forward to addressing our concerns with verification, but not the end of the road. Even though a phased-out approach gives us additional credit in future years, it does result in zero at some point in time so we still need to address that.

James Martin: One of the ideas I had was something like a half-life type of setup. Each year after credit duration you would lose half of the credit, or something like that. That would at least get us away from ending up at zero after 4 or 5 years. Theoretically, we could completely replace the concept of credit duration with such a half-life approach.

Cassie Davis: My only hesitation is how much time it will take to create this change.

Jess Rigelman: I can't speak to the specifics. It will be a big lift, definitely. But it's possible. The systems now are not necessarily set up to do that.

James Martin: I think the transparency part of it will be difficult as well. It's easy to show NEIEN error reports now, but in a phased-out approach it might be more difficult.

Olivia Devereux: We have 2000 users for CAST and a lot of them have other objectives than this. We would have to come up with a way to clearly explain these changes in CAST to them.

Loretta Collins: That's a good point. Communication and confusion is critical. James, can I ask for clarification from you about verification - you think what's in the model is less reliable now than before the BMP verification. Is that because of practices dropping out?

James Martin: Yes.

Loretta Collins: Got it. Dana, in regard to your comment about checking the monitoring against the science, I know there's an effort right now in STAC that is supposed to look at the monitoring and

science and the incongruities between the two. This speaks to what James was saying about how the model might be less reliable now than before.

Vanessa Van Note: Cassie, we don't have an accurate timeline of how long this would take to incorporate into NEIEN. We would have to decide on a method, what BMPs it would apply to, etc. This would also be a communication challenge, as Alana brought up in the chat.

Action: Vanessa Van Note, EPA, will verify the decision made in the WTWG about the inclusion of CTA practices in the CAST model.

11:00 **Adjourn**

Meeting Chat

From Rebecca Hanmer to Everyone: 09:08 AM

Thank you Elliott, Leon and Olivia for following up on the use of NRCS reporting in verification. This will really be of value to FWG, for sure.

From Lisa Beatty, PA DEP to Everyone: 09:11 AM

The "other" Agriculture issues, does that include BRC and LLM credit duration discussions?

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 09:13 AM

Lisa, yes.

From Alana Hartman, WVDEP to Everyone: 09:14 AM

for WV I'm the same person for both groups

From Lisa Beatty, PA DEP to Everyone: 09:15 AM

Vanessa Thank you!

From James Martin to Everyone: 09:15 AM

Lucky you, Alana :-)

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 09:36 AM

That is correct.

Only the credit duration extension.

From Olivia Devereux to Everyone: 09:56 AM

Vanessa, Thanks for clarifying the process. Dr. Kellner and you are good leaders and I appreciate the clarification of the process.

From Jill Whitcomb - DEP Chesapeake Bay Office to Everyone: 09:59 AM

Are there some that are 30 years? Like easements?

From sally claggett, usfs to Everyone: 09:59 AM

yes, some buffers can now be 30 years under CLEAR

From Jill Whitcomb - DEP Chesapeake Bay Office to Everyone: 10:01 AM

Thank you, Sally. There seemed to be a decent amount of enrollment in CLEAR this past year, from what I've read in the USDA report.

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 10:03 AM

vannote.vanessa@epa.gov

Please feel free to email me to expand on your support or reservations towards the proposal.

From sally claggett, usfs to Everyone: 10:03 AM

The vast majority of buffer contracts are 15 years-- but again we would benefit from better access to those data.

From Leon Tillman to Everyone: 10:04 AM

And for clarification CRP contracts (different than CREP) are 10-15 year contracts based on the election of the participant.

From Norm Goulet to Everyone: 10:04 AM

I apologize for having to leave for another meeting and I appreciate everyone's indulgence with my comments and concerns.

From Matt Ehrhart to Everyone: 10:04 AM

I would support Rebecca's comments and emphasize that that the question, as she noted is during establishment in the first 5 years. It's also worth noting that, while there were a lot of failed buffers in the early days of CREP, establishment practices are much improved and we vary rarely see those failures today (at least in the geographies where I work).

From Jill Whitcomb - DEP Chesapeake Bay Office to Everyone: 10:14 AM

Yes, as part of our QAPP and our reporting framework, we need to be able to identify if practices are funded by NRCS or FSA and where they are not.

To avoid duplication.

From Ted T to Everyone: 10:15 AM

It would take a special effort, but possible in PA

From Emily Dekar - Upper Susquehanna Coalition to Everyone: 10:19 AM

While there is a question regarding limiting partial credit to those practices that come from the aggregated data, I just wasn't sure if it was possible to identify those in order to apply partial credit to those practices only.

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 10:29 AM

Thank you for pointing that out, Jill.

We will need to make sure it is reflected accurately in the appendix (with a link to the WTWG decision/conversation). If it is not properly documented, we may need to revisit it at the WTWG.

Clare, can Delaware also distinguish between federal and non-federal practices?

From Jill Whitcomb - DEP Chesapeake Bay Office to Everyone: 10:29 AM

Although the CTA records might provide a useful measure of conservation practices implemented without Federal financial assistance, currently the CBP Partnership has decided to prohibit the inclusion of these data in the Annual Progress Review, until they can confirm that the practices meet NRCS practice standards and specifications and protocols are established for ensuring that the records are not double counted. The CTA practices were identified in the NRCS dataset by contract program name = "Conservation Technical Assistance-General.

Appendix F - page 17

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 10:30 AM

Thanks, Jill.

From Leon Tillman to Everyone: 10:31 AM

Thanks for that information and background everyone

From Alana Hartman, WVDEP to Everyone: 10:48 AM

on the communication issue, if we were to implement a partial credit fade-out, it might actually help to lessen the need to communicate why we see sudden big BMP losses due to them reaching their credit duration, because there wouldn't be as many of those sudden big BMP losses.

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 10:49 AM

Thank you for that perspective, Alana.

From Bill Tharpe - MDA to Everyone: 10:52 AM

MD believe that verification is the proper method to ensure accurate data for CAST. It is understood that Federal partnerships in different states have extremely different relationship. For this reason, MD is open to the partial credit.

From Me to Everyone: 10:54 AM

www.menti.com

Code: 92 28 11 5

From Jill Whitcomb - DEP Chesapeake Bay Office to Everyone: 10:55 AM

Give me a minute, please....trying to get to the website. Thanks!

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 10:56 AM

No worries, Jill! Just let us know when you've got it.

From Jill Whitcomb - DEP Chesapeake Bay Office to Everyone: 10:56 AM

Got it!

From Alana Hartman, WVDEP to Everyone: 10:59 AM

I might use this "looking for the sweet spot" concept as we prepare our WV presentation for this group in the near future.

From Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA to Everyone: 11:00 AM

I'd second Alana's thought - it's often hard to communicate that there are acres, etc, on the landscape beyond what is credited in a progress year given that that number only reflects recent implementation or re-verified practices. From a planning perspective that can be challenging to understand as a local district works towards their target implementation levels. They can implement and install practices but see no "progress" in a category because a large practice "fell off" that year.

Participants

Jackie Pickford, CRC

Elliott Kellner, WVU

Jason Keppler, MDA

Vanessa Van Note, EPA/CBPO

Jennifer Starr, LGAC

Cassie Davis, NYS DEC

Suzanne Trevena, EPA

Alana Hartman, WV Dept. of Environmental Protection

Dana York, Green Earth Connection, TN

Leon Tillman, NRCS

Mark Dubin - UME/CBPO

Sally Claggett, USFS

Bill Tharpe, MDA

Rebecca Hanmer, Chair FWG

Jennifer Walls, DNREC

Emily Dekar - Upper Susquehanna Coalition

Jessica Rodriguez, DoD Chesapeake Bay Program

James Martin, VA DEQ

Matt Ehrhart - CAC

Ruth Cassilly, UMD

Adrienne Kotula, CBC

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting, Inc.

Ted T, PA DEP

Norm Goulet, Urban Stormwater WG

Lee McDonnell, EPA

Lisa Beatty, PA DEP

Jessica Rigelman, J7 LLC,

KC Filippino, HRPDC, co-chair LUWG

Curt Dell, USDA ARS

Loretta Collins, UMD, AgWG Coordinator

Jill Whitcomb, PA DEP