To: Bill Angstadt <angstadtconsult@aol.com>,
Cc: aswanson@chesbay.us, azemba@state.pa.us, jennifer.volk@state.de.us,
rhoderjc@mda.state.md.us,
Bcc:
Subject: Re: Verification
From: Richard Batiuk/CBP/USEPA/US - Thursday 03/29/2012 10:08 AM

Bill-

Thanks for your email message. My apologies for the delay in responding. Please see my responses embedded in your original email message below.

I plan to use your set of questions, the questions that Roy Hoagland shared with the Steering Committee and other questions raised during Tuesday's conference call to as the start of a growing set of Qs and As to share first with the Steering Committee and then with the larger partnership. I don't have all the answers as many of those answer need to come for discussions and decisions within the partnership. I will strive to start the process of getting answers by helping move the dialogue forward.

Thanks for joining the Steering Committee, your participation in Tuesday's conference call, and your continuing willingness to share information and ideas to keep us all moving forward.

Thanks, Rich

Richard Batiuk
Associate Director for Science
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Chesapeake Bay Program Office
410 Severn Avenue, Suite 109
Annapolis, Maryland 21403
410-267-5731
1-800-968-7229 Ext 731
443-223-7823 Cell Phone
410-267-5777 FAX
batiuk.richard@epa.gov
www.chesapeakebay.net
www.epa.gov/chesapeake

Bill Angstadt	Rich:	03/26/2012 12:22:11 PM

From:	Bill Angstadt <angstadtconsult@aol.com>
To:	Richard Batiuk/CBP/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc:	aswanson@chesbay.us, rhoderjc@mda.state.md.us, azemba@state.pa.us, jennifer.volk@state.de.us
Date:	03/26/2012 12:22 PM
Subject:	Verification

Rich:

1. Protocol development work flow

   I am confused on the work flow among the states (jurisdictions); the Panel; source sector workgroups; and the Management Board - maybe a flow chart would help me.

RESPONSE: The Steering Committee made a similar request during Tuesday's conference call. This will be captured as an action item assigned to CBPO staff within the forthcoming conference call summary.

- Panel will "assess the state verification programs" - does this mean each state is building their own program?

RESPONSE: Yes, the BMP Verification Panel will be reviewing each state's verification program. And, yes, each of the six states and the District will be building/documenting their state specific verification program, building from existing tracking, reporting and verification efforts and factoring in the partnership's agreed to protocols and adhering to the partnership's agreed to principles.

- Or are the source sector workgroups building verification protocols (with each state participating on those workgroups) - then the Panel will assess and make recommendations to workgroup?

RESPONSE: The source sector and habitat restoration workgroups are developing verification protocols for review and adoption by the partnership. Each state is represented on these technical workgroups. Several of the workgroups have requested access to Panel members during the workgroups protocol development processes to gain from their (the panel members) experiences. At this time, we will not be asking the Panel to review the protocols themselves, but we will be asking the panel to review how each state/DC uses/applies the protocols within their jurisdiction's overall BMP verification program.

- Or are the Panel experts the technical advisors to the source sector workgroups from the start?

RESPONSE: Several of the workgroups have requested access to Panel members during the workgroups protocol development processes to gain from their (the panel members) experiences. We are working towards convening the Panel earlier in the process so that the workgroups can benefit from interactions with key panel members AND panel members can learn more about the challenges facing the partnership early on.

- Do the source sector workgroups bring their draft protocols to first the WQGIT, then to Panel, then to MB?

RESPONSE: The envision sequence is: Steering Committee => WQGIT (or Vital Habitat GIT in the case of habitat restoration) => MB => PSC as part of the larger BMP verification framework package for final review/adoption

2. "Panel Charge & Membership" document, <u>Overview</u>: "for confirming nutrient and sediment reductions from the full array of best management practices and technologies implemented across all sources".

  a. I would suggest the addition: full array of individual best management practices, <u>management systems</u>, and technologies.

RESPONSE: Excellent edit--you raised this on the conference call as well. I will incorporate into the next draft version of the charge along with other feedback from the conference call and follow up with individual Steering Committee members.

  b. Most reduction solutions require multiple practices - a management system - to maximize effectiveness.

RESPONSE: I will work to factor in this point as well. I know the Urban Stormwater Workgroup is moving more and more towards systems and away from individual BMPs.

3. "BMP Verification Principles" document, <u>Overview</u>: "assessing management effectiveness"; "evaluating and quantifying"

- I would be interested in some discussion on will the verification process not only count practices, but also quantify their effectiveness? Effectiveness could be a very site-specific calculation.

RESPONSE: I understand and agree with the need to work toward quantify effectiveness. We have a parallel (now increasing intersecting) well establish process and adoption protocol for review and partnership adoption of efficiencies. Adding evaluation of effectiveness to our verification procedures would greatly increase costs of these efforts. I would like to hear more about what you have in mind on this topic so we can frame it for further discussion by the Steering Committee.

4. Please clarify my understanding that the focus for verification are practices implemented since 2006 (after WSM 5 calibration)

RESPONSE: The verification protocols are focus on verifying practices from now into the future. The 'historical data clean-up' component of the larger verification framework will focus on those practices, treatments, technologies, etc all ready tracked and reported by the jurisdictions from 1985 through 2011.

Thanks, looking forward to tomorrow's call.

Bill Angstadt
Delaware Maryland Agribusiness Association
Angstadt Consulting, Inc.
P.O. Box 377
Reading, PA 19607
610-374-1249
angstadtconsult@aol.com