

# Chesapeake Bay Program Best Management Practice Verification Program Design Matrix

## Support Document

**1) The Matrix should be used to guide** development of sector/jurisdiction BMP Verification Programs. The BMP Verification Review Panel will consider sector/jurisdiction's BMP verification programs using this Matrix, the Panel's General Guidance for Development of BMP Verification Programs, the five Verification Principles, and the additional public documents listed under item 4 below.

**2) The Matrix includes four columns that contain components and optional designs of a BMP Verification Program.**

**A) Verification Program Component.** This column contains the three main parts of a verification program:

**i) BMP Site Review (Verification)**—This is step #1 in the verification process where a BMP is initially determined to be present and functioning. The intensity of site review determines the level of validation subsequently required in step #2.

**ii) Data/Program Evaluation (Validation)**—Step #2 in the verification process is to determine if the data was collected, compiled, and submitted per Chesapeake Bay Program guidance

**iii) Performance (Outcomes)**—Step #3 in the process is to collect scientific evidence that the performance of the BMP is consistent with the efficiency approved by the BMP Expert Panels and utilized in the Chesapeake Bay Program models. These analyses can help refine BMP efficiencies, jurisdictional policy decisions, and support continued research and development into new BMPs. Based on jurisdictional ability to collect this data, further work by outside experts may be needed, and a certain amount of performance checks may be required for each jurisdiction.

**B. Program Elements-** This column contains 16 verification program elements, phrased as questions, which jurisdictions must consider when designing a program. Other elements may be considered at the jurisdiction's discretion.

**C. Element Options-** This column describes some examples of the options that may be considered to meet each program element. There could be numerous sub-element options not listed here depending on the BMP type and data collection method.

**D. Increased Spot Checking that May Be Required Without This Minimum Level of Review-** This column establishes a “feedback loop” between site review and validation. One of the Panel’s General Guidance concepts is the more intense the on-site review of BMP (i.e. in person review vs. a paper review) the less intense the required spot-checking will be after the fact. In this example, if a BMP has been visually reviewed by a in the field, a less rigorous sample may be needed for evaluating BMP data validity. In Data Validation and Outcomes program components this column refers to the guidance that may need to be developed to have confidence in the data provided and the observed outcomes.

4) **The Matrix should be considered in conjunction** with the Verification Principles, the NAS 2011 Report Chapter on BMP Tracking and Accounting, the various Advisory Committee Reports/Recommendations, the NEIEN Trading Partner Agreements, and Quality Assurance Plan guidance as required for CBP Grants and the Panel’s General Guidance for Development of BMP Verification Programs.