

Verification Review Panel Meeting

July 30-31, 2015

Panel Members

- Dana York
- Rebecca Hanmer
- Dianna Hogan
- Curtis Dell
- Mike Gerel
- Tim Gieseke
- Rebecca Stack
- Robert Traver
- Tom Simpson

General Process

- Panel received State Protocols from CBP
- Each Panel member reviewed protocols and filled out Evaluation Forms and Verification Principle worksheets for each state and DC
- Worksheets were sent to CBP and scores were combined

General Findings

- Many cross-state general findings
- Will be provided in August 7 report

Panel Review

The Panel reviewed individual State evaluations and used a stoplight approach to provide preliminary ratings and recommendations for each State's Protocol Proposals:

GREEN-Predominately consistent with Sector Guidance and Verification Principles

YELLOW-Notable gaps and some inconsistencies compared to Sector Guidance. States must fill gaps to be in agreement with Sector Guidance and Verification Principles.

RED- Inadequate or does not follow Sector Guidance or meet many Verification Principles. Missing substantial amounts of information or may need to change approach.

State Preliminary Ratings

Table 1. Summary of preliminary CBP BMP Verification Review Panel evaluations of submitted draft BMP Verification Program Plans. (7/31/15)

	DE	MD	WV	VA	PA	NY	DC
Agriculture							NA
Forestry							
Stream Restoration							
Urban Stormwater							
Wastewater							
Wetlands							?
KEY:		= Predominately consistent with Sector Guidance and Verification Principles.					
		= Notable gaps and some inconsistencies compared to Sector Guidance. States must fill gaps to be in agreement with Sector Guidance and Verification Principles.					
		= Inadequate or does not follow Sector Guidance or meet many Verification Principles. Missing substantial amounts of information or may need to change approach.					

State Verification Principle Achievement

	Comments
Practice Reporting	Most states affirmed the need for, and developed inspection and verification protocols. However, states that only provided how they collect and transmit data would not meet this Principle. Panel members could in some cases identify that states had good programs in place, but had not followed the guidance and provided the requested information.
Scientific Rigor	Some sectors, by their nature, have scientific rigor (i.e. Wastewater). However, statistical sampling (such as accepting others' methods, i.e. NRCS 5%) may not contain the required robustness, or meet WIP requirements. Varying methods of verification were proposed, but documentation provided did not always allow the Panel to determine scientific rigor.

State Verification Principle Achievement

Public Confidence	<p>The Panel felt that states that used the suggested, data-filled tables and concise narratives could be more easily understood by a layman. Identifying the connections to the WIP priorities helped the public understanding. Using independent verification methods is necessary to increase public confidence.</p>
Adaptive Management	<p>Few states addressed how to learn from uncertainty found in natural systems and human behaviors to inform the process. Information collected from inspection and verification can also be used to improve or adapt future verification guidance through the technical workgroups and expert panels. The Panel urges more conversation about what adaptive management entails and how it applies to verification within the various funding/staffing levels. Several states discussed pilot projects to determine the efficacy of various verification techniques. These pilots will be valuable if findings are reported out so that sectors might consider adding them to sector verification protocols.</p>
Sector Equity	<p>If states follow the sector guidance, most of the time sector equity should be achieved. However, the Panel felt that the evaluation questions, especially for stream restoration and wetlands, should be incorporated into their programs. The forestry guidance was changed after state draft submission; states should review and adjust their verification program plans to incorporate those revised requirements.</p>

Final Timeline

- **August 7:** Each jurisdiction receives a written compilation of the Panel's evaluations and recommendations on the additional work needed and the additional documentation requested.
- **August 27-28:** The Panel meets with each jurisdiction to discuss the Panel's review, working collaboratively to address comments, concerns, and recommendation put forth by the Panel.
- **August 28:** The Panel meets with the Committee to discuss the Panel's overall jurisdictional feedback and recommendations.
- **September 1 through November 16:** Continued collaboration between jurisdictions and Panel members to work through the Panel's comments and recommendations.
- **October 2:** Final draft set of jurisdiction-specific Panel reviews and recommendations distributed to Panel members for one final review and providing feedback back to Dana York.
- **October TBD:** Committee conference call with Dana York to get a verbal briefing on the Panel's final feedback and recommendations prior to the formal public release on October 16.
- **October 16:** Dana York sends the Panel's final written feedback and recommendations on each jurisdiction's verification program to the CBP's BMP Verification Committee, Water Quality Goal Implementation Team, Management Board, and Principals' Staff Committee. **The Panel is officially closed down after delivery of its final report to the Partnership.**

Where to Look for Good Examples

- **DE:** Forms and content throughout
- **WV:** Status of WWTP meeting WIP
- **PA:** Quantifying priority BMPs to WIP goals; good tables and narrative
- **VA:** Table on statistical confidence (needs to be reviewed)
- **NY:** Training for Ag and WWTP personnel involved in programs
- **DC:** Transparency/access of stormwater information
- **MD:** Ag protocols/tables; proposing independent verification team

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS