

BMP Verification Ad-Hoc Action Team

Meeting Minutes

May 14th, 2021

9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Meeting materials: [link](#)

Summary of Actions & Decisions

Action: Vanessa Van Note will attend the June Wetland Restoration meeting and keep the group updated on wetland restoration credit duration.

Decision: The BMP Verification Ad-Hoc Action Team has decided to table the conversation of extending BRC and LLM credit durations.

Welcome, Introductions, Roll Call, Elliott Kellner, Chair (WVU)

- Welcome & Roll Call of participants
- **Announcement** – Update from the FWG on Forest and Tree Planting BMPs, *Sally Claggett, FWG*
- **Announcement** – Back-Out and Cut-Off due to Land Use Update from WTWG, *WTWG Coordinator*
- **Announcement** – Wetland Restoration, *Vanessa Van Note (Coordinator)*
- **Next Meeting: Friday, June 11th, 9:00 am to 11:00 am**

Action: Vanessa Van Note will attend the June Wetland Restoration meeting and keep the group updated on wetland restoration credit duration.

The Path Forward for BRC and LLM, Elliott Kellner, Chair (WVU)

Because the Ad-Hoc Action Team did not achieve consensus on the decision to draft a recommendation to extend the credit durations of BRC and LLM from 10 years to 15 years, Elliott reviewed the potential options for moving forward.

Discussion:

Elliott Kellner: I want to share my own perspective on this. First, I think given the results of the vote, it is unlikely at this time that we'll reach consensus on these items. We were pretty evenly split. Given the rationales and concerns that were voiced, I doubt we'll be able to resolve those issues at this point in time with the information we currently have available. Second, I am not convinced that we have done enough work yet to elevate this issue to the WQGIT. In my opinion, I think the best route forward is to table the issue. Many people wanted more information and if we decide to table this, we could use this time to collect that information. We have a two year charter as a team so we have until August 2022. Third, I think we are observing a better pace of progress on these credit duration extensions from the source sector workgroups. As a prime example, Sally and Rebecca are moving really well and efficiently in the FWG on considering the extension of credit durations for forestry and tree planting BMPs. My suggestion is that maybe after we table this we could consider punting these issues to the AgWG. I say that based on the rationale of several members who stated that the source sector workgroups should be more involved in the process.

Bill Tharpe: I agree with tabling the issue. My comments from last month were that we needed more information. I also believe there's another angle of conversation that I see is on the agenda for later, which is maybe moving towards a partial credit system.

Dana York: Even looking at these credit durations seemed a little out of place. I thought this group would be doing more about expanding ways verification should happen, so I am in full agreement that this should go back to the source sector workgroups.

Ted Tesler: Dana, I agree. I think the WGs could have the best perspective as to how to address this. I don't know what new information people are looking to obtain. If there is going to be additional data development or perspective, I think it should exist in the sector WGs. Also, I think that those that objected should have offered a little more information on why.

Elliott Kellner: In my mind, tabling the issue doesn't mean we are putting it aside necessarily. It just gives us the option to encourage the AgWG to take it up and then work in coordination with the AgWG (similarly to the way we are working with the FWG and Wetland WG) to make progress on those issues. I think the best chance for progress is at the WG level.

Loretta Collins: I'm the AgWG coordinator. One of my concerns with this group in general is that issues of credit duration should be dealt with in the source sector workgroups. The difference with BRC and LLM, compared to the wetland and FWG credit durations, is that none of these issues came up in the AgWG. These were brought up as a top-down approach in the scope of verification. In response to those who want to punt it to the AgWG - expecting a different result with the same information at the AgWG seems optimistic. I don't know that there is any more information available. The AgWG is 100% consensus based so we will probably run into the same issues. A point I want to make about partial credit - Cherry picking what BMPs we want to extend the credit duration for is not addressing the actual concern. I think there is a fundamental disagreement on what we mean by verification, and what credit duration means versus lifespan. Credit duration is an accountability framework. There are fundamental issues with reporting and tracking that we need to improve, and this concern is raised in this group and in other groups over and over again. I feel like we need to be on the same page with what we mean by credit duration and how that does and does not relate to lifespan.

Lisa Beatty: I agree with Loretta's concerns - I'm not sure what punting to the AgWG is going to accomplish. Our fundamental issue is confusion with credit duration and lifespan. I don't know how to solve that problem. I don't think everyone took the data that PA or NY provided into consideration. Other jurisdictions that are opposed have not provided any statistical information to counter what the current science is. We could have another discussion about the difference between credit duration and lifespan and then after that elevate it to the WQGIT. We say there is no consensus but is that because we're not understanding what people are presenting, or just the basic fundamentals of credit duration and lifespan? Or is there confusion on how the statistics were derived from the programs we have in PA to best answer the questions that were proposed? In short, PA would like to elevate this to the WQGIT.

James Martin: If we were going to go down the path of giving this to the source sector WGs. Would we just be doing the BRC and LLM? If we move that way with these two, would we just send all of the ones on our list?

Vanessa Van Note: We currently have BRC, LLM, Forestry practices, wetland restoration practices, and grass buffers. Forestry and wetland restoration have been brought to the FWG and Wetland WG's for consideration.

James Martin: So if we send BRC and LLM to the AgWG then we would just have grass buffers left?

Vanessa Van Note: Correct.

Loretta Collins: I mean I doubt the AgWG could come to a decision about structural practices. If we can't reach consensus on structural BMPs, something like grass buffers doesn't seem to have much of a chance, but that's just my initial impression.

James Martin: Yeah, I agree with you. It's not likely that we would see any different result on those.

Vanessa Van Note: I also want to quickly say that we wanted to get the technical changes to the group and potentially approved by the CAST21 deadline so that's why we took the approach that we did. But obviously we can change our approach if we need to. Also, Dana put a really great recommendation in the chat.

Dana York (in chat): If you look at our task statement for this group I really think we should be proposing what should be used to change credit duration but not be the group that determines changes to individual practice credit duration. We really need to look at new verification methodologies, to help get more practices verified and reverified.

Elliott Kellner: I agree with discussing the broader, programmatic issues at length. Tabling this will provide extra bandwidth to having those discussions. Responding to Loretta and your comments, I hope you do not feel ambushed, I didn't mean to spring this on you. What I really mean by "punting to the AgWG" is that we would encourage members of the AgWG to exercise their prerogative to take up these issues. If they determine there is insufficient data or rationale for taking these issues up, that is the prerogative of that group. I do think we should provide the *option* to consider and take up these issues. If they don't want to do that, then that's fine. Lisa - you talked about PA desire to elevate to the WQGIT. That is your prerogative. I don't think that's necessarily something we need to do as a group, but we need to be sure that we are communicating to those members of our group that are also members of the WQGIT that this is an option they have.

Loretta Collins: No offense taken, Elliott. If we do table it at this group, is there an expectation that we will have this as an agenda item at the AgWG? I completely agree with Dana's point in the chat - I think this is more programmatic, like how are we doing verification at this point. I'm not sure addressing individual BMPs is a valuable use of the AgWG's time since we've already laid out all the information at this group.

Dana York: My thought process is that we've gotten various statistics and methodologies from the states saying here's why this should be changed. I think we need to clarify what exactly they need to provide us with in order for us to change it- statistics, background, research, etc.

Loretta Collins: I just don't think we should be addressing verification on a practice by practice level. I think we need to focus on what we mean by verification, is accountability for practices that go into the model the same as potential lifespans of practices if they are managed appropriately over time? I'm still stuck on that.

Elliott Kellner: The process that the AgWG does or does not employ for this is the prerogative of the workgroup. The responsibility needs to be born by the parties advocating for the change at the workgroup and GIT levels. I don't think the coordinator and the chair of the group need to be spearheading that process or advocating for any kind of change.

Brittany Sturgis: I'm curious - is it really a lifespan/credit duration issue for jurisdictions? For Delaware, our issues are mostly programmatic. I highlight this in my presentation.

Elliott Kellner: I would agree that there are various concerns regarding BMP verification right now. The reason we took up this specific issue of extending credit durations is because that was part of our charge. If we have now taken it up and then decide as a group that there's nothing here and we'd rather focus on broader issues, then if a workgroup should decide to extend credit duration then they can have

at it if that's what they decide. The only reason we took up the technical bits of the issue was because of that impending CAST21 deadline.

Dana York: Our charge talks about revisiting it. I think we dove in too deep. I think we need to back out and say: if you provide this information determined by this group, then we should move forward.

Rebecca Hanmer: I agree completely that the WG is really where the technical information can best be assembled. It is useful in the FWG context, if the group wants to do this, to come to a group like ours to talk about it. We've gotten better quality feedback from being able to bring our briefings to this group. Also, in our experience, the biggest pressure that our states seem to be feeling about their verification programs is where practices are funded by NRCS and states don't have access to the information or the sites of the BMPS. That's a complicating factor we talked about 5 years ago when we did the verification framework that I am not sure has been rectified.

Alana Hartman: Vanessa and Elliott - I want to make sure that we are allowed to change the direction of this group.

Vanessa Van Note: For me, I'm viewing it as a reinterpretation of our charge. Going for the larger programmatic aspect, that is still covered under our charge. Our initial thought was to go right into the pain points with these practices and relieve them, which is why we did this deep dive. We're going to take this back to the Management Board and tell them how we addressed each of these tasks they gave us. I definitely don't want folks to think we are ignoring our charge or what the MB asked us to do. Is that helpful Alana?

Alana Hartman: Yes, very helpful.

Jill Whitcomb: The agenda had three options and none of them had the AgWG in them. I suggest we follow the logic. Since this committee goes to the WQGIT, it should go to them first and they decide if it should go to the AgWG for more technical discussion.

James Martin: Bureaucratically, Jill's suggestion makes more sense. I don't know if this Action Team has the authority to task the AgWG with something like this. If the intent is to table and request input from the sector workgroups from these topics, then that recommendation should go to the WQGIT and then they would be the one to task it to the AgWG.

Norm Goulet: As a WG chair, it is always within the prerogative of a source sector WG to reevaluate anything that they have previously passed in terms of verification. If the AgWG wants to take it up, they can. They don't need a recommendation from the WQGIT or from this group whatsoever.

Jill Whitcomb: The reason why I suggested that was to bring more transparency to this discussion. I'm concerned it's just going to churn. The AgWG may decide to or not to take it up. But the amount of time that all of us have spent on this topic, I think it should be at least elevated to bring more light to this issue rather than letting it churn at the source sector WG level. I'm worried that the AgWG might not take it on if there isn't a charge from the WQGIT.

Norm Goulet: Right, but if the AgWG doesn't want to take it on then that's within their full right. If there's enough people who want to have it reevaluated, then it will be reevaluated. Also, there is an update every month at the WQGIT about this group, so it could be brought up during the announcement and at that point if an individual state wants to make a motion to have the whole GIT pass on a recommendation, it can be done at that point.

Loretta Collins: I agree with Norm. Jill, I don't know how much more light we can shine on this. I feel it's been quite transparent so far. I will reiterate - I think the conversation is about verification and the process associated with it. I don't think it's a BMP issue.

Elliott Kellner: I completely agree with you Norm. I want to clarify that I definitely didn't intend to "task" the AgWG with anything, I don't believe that is within our purview. I was trying to provide an example

for jurisdictions who want the change that if we table it, there are still avenues of moving forward if people are interested in doing so. Jill, to your point, I think that PA or any representative can do exactly what Norm was just describing. If the jurisdictions pushing this want to push this in other workgroups or at the GIT level, I would encourage them to do so.

Dana York: I move that we table this.

Norm Goulet: I second.

Elliott Kellner: Any objections?

James Martin: I'm going to speak against it just so we don't have consensus.

Elliott Kellner: Thank you James. I want to reiterate my encouragement of members to explore those other avenues on extending these credit durations, should that be speaking up at the WQGIT or getting your jurisdictional representative to take it up at the AgWG. Again, we can revisit these at a later date.

Decision: The BMP Verification Ad-Hoc Action Team has decided to table the conversation of extending BRC and LLM credit durations.

A Broader Programmatic Discussion: Successes and Challenges of the DE Verification Program,

Brittany Sturgis, DNREC.

Brittany presented on the challenges DE is facing with their verification program.

Discussion:

Loretta Collins: Could you review what the BMP ID issue was?

Brittany Sturgis: It was an error in the database where whenever we would reupload our progress submissions, the database was changing the unique BMP IDs, so we had no way to refer back to what that BMP was originally named and find a specific BMP to then enter inspection information.

Jill Whitcomb: Thank you for bringing this to the group. It was a great presentation. We have similar challenges in PA, especially relating to expired practices and BMP ID's. Your questions at the end here are very valid and valuable for us to consider as a partnership moving forward. I wanted to note my appreciation for this and hope to continue this conversation moving forward.

James Martin (in chat): Even if you knew where the NRCS practices were, you would not have authority to access the private property to inspect it. (at least we don't have the authority in VA)

Vanessa Van Note: James, in VA are you facing issues with both point location and not being able to access private property? Or have you already dealt with the former and are now dealing with the latter?

James Martin: I'd say we still have both issues. VA was recently able to strike an MOU with NRCS, whereby NRCS would provide detailed info on practices that were no longer within their contractual term to DCR to help facilitate inspections. But ultimately the process still requires the development of correspondence to the NRCS participant to access the property and verify the practice and offer that producer to sign up for an ongoing maintenance contract. It is still starting out so we are still having a lot of challenges.

Loretta Collins: So James, once the NRCS contract is over, then NRCS can provide the locational data to the agency they have the MOU with for them to reach out to specific farmers about future verification or inspection?

James Martin: I'm not sure if they give the contact information or the locational information.

Olivia Devereux: James mentioned that effort with DCR and NRCS and that's great, I hope there is success with that, but it still doesn't solve the issue of reporting inspections for practices in contract.

Loretta Collins: But in theory, during the contract, NRCS is aware that the practice is implemented and functioning for the duration of that contract, right?

Olivia Devereux: Right but that information never makes its way to the state reporting lead and the Bay Program.

Brittany Sturgis: And the inspections that NRCS does doesn't meet the standards of our verification program. So even if we were to get that information, it's not what we think it is.

Vanessa Van Note: Ideally, though, the contract duration period from the NRCS side should be the amount of time that credit duration is attached to initially.

James Martin: I disagree. The way that NRCS administers their program and what they choose to keep as a contractual period and the producers they sign up has nothing to do with the expected performance of the practice. It is largely administrative. I know that is what we used, largely absent of any other information, when we originally set those credit durations. I just disagree that that should have been the basis of their credit duration.

Elliott Kellner: We have Chad Wentz and Tim Peters with NRCS - any clarification or input you would like to provide?

Tim Peters: Agronomic may be handled differently but for an engineering practice - we don't have a contract with a landowner after it's been constructed. The whole root of what we do is based on being a voluntary program, so when you start providing information to do ongoing inspections that are intended for landowners to make changes or fixes, that could be interpreted as going against the work that NRCS is really doing.

Chad Wentz: There's a difference between the length of our contracts versus practice lifespans - those don't necessarily equal one another. The agreement that was mentioned prior between NRCS and Virginia - we're not going to release practice specific information until we have a release of authorization from the participant on the practice details and specific locations, just to clarify that a little bit.

Introducing the Concept of Partial Credit, Vanessa Van Note, Coordinator.

Vanessa gave an introduction to the concept of partial credit and highlighted both proposals for and reservations towards the inclusion of partial credit submitted by members of the group.

Discussion:

Lisa Beatty: Before we get into this - is it even possible to do this within CAST from a technical standpoint?

Jess Rigelman: There are a lot of questions we have as far as the details about how this will be done. It will be a monumental amount of work but yes, it is possible.

James Martin: Has this ever been implemented in the model?

Norm Goulet: In terms of the efficiency downgrade, it was incorporated into the 43 or phase 5, I don't remember. It was fully implemented, but it's no longer there.

Elliott Kellner: If there is insufficient support from this group for taking up this issue of partial credit, then I think it would be good to hear that before we take that on.

Lisa Beatty: I think first we need to see how feasible this really is with the technical modeling team. If it's going to create huge implications within CAST and be a mountain of work, is that really what we want to focus on for this particular solution? What other implications will this have on the model as a whole? Can we really even do this in the time we have allotted?

Jason Keppler: I don't think our decisions need to be made without consultation from the modeling folks. It sounds like anything is doable but some things can be done easier than others, which I think should be taken into consideration when we talk about this process.

Olivia Devereux: It is true that technically anything is feasible, it's just a question of how long it takes and the agreed upon methodology, but this would not be quick or easy to implement at all. It is very complicated. A conceptual issue is that we're using an average hydrology in the model - to apply that to varying BMP effects calls into question fundamental algorithms that are used within the model, so I am just throwing that out there for consideration.

Lisa Beatty: Right, that is my concern. There are unintended consequences that may occur and I think we need to take that into consideration before spending months and months discussing this issue.

Vanessa Van Note: So that's why we wanted Olivia and Jess here. If there are unintended consequences as Olivia mentioned then that is what we need to be discussing and considering.

Norm Goulet: To piggyback on what Olivia brought up. When the source sector WGs set an efficiency, we're basically looking at an average efficiency. I personally don't think we can start splitting out efficiencies. We just don't have the scientific information to say that a certain BMP will degrade by a certain period of time by a certain amount.

James Martin: Well now we just say that it degrades from 100% effective to 0% effective.

Norm Goulet: Right because there was no inspection program that is required for those non-urban BMPs. It was basically a carrot and stick approach for you guys to say okay we need to establish some kind of program in these non-regulatory areas so we don't lose these efficiencies. If the state decides not to put its money into the verification program, then that's on the states, you just lose the credit.

Jason Keppler: Norm, I agree with your concerns about reducing the efficiencies over time, but maybe we could reduce the acres as a proxy for that.

Norm Goulet: I would think that would be more problematic from a technical CAST standpoint. And that is why most of these went all or nothing because of all the complications that are involved.

Lisa Beatty: I'm interested in Norm's comment that the credit duration was based on the incentive to verify and report the BMP and not on the actual function of the BMP. Because what we're saying is that these BMPs are functioning beyond that actual time so it's just confusing to me.

Norm Goulet: Lisa, the key to that is the inspection. If you are inspecting it, you are verifying that it still exists and is performing as expected. Without that inspection, we can't verify that it's functioning as intended. Yes we know that a lifespan is associated with a BMP. But over that lifespan, there are issues that occur. So that was the whole purpose behind the reporting, verification, and inspection program, to ensure that the BMPs going into the model are functioning as intended.

James Martin: The verification program was to make sure that the best data possible was in the model, not to drive the development of inspection programs. That was the result but not the purpose. The purpose, as Norm was getting at, was to make sure that the practices in the model represent practices that are effective on the ground. Prior to implementation verification, BMPs once reported stayed in the model forever. I think we've gone from one extreme to the other extreme. I think if we want to achieve the best representation of what is on the ground and its effectiveness, then we need to let the pendulum swing back into the middle a bit.

Norm Goulet: I would disagree. As a regulated MS4, you require my jurisdictions to verify BMPs over the life of a MS4 period. A locality has to inspect every BMP over the 5 year period of time annually. We're not suggesting anything other than what you're forcing on the majority of the regulated community here.

James Martin: But Norm, only a very small fraction of the universe of BMPs is in a regulated area.

Norm Goulet: Right, but we said that you can develop some statistical method for the unregulated areas as your inspection program so if you come up with a methodology that says we only have to inspect 20% of the BMPs to have a certain level of confidence then you can do that also.

James Martin: NEIEN and CAST are not set up well to do a statistically based system.

Norm Goulet: We developed the policy and it's up to the states to make sure that the guys develop the programs.

Meeting Adjourned

Meeting Chat

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 09:19 AM

In addition, Jackie made a reference sheet for the group that outlines the options we have for expanding upon the data and working towards a solution/ tabling it and working towards a solution in the future (our group charge still has over a year left). This may be helpful for your reference. Thanks!

From Norm Goulet to Everyone: 09:22 AM

I vote #2 - Table

From Rebecca Hanmer to Everyone: 09:23 AM

I strongly agree with Dana regarding WG role.

From Brittany Sturgis to Everyone: 09:30 AM

I think my presentation will help drive home Loretta's point of having fundamental issues with verification

From Matt Ehrhart to Everyone: 09:33 AM

While I'm not opposed to the Ag Workgroup taking this up, My impression of the opinions (and my personal perspective) was not that an extended lifespan was not reasonable, but that the data we were seeing did not sufficiently speak to the question. I certainly felt that we needed to have some better data to point to. Perhaps it would be possible for a subgroup to clarify what details we felt would support the change and inquire whether that information is available.

From Dana York to Everyone: 09:33 AM

If you look at our task statement for this group I really think we should be proposing what should be used to change credit duration but not be the group that determines changes to individual practice credit duration. We really need to look at new verification methodologies, to help get more practices verified and reverified. .

From Bill Tharpe - MDA to Everyone: 09:35 AM

I agree with Dana

From Brittany Sturgis to Everyone: 09:36 AM

I also agree with Dana

From Rebecca Hanmer to Everyone: 09:36 AM

The mix of practices in BRC and LLM was a complicating factor in interpreting the information.

From Loretta Mae Collins to Everyone: 09:38 AM

Agree with Dana

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 09:39 AM

Thanks, Dana. That is the direction we are headed in.

From Loretta Mae Collins to Everyone: 09:57 AM

Agree with Norm

From Dana York to Everyone: 10:03 AM

I will say again- I think states need to know what evidence they need to provide to get changes. I think using the work done by the states is really good. What more would they have to provide?. That is what we can bless then states/workgroups would know how to get a change.

From Rebecca Hanmer to Everyone: 10:07 AM

I was going to say the same thing as Dana - while I agree with tabling, I think we owe the states who proposed the extension a more detailed explanation of the analysis and rationale they need to provide. If, as part of tabling, we take up the general procedure for credit extensions, we can provide advice on BRC and LLM after that.

From Matt Ehrhart to Everyone: 10:08 AM

I agree with Dana & Rebecca

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 10:09 AM

Dana, Jackie's sheet that was on the screen and I included in the chat earlier outlines requests from those who did not endorse drafting a proposal at the last meeting. I intend to work with the AgWG to figure out what is needed. These are questions that have been asked and discussed in the past within this group. At the time, we didn't have additional data, so the approach was to gather everything we had. Now, members have requested specifics after seeing what is available. I am happy to bring an outline of what is needed to the group in the next couple of meetings.

From Jill Whitcomb - DEP Chesapeake Bay Office to Everyone: 10:13 AM

Clear direction is needed, then, for states to be able to document and collect the information in order to make the recommendation for change.

Brittany - that is a very important piece of information - the BMP ID. I think it would be a good idea for you to repeat that statement.

From Alana Hartman, WVDEP to Everyone: 10:18 AM

Brittany, is the "Forest Buffers" and "Grass Buffers" line graphs slide showing data from CAST BMP summary?

From Clare Sevcik to Everyone: 10:23 AM

Alana, yes, the data from those two graphs were from the BMP Summary reports from CAST

From James Martin to Everyone: 10:28 AM

Even if you knew where the NRCS practices were, you would not have authority to access the private property to inspect it. (at least we don't have the authority in VA)

From Loretta Mae Collins to Everyone: 10:28 AM

Terrific presentation Brittany!

From Dana York to Everyone: 10:28 AM

Good presentation—Vanessa and group- I think we had to go through the process we did—see the data that states have, the vote and see the concerns— to see the bigger picture. I don't think we have wasted our time, but maybe can now be clearer on what is needed from the group to help states collect data that is acceptable for changes to BMP verification so they don't go down a "black hole" of requests for more data.. Our discussion gives us a idea of what is possible to collect, (the states gave us examples) but I think there are new opportunities for us to bless methodologies/ scientific evidence since the last verification protocols that were approved.

From Rebecca Hanmer to Everyone: 10:29 AM

Outstanding presentation. Hits the nail on the head. This 1619 issue is what we should talk about.

From Matt Ehrhart to Everyone: 10:33 AM

great presentation. the tension between new implementation and verification of existing practices certainly continues. You very clearly identify the 1619 issue and concerns, particularly given how much work is done by NRCS funds. I agree with Rebecca that this deserves specific discussion with respect to verification expectations.

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 10:33 AM

Thanks, James.

From James Martin to Everyone: 10:42 AM

Thanks Chad. I appreciate the clarification.

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 10:43 AM

Tim, for the engineer practices, if the contract is 10 years, when can you expect that practice to be fully constructed and operational?

From Rebecca Hanmer to Everyone: 10:46 AM

For the revised 2018 Forestry verification guidance, we obtained information from NRCS on the inspection practices during life of contract. In effect, we accept this as "verification" for the life of a CREP contract. FWG will be happy to present this for discussion at a future BMP meeting. As Olivia points out, this type of inspection information does not get submitted to the Bay Program.

From James Martin to Everyone: 10:52 AM

It is important to recognize that the Partnerships Verification Framework included a section titled "Ensuring Full Access to Federal Conservation Practice Data" that is largely about the 1619 issue. It is an integral component of the Framework and has not been implemented/resolved.

From Lisa Beatty to Everyone: 10:52 AM

When you take up these broader issues I suggest you have a action goal in mind. It would not be beneficial to have discussions on the agreed issue without proposed solutions. We will just be talking about the same problems over and over without a goal of a solution.

From Dana York to Everyone: 10:59 AM

I can talk to the original discussions and decisions for 1619 and politically what happened at USDA through 2010. Maybe it is time to revisit 1619 and data access at USDA at the highest levels? However that would be in the context of contract lifespan that NRCS currently uses for quality review.

From Brittany Sturgis to Everyone: 11:00 AM

Dana, I think that's a great idea

From sally claggett, usfs to Everyone: 11:01 AM

I think its important for the data to be as transparent as possible and understandable with casual inspection. So I am dubious about partial credit.

From Olivia Devereux to Everyone: 11:01 AM

Dana, RE: 1619 agreemetns. Yours is a great idea. NRCS moved to a new philosophy that there would not be sharing of data even among those who have 1619 agreements--meaning the agreements were only bi-lateral from NRCS to another group. It seems like NRCS is rethinking this somewhat.

From Matt English (DC) to Everyone: 11:02 AM

I need to go to another meeting. I look forward to discussion on this next time

From Loretta Mae Collins to Everyone: 11:03 AM

FYI- We have a new NRCS Chesapeake Bay Coordinator, Leon Tillman (coming from Tennessee NRCS). He just came on board a couple of weeks ago.

From Brittany Sturgis to Everyone: 11:05 AM

could be invite Leon to a future meeting and go over our current issues?

we*

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 11:05 AM

For those who have to jump off, in the next meeting, we will plan to have a more substantial discussion on the 1619 and talk possible solutions/paths forward -- For partial credit, I will continue to work on the backend with the modelling team (specifically on two approaches outlined here). Leon has been invited to future meetings. I need to give him background on the issues as he is new to the position.

From Brittany Sturgis to Everyone: 11:09 AM

Can we make sure to also focus on the overall picture if verification programs are still working? Or if we need to bring it up to leadership to revisit verification programs?

From Ted T to Everyone: 11:10 AM

I'm having a 10 yr flashback

From VANESSA VANNOTE to Everyone: 11:10 AM

Absolutely, Brittany. I would like to consolidate all the issues into one place so we are aware of what has been resolved and what is an outstanding issue. I will see if other jurisdictions would like to bring their issues/pain points forward.

From Rebecca Hanmer to Everyone: 11:11 AM

If the Partial Credit still includes a question of whether the BMP group should take up the issue of changes of BMP efficiency over time, note that the FWG would not likely support revisiting the forestry BMPs and decisions of the Expert Panels.

Participants

Jackie Pickford, CRC

Elliott Kellner, WVU

Vanessa Van Note, EPA/CBPO

Jason Keppler, MDA

Bill Tharpe, MDA

Alana Hartman, WV DEP

Brittany Sturgis - DE

Adrienne Kotula, CBC VA

Emily Dekar - Upper Susquehanna Coalition (NY)

Suzanne Trevena, EPA

Jennifer Starr, LGAC

Cassandra Davis, NYS DEC

Loretta Collins, UMD

Dana York, Green Earth Connection

Clint Gill, DDA

KC Filippino, HRPDC, co-chair LUWG

Matt English - DOEE DC

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting, Inc.

Jessica Rodriguez, DoD Chesapeake Bay Program

Ted Tesler, PaDEP

Matt Ehrhart, CAC and Stroud Water Research Center

Jessica Rigelman, J7 LLC, contractor to the CBP

Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA

Lisa Beatty from PA DEP

Curt Dell, USDA-ARS

James Martin, VA DEQ

Katie Brownson, USFS

Norm Goulet, NVRC

Rebecca Hanmer, FWG