

Chesapeake Bay Program's BMP Verification Committee's BMP Verification Review Panel Membership Recommendations to the Management Board

BACKGROUND

At its February 16, 2012 meeting, the Partnership's Principals' Staff Committee agreed to proceed forward with development of a basinwide BMP verification framework, including convening of a panel of verification experts. At its February 9, 2012 meeting, the Partnership's Management Board decided it would be responsible for making decisions on the BMP Verification Review Panel's final membership and charge based on recommendations from the BMP Verification Committee. The draft panel charge (Attachment A) and recommended panel member nominees (see below) have been developed by the BMP Verification Committee and are ready for decisions by the Management Board.

NOMINATIONS RECEIVED

Based on the June 21st call for nominations distributed via email to the Water Quality and Habitat Goal Implementation Teams, their workgroups, and the Partnership's three advisory committees (CAC, LGAC, and STAC), the BMP Verification Committee received a total of 27 nominations (Attachment B). Committee members then were asked on July 30th to provide their top five nominees as well as identify any nominee(s) they felt had either a conflict of interest or did not have the expertise being sought for the panel members.

The results from Committee members voting were compiled and shared with the full Committee membership in advance of its August 16th conference call. During the August 16th conference call, Committee members narrowed down the list of nominees and requested a matrix containing the following information be drafted:

- Located inside or outside of the Chesapeake Bay watershed;
- History of working with the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership;
- Pollutant source sector expertise;
- Local implementation experience; and
- Narrative description of proficiencies/experts relevant to the panel charge.

As a follow up to the August 16th conference call, Committee members received a listing of the narrowed down set of nominees with the supporting matrix (Attachment C), with the addition of another nominee with local implementation experience (recommended during the conference call) as well as another nominee from the National Academy of Sciences' Chesapeake Bay Program Evaluation Committee (to fill a recognized gap in the panel membership).

BMP VERIFICATION COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

The BMP Verification Committee had one final review of the narrowed down set of nominees through the end of August, with a number of Committee members concurring with the full list for submission to the Management Board for the final selection of panel members. Several committee members commented they were supportive of the overall list, but expressed concern

that a total of 13 possible panel members would make the panel unmanageable. In addition, there were also several recommendations from individual members for further narrowing down the list of nominees for the Management Board's consideration.

Working from the original narrowed down set of nominees and factoring in the above further feedback from committee members during the final review process to further narrow the list to a more manageable number, here's the Committee Chair's recommended set of BMP Verification Review Panel members:

- Curtis Dell, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service
- Dana York, Green Earth Connection
- Mike Gerel, Sustainable Northwest
- Dan Zimmerman, Warwick Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania
- Gordon Smith, Wildlife Works Carbon
- Diana Hogan, U.S. Geological Survey, Eastern Geographic Science Center
- Tim Gieseke, Ag Resource Strategies
- Robert Traver, Villanova University, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Rebecca Stack, District of Columbia Department of Environment
- Andrew Sharpley, University of Arkansas

This group of 10 nominees provides the following:

- A balance of panel members located within (5 members) and outside (5 members) of the Chesapeake Bay watershed;
- A majority of panel members with some level CBP experience (7 members);
- Representation across five of the six pollutant source sectors with the exception being on-site treatment systems; and
- Five panel members with direct local implementation experience.

A solid cross section of the expertise and proficiencies, originally outlined within the draft panel charge, are addressed by the recommended nominees:

- Applied knowledge and experience in developing and managing verification programs (e.g., York, Smith, Gieseke)
- Applied knowledge and experience in balancing verification needs with resource/staff needs (e.g., York)
- Knowledge of variety of verification tools (on-the-ground data collection, verification techniques, statistical techniques, survey techniques, etc.) available and their utility and application for verifying practices across a multitude of sources (e.g., Dell, York, Hogan)
- Expertise in the social sciences with regard to understanding how to best structure surveys and other mechanisms for gathering data and verifying actions taken (e.g., Sharpley)
- Knowledge of water quality-related nutrient and sediment reduction practices and innovative technologies within various source sectors (agriculture, urban, on-site systems, wastewater, etc.) (Dell, York, Gerel, Zimmerman, Hogan, Gieseke, Traver, Stack, Sharpley)

- Knowledge of the Chesapeake Bay Program, TMDLs, and concept of reasonable assurance for nonpoint source nutrient/sediment reductions (e.g., York, Gerel, Hogan, Stack)
- Knowledge and expertise necessary to really work through the entire verification framework coming forth from the work of the partnership (all listed members)
- Understanding of how practices and technologies and their effectiveness may vary by geographic region in the watershed (e.g., York, Gieseke)
- Balance of membership from government, academic, programmatic, private sector, etc (nominees representing local government, state government, federal government, university, non-governmental, and consulting)

Specific members were sought from the following types of members, but there was no requirement for ensuring all of these potential members were included on the panel:

- Members with specific source sector experience in agriculture, stormwater, and on-site treatment systems (all listed members)
- Member from the prior National Academy of Science/National Research Council's Chesapeake Bay Independent Evaluation Committee (e.g., Sharpley).
- Member(s) with recognized national perspective and can provide a larger view than just a regional and local focus (e.g., York, Gieseke, Sharpley).
- Member with from a local government with well recognized hands-on experience with verification at the locality scale (e.g., Zimmerman, Stack)
- Member with demonstrated habitat restoration and mitigation program verification related experience (none—this could be a key unmet need)
- Private sector member with ISO 9000/14000 experience (not known)
- Member with LEED/Green Building Council experience with verification procedures (none)
- Member(s) from the Chesapeake Bay Commission's Economics of Nutrient Trading Study Advisory Council members (none—but several are members of the Committee itself—Baxter, McGee, Rhoderick)
- Members with recognized regional/local expertise so the members come to the table already knowing the Bay watershed states, the issues, and the challenges being faced (e.g., Dell, York, Gerel, Zimmerman, Hogan, Stack, Sharpley).

BMP VERIFICATION REVIEW PANEL OPERATIONS

During its August 16th conference call, the BMP Verification Committee also reviewed and approved for transmittal to the Management Board's final decision the BMP Verification Review Panel's operating procedures and overall current schedule (Attachment D).

DECISIONS REQUESTED

DECISION 1: Management Board approval of the draft charge to the BMP Verification Review Panel as recommended by the BMP Verification Committee.

DECISION 2: Management Board approval of the draft proposed operations for the BMP Verification Review Panel as recommended by the BMP Verification Committee.

DECISION 3: Management Board agreement on the list of nominees to be invited to participate as BMP Verification Review Panel members.