A. Specific Practices to Explore Partial/Variable Credit:
1) Animal Waste Management Systems
2) Barnyard Runoff Control
3) Loafing Lots
4) Forest Buffers
5) Grass Buffers

How do you interpret the concept of partial/variable credit?

B. Specific Practices to Address Credit Duration and any inconsistencies that may currently exist:

1) Forest Buffers
2) Grass Buffers
3) Exclusion Fencing with Forest Buffers
4) Barnyard Runoff Control
5) Loafing Lots
6) Animal Waste Management Systems
7) Ag Stream Restoration
8) Urban Stream Restoration
9) Ag Tree Planting
10) Urban Tree Planting

BMP	Resource Improvement (RI)	Credit duration	Established	Ref
Barnyard Runoff Control		10	2003	CBP Nutrient Subcommittee
Barnyard clean water diversion RI	RI-16	5	2014	Berg et al.
Loafing Lot Management		10	2003	CBP Nutrient Subcommittee
Animal Waste Management System		15	2016	Hawkins et al.
Grass Buffers		10	2009/2014	Simpson and Lane (Weammert); Belt et al.
Grass buffer on watercourse RI	RI-8	5	2014	Ensor et al.
Grass buffer - narrow		10		
Grass nutrient exclusion area on watercourse RI	RI-7	5	2014	Ensor et al.
Forest Buffers		10	2009/2014	Simpson and Lane (Weammert); Belt et al.
Forest buffer narrow		10		
Forest buffer on watercourse RI	RI-10	5	2014	Ensor et al.
Forest nutrient exclusion area on watercourse RI	RI-9	5	2014	Ensor et al.
Forest buffer with exclusion fencing		10	2009/2014	Simpson and Lane (Weammert); Belt et al.
Exclusion fence with forest buffer RI	RI-6	5	2014	Ensor et al.
Exclusion fence with narrow forest buffer	RI-4b	5		
Grass buffer with exclusion fencing		10	2009/2014	Simpson and Lane (Weammert); Belt et al.
Exclusion fence with grass buffer RI	RI-5	5	2014	Ensor et al.
Exclusion fence with narrow grass buffer RI	RI-4a	5	2014	Ensor et al.
Grass buffer-narrow with exclusion fence		10		
Ag Tree Planting		10	Trib Strat	
Urban Forest Planting		15	2016	Law et al.
Urban tree canopy expansion		10	2016	Law et al.
Urban forest buffer		10	Trib Strat	
Ag Stream Restoration		10	2014*	Berg et al.
Urban Stream Restoration		5	2014	Berg et al.

C. Additional Verification Concerns:

1) Understanding the intersection of credit duration and back out for land use change practices. The Verification Framework and Jurisdiction verification plans pre-dated the Partnership's decisions to regularly update land cover data. When the land cover data (or ag census) data is updated, land use change practices reported installed prior to the date of the imagery (or survey) are backed out of the reporting. The presentation would lay out the details of credit duration for land use change practices and walk us through examples of BMP processing for land use change practices, specifically how practice credit duration and back out are applied.

Are land use change BMPs when removed due to credit duration still included in the back out?

Is the back out amount updated each year to account for practices removed for credit duration?

Are there differences between the land use change and upland treatment portions of these practices as it relates to back out and credit duration?

Request for Clarification: When BMPs reach the end of their credit duration and are not verified, or fail inspection, for the new NEIEN submittal, they do not appear in the "submitted" column in CAST, which would then affect the "amount backed out" column (referring to the Submitted Vs. Credited report), and I don't think yesterday's discussion clarified that connection very well.

2) Alternative verification methods (e.g. remote sensing, statistically representative sub-sampling) have repeatedly been identified by the CBP as possible options for jurisdictions, but it seems the focus has remained on one-to-one visual verification. Aware of a couple examples of states/agencies attempting to incorporate alternative methods in their verification plans but receiving resistance from the CBP. Granted, visual verification of every implemented BMP may be possible in some well-funded smaller jurisdictions, but it does not seem feasible everywhere. Therefore, I request that the *ad hoc* team explore the feasibility of alternative verification methods.

3) Impact of Verification on 2019 Progress. A presentation summarizing the BMPs that were removed from the reporting due to credit duration and estimating the additional load reduction that could have been gained if all of the practices had been credited.

Which BMPs were most frequently lost for credit duration.

What commonalities exist between jurisdictions?

4) Progress updates from Workgroups working on other verification issues. Presentation from workgroups chairs/assigned CBPO staff on the progress made in addressing items from the WQGIT Memo/MB response.