Overview of the Chesapeake Bay Program's BMP Panel Protocol

Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting,
June 17, 2014

Lucinda Power, US EPA
Chesapeake Bay Program Office

History & Development of BMP Efficiencies– Role of STAC

- 2007: STAC BMP Efficiencies Task Group reviewed logic and process used by MAWP/UMD to assess recommendations for BMP definitions & efficiencies
- Findings include:
  - Peer-review literature is more credible than design standards/manuals
  - Lack of justification behind magnitude of adjustments
  - More attention needs to be directed to assessment of research quality of BMP efficiencies
  - Best professional judgment was used to discount efficiencies to reflect variability

History & Development of BMP Efficiencies– Role of STAC

- 2008: STAC BMP Efficiencies Task Group reviewed process developed by MAWP/UMD to produce reduction effectiveness estimates for BMPs
- Recommendations include:
  - Develop formalized metrics for factors like results variability to ensure consistency and transparency
  - CBPO should adopt formal procedures to:
    - Evaluate BMP research results when reviewing or establishing BMP efficiencies
    - Undertake periodic literature reviews to assess current state of science
    - Update effectiveness rates on a regular basis based on any new science

What is the BMP Panel Protocol?

- Guides the process for bringing together scientists, technical experts, and practitioners to review best available science and data associated with BMP implementation (i.e. BMP Expert Panels)
- Articulates scope of BMP Expert Panels and expectations of Panel members
- Provides specific procedures for Partnership review and approval of BMP efficiencies
- Strives to establish a process that is **consistent, transparent, and scientifically defensible**

Data Source Matrix

Table 1. Data source characterization matrix			
	High confidence	**Medium confidence**	**Lowest confidence**
Applicability	Definition matches technical specifications	Generally representative	Somewhat representative
Study location	Very representative of soils and hydrology	Generally representative	Somewhat representative
Variability	Relatively Low	Medium	Relatively High
Number of studies	Many	Moderate	Few
Scientific support	Operational scale research (peer reviewed)	Research scale (peer reviewed)	Not peer reviewed (“gray” literature)

Refinements Suggested for Protocol

- Ensure Expert Panel process is transparent
- Process should be more inclusive of other partners, such as Goal Implementation Teams and STAC
- Provide flexibility to go beyond nutrient and sediment scope
- Clearly define conflict of interest and use of best professional judgment
- Streamline review and approval process

Expert Panel Resources

- Cooperative Agreements awarded to:
  - Virginia Tech
  - Chesapeake Stormwater Network
  - Center for Watershed Protection
- Tetra Tech support
- Continued funding for key coordinator positions
- Staffing support through the Chesapeake Research Consortium

Thank you!

Questions?