

# Proposed Revisions to the BMP Expert Panel Protocols

Jeremy Hanson, CRC and Lucinda Power, EPA/CBPO  
March 8, 2022 STAC Quarterly Meeting

# Impetus for Revisions

- BMP Expert Panel Protocols last revised in 2015. Many updates and lessons learned since that time
- Questions and concerns have been raised about the process associated with convening and executing Expert Panels, as well as the application of the existing Protocols

# Highlights of Proposed Revisions

- Separation of the scientific findings of an Expert Panel report from the technical appendix, which explains how the BMP is to be tracked, verified, and reported for progress
  - Scientific findings would be reviewed by partnership, but only technical appendix and whether scientific findings are incorporated into CAST would require partnership approval
  - Development of scientific findings and technical appendices would occur concurrently
- Any requests to revisit an existing Expert Panel report must include scientific justification for doing so

# Highlights of Proposed Revisions

- A suggested definition for “best professional judgement” was added
- The communication of the status of Expert Panels was consolidated and the website for Expert Panel reports and associated documentation was updated to reflect all CBP-partnership approved Expert Panel reports
- Language was added that “It is the responsibility of the hosting Workgroup, GIT, or the original requestor for the Expert Panel to identify and provide any required resources needed to convene and fully execute an Expert Panel,” following this Protocol and in consultation with the CBP partnership

# Highlights of Comments *(not comprehensive)*

**First comment period ended on February 18, 2022.**

- Ensure Expert Panels function in a manner consistent with a peer review process (independent and diverse group of experts to review report once finalized by Expert Panel)
- Questions about logistics and timing of developing the technical appendices, along with Expert Panel reports
- Flesh out definition and use of Best Professional Judgement in Expert Panel deliberations; perhaps subject to independent peer review
- Concern that support for convening and executing expert panel falls to the requestor, workgroup, and/or GIT

# Next Steps

- March 28 WQGIT Meeting: Presentation of revised protocols based on comments received to date; response to comments document
- March 29 – April 29: Final review and comment period
- May 23 and/or June 27 WQGIT Meetings: Seeking consensus on revisions
- **What role would STAC like to play in the review and comment period?**

# Questions?

Jeremy Hanson

WQGIT Coordinator/STAC Research Associate

Chesapeake Research Consortium

[hansonj@chesapeake.org](mailto:hansonj@chesapeake.org)

Lucinda Power

Implementation and Evaluation Team Leader

EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office

[power.lucinda@epa.gov](mailto:power.lucinda@epa.gov)