

Nontidal Network Workgroup Monthly meeting

Wednesday, August 16th, 2023

1:00PM – 2:00PM

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

This meeting was recorded for internal use to assure the accuracy of meeting notes.

ACTIONS/NEXT STEPS

- ✓ USGS: By mid-October at the latest, a decision must be reached on whether USGS will conduct analysis of the 2022 Nontidal loads and trends, or the 2023 Nontidal loads and trends. Jurisdictions and researchers who rely on these trends should be consulted.
 - Additional action – create a timeline for the proposed change to help visualize it.
- ✓ Tom Parham reach out to Mark Nardi regarding the issue of potentially moving the Patuxent at Bowie NTN monitoring site. If needed, schedule special issue meeting with NTN in September to get feedback.

MINUTES

1:00 PM Welcome and announcements

- [University of Maryland Symposium on Environmental Justice and Health Disparities](#) – September 11-12 ([virtual](#)) and September 14-16 ([in person](#)), University of Maryland, Stamp Student Union.
- [Chesapeake Studies Conference](#) – September 15-16, 2023, Salisbury University, Salisbury, MD.
- [Potomac Conference](#) – September 21, 2023, Lorton, VA.
- [Virginia Water Monitoring Conference](#) – September 26, 2023, Henrico, VA.
- [Chesapeake Watershed Forum](#) – November 3-5, 2023, Shepherdstown, VA.
- [CERF 2023 Conference: Resilience & Recovery](#) – November 12-16, 2023, Portland, Oregon.
- [National Conference on Ecosystem Restoration](#) – April 14-19, 2024, Albuquerque, New Mexico. [Abstracts](#) are due September 1, 2023.

1:10 PM Updates

- Updates on reconstruction of historic and current data sets (James Colgin)
 - As a reminder, I'm pulling in as much NTN data as I can including in house data used to compile loads and trends, data from CBP data hub, and water portal. First I got together a cross walk connecting the data sources and sites. Now that I've got the data sources all connected and pulled in all the data, right now I'm able to output a bunch of plots by site and by parameter. That will be a step in

looking through this data to identify discrepancies, both visually and with tables. If we want to go to the data provider if we're seeing big discrepancies at a certain site/parameter we can.

- Doug: As we're starting to look at the completeness/accuracy of these regenerated database and the dataset for each NTN site, USGS team will be going through and seeing how similar or different it is from historical data. Will interact with each of the jurisdictions for their sites if there are issues or to give an update on where we stand. James gave a presentation to the Data Integrity WG, which includes all the labs analyzing our tidal and nontidal samples. We asked them if they would review our process for coming up with individual constituents for evaluating TN and TP. Sometimes in the record we have a direct determination, while other times we add individual pieces to get to a total. James has a one size fits all decision tree for this. We want to make sure that each lab agrees with these rules to see if we need to make any modifications or if they support continuing to use it. We were told that review probably can't occur until the fall. Once we look at new compared to old database we will sit down with each of the lab groups and see if they agree with our decision tree.
- There will be a delay in the running of 2022 loads and trends. I will want to work with the NTN and leadership at EPA to propose shifting to a 2023 analysis which is within a year already. We would run 2023 instead of 2022. That would position our results well for the approach to 2025. Also allows us to ensure we're at a good point with the database. We'd want to work with the teams here to ensure that the data transmission is as expedient as possible. This is an idea just at this point. There are people who rely on our results.
- Peter said the idea of having data transmittals sped up would be an issue within our grants since there are dates in our calendar we agreed to. With everyone's capacity it may be difficult to speed up data transmittals given deadlines already agreed upon.
- Doug said one benefit of having one more year would be that all 2 of our NTN stations would have trend results for all constituents.
- Durga: I looked through all the data you sent us. I know we're looking at historic data. I'm just trying to think does inclusion of historic data impact any of the rules that we are creating? Basically, are we restricting ourselves by using historic data, and should we think about a mid-section data? Should we only emphasize later data vs historic data? I'm a little concerned about the impact of going back to the jurisdictions would be given the time lag.
- Doug responded: I appreciate the concern. I don't think we can avoid opening up the historical window because we want to reproduce the data. Right now the

concern is how was those historical data gathered, stored and included as part of our every other year running of loads and trends. This is a process to have confidence in the database. I understand the time sink potential issue but all we would be asking is do you agree with the data sets, are there any quality issues? It's more data completeness as number 1 objective (does each jurisdiction believe we have all data to represent that NTN station) and are there any QA issues that they can address?

- Durga: I see your perspective. My question is that I understand the part about completeness of data sets and QA. My question is can the same set of rules that we define now apply to a truncated data set as well as a completed, as in historically completed data set? Or do you think at some point we should consider a different set of rules for historical data sets in which we have some ambiguity in methods, vs data sets that are more complete which are later datasets.
- Doug: I think our team has been treating them the same. I don't think we would discriminate whether it was collected 20 years ago or last year. Our initial QA analysis will reveal any issues coming in. Before we run our loads and trends we are looking at the entire dataset as a single dataset, even though we know there are caveats.
- Peter: re 2022 or 2023 decision we would want to check with Kaylyn, as project officer. We are looking at this reaching 2025/beyond 2025 for information, and many products are targeting that. Recognizing that this is a one time concentrated issue. Once you have 2023 would you recreate a 2022 and a 2023, or just skipping 2022?
- Doug: Skipping 2022. The resources that would have gone to the load and trend analysis for 2022 have been channeled towards helping with database and documentation as well as rolling into this next 2023 analysis and report out.
- Peter: Would RIM analysis still stay on an annual schedule?
- Doug: We are on an annual basis but we would say as we get into next year to expedite it, maybe having a one time running of NTN and RIM loads at the same time so there isn't a delay. And everything is connected so we'd want to have discussions within the CBP community on hypoxia analysis to see if that would impact them, we don't want to put them in a bad situation.
- Peter: Can we get a timeline for this/Gant chart, please?
- Doug: Yes, we can do that. **ACTION**
- August: When does this decision need to be made?

- Peter: Late fall is when people would be looking for results. So we have about 1-2 months to come up with a decision. Let's connect with jurisdictions and monitoring team to see how this schedule change would impact everyone.

ACTION

- Updates on small agricultural watershed monitoring sites (Kaylyn Gootman)
 - Talking with partners across the watershed to find locations that work in different states. Have an agreement set up with NRCS and have a great lead in Delaware. Two potential sites with help from PA DEP in PA. Had good conversations with MD. Jimmy Webber has been working on Virginia.
 - Next month there will be another water quality GIT submersion series focused on small agricultural watershed monitoring sites. Tentative date Sept. 14th. Not just USGS but partners across the watershed.
 - Peter added that there is so much material it will probably be two webinars eventually. This series is a way to get managers the pure science without worrying about policy questions.
- Field audits funding (Peter Tango)
 - Before covid, we had money set aside to support this, but due to the pandemic funds weren't used and they went back into EPA for other things. We brought that issue to Lee McDonnell. He said we need to revisit that and it's on his radar. I don't have a funding amount or date in hand, but he understands that it is a need where funding went away.
 - Kaylyn: It's at the top of my list as we start to talk about the next budgets. We'll make sure it doesn't fall through the cracks.
 - Peter: The next FY starts in October, and it would be helpful to have something for then so we can plan for that.

1:30 PM Planning ahead – Peter Tango

- Planning for a potential partial government shutdown
 - In the past our programs have gone on while waiting for the government to reopen. If there are things we need to do on our side, funding side, capacity?
- Early budget results & possibility of level funding
 - Not sure how/if this will affect us. Just recognizing that it may potentially impact us. We've just done our scopes of work and everything that Lee has provided us with infrastructure money is robust.
- Let us know if you have topics for next meeting.

- Tom Parham: We're talking about moving the Patuxent site at Bowie and want to get everyone's insight. There's ownership and structural issues. One of the options is to move 500 yards downstream to a beach.
- Peter: we'll definitely put that on the next meeting schedule. Something I missed. Moving a RIM site is huge.
- Doug: Is there a bridge at the downstream site, or how will storms be collected? Are we able to have dual sample collection at both locations to see how well they compare?
- Tom: Mark has been to these sites and based on scouting it seemed like a viable site.
- Doug: Are they relocating the gauge as well?
- Tom: I think so. The bridge is crumbling and banks are undercutting. Where they were trying to attach their gear had issues.
- Peter: When Mark and I touched on this recently there was some expectation of doing some dual comparisons between the old and new sites.
- Tom: I will reach out to Mark and see what the timeline is and if a focused meeting in September would be needed. **ACTION**

2:00 PM Adjourn

Participants: August Goldfischer (CRC), Bhanu Paudel (DE DNREC), Cindy Johnson (VADEQ), Doug Chambers (USGS), Doug Moyer (USGS), Durga Ghosh (USGS), James Colgin (USGS), Kaylyn Gootman (EPA), Kristen Heyer (MD DNR), Lori Brown (DE DNREC), Lucretia Brown (DC DOEE), Mark Brickner (PA DEP), Meighan Wisswell (VA DEQ), Mike Mallonee (ICPRB), Nick Murray (WVDEP), Nicholas Santoro (USGS), Peter Tango (USGS), Tammy Zimmerman (USGS), Tom Parham (MD DNR), Tyler Shenk (SRBC)