Process for Incorporating Proposed Changes from WTWG Members

Goal: Incorporate proposed changes agreed to by the EPA into Appendix V to be applied in the analysis of the 2021 Progress Data Submission.

Section I: Background – The Need for BMP Verification & Assessment

- No changes identified. Verbiage will be reviewed by EPA to ensure it is up to date.

Section II: EPA Progress and Verification Assessment

- Clarifying the potential consequences for "flagged" BMPs – If the raised issues are not resolved.
    - Currently the document states *"It is important to note that, according to EPA CBPO's Grant Guidance, in the event that data are not submitted on time, are inaccurate, or do not use the appropriate NEIEN or wastewater formats for the CBPO to calculate annual progress, the CBPO will use the previous year's data submitted by a jurisdiction or will not account for implementation of the BMP or control measures"*

- Clarify the guidelines for the QAPP evaluation portion of the progress evaluation and verification assessment.
    - Appendix V briefly touches on QAPPs, but the full guidelines are in Appendix Q. The purpose of Appendix V is to outline the Protocols for Verification of Annual BMP Data Submissions.

- Specifically address modeled load changes in the analyses outlined on page 3 as Modeled Load Changes is the first item under the verification assessment.

    The analysis by EPA and CBPO staff to assess the quality of submitted BMP data includes assessments for the following information:

    - *over- and under-reported implementation rates*
    - *newly reported BMPs*
    - *reported dates for implementation and inspection*

Proposed Changes to Analyses A-D

- *Proposal of a New Analysis (Analysis E):* Annual Rate of Implementation
    - We have the ability to isolate reported records (in acres reported) from NEIEN to track the change in reporting, or annual rate of implementation, from year to year.

- Update visuals under each analysis.

A. Modeled Load Changes

- Proposal to complete this analysis last after the Newly Reported BMPs (B) and Reported BMP Implementation Rate Changes (C).
    - Rationale: Once EPA and Bay Staff finalize the BMP analysis and ensure all datasets are accounted for and the implementation is well understood, then the loading analysis should be complete.

- Clarify that a significant percent change (page 3) is an increase or decrease greater than 2%.

    *The document states: "**In the past, "significant" has been defined as being greater than 2% but this can change from year to year depending on the measure of load changes (either back to 1985 or back to 2009**) that are used as reference points. Whichever percentage change was used in the analysis, it is the same for every source and for every jurisdiction in order to provide equity in the measure."*

- Explain the differences between the verification assessments for each analysis. Page 4 and Page 5 reference "The second verification assessment…" and a "re-run".
    - This refers to the two versions of annual load changes, one with the change form published versions of previous years' official scenarios and the second with re-runs including submitted data to see how the reported historic BMP implementation has changed. This can be expanded upon with a visual.

B. Newly Reported BMPs

- Referencing page 5, add an additional example of newly reported information, such as a new method of reporting or a BMP that is new to the Bay watershed model.
    - Example given: reporting of stormwater performance standard BMPs was a new method of reporting with insufficient detail in prior records to create historic implementation (and reported under other BMPs).

- Clarify definition of "inventory number" and the expectations of providing historic data.
    - If an inventory is being reported to the Bay Program, the practices need to be reported with accurate implementation dates to track how the practice implementation has changed through time.

C. Reported BMP Implementation Rate Changes

- Explain what is meant by "implementation" as some partners refer to implementation as only annual implementation. Is there a better word choice to define "cumulative implementation" (implementation over time)?
    - Clearly state what constitutes a "rate of implementation" for each BMP.

- Clarify what the most recent progress year is being compared to (*the annual change, the previous progress year to the current progress year and the change over time, from the 2009 progress year to the current progress year*).
    - Clearly state the equations/processes used to determine the rate of implementation for BMPs.

D. Implementation and Inspection Dates for Reported BMPs

- Proposed two options: 1) Discontinue analysis D due to the repetitive date issue or 2) Exclude USDA funded practices from analysis D.
    - To expand on option 2: Jurisdictions may provide a list of BMPs that are aggregated and assigned a date as part of their reporting process. As an example, for Virginia, this may include ag and urban NM, tillage, ESC, FHP, and all USDA records. This would need to be properly documented in the state QAPP if EPA considers this option.

- Repetitive dates may have resulted from data that was aggregated at a county scale being provided repetitive dates during the phase 6 historical data collection process.
    - These BMPs need to be properly identified and the condition should be documented in Appendix V.

- Acknowledge that federally reported (USDA/FSA) BMPs are always aggregated and provided to jurisdictions with repeated dates.
    - This will be further expanded on to mention that the QAPP should specifically list the BMPs and their sources for which this condition applies.
    - Jurisdictions have stated they received verbal guidance to pick a date in that water year and apply that to each record. If this guidance is correct, this guidance needs to be included in this document.

Section III: Schedule for Verification of Annual BMP Data Submissions

- Update Page 8 – "each jurisdiction's password-protected online files."
    - All validation reports for each draft Progress scenario are available to the technical representatives through CAST.