

How do you view your role as a WTWG member?

keep up to date on best practices for reporting progress data for the model

understanding the benefits of the various BMPs as they relate to one another to ensure consistency

Provide insight that can enhance CAST to mirror on the ground activities.

Active Participant

Facilitate discussion - Remain neutral to the best of my ability.

Collaborator – value the opportunity to connect with colleagues working on the same processes from different jurisdictions or agencies

Remaining impartial, meaning I do not represent a sector, to review procedures and credits across those sectors

As an engaged and contributing member that provides input, feedback, and recommendations to the WG from a federal agency perspective.

Neutral voice representing on the ground practitioners

How do you view your role as a WTWG member?

ensure reporting reqs are in-line with real world applications

review so we aren't gaming the system/model

I do find the meetings engaging and find lots of value in the "side discussions" that sometimes happen in the chat - I wonder if that can be introduced somehow to the agenda. Maybe 15 minutes per meeting of free discussion?

react to new rules and opportunities passed down from EPA to the jurisdictions regarding BMP implementation and reporting

provide feedback on the technical appendix of expert panel reports

Ensure that state BMPs are being correctly credited in the TMDL effort. That state practice definitions are in agreement with bay model definitions and that data collection efforts are not unduly onerous

Coordinate between source sector work groups and reporting

What would you like to see the WTWG discuss in future meetings?

How does the monitoring data match up with our modeled results?

Data Quality Assessments - especially those used as model input

maybe review the "new BMPS implemented" charts from NEIEN that were used in our progress assessment this year. I realized ours are almost DOUBLE for some BMPs because they weren't making it through CAST and we had to submit them 2 different ways.

touch upon the fact that jurisdictions have been asked to come up with new forest buffer strategies - this seems to be happening somewhat outside the usual WIP channels, so it would be helpful to hear from WTWG leaders and colleagues about it

Are there cross-sector BMPs, ex solar is climate resilience also has stormwater and ag implications, the WTWG could review?

A more jurisdictional approach to technical CAST issues instead of overall watershed summary.

Change report outputs to make review of submitted vs credited easier to review and comprehend.

BMP tracking, reporting, and simulation/ crediting in the watershed model with respect to what other WG, GITs, and Ad Hoc teams are considering.

Variable BMP crediting based on proximity to a stream corridor

What would you like to see the WTWG discuss in future meetings?

How jurisdictions vary with data collection/submission to the model.

BMP data reporting - maintain integrity for credits but lower burden on implementers

how to work better with the living resource focused groups w/in CBPO. b/c mussels, oyster reefs, etc. as BMPs are hot topic

BMP performance over time

in the BMPVAHAT group, we started having good, honest discussions about what is working/not working in our jurisdiction regarding verification. Maybe we could continue that since BMPVAHAT has stopped meeting.

Being transparent about the error associated with CAST.

How could our WTWG meetings be more effective and engaging?

It is good to compare among states the reporting practices. We can learn from each other and save having to reinvent the wheel.

Your charm makes it all worthwhile.

I think they are already effective and engaging

Make sure materials are sent out before the meeting and meeting decision asks are clear

Please post meeting materials 2-3 days before the meeting. Please send out the meeting minutes prior to the meeting. It is an inefficient use of time to be asked to discuss or decide something when the background information is not provided.

"step up, step back" as a membership 'guideline'. too often hear from the same people

The meetings are usually fine, and it's nice to have Cassie presenting sometimes. Good stuff.

I echo the comment about meeting materials being sent out earlier - topics require collaborative answers sometimes, and there isn't always enough time to get those conversations in ahead of time.

Decisions can be made faster when information is provided before the meeting. Sending out tasks with due dates between meeting facilitates decisions at the meetings.

How could our WTWG meetings be more effective and engaging?

use tools like menti