

## Expectations for 2013 Progress Model Assessment

### Adhere to schedule for 2013 Progress

- **July 31, 2013** – BMP listing, descriptions, and mapping were due from jurisdictions for any proposed BMPs that will be submitted for the 2013 Progress assessment that are NOT included in the NEIEN Appendix.
- **July 31, 2013** – Requests to modify the NEIEN Schema or Plug-In were due.
- **August 30, 2013** – Watershed Technical Workgroup approves agreed-upon changes to the NEIEN Schema and Plug-In for 2013 Progress as well as agreed-upon mapping requests for the Appendix.
- **August 30, 2013** – Data submissions and descriptions due for 1) permitted harvest acres and 2) continually disturbed and permitted construction acres – including estimates of any unpermitted acres.
- **September, 2013** – Jurisdictions to be provided with animal projections for 2013 Progress assessment – if needed for any changes to CAFO/AFO animal splits.
- **October, 2013** – Final approval of the 2013 pre-BMP land use and CAFO/AFO animal splits.
- **December 1, 2013** – BMP submissions due from jurisdictions for 2013 model progress assessment – both wastewater data and non-wastewater BMPs.
- **December 1, 2013** – deadline for submission of jurisdictional requests for BMP geographic roll-ups with justifications for 2013 Progress.
- *January 15, 2014* – Jurisdictions submit draft 2014-2015 milestone input deck and programmatic milestones.
- *February 4, 2014* – Scheduled date for USDA 2012 Ag Census data.
- **February 15, 2014** – Final 2013 Progress run information available to jurisdictions.
  - Final needed for outside reporting of progress on commitments and to keep results relevant.
- *Feb 15, 2014* – Jurisdictions receive EPA comments on programmatic and numeric milestone submission of January 15.
- *March 17, 2014* – Jurisdictions have option to submit amended draft milestone input deck and/or revised programmatic milestones based on EPA comments/**2013 Progress run results**.
- *April 8, 2014* – Revised 2015 projections available; EPA starts to rerun latest milestone input decks with these 2015 background conditions.
- *April 15, 2014* – EPA provides results of latest milestone model run on updated 2015 projections to jurisdictions.
- *May 15, 2014* – Jurisdictions submit final input decks and programmatic milestones based on updated 2015 projection information as well as **final 2013 progress run results** and EPA comments on January 15 submissions.
- *July 15, 2014* – EPA completes evaluation of final milestone commitments and loading targets.

### Other expectations of 2013 Progress

Much of the following is from 2012 Progress Review (Lessons Learned) @ 4/13/13 Watershed Technical Workgroup meeting @

[http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel\\_files/19138/2012\\_progress--lessons\\_learned\\_corrected.pdf](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/19138/2012_progress--lessons_learned_corrected.pdf)

- Submittal process – jurisdictions are to be independently using NEIEN Node and creating XML.

- Expecting fewer corrections to submitted data than previous years.
  - Jurisdictions report BMPs as they occur on the landscape.
    - Finest legal spatial scale, accurate implementation date, original BMP name, attributes of project, etc.
    - QAPPs are to document how jurisdictions are reporting progress run data and should be up to date 1) to assist in facilitation of grant monitoring process by CBIG/CBRAP project officers (See presentation at 4/1/13 Watershed Technical Workgroup meeting @ [http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel\\_files/19138/sweeney\\_qapp-wtwg\\_040113.pdf](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/19138/sweeney_qapp-wtwg_040113.pdf)), 2) to accommodate needs of the CBP Verification Review Panel.
  - NEIEN provides a cross-walk to SB land uses and BMP names.
  - CBPO QA/QC provides credit where input follows the rules associated with the BMP and no credit where the input violates those rules.
    - As with 2012 Progress, jurisdictions will re-submit when necessary rather than CBPO making changes on behalf of the jurisdictions.
- Verification – Proposed Addendum to the BMP Verification Principles: Transparency
  - Transparency means operating in a way so any outside reviewer can determine what actions were taken, which data were synthesized to generate a report or conclusion, how data was collected and obtained, what measures were employed to ensure data accuracy, who is responsible for data collection and synthesis, who is responsible for ensuring data accuracy, and the methods of data analysis utilized.
  - Recommendations
    1. The measure of transparency will be applied to three primary areas of verification: data collection, data synthesis and data reporting.
    2. Transparency of the process of data collection must incorporate independent QA/QC procedures, which may be implemented by the data-collecting agency or by an independent third party.
    3. Transparency of the data reported should be transparent at the most site-specific scale that conforms with legal and programmatic constraints, and at a scale compatible to data input for the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership modeling tools.
    4. It is recognized that transparency of data reported will vary across verification methods and data collection and reporting programs. This variance, however, should not negate the commitment and obligation to ensure transparency at the highest level possible in collection, synthesis and reporting.
  - Verification Subcommittee will be reviewing NEIEN fields that may be required in the future.
    - These include, but are not limited to, source of data (e.g., agency); qualifiers for manure application on cover crops; capacity for AWMS/excess manure spreading; others.
  - Most “voluntary” implementation is not currently eligible for “credit” in the Watershed Model assessment; however, there are some exceptions.

- For example, conservation-tillage that follows CBP definition and is tracked through valid methods is eligible.
  - Voluntary BMPs can be recorded through NEIEN (for potential credit in the future), just not mapped to CBP BMPs until guidance is complete from CBP Verification Review Panel and verification operating “on the ground”.
- History of implementation can be revised only back to the first year of NEIEN submissions (2010 Progress = post-July 1, 2009 implementation) – only to improve accuracy of data implemented during this period.
- Progress reporting is for changes in management. The model measures *changes*.
  - Example: Changing the reported BMP name due to a reinterpretation of the BMP definitions is not a change in management.
  - Example: Forest preservation is not a land use change, but keeps the land use in the same condition.
- Expectation is that BMPs are tracked, not estimated (for example) by looking at available acres in the model and determining a percent implementation – which is, in turn, converted to acres and submitted as if tracked.
- 2013 Progress assessment will use projected background conditions for crops, land use and animal populations that do not incorporate USDA’s 2012 Ag Census data expected in February, 2014 – as the final 2013 Progress run information is due February, 2014.
- BMPs that were formally “interim” that have been approved by relevant groups (through WQGIT) are available for “credit” in the 2013 Progress assessment. Currently and since 2012 Progress, these BMPs include the following:
  - New State Stormwater Performance Standards
  - Urban Stormwater Retrofits
  - Urban Nutrient Management
  - Urban Stream Restoration
- Interim BMPs – or those that have not been approved by relevant groups (through WQGIT) by November 1, 2013 – are not available for “credit” in the 2013 Progress assessment. BMPs currently on the interim list that are also in process at the Expert Panel level include the following:
  - Agricultural Nutrient Management (efficiency version), Continuous No-Till, Poultry Litter, Enhanced Erosion and Sediment Control, Urban Filter Strips, Urban Tree Canopy and other forestry, Shoreline Erosion Control, Algal Turf Scrubbers, Illicit Discharge Elimination, Advanced Onsite Systems
- Jurisdictions are expected to QA/QC for multiple counting and missing data prior to submissions – for all sources of data including NRCS.
  - NRCS BMP-Wetland restoration includes phragmites removal which is acceptable to NRCS but does not meet CBP’s definition.
  - CREP forest buffers in 15-year contracts that are re-enrolled to keep receiving the rental payments are not to be reported as new buffer acres from the FSA data. Without removal of the expired contracts, CREP forest buffers will be double counted.

- Part of QA/QC is careful review by jurisdictions of the following reports:
  - NEIEN/BayTAS reports – comparing what was submitted to NEIEN and what validated.
  - ScenarioBuilder reports – comparing outputs of NEIEN and what goes to the Watershed Model, a.k.a. submitted versus credited.
- Active communication between CBPO and jurisdictions is expected to ensure accurate data that's processed on schedule. The expectation is to proactively identify possible problems and address them.