

# 2012 Progress Review—Lessons Learned

---

## 2012 Review: Successes, Data Errors, and Outstanding Issues—Olivia Devereux

1. Fewer corrections required:

Progress Year	NEIEN-only submissions	Scenario Builder-only runs	Watershed Model runs
2011	2-9	2	3
2012	2-7	1	2

2. Far fewer changes made to Annual Progress Review data by CBP; data was managed by the jurisdictions. CBP built in a way to systematically handle exceptions (See document: *Changes Made to Annual Progress Review Data*).
3. Fewer data errors than in previous years. Some errors found in NRCS data (two states). For example, there were some BMPs that were submitted as feet but marked as acres
  - Grassed waterways (Grass Buffers). Thousands in 2012 compared to <100 in prior years.
  - Animal trails and walkways (barnyard runoff control).
4. CBP Submitted vs. Credited reporting error corrected.
5. Multiple states had NEIEN file submission issues, such as duplicate or missing data submissions.
6. Implementation from previous years may be showing up as “new” implementation for 2012.
7. NRCS BMP-Wetland restoration includes phragmites removal—acceptable to NRCS, does not meet CBP’s definition.
8. CREP Forest buffers: Most of the contracts are for 15 years. The first contract expirations have just started to come up in the last year or so. Ideally, most of those landowners will re-enroll to keep receiving the rental payments for the buffer they originally planted (and to assure us the forest acres are conserved for another 15 years). If they do re-enroll, that will show up as new buffer acres in the FSA data. Without removal of the expired contracts, we will be double counting those CREP forest buffers. How can we handle this moving forward?

## 2013 Progress Review Scheduling—Matt Johnston and Marty Hurd

1. Progress Schedule
2. New submission deadline of December 1<sup>st</sup>
3. NEIEN Open Enrollment period—what it means for jurisdictions

## Issues to be Addressed for 2013—Jeff Sweeney

1. Submittal process—jurisdictions should independently be using NEIEN Node and creating XML.

2. Verification—the Verification Subcommittee is reviewing NEIEN fields that may be required in the future. These include: source of data (e.g.: agency), qualifiers for manure application on cover crops, capacity for AWMS/excess manure spreading, and others. The Scenario Builder team will provide more specifics on how to use these existing fields.
3. QAPPs are to document how jurisdictions are reporting progress run data. The Scenario Builder Team, Tim Roberts and the Grants Project Officers, and Mary Ellen Ley will clarify how often QAPPs need to be updated and in what format, what they need to include so that the CBIG/CBRAP project officers can facilitate the grant monitoring process.
4. Poultry phytase—The Progress Team has been adding this BMP to the states' submission. Jurisdictions submit this BMP for Milestone and WIP scenarios, and should submit to NEIEN for 2013. Also, there is an expert panel looking into the reductions, which may provide more options/changes.
5. There is a new wastewater module on BayTAS. This is an online tool that may be used for 2013 wastewater submissions. The wastewater module produces error reports and should decrease the amount of time spent identifying and correcting errors.

## General Reminders on Progress Requirements—Olivia Devereux

1. **Scale:** Jurisdictions are requested to submit data to NEIEN at the finest scale they have. CBP is addressing the modeled scale issue as follows.
  - a. **Problem:** The more specific scale on which data is used in the models, the more cutoff (e.g.: PA urban stream restoration on a land-river segment with zero acres in that land use).
  - b. **Solution:** Rolling up BMPs to larger land use groups than the scale submitted generates more model credit.
2. History can be revised in NEIEN. All BMPs may be resubmitted post 2005 except land use change BMPs, which are post 2007. Jurisdictions may update all the data, not just some BMPs. Jurisdictions may update moving backward in time, but cannot do an earlier year without subsequent years. For example, a state may not update 2007 without also updating 2008-2009.
3. Progress reporting is for changes in management. The model measures *changes*.
  - a. Example: Changing the reported BMP name due to a reinterpretation of BMP definitions is not a change in management.
  - b. Example: Forest preservation is not a land use change, but keeps the land use in the same condition.
4. BMPs should be tracked. BMPs should not be estimated by looking at available acres and determining a percent implementation. BMPs should not be submitted as acres by applying a percent implementation to acres available and then submitting those acres as if they were tracked.
5. BMPs should be submitted with the actual implementation dates
6. Voluntary implementation is not currently recorded in the Annual Progress Review.
7. Interim BMPs are not to be used in Progress.