



# 2012 Progress Calendar

## Land Use, Animal and Septic Projections

Jeff Sweeney  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Chesapeake Bay Program Office  
[jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net)  
410-267-9844

Watershed Technical Workgroup Meeting  
Chesapeake Bay Program Office  
Annapolis, MD  
October 1, 2012



# 2012 Model Assessment

## Proposed Schedule

Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	Resource Names
<b>2012 Progress Run</b>	<b>130 days</b>	<b>Mon 9/3/12</b>	<b>Fri 3/1/13</b>	<b>Stakeholders</b>
<b>Update BMP submission list, new mappings</b>	<b>30 days</b>	<b>Mon 9/3/12</b>	<b>Fri 10/12/12</b>	<b>Stakeholders</b>
<b>Address "parking lot" items</b>	<b>21 days</b>	<b>Mon 9/3/12</b>	<b>Mon 10/1/12</b>	<b>TT</b>
<b>Projections</b>	<b>31 days</b>	<b>Mon 9/3/12</b>	<b>Mon 10/15/12</b>	<b>Stakeholders</b>
<b>Data projections (land, animals, septic)</b>	<b>15 days</b>	<b>Mon 9/3/12</b>	<b>Fri 9/21/12</b>	<b>CBPO</b>
<b>Jurisdictions review and comment on projections, AFO/CAFO splits</b>	<b>10 days</b>	<b>Mon 9/24/12</b>	<b>Fri 10/5/12</b>	<b>Jurisdictions</b>
<b>Revised projections provided to jurisdictions</b>	<b>3 days</b>	<b>Mon 10/8/12</b>	<b>Wed 10/10/12</b>	<b>CBPO</b>
<b>Final approval of projections</b>	<b>3 days</b>	<b>Thu 10/11/12</b>	<b>Mon 10/15/12</b>	<b>Jurisdictions</b>
<b>Update Node Plug-in</b>	<b>4 days</b>	<b>Tue 12/4/12</b>	<b>Fri 12/7/12</b>	<b>TT</b>
<b>Initial 2012 Data Submit</b>	<b>30 days</b>	<b>Tue 10/16/12</b>	<b>Mon 12/14/12</b>	<b>Jurisdictions</b>
<b>Feedback, Review, Progress Run Results</b>	<b>48 days</b>	<b>Wed 10/17/12</b>	<b>Fri 12/21/12</b>	<b>Stakeholders</b>
<b>Jurisdictions confirm NEIEN Summary Reports &amp; resubmit; Fixes if needed</b>	<b>43 days</b>	<b>Wed 10/17/12</b>	<b>Fri 12/14/12</b>	<b>Jurisdictions</b>
<b>CBPO internal data review &amp; Submitted-Versus-Credited Report</b>	<b>38 days</b>	<b>Wed 10/24/12</b>	<b>Fri 12/21/12</b>	<b>CBPO</b>



# 2012 Model Assessment Proposed Schedule

Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	Resource Names
2012 Progress Run	130 days	Mon 9/3/12	Fri 3/1/13	Stakeholders
<b>Final 2012 Data Submit</b>	<b>1 day</b>	<b>Mon 12/31/12</b>	<b>Mon 12/31/12</b>	<b>Jurisdictions</b>
Data Cleanup & Review Iterations	38 days	Wed 1/2/13	Fri 2/22/13	Stakeholders
Jurisdiction sign-off on final NEIEN Data Summary Reports	6 days	Wed 1/2/13	Wed 1/9/13	Jurisdictions
Generate Submitted-Versus-Credited Reports	13 days	Wed 1/2/13	Fri 1/18/13	CBPO
Feedback, review, resubmit data	10 days	Mon 1/21/13	Fri 2/1/13	Jurisdictions
Generate Submitted-Versus-Credited Reports	10 days	Mon 2/4/13	Fri 2/15/13	CBPO
Feedback, review, resubmit data	5 days	Mon 2/18/13	Fri 2/22/13	Stakeholders
<b>Progress Run Finalized based on Feedback</b>	<b>5 days</b>	<b>Mon 2/25/13</b>	<b>Fri 3/1/13</b>	<b>CBP</b>



# 2012 Model Assessment Process

---

- Timely reporting
- Careful review
- Clear communication, feedback





# 2012 Model Assessment Resources

---

- Olivia Devereux
  - 301-325-7449, [olivia@devereuxconsulting.com](mailto:olivia@devereuxconsulting.com)
- Matt Johnston
  - 410-267-5707, [mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net)
- Jeff Sweeney
  - 410-267-9844, [jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net)
- Sucharith Ravi
  - 410-267-5779, [sravi@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:sravi@chesapeakebay.net)
- Marty Hurd
  - 703-385-6000 x331, [martin.hurd@tetrattech.com](mailto:martin.hurd@tetrattech.com)
- Ning Zhou
  - 410-267-5727, [zhou.ning@epa.gov](mailto:zhou.ning@epa.gov)



# 2012 Base Conditions

## Landuse Projections

---

Projection methods are the same as those used for Phase 5.3.2 scenarios, 2009 Progress, 2010 Progress, Milestones and WIPs, and 2011 Progress.

### Land Use Methods:

- 1) Agricultural Census crop information (100+ categories of crops) is used to determine agricultural land use acres by county for the county as a whole.

Methods for assigning crops to land uses are described in more detail in the Scenario Builder documentation @

[http://www.chesapeakebay.net/about/programs/watershed\\_implementation\\_plan\\_to\\_ols/#52](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/about/programs/watershed_implementation_plan_to_ols/#52)

- 2) Projected urban land use acres derived by CBPO's GIS Team from land cover data, impervious data set, road network, etc.
- 3) Forest acres derived by subtracting total agricultural and urban acres from total area.
  - a. If this subtraction results in negative forest acres, then agricultural land uses are reduced proportionally with the exception of AFO and CAFO land uses which remain at constant level.
  - b. If there are still negative acres, non-regulated pervious developed and non-regulated impervious developed acres are reduced proportionally.
  - c. If negative acres still exist (which is rare), all remaining urban land uses are reduced proportionally.



# 2012 Base Conditions

## Animal Projections

---

Projection methods are the same as those used for Phase 5.3.2 scenarios, 2009 Progress, 2010 Progress, Milestones and WIPs, and 2011 Progress.

### Animal Methods:

- 1) For each animal type in each county, linear regression of data from the last six Agricultural Censuses.
- 2) Initial 2012 animal numbers are forecast of this trend.
  - a. Virginia submitted poultry and dairy numbers for Agricultural Census years.
  - b. All states submit equine (horse) numbers.
- 3) Projected animal numbers are weighed against state-submitted CAFO data for year 2009.
  - a. If projected datum is higher, more animal in AFO while CAFO animal numbers remain at state-supplied 2009.
  - b. If projected datum is lower, projection is overwritten by state CAFO number.
  - c. Exception for NY dairy.
- 4) **If a state has 2012 CAFO numbers (animal numbers/splits), it should submit to CBPO.**
  - a. Established methods for incorporating this data will continue.



# 2012 Base Conditions

## Septic Projections

---

Projection methods are the same as those used for Phase 5.3.2 scenarios, 2009 Progress, 2010 Progress, Milestones and WIPs, and 2011 Progress.

### Septic Systems Methods:

- 1) The total population on septic systems is derived by GIS Team – generally as the counterpart of data on sewer area and population on sewer.
- 2) If a state has 2012 septic systems data, (i.e., new septic permits), it should submit to CBPO.
  - a. Established methods for incorporating this data will continue.
  - b. Septic connections are submitted through NEIEN as a BMP.





# 2012 Base Conditions

## Landuse, Animal and Septic Projections

---

Recommendation from VA DCR for EPA to indicate “that these types changes can be made up to a specified date for the 2012 progress run base inputs. Sort of an open enrollment for the land use and other base info data to allow for logical and justifiable changes.”

- CBPO comment: Partnership decides, not EPA
- DCR Examples
  - No CAFO/AFO area in CBW portion of VA Beach; hog operations are actually in non-CBW of locality – yet 2011 forecast data yields 34 hogs in the CBW and 1,996 hogs outside.
  - 99 acres of extractive land use in the Richmond SS – but quarries or other surface mining is downstream of STP outfall. Recommendation to re-categorize as cid and cpd.
  - Expecting county harvest data from VDOF which indicates different acres of hvf (harvested forest).
  - Similar modification to the rcn (regulated construction) may also be needed to reflect actual conditions.



# 2012 Base Conditions

## Landuse, Animal and Septic Projections

---

Ground rule is if change would violate calibration

- DCR Examples
  - CAFO/AFO area and some hogs were in CBW portion of VA Beach in 1985-2005 calibration data
    - Array of (animal types):(segments that straddle the border) is huge
    - Application rates of manure and chemical fertilizer are at the scale of counties as a whole
  - Some extractive land use in Richmond SS in 1985-2005 data
  - Method for area in hvf (harvested forest) came from partnership task group of Forestry Workgroup – due to sparse (and variable) jurisdictional data for 1985-2005 calibration
  - Construction acres on the ground vary from year to year yet very little state-supplied data for 1985-2005 calibration – so methods documented



# 2012 Base Conditions

## Landuse, Animal and Septic Projections

---

Ground rule is if change would violate calibration

- Other
  - Agriculture on federal land
  - Pasture stream corridor = “trp”
  - 100% implementation levels
  - 0% implementation levels
  - Etc.
  
- Discussion
  - When to bring in “local” data?
  - What if all jurisdiction can’t provide?





# Draft Grant Guidance Data Submission Schedules

Jeff Sweeney  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Chesapeake Bay Program Office  
[jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net)  
410-267-9844

Watershed Technical Workgroup Meeting  
Chesapeake Bay Program Office  
Annapolis, MD  
October 1, 2012



# Draft Grant Guidance Data Submission Schedules

---

- 2013 Draft Grant Guidance
  - Sent to jurisdictions 9/21/12
  - Comments due back by 10/15/12





# Draft Grant Guidance

## Data Submission Schedules

---

### ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT GUIDANCE

#### F. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CHESAPEAKE BAY IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, HEADWATER STATE GRANTS, AND CHESAPEAKE BAY REGULATORY AND ACCOUNTABILITY GRANTS

##### 1. Data Submission Schedules

Annual progress reporting is an output of grants. Grant recipients are expected to provide point source and non-point source nutrient and sediment load reduction implementation progress data on the following schedule:

##### Initial Submission:

Between October 16, 2013 and November 26, 2013;  
Data from July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013.

##### Final Submission:

December 1, 2013;  
Data from July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013



# Draft Grant Guidance

## Data Submission Schedules

---

### ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT GUIDANCE

#### F. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CHESAPEAKE BAY IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, HEADWATER STATE GRANTS, AND CHESAPEAKE BAY REGULATORY AND ACCOUNTABILITY GRANTS

##### 1. Data Submission Schedules

This schedule may not apply to the wastewater sector for the Commonwealth of Virginia, which may submit its data in accordance with the Nutrient Allocation Compliance and Reporting requirements under Section 62.1-44.19:18 of the Virginia Code. Those data that are submitted to the CBPO are expected to be complete, quality assured, and in proper format for immediate processing in a CBP WSM annual progress scenario. (See Attachment 6 for data specifications and requirements.)

In addition, this schedule does not apply to the wastewater sector data for the District of Columbia due to a combination of factors, including the report schedule for DC's Water DMR reports, and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Government's role in support of DC Water and the District of Columbia to prepare the flow/load allocation reports.

The Virginia and DC wastewater sector data will be submitted using the following schedule:  
January 31, 2013; Data from January 1, 2012- December 31, 2012

In the event that data are not submitted in time, or do not use the appropriate NEIEN or wastewater format for CBPO to calculate annual progress toward the Reducing Pollutions Indicator, CBPO will use the most recent data submitted by the watershed jurisdictions.

In future years, grant recipients will be expected to submit data as necessary for the midpoint assessment by specified dates.



# Draft Grant Guidance Verification

---

## ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT GUIDANCE

### C. WORK PLAN

#### Additional Work Plan Content Specific to CBRAP Grants

##### 1. Examples of eligible grant activities include:

##### d. Improved Tracking, Reporting, Verification and Accountability Consistent with WIPs and/or Two-Year Milestones for Water Quality

- Development and implementation of National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN) BMP data flows to report practices to the Chesapeake Bay Program
- Improved verification of point and nonpoint sources of pollution and management actions (e.g., procedures for verifying that agricultural conservation practices - both cost-shared and non-cost shared are properly designed, installed, and maintained) consistent with the November 4, 2009 and December 29, 2009 expectations letters, as well as the Guide for EPA's Evaluation of Phase I Watershed Implementation Plans issued April 2, 2010, **as amended or clarified by subsequent EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership communications, including the CBP Partnership's verification framework, which is currently under development.**