



§319 semi-annual watershed project reporting

West Virginia's Nonpoint Source (NPS) Program must enter report information into the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Grants Reporting and Tracking System (GRTS). All projects are tracked within the GRTS using multiple fields and geographic information systems (GIS). Specific practices installed are matched to water quality improvements in a specific reach of the stream or portion of the watershed. The minimum reporting unit is the sub-watershed (SWS) scale.

To comply with the EPA's reporting requirements, all §319 grant recipients are required to report their progress on a semi-annual schedule timed to the **federal fiscal year**. The first semi-annual report is for October 1 - March 31; it is due **May 1**. The second semi-annual report is for April 1 - September 30 and is due **November 1**. The **final report** is due when the project is complete. The submission deadline is 30-days following the performance period end date.

Your report should tell the story of your progress and it should contain elements that allow for quantitative tracking. To begin with, **all reports must include a summary narrative of a paragraph or less**. This is necessary for the GRTS status update section. The details of each report **must contain** the following:

1. The report **cover** must contain the **grant number, award year, and contact information** (Name, mailing address, phone number, email etc.) of the Project Manager or other primary contacts.
2. A brief narrative describing the progress that has occurred during the appropriate reporting period (digital photos welcomed).
3. Map(s) that shows the watershed, streams, and the project site(s).
4. An easy to read list of **pollutant load reductions** and the best management practices (**BMPs**) that have occurred within the reporting period. Include types and sizes of BMPs. Note: The report must distinguish between the load reductions estimated in the original proposal and those that have occurred in the project thus far. It is also important to note any reductions over and above those proposed in the project proposal.
5. A milestone schedule that illustrates the project's status (e.g., not implemented, on-schedule, behind schedule, complete, etc.) and its percent completed.
6. A table with a description of expenditures for the period; download the financial **spreadsheet**, fill it out, then submit it as a separate (xls or xlxs) file with your report.

Important Note: Typically, the entire report is included in the GRTS record, especially the final report.

Penalties

If reports and reimbursements are not submitted in a timely manner your grant award will be non-compliant, which comprises current and future grant opportunities. Non-compliance can result in one or more of the following penalties:

- Withholding payment until the condition complies
- Disallowing costs
- Suspending or terminating the current award
- Withholding future awards

§319 AGO reports

Additional grant opportunity (AGO) reporting is the same as all other §319 reporting requirements, especially if the AGO project calls for pollution reductions. However, in some cases an AGO project may focus more on



evaluations, monitoring or outreach. In those cases, there are still goals and objectives. Your report must reflect your progress towards the goals and objectives stated in your original work plan. Each year WIB determines how much AGO funds may be available (funding is a portion of our annual §319 award). If funding is available, the AGO opportunity is typically announced in late winter or early spring, but the announcement count occur at any time.

§319 Final Reports

Waterbody Improved Waters from agricultural production and the presence of livestock in riparian areas degraded water quality in Kitchen Creek. As a result, the stream was placed on the 2008 Clean Water Act (CWA) section 303(d) list as impaired for fecal coliform. The West Virginia Conservation Agency (WVCA) developed and implemented a watershed-based plan to address the problem through practices such as limiting livestock access to the stream and constructing waste storage facilities. Water quality has generally improved in response to this restoration work; bacteria levels have decreased and habitat conditions have improved.

Problem Kitchen Creek is in the Gap Mills area of Monroe County in southeastern West Virginia. It flows along the northern foot of Peters Mountain from the confluence divide, and travels southeast to Second Creek. Second Creek flows northwest to the Greenbrier River. Kitchen Creek is a 5.5-mile-long stream that flows into Second Creek at Gap Mills (Figure 1). The Kitchen Creek watershed contains mostly grass-land pasture used for beef cattle and dairy operations.

West Virginia's fecal coliform (FC) bacteria standard states that water samples are not to exceed 200 colonies (col) per 100 milliliter (mL) in a monthly mean, based on at least five samples per month. In addition, no more than 10 percent of all samples taken during the month may exceed 400 col/100 mL. Data collected in 2010 and 2012 fall clearly above criteria, causing Kitchen Creek to be placed on the 303(d) list based on the 2010 CWA section 303(d) list of FC bacteria. A total maximum daily load (TMDL) was developed for the Greenbrier River in 2008, which included Kitchen Creek and Second Creek. The TMDL analysis revealed that the use of the stream for agricultural practices was the root of the bacteria contamination. At one time there were three dairies and two large beef feedlots with very little, if any, waste storage, and much of that waste was able to enter the stream (Figure 2).

Cowbarns in the area allowed a restricted grazing of beef cattle along the riparian area, while also co-applying liquid and solid manure, poultry litter, and fertilizer to pasture and cropland. In addition, the barnyards of the area regularly had a slow release of bacteria into the stream from underground sources.

The 11 alternative grazing systems were vital to restricting livestock access to the riparian pasture. These systems provided cleaner and fresher water for livestock while grazing, and also allowed farmers to implement rotational grazing systems to decrease bacteria-laden runoff. Some of the alternative waste sources also used renewable energy such as wind and solar power for pumping.

Project Highlights The key best management practices (BMPs) implemented to address the FC bacteria contamination included installing alternative waste systems, limiting livestock access to the riparian area, and building waste storage facilities. The majority of these practices were implemented from 2010 to 2014 as part of the Second Creek watershed-based plan (see Figure 1 for BMP implementation locations).

Figure 1. Kitchen Creek watershed and BMP locations.

When the project is completed the **Basin Coordinator**, **NPS Coordinator** or designee conducts a **final inspection** with the local project manager and completes the final inspection form (FIF). In addition to this inspection a **final report** is required. The final report is due no more than 30-days after the end of the grant's performance period but should be submitted prior to that date, if possible.

The final report is a summary of the entire life of the project. It is submitted to USEPA and becomes part of the project record in GRTS. It should correctly reconcile all information from previous semi-annual reports and ideally is in a format similar to USEPA's §319 **Success Story**. If the project is a success story candidate this format makes it easier to develop the future success story submission.

1. Title and summary (i.e., abstract)
2. Location and problem description
3. Project highlights: What was accomplished; how does it compare to the work plan goals/objectives.
4. Results: i.e., number and types of BMPs and the dimensions (acres, feet, square-feet etc.), load reductions, outreach etc.
5. Partners and funding: Include a table that compares the original budget to the actual expenditures. Don't forget your match.
6. Complete a final financial report using the spreadsheet tool.

Note: If the project is complete at or near the semi-annual reporting deadline, submit the final report only.

A final word

Your §319 report should be well-written, accurate and submitted on time. Reports must follow the guidelines provided. Your report should **tell the entire story** of the project. It should be specific to the work plan activities and budget expenditures. Progress narratives for each activity should include work completed, pollution reductions, partners involved, other funding secured for the implementation of the activities, etc. If the project is/did not progress as planned, the narrative should discuss and indicate what efforts/plans were made to overcome those challenges. **Note:** §319 reports are public information and subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Questions? Email: timothy.d.craddock@wv.gov.