	Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned		Yellow - action has encountered minor obstacles		Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier							

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available		Resources Needed		Annual Progress to Date	Reason for Change to Action Item
1.1	Catchment Assessments and Prioritization	All 59 catchments assessed prior to 2025

Game plan outlining "step-by-step" analysis process by end of 2021 | Chester County Conservation District (CCCD), Chester County Water Resources Authority (CCWRA), Technical Service Providers (TSPs), watershed groups, local municipalities, Environ. Advisory Committees (EACs), Ag Action Team (AT), Riparian Buffer (RB) Action Team (AT), Municipal Action Team (AT), Data Management (DM) Action Team (AT) | All areas (all catchments to be assessed) | 59 total catchments 2021: 4, 2022: 20, 2023: 20, 2024: remaining (dependent on acquired funding)

Timeline with no additional funding for 59 total catchments: 2021: 2-3 2022-2030 at 6/year | Use the Catchment Management Database (CMD) as preliminary prioritization to assess individual catchments and outline conditions, needs, opportunities, etc.

"Political" overlay with initial steps including local municipality outreach to determine willingness or receptiveness is critical

"Boots-on-the-ground" funding and capacity for engagements, assessments, etc.

Coordinate with other action teams for agricultural, buffer, and urban conservation opportunities and needs

Lack of funding would result in a timeline through 2029/2030 to | **Technical**

CCCD, Octoraro Watershed Association (OWA), Stroud, Alliance for the Ches. Bay (ACB), Ches. Bay Foundation (CBF), Chesapeake Conservancy, Brandywine Conservancy, Ag Preserve. Board, local engineers/ consultants, County DCIS (Dept. of Computer and Info. Services), TSPs, CCWRA | **Financial**

NFWF, Chesapeake Bay Trust (CBT) | **Technical**

Centralized database platform | **Financial**

$2,500/ catchment (~$50,000/yr) for on-the-ground efforts, engagements etc. (TOTAL: $147,500)

Assume assessments personnel and funding will convert to long-term verifications personnel and funding; and potentially maintenance | **2025**
EPA contracted with Cadmus to begin the ARP for the Octoraro Watershed. With input from stakeholders, they selected Knight Run in Chester County as the sub-watershed of focus.
2024
The "Water Quality Modeling to Support Source Water and Aquatic Life Protection in Octorara Creek Watershed" project including local stakeholders, Stroud, USEPA, PADEP, and more continues to support the potential development of Alternative Restoration Plan (ARP) for the Octorara watershed. Water quality data collection and analysis with the intent to build a fully operational WQ model is the current focus of efforts.

2023
EPA has begun the preliminary process of creating an Advanced Restoration Plan in one or two catchments above the Octoraro Reservoir. EPA is looking for input | |

| | | | | | cover all catchments with existing resources (~6/yr)

Efforts should result in regional projects that provide multiple benefits where accelerated permitting processes would be ideal.*

Action is inherently tied to all other priority initiatives.

Catchment targeting will involve a desktop analysis step followed by game plan for outreach and field verifications outlining the who, when, where, etc. | | | | | on catchment selection. We have asked EPA if they are able to provide some quantitative information about each potential catchment in Chester County. The Ag Team will be tasked with giving a qualitative evaluation of the "human element" of each catchment to get a feel for openness to conservation the community is. One catchment has been looked at in this manner so far. Upper Oxford Township outreach visits were completed.

2022
Currently solely focused in the Upper Oxford area (primary watershed) to fully flesh the entire process out across all sectors (ag, urban/ suburban, natural sectors).

Catchment selection has been dependent on existence of current partnerships (such as the Oxford Region Planning Committee and CCCD's new partnership with Upper Oxford) where municipalities are working towards getting their PRPs approved and learning how to find resources for implementation. | |

											a sense of the "political overlay" of the region. The catchment assessment and prioritization has been an important part of the other priority initiatives.	
1.2	Conservation Opportunities	*Farmland Conservation – 4,000 total acres* *Forest Conservation – 300 total acres* *Wetland Conservation – 20 total acres*	CCCD, Ag Preserve Board, County, local watershed groups	All areas with emphasis on prioritized catchments	On-going with inherent tie to Action 5.1	Potentially extend Eco Invest. Partners (EIP) P3 in Cecil County (Elk and North East watersheds) into Chester County. Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Programs Carbon credits program for private forests (provides incentives for forest conservation that also provides nutrient and sediment reductions)	Ag Preserve. Board, Cecil Land Trust, Brandywine Conservancy, local TSPs	Ag Preserve. Board				**2025** Outreach and engagement continues, particularly in the Octoraro Watershed. **2024** Outreach and engagement continues; an additional 161 acres were preserved during the current year. **2023** Continuous outreach with existing preserved farms. Additional farms preserved as appropriate and landowner receptive. **2022** Continuous outreach with existing preserved farms. Additional farms preserved as appropriate and landowner receptive.	
1.3	Low Volume (LV) / Dirt & Gravel Road Opportunities	*Driving Surface + Raising the Roadbed – 2,000 new linear feet*	CCCD, local municipalities	All areas	On-going with inherent tie to Action 5.1	Continue popular local program	CCCD				Capital Cost: ~$30,000	**2025** There have been no DGLVR projects in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed in Chester County in 2025. **2024** No DGLVR implementation realized during 2024, but additional funding may assist advancing new opportunities. **2023** No DGLVR implementation in 2023. Current DGLVR projects are not in the Chesapeake Basin. Outreach	

										within the watershed continues to municipalities through partner promotion and through two newsletters. **2022** No DGLVR implementation in 2022; outreach conducted to individuals municipalities through two newsletters and one-on-one outreach.	

Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Progress and Milestones Template

Each county-based local area will use this template to identify:

1. Inputs – These are both existing and needed resources, public and private, to implement the identified priority initiative. These include both technical and financial resources, such as personnel, supplies, equipment and funding.

2. Process – what is each partner able to do where and by when. These are the action items listed under each priority initiative.

3. Outputs and outcomes – both short and long-term. These are the priority initiatives identified by each county.   The performance targets are the intermediate indicators that will measure progress.

4. Implementation challenges – any potential issues or roadblocks to implementation that could impede outputs and outcomes.

Asterisk: Place an asterisk next to the action number(s) for action items that appear in both the County Planning and Progress Template and the Programmatic Recommendations Template.

For each Priority Initiative or Program Element: Use the fields, as defined below, to identify the inputs and the process that will be followed to achieve each priority initiative. This is the "who, what, where, when and how" of the plan:

Description = What. This may include programs that address prevention, education, or as specific as planned BMP installations that will address the Priority Initiative. A programmatic or policy effort will require some ability to quantify the anticipated benefits which will allow calculation of the associated nutrient reductions.

Performance Target = How. This is an extension of the Description above. The Performance Target details the unique BMPs that will result from implementation of the Priority Initiative and serves as a benchmark to track progress in addressing the Priority Initiative. Performance Targets may be spread across multiple Responsible Parties, Geographies, and Timelines based on the specifics of the Initiative.

Responsible Party(ies) = Who. This is/are the key partner(s) who will implement the action items though outreach, assistance or funding, and who will be responsible for delivering the identified programs or practices.

Geographic Location = Where. This field identifies the geographic range of the planned implementation. This could extend to the entire county or down to a small watershed, based on the scale of the Priority Initiative, range of the Responsible Party, or planned funding/resources. *NOTE: Resource limitations alone should not limit potential implementation as additional funding may become available in the future.*

Expected Timeline = When. Provide the expected completion date for the planned activity. This should be a reasonable expectation, based on knowledge and experience, that will aid in tracking progress toward addressing the Priority Initiative.

Resources Available: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources secured/available to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the resources identified in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if available, to each action.

Resources Needed: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources needed/outstanding to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the additional resources projected and identified as needed in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if possible, to each action.

Potential Implementation Challenges/Issues = This field will note challenges and issues that may delay program implementation (Description).

Annual Progress to Date = This field will be used for annual reporting on priority initiatives. This is a description of the action(s) your county took toward achieving the priority initiative. Examples include education and outreach, programmatic changes, etc. For numeric priority initiatives your county can retrieve those numbers directly from *FieldDoc* or put in the column "See *FieldDoc*."

Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Annual Progress Update – Chester County

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available		Resources Needed		Annual Progress to Date	Reason for Change to Action Item
							Technical	Financial	Technical	Financial		
2.1	Plain sect farmers outreach and engagement	No specific target, success will be measured by implementation rates of BMPs on plain sect farms *One farm-anchor project in 2022* *Game plan that includes Environmental Education (EE) Grant content details 1st qtr 2022*	Chester County Conservation District (CCCD)	All areas with inherent tie to prioritized catchments	On-going with inherent tie to Action 2.3 Game plan development in late 2021 to early 2022 that includes details for an Environmental Education (EE) grant application (game plan intended to detail who, what, where, etc. that forms the basis of an EE application)	Specific individual solely focused on plain sect community engagement and assistance (boots-on-the-ground) Organize teams (similar to PSU teams) to target 1 or 2 communities (reference BC efforts in Honeybrook area) "Bay Fisherman to Amish Country" endeavor (bring fisherman up from the Bay for field day) Macros training via Amish schools (Octoraro Watershed Association effort) and kits Funding for outreach individual is necessary to improve probability of finding the right individual*	CCCD	EE Grant Envirothon (being used for kits)	Individual with a blend of technical knowledge, experience, and ability to successfully engage the plain sect community	$35,000/year (assuming part-time individual to start)	**2025** 30 visits to Plain Sect operations were made by the Outreach Coordinator over the past year. Additionally, all ag staff works with Plain Sect operators, providing educational and technical assistance. Manure management workshops are being planned for winter 2025/26 with consideration for ease of travel for Plain Sect farmers. **2024** Outreach visits and engagements continued through 2024. The "Bay Fisherman to Amish Country" event is still under consideration; but an alternative in partnership with CBF was organized for a custom boat experience (PA farmers to the Bay) during the 2024 calendar year. **2023** CCCD outreach visits continue. Twenty plain sect outreach visits have occurred since January 2023. These include visits solely for new outreach and do not include normal technical visits to Plain Sect Farms. The "Bay Fisherman to Amish Country" endeavor is planned to happen in early 2024 as a part of either the annual Producers Meeting or a joint meeting with the	

										Octoraro Source Watershed Collaborative. Planning is underway.	
										2022 Outreach occurring as part of a broader outreach effort. In addition to regular interactions with the Plain Sect community through BMP implementation projects, individual meetings have been held for purely education and outreach purposes. These outreach visits have consistent topics including planning and implementation needs on each farm, program availability, and resources available for farmers. Since 8/1/2022, 15 outreach visits have been held on Plain Sect operations. Although we did not receive the EE grant identified yet, we received funds through Upper Oxford Township Outreach Agreement to perform outreach. We have not prioritized the "Bay Fisherman to Amish Country" endeavor because of the aforementioned opportunity in Upper Oxford TWP. An Aquatics Kit was created for use by educators through Envirothon funds.	

	2.2	General ag-focused education and outreach	No specific target, success will be measured by implementation rates of BMPs across the ag sector *Game plan 1st qtr 2022*	CCCD, Chester County Water Resources Authority (CCWRA), Technical Service Providers (TSPs), Penn State Extension, NRCS, watershed groups	All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments	On-going, with inherent toe to Action 2.3 Game plan in late 2021 to early 2022	Digital and paper support materials (comparing compliance vs. stewardship) Series of publications outlining individual BMPs (build off CCCD initial efforts) One-on-one engagements with individual farmers. **Funding for outreach individual is necessary to improve probability of finding the right individual***	CCCD, CCWRA, Penn State Extension, TSPs, NRCS, Ag Preserve Board	EE Grant	Individual with a blend of technical knowledge, experience, and ability to successfully engage the ag. community	See Financial Need for Action 1.1 for proposed individual	**2025** CCCD continues to publish outreach materials, including newsletters and social media posting. The most effective outreach method is through personal interactions, which continue across staff with cooperators. CCCD's former Outreach Coordinator conducted 49 one-on-one visits, all in the Chesapeake Bay, with farmers prior to her retirement in early June. Additional visits have been conducted by the Octoraro Watershed Coordinator. **2024** General outreach continued via CCCD newsletters, mailings, and visits/engagements. **2023** General outreach conducted through newsletters, mailings, and standard CCCD farm visits. CCCD's Back 40 Newsletter is being organized and is set for publishing in early October. As of 11/20/2023, 70 farms have been visited in Upper Oxford Township. This completes the outreach effort for Upper Oxford Township. **2022** General outreach conducted through newsletters, mailings, and standard CCCD farm visits. CCCD's Back 40 Newsletter was organized and is set for publishing in early October. This newsletter is distributed to over 1000 individuals, the vast majority being within the farming community. Additionally, a focused effort commenced in	

										partnership with Upper Oxford Township. As of September 27, 100 individual farms have been visited. Ultimately, all farms in the municipality will receive this focused visit, which includes a discussion of conservation needs, including planning, new BMPs, or maintenance to existing BMPs.	
2.3	Catchment Targeting Initiative	Metrics inherently tied to other action items (needs will be established on a catchment-to-catchment basis)	Ag Action Team (AT), Data Management (DM) Action Team (AT), Catchment Targeting (CT) Action Team (AT), Municipal Action Team (AT), watershed groups, local municipalities, Brandywine Conservancy, CCCD, CCWRA, Environ. Advisory Committees (EACs)	Prioritized catchments (TBD)	Late 2021 launch with inherent tie to Priority Initiative (P.I.) 1- Catchment Targeting Initiative (with funding: 4 catchments in 2021, 20 in 2022)	Partner with Catchment Targeting (CT) AT during catchment prioritization efforts to identify individual catchment needs, BMP probabilities, etc. specifically for the ag sector	Practice Keeper (PK)			See P.I. 1 for overall catchment targeting financial needs	**2025** EPA contracted with Cadmus to begin the ARP for the Octoraro Watershed. With input from stakeholders, they selected Knight Run in Chester County as the sub-watershed of focus. EPA will give a formal update on this process at the Octoraro Source Water Collaborative Annual Meeting in November. **2024** Primary efforts and support have been focused within the Octorara watershed as it relates to the potential ARP and Source Water Collaborative project. **2023** EPA has begun the preliminary process of creating an Advanced Restoration Plan in one or

										two catchments above the Octoraro Reservoir. EPA is looking for input on catchment selection. We have asked EPA if they are able to provide some quantitative information about each potential catchment in Chester County. The Ag Team will be tasked with giving a qualitative evaluation of the "human element" of each catchment to get a feel for openness to conservation the community is. One catchment has been looked at in this manner so far. **2022** Currently solely focused in the Upper Oxford area to flesh out and finalize the process from start-to-finish. This will help better define partner outreach, technical considerations, etc. for the next set of catchments and watersheds.	

| 2.4 | Focused Ag BMP implementation | *Soil Conservation and WQ Plans – 26,210 total acres*

Nutrient Management Core N – 12,000 total acres

Nutrient Management Core P – 8,000 total acres

Barnyard Runoff Control – 20 new acres

Prescribed Grazing – 1,350 total acres

Manure Storage Facilities – 11,925 new AUs

Precision Feeding – 4,000 Dairy Cow AUs | CCCD, NRCS, TSPs | All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments | On-going with inherent tie to Action 2.3 | Promote broad slate of BMP types across ag industry and based on individual farm conservation needs based on initial implementation scenario

Future scenario adjustments based on rates of implementation realized and progress under BMP reconciliation efforts

Assume increased realized and/or capture of unreported acres through catchment targeting

Farmer/Amish community resistance to buy-in (including farmers indicating they do not want assistance as they are unsure if they will still be in business in 2-3 years)

Partner with Riparian Buffer (RB) AT for potential buffer bonus or buffers implementation

Need to separate "inspections" from "verifications" and acquiring info/data from farmers | Farm survey, CCCD Bay Implem. Plan, Penn State Extension, NRCS, TSPs, CCCD, Ag Preserve Board | REAP, CEG, EQIP, RCPP, Most Effective Basin Funding (MEBF), State Reimb. Program, PennVEST, PL566 | Practice Keeper (PK) entry/ mgmt at CCCD

Long-term verification processes | $110,000/yr – 2 persons (PK mgmt-individual dedicated to PK; verifications person/field)

Capital Costs: ~$14.6 million | **2025**
Through ACAP, CAP, and LGI-CWIP funding, 48 new BMPs were installed over the past year. There are also seven additional projects either currently in construction or awaiting contractor commencement which will result in additional BMPs installed before the end of 2025. CCCD continues to work with partners, such as NRCS, to implement additional BMPs. The new Octoraro Watershed Coordinator position is working with partners to determine funding for a number of potential 2026 projects within that watershed.
2024
Implementation continued via all watersheds with an elevated focus in the Octorara via direct leveraged funding through CAP, RCPP, ACAP, and EQIP; along with collaboration with primary partners including the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay that has leveraged a $500k NFWF grant for the implementation of 33 BMPs (including 10 Conservation and Nutrient Management Plans)

2023
BMP implementation has occurred throughout the Bay watersheds using a variety of available programs, including RCPP, ACAP, EQIP, and CAP Implementation Funding (PADEP). In total, 76 BMPs were installed within the Chesapeake Bay watershed in 2023.

ACAP round 1 projects have been selected, and round 2 project selection is underway. 95 BMPs are planned for ACAP | |

| | | | | | | | | | | implementation in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

2022
BMP implementation has occurred throughout the Bay watersheds using a variety of available programs, including RCPP, REAP, EQIP, Chesapeake Bay Phase II Funding (PADEP), and CAP Implementation Funding (PADEP). In total, 78 BMPs were installed within the Chesapeake Bay watershed in 2022.

In addition, applications for other grant programs through NFWF have been submitted for further implementation in the watersheds.

Further work has been accomplished to create a new application for future CAP Implementation Grant projects, which is now in use. A corresponding ranking tool has been finalized.

Organizing has begun in anticipation of state ACAP funding with an emphasis on ensuring that CAP goals are addressed with this funding. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

2.5	Mushroom Farms Conservation	Metrics inherently tied to other action items	CCCD, TSPs	All mushroom farms	2022-2025 (4 year cycle, via Growing Greener funding)	Continued specific individual at CCCD focused on mushroom industry (plans, assistance, and inspections) **Mushroom composting as a delineated and specific BMP would provide reductions***	Mushroom farm resource conserve. on staff (via GG funding), TSPs	Growing Greener (GG) funding for current staff	Resource Conserv. Focused on mushroom industry	GG app: $200,000 (+~$40,000 match)	**2025** BMP implementation on mushroom farms increased significantly in 2025 as previously planned projects have gone to construction. This includes projects on farms within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, where mushroom operations have slowly migrated over the past decade. **2024** Outreach and verifications continued (including capture of previously implemented BMPs) under the mushroom ag resource conservationist position. **2023** The mushroom ag resource conservationist position is filled. In 2023 Seven MFEMPs have been reviewed. BMPs implemented on mushroom farms have been included in the totals for 2023 found in 2.4. **2022** A Growing Greener grant was obtained, which will fund the mushroom position through 2024. This position focuses on the review of Mushroom Farm Environmental Management Plans (MFEMPs) submitted by consultants for individual operations. The position then works with partners to implement BMPs from these plans. Additionally, this position provides outreach to the mushroom farming community and	

										works with DEP to maintain compliance on farms.	
2.6	BMP Reporting Reconciliation			Ag AT, Data Mgmt AT, Catchment Targeting AT	All areas with focused actions in prioritized catchments	Aligned with Action 2.3 activities	Partner with Data Management AT for reconciliation of BMP reporting numbers (primarily through catchment targeting) Current perception/ organization of BMP targets is a mix of uncaptured/ underreported BMPs and additional BMP implementation. Reconciliation in conjunction with catchment targeting will provide a pathway to delineate (and capture) underreported BMPs and needs for additional BMPs. **Transfer of BMPs from NRCS and other entities into local PK platform would streamline process***	CCCD, TSPs, NRCS, Ag. Preserv. Board, County DCIS (Dept. of Computer and Info. Services) PK		See Action 1.4 for technical needs	See Action 2.4 for financial needs	**2025** All farm visits, inspections, and project implementation are being recorded in PK. Existing, non-reported BMPs are being recorded as practical through inspections and outreach visits. A wider effort to document unreported BMPs is being explored with a private contractor. **2024** On-farm visits and engagements include capture of under-reported (including reverification) of ag-related BMPs into PK. Primary focus has been within Octorara watersheds as support for efforts tied to the proposed ARP and Source Water Collaborative. **2023** Increased reporting of BMPs into PK throughout the county has continued in 2023. **2022** Efforts have been made to increase reporting of BMPs into PK throughout the county, and particularly	

| | | | | | | | | | | within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Plans are obtained during outreach visits and Phase II inspections, which are entered in PK. Previously installed BMPs associated with these plans are verified when appropriate and noted as such in PK.

NRCS has begun adding practices 390 and 391 when planning exclusion fencing. None of these have been implemented yet, but this will help account for buffers in the future. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 2.7 | Horse Farms Conservation | *Horse Pasture Management – 1,450 total acres* | CCCD, TSPs, NRCS | All horse farms with outreach driven by prioritized catchments | Coincides with Catchment Targeting Initiative and Action 2.3 (where horse farms are encountered) | A number of pastures may meet requirements but are not captured at this time.

Individual farms may present other opportunities based on conservation needs.

Current definition of horse pasture management does not provide nutrient reductions* | CCCD, TSPs, NRCS, PA Horse Breeders Assoc. (PHBA) | Breeders Fund

EQIP, etc. | | $521,739 (capital cost only-assuming full implement. required) | **2025**
CCCD staff participated in two workshops specifically focused on equine farm conservation. Additionally, multiple manure management workshops are being planned for the winter of 2025/2026 with priority given to equine operators. Finally, BMP implementation projects were completed in 2025 on equine operations using ACAP, and LGI-CWIP funds, which included the installation of 15 BMPs.
2024
Engagements and educational outreach efforts have more deliberately included a focus with equine operators (including manure management workshops).

2023
Staff continues to work with a number of equine producers with a focus on pasture management and erosion reduction. BMP implementation is planned for several of these operations using ACAP and EQIP funds. A manure management workshop is being planned for 2024 with emphasis on including equine operators.

2022
Increased outreach to equine operations demonstrated through manure management workshop specifically for horse operations. The event was held in April, and 9 participants left the meeting | |

										with a completed manure management plan.	
2.8	Road run-off to farms	*Game plan early 2022*	CCCD, local municipalities, PennDOT, TSPs, EACs	All areas with emphasis on prioritized catchments	Game plan late 2022 that determines method to capture farms and identifies and spells out partners that need to be involved and arena(s) for coordination	Delineate between PennDOT and local roads as distinct approaches required for each type of agency	Infrastructure improvements may be required to mitigate impacts from runoff	Local engineers, TSPs, PennDOT, County Planning	Metropol. Planning Org. TIP, American Rescue Plan Act (ARCA) Local Relief Fund, PennVEST	DEP		**2025** Previously awarded project in active construction in fall 2025. Additional outreach and technical assistance provided as staff was made aware of road runoff impacts; plan developments in progress and future implementation potential being determined. **2024** One project was awarded for improvements that will reduce impacts from road run-off to a farm; additional opportunities will be noted

 											as catchment assessments continue. **2023** C3AP non-ag sub-grants program includes preferences towards projects that reduce run-off damage to farms. **2022** In partnership with Upper Oxford Township, CCCD is seeking opportunities to reduce impact from roads onto farms and from farms onto roads. The newly developed non-ag sub-grants program includes preferences towards projects that reduce run-off damage to farms.	
2.9	Farmer's only Roundtable			Ideally minimum of five (5) local farmers	Active farmers located in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed (CBWS)	2022	Extension of previous focus activities providing an arena for farmers ONLY (no others) that report back thoughts, recommendations, etc. Provide topics/talking subjects (e.g. how to create "win-win" scenarios)	Local farmers				**2025** CCCD anticipates hiring a new Outreach Coordinator in 2026; one of the tasks would be to organize events such as a farmer roundtable. Until then, we will continue to solicit feedback on services and programs from our cooperators. **2024** While this effort would be an ideal event, limited staff resources has led to incorporating desired objectives of a farmer's only roundtable with other on-going events (e.g. Producers Meeting, Winter Meetings, etc.). A Farmer's only Roundtable may be currently shelved, but the option for development may be revisited. **2023**	

											This has not been planned yet. Ag team event planning is currently being focused on the Producers Meeting, rather that this kind of special event. The primary challenge is staff time, and this event will be considered for a future year. This concept was considered in lieu of our normal Producer's Meeting, but we felt we needed an event this year where we are in the room. This will be considered for a future year. In-person events are just ramping back up post-COVID. **2022** This has not been done yet. Primary challenge is staff time as well as in-person meeting concerns. However, internal discussions have recently occurred about holding farmer meetings, including a farmer roundtable in 2023.	
2.10	Soil Health BMP Implementation	*Tillage Mgmnt High Residue – 11,000 total acres/yr* *Tillage Mgmnt Conservation – 8,000 total acres/yr* *Cover Crop Traditional – 6,000 total acres/yr* *Cover Crop with Fall Nutrients – 12,500 total acres/yr* *Commodity Cover Crops – 300 total acres/yr*	CCCD, TSPs, NRCS	All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments	Coincides with Catchment Targeting Initiative and Action 2.3	Future scenario adjustments based on rates of implementation realized and progress under BMP reconciliation efforts Assume increase on implementation through catchment targeting **Limited definition of cover crops and what counts as a reduction*** Potential gap between FSA reporting and CAST reported data	CCCD, Penn State Extension, NRCS, TSPs, transect survey, Penn State AEC/ farm survey	REAP, CEG, EQIP, RCPP, MEBF, PennVEST, PL566		Capital Cost: ~$1.4 million $20,000 for cover crops incentive program start-up	**2025** NRCS funding specifically for cover cropping was heavily used in 2024 into 2025, but that funding source has been eliminated. Existing use of BMPs to improve soil health continue to be recorded and are encouraged when not in use. ACAP, CAP, and EQIP will be the funding sources for soil health practices, but there is no source specifically dedicated to soil health practices. **2024** Resources improvements via standing funding	

						Lock down and potentially expand transect survey process **Funding to launch incentives for adopting cover crops would remove barriers for certain farmers***					streams (ACAP, CAP, EQIP, etc.) have been the primary focus with messaging to garner adoption of soil health practices. **2023** Promotion and encouragement of soil health BMPs is a part of outreach and engagements with farmers subject to ACAP funding opportunities. Additionally, promotion of NRCS funding programs with a focus on soil health has increased with new funding from the Inflation Reduction Act. **2022** This has not been done yet. Primary challenge is staff time. A preliminary plan for more fully assessing cover crop implementation is taking place. This would involve a visual survey of farms within the watershed followed by recording into PracticeKeeper. If this proves feasible, a similar effort will take place to record no-till implementation in the spring of 2023. Beyond that, promoting the adoption of new acreage into cover crops and no-till will be a focus of available ACAP funds in 2023.	
2.11	Expanded Nutrient Management	NM N Rate – 5,000 acres NM N Placement – 4,000 acres NM N Timing – 4,000 acres NM P Rate – 5,000 acres		All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments	Coincides with Catchment Targeting Initiative and Action 2.3	Aim to increase level of organization and understanding of developed, implemented, and back-logged Soil Conservation Plans prior to tackling expanded nutrient management	CCCD, Penn State Extension, NRCS, TSPs, Penn State AEC/farm survey	REAP, CEG, EQIP, RCPP, MEBF, PennVEST		Capital Cost: ~$230,000	**2025** 29 new MMPs were developed and recorded over the past year. Knowledge of manure planning and implementation is greatest in the Chesapeake Bay watershed through inspections, but most	

		NM P Placement – 4,000 acres *NM P Timing – 4,000 acres*				planning and approaches					**importantly through individual outreach visits.** **2024** Additional MMPs have been developed and implemented during the past year. **2023** Continuation of outreach visits has resulted in additional manure management plans being recorded. 13 new MMPs were developed within the watershed in 2023. **2022** There has been an effort to increase the amount of recorded conservation plans to give us a better understanding of what needs remain. This has mostly been done through collecting plans through outreach visits and inspections. This has also led to an increase in manure management plans being completed as farms in need have been found. Farms required to have an Act 38 nutrient management plan (CAOs, CAFOs) have not be found through this approach, but will be directed to if and when they are discovered.
2.12	Manure Transport	*Manure Transport out of Chester County – 1,000 DT/yr*	Farmers, haulers, CCCD, TSPs	All areas	On-going	Act 38 reporting	TSPs, NRCS, CCCD			Capital Cost: ~$20,000	**2025** Continuing to rely on Act 38 records and reporting to determine transport of manure and nutrient sources out of Chester County. **2024** Currently rely on Act 38 reporting results for determinations or

									assessments of manure transport activities. **2023** This has not been done yet. Primary challenge is staff time. **2022** This has not been done yet. Primary challenge is staff time.	

Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Progress and Milestones Template

Each county-based local area will use this template to identify:

1. Inputs – These are both existing and needed resources, public and private, to implement the identified priority initiative. These include both technical and financial resources, such as personnel, supplies, equipment and funding.

2. Process – what is each partner able to do where and by when. These are the action items listed under each priority initiative.

3. Outputs and outcomes – both short and long-term. These are the priority initiatives identified by each county.   The performance targets are the intermediate indicators that will measure progress.

4. Implementation challenges – any potential issues or roadblocks to implementation that could impede outputs and outcomes.

Asterisk: Place an asterisk next to the action number(s) for action items that appear in both the County Planning and Progress Template and the Programmatic Recommendations Template.

For each Priority Initiative or Program Element: Use the fields, as defined below, to identify the inputs and the process that will be followed to achieve each priority initiative. This is the "who, what, where, when and how" of the plan:

Description = What. This may include programs that address prevention, education, or as specific as planned BMP installations that will address the Priority Initiative. A programmatic or policy effort will require some ability to quantify the anticipated benefits which will allow calculation of the associated nutrient reductions.

Performance Target = How. This is an extension of the Description above. The Performance Target details the unique BMPs that will result from implementation of the Priority Initiative and serves as a benchmark to track progress in addressing the Priority Initiative. Performance Targets may be spread across multiple Responsible Parties, Geographies, and Timelines based on the specifics of the Initiative.

Responsible Party(ies) = Who. This is/are the key partner(s) who will implement the action items though outreach, assistance or funding, and who will be responsible for delivering the identified programs or practices.

Geographic Location = Where. This field identifies the geographic range of the planned implementation. This could extend to the entire county or down to a small watershed, based on the scale of the Priority Initiative, range of the Responsible Party, or planned funding/resources. *NOTE: Resource limitations alone should not limit potential implementation as additional funding may become available in the future.*

Expected Timeline = When. Provide the expected completion date for the planned activity. This should be a reasonable expectation, based on knowledge and experience, that will aid in tracking progress toward addressing the Priority Initiative.

Resources Available: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources secured/available to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the resources identified in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if available, to each action.

Resources Needed: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources needed/outstanding to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the additional resources projected and identified as needed in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if possible, to each action.

Potential Implementation Challenges/Issues = This field will note challenges and issues that may delay program implementation (Description).

Annual Progress to Date = This field will be used for annual reporting on priority initiatives. This is a description of the action(s) your county took toward achieving the priority initiative. Examples include education and outreach, programmatic changes, etc. For numeric priority initiatives your county can retrieve those numbers directly from *FieldDoc* or put in the column "See *FieldDoc*."

	Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned		Yellow - action has encountered minor obstacles		Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier						

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available		Resources Needed		Annual Progress to Date (2023)	Reason for Change to Action Item
3.1	Buffer Opportunities and Targeting Tool(s)	See P.I. 5 (Data management) for targeting tool metrics	Riparian Buffer (RB) Action Team (AT), Data Management (DM) Action Team (AT), Catchment Targeting (CT) Action Team (AT), County Planning (CCPC), Chester County Water Resources Authority (CCWRA)	All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments	On-going with inherent tie to Priority Initiative (P.I.) 5	Potentially extend Lancaster County tools (developed by Chesapeake Conservancy) into Chester County (Octoraro already included in LC tool) Assume BMP reconciliation can be achieved through targeting tool Field verification required through Catchment Targeting Initiative as efforts progress through individual catchments	Technical Chesapeake Conservancy, County, CCPC, Brandywine Conservancy, Stroud, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay (ACB), Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF), Technical Service Providers (TSPs), Chester County Conservation District (CCCD), Lancaster County Conservation District (LCCD), CCWRA, County DCIS (Dept. of Computer and Info. Services)	Financial NFWF, Growing Greener (GG)	Technical	Financial See DM AT (P.I. 5) targeting tool action item for more information	2025 Primary focus remains within the Octorara watershed due to the ARP development and Source Water Collaborative efforts for opportunities identification. Several projects have been identified this year for implementation this year and next year. These include a large agricultural project including a manure handling system, a municipal stream restoration project, and possibly a municipal street tree installation project. 2024 **Primary focus remains within the Octorara watershed due to the ARP development and Source Water Collaborative efforts for opportunities identification.** 2023 OWA performs monthly stream monitoring in the Octoraro watershed. Local partners have a keen eye on potential opportunities for buffers, as they frequently view the land from the stream and keep a close eye on stream conditions.	

Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned   Yellow - action has encountered minor obstacles   Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available	Resources Needed	Annual Progress to Date (2023)	Reason for Change to Action Item
									Octoraro Source Water Collaborative also has a monitoring work group, partnering with several organizations, which provides the OSWC with helpful information it needs to know where buffers might be needed. 2022 Met with Chesapeake Conservancy to discuss CWMT platform to capture BMP instances and potential BMP opportunities; Chester County analysis in progress.	

Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Annual Progress Update – Chester County

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available	Resources Needed		Annual Progress to Date (2023)	Reason for Change to Action Item
3.2	Ag Riparian Zone	Forest Buffer – 300 new acres Forest Buffer with exclusion fencing – 300 new acres Forest Buffer Narrow with exclusion fencing – 200 new acres Grass Buffer – 200 new acres Grass Buffer with exclusion fencing – 110 new acres Grass Buffer Narrow with exclusion fencing – 80 new acres	CCCD, TSPs, NRCS, watershed groups, Brandywine Conservancy, Stroud, ACB, CBF, Environ. Advisory Committees (EACs), Oxford Reg. Planning Comm., municipalities, MWS, CCPP, farmers	All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments (as catchments analyzed)	On-going with inherent tie to P.I. 1 (catchment targeting)	Farmer resistance or buy-in Proposed implementation numbers need reconciled as general perception is proposed BMP rates are more than available or capable Buffers with exclusion fencing are exclusive to riparian corridors (and applied to pasture land uses); Buffers (no exclusion fencing) are not exclusive to riparian corridors and applied to crop, hay, turfgrass, and similar land uses (can be applied to field borders and similar upland scenarios). **Separate coding or definitions reflecting these conditions would be ideal.***	CCCD, NRCS, TSPs, Stroud, ACB, CBF, watershed groups, Brandywine Conservancy	NFWF, GG, DCNR, CREP, Keystone, TreeVitalize, PACD, RCPP, EQIP, Most Effective Basin Funding (MEBF), Chesapeake Bay Trust (CBT)	Capital Cost: ~$7.5 million	**2025** 24.8ac on 4 sites installed by Stroud Water Research Center. Stroud has developed the most appealing program for Riparian Buffer implementation, so CCCD refers potential projects to Stroud, providing mapping and program information to the landowners. CCCD also partners with Stroud to provide additional BMP implementation where necessary. This partnership has grown in recent years. Keystone 10 Million Trees Partnership(K10) has also provided trees and shelter materials for buffers. 025 is the final year of K10. **2023** See progress notes for Action 3.1. Implementation occurs where farmers are receptive and implementation is appropriate. Riparian forest buffers have been implemented through the Keystone 10 Million Trees Partnership. **2022** See progress notes for Action 3.1. Implementation occurs where farmers are receptive and implementation is	No changes have been made to this action item.

	Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned			Yellow - action has encountered minor obstacles		Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier					
Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available	Resources Needed		Annual Progress to Date (2023)	Reason for Change to Action Item
(yellow)										appropriate. Riparian forest buffers have been implemented through the Keystone 10 Million Trees Partnership.	
3.3 (green)	Urban/ Developed Areas Riparian Zone	MS4 Riparian Forest Buffers – 20 new acres Non-MS4 Forest Buffers – 30 new acres	Local municipalities, watershed groups, Brandywine Conservancy, Stroud, ACB, EACs, Oxford Reg. Planning Comm., CCCD, Octoraro Watershed Association (OWA)	All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments (as catchments analyzed)	On-going with inherent tie to P.I. 1 (catchment targeting)	Landowner resistance or buy-in Watershed organizations or other non-profits to assist with Keystone implementation for small projects	CCCD, local municipalities, Stroud, ACB, CBF, watershed groups, Brandywine Conservancy, local engineers/ consultants, CCPC	NFWF, GG, DCNR, Keystone, TreeVitalize, CBT	Capital Cost: ~$200,000	**2025** Currently anticipate development of more riparian area opportunities implementation with the next MS4 permit cycle. A new 5 acre urban forest buffer implemented through CAP in Fall of 2024. **2024** Currently anticipate development of more riparian area opportunities implementation with the next MS4 permit cycle. **2023** Implementation efforts pursued through Keystone 10 Million Trees in Chesapeake Bay Watershed: 4 acres implemented in Spring 2023 3 acres implemented in the Fall 2022 No TreeVitalize projects took place in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed in 2023. TreeVitalize is going through a rebranding right now. The new program	

	Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned		Yellow - action has encountered minor obstacles		Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier						

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available		Resources Needed	Annual Progress to Date (2023)	Reason for Change to Action Item
										name is Trees For Watersheds. **2022** Implementation efforts pursued through Keystone 10 Million Trees: 22 acres implemented in Spring 2022 17 acres planned for Fall 2022 TreeVitalize: 11 acres implemented in 2022 Grant opening for 2023 imminent	

	Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned		Yellow - action has encountered minor obstacles		Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier				

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available	Resources Needed	Annual Progress to Date (2023)	Reason for Change to Action Item
3.4	"Buffer Bonus" Program	*Game plan by late 2021*	ACB, CBF, Stroud	All areas	Game plan for program development by late 2021	Expand or mimic existing initiatives into Chester County

Complement other funding streams for implementation coinciding with other BMPs | ACB, CBF, Stroud, CCCD, TSPs, NRCS | | **2025** This potential program will be revisited upon final goals and objectives of the potential ARP for the Octorara watershed. **2024** This potential program will be revisited upon final goals and objectives of the potential ARP for the Octorara watershed.

2023 This has not been done yet. Farmers who are getting upland BMPs installed have resources to get trees planted in their riparian zone if they want. Funding for Ag BMPs is also not limited right now with ACAP entering the scene, so farmers interested in Ag BMPs don't want an additional hurdle to accessing funding. As a way to promote buffer installation, priority is given to farmers applying for ACAP that are willing to install a buffer.

2022 This has not been done yet. Primary challenge is staff time. Resources have mainly gone to Keystone 10 Million Trees Partnership Program. | |

| | Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned | | Yellow - action has encountered minor obstacles | | Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier | | | | | | |

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available		Resources Needed	Annual Progress to Date (2023)	Reason for Change to Action Item
3.5	Focused Stream Corridor BMP implementation	*Urban Stream Restoration – 12,000 new LF* *Non-urban Stream Restoration – 22,430 new LF* *Wetland Creation – 15 new acres* *Wetland Restoration – 30 new acres*	Local municipalities, TSPs, watershed groups, EACs, CCCD, developers	All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments (as catchments analyzed)	On-going with inherent tie to P.I. 1	Potential regional projects for PRP reductions distributed amongst multiple municipalities	CCCD, Trout Unlimited (TU), watershed groups, Brandywine Conservancy, local engineers/ consultants, Cecil Land Trust/EIP	NFWF, GG, CBT, PennVEST, MEBF, private	Capital Cost: ~$13.9 million	**2025** One stream restoration project implemented in 2025. Another is potentially planned for 2026, depending on CAP funding availability. **2024** One significant floodplain/stream restoration project awarded with assistance from CAP funds during the 2024 calendar year. **2023** Toured Elk Creek floodplain restoration with RES and others. Ag Team, CCCD Board of Directors, and partners learned about this a potential option for some farmers. **2022** Aware of three "large" stream restoration projects in development. 3rd party entities (e.g. RES) exploring banking opportunities in the Bay watershed.	

Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Progress and Milestones Template

Each county-based local area will use this template to identify:

1. Inputs – These are both existing and needed resources, public and private, to implement the identified priority initiative. These include both technical and financial resources, such as personnel, supplies, equipment and funding.

2. Process – what is each partner able to do where and by when. These are the action items listed under each priority initiative.

3. Outputs and outcomes – both short and long-term. These are the priority initiatives identified by each county.   The performance targets are the intermediate indicators that will measure progress.

4. Implementation challenges – any potential issues or roadblocks to implementation that could impede outputs and outcomes.

Asterisk: Place an asterisk next to the action number(s) for action items that appear in both the County Planning and Progress Template and the Programmatic Recommendations Template.

For each Priority Initiative or Program Element: Use the fields, as defined below, to identify the inputs and the process that will be followed to achieve each priority initiative. This is the "who, what, where, when and how" of the plan:

Description = What. This may include programs that address prevention, education, or as specific as planned BMP installations that will address the Priority Initiative. A programmatic or policy effort will require some ability to quantify the anticipated benefits which will allow calculation of the associated nutrient reductions.

Performance Target = How. This is an extension of the Description above. The Performance Target details the unique BMPs that will result from implementation of the Priority Initiative and serves as a benchmark to track progress in addressing the Priority Initiative. Performance Targets may be spread across multiple Responsible Parties, Geographies, and Timelines based on the specifics of the Initiative.

Responsible Party(ies) = Who. This is/are the key partner(s) who will implement the action items though outreach, assistance or funding, and who will be responsible for delivering the identified programs or practices.

Geographic Location = Where. This field identifies the geographic range of the planned implementation. This could extend to the entire county or down to a small watershed, based on the scale of the Priority Initiative, range of the Responsible Party, or planned funding/resources. *NOTE: Resource limitations alone should not limit potential implementation as additional funding may become available in the future.*

Expected Timeline = When. Provide the expected completion date for the planned activity. This should be a reasonable expectation, based on knowledge and experience, that will aid in tracking progress toward addressing the Priority Initiative.

Resources Available: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources secured/available to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the resources identified in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if available, to each action.

Resources Needed: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources needed/outstanding to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the additional resources projected and identified as needed in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if possible, to each action.

Potential Implementation Challenges/Issues = This field will note challenges and issues that may delay program implementation (Description).

Annual Progress to Date = This field will be used for annual reporting on priority initiatives. This is a description of the action(s) your county took toward achieving the priority initiative. Examples include education and outreach, programmatic changes, etc. For numeric priority initiatives your county can retrieve those numbers directly from *FieldDoc* or put in the column "See *FieldDoc*."

Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned   Yellow - action has encountered minor obstacles   Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available	Resources Needed	Annual Progress to Date (2023) *add new 2023 progress above the existing 2021 and 2022 progress. Date each entry	Reason for Change to Action Item (2023-2024 milestone period)
4.1	Basin Retrofits Pilot Project		Chester County Conservation District (CCCD), Chester County Water Resources Authority (CCWRA)	Where basin and landowner receptiveness coincide	Late 2021 launch	Establish retrofits program that can be mimicked across the watershed A basin called out in an MS4 PRP could serve as the pilot	Local engineers/ consultants, CCWRA, Chester County Parks and Preserve. HOA Open Space GIS layer	NFWF, Growing Greener (GG) (assuming spring 2022 availability)	**2025** One basin retrofit was implemented in 2025 using CAP funding. Another is planned for 2026 depending on CAP funding availability. **2024** Basin Retrofits Project to serve as a pilot/model underway. **2023** One Basin Retrofit project is set to be implemented in late 2023 using CAP funding. **2022** Applied for funding from NFWF Small Watersheds Grant and were turned down. Looking to fund these projects another way. Municipal partners have been identified, sites have been selected, and project development is underway.	

4.2	Minimum Control Measure (MCM) 3 (IDD&E) Compliance Assistance	*Advanced IDD&E Control – 3,000 acres treated*	CCWRA, local municipalities, Environmental Advisory Committees (EACs)	MS4 regulated areas	Ongoing	Identify needs and assistance channels for compliant MS4 programs (specifically MCM #3 for Illicit Discharge Detection & Elimination (IDD&E) and education/outreach channels)	DEP, local engineers/ consultants, EPA		IDD&E public works training, mock inspections		**2025** Oxford Borough filed its first annual MS4 report this September, and its PRP was approved. Until there is some sort of noise from SERO, there likely won't be motivation in the region to implement an IDD&E compliance regime. The regional EAC would be willing to help broker some sort of collaborative approach to doing this. **2024** Do not anticipate much movement with this action item until the new MS4 permit draft is released. **2023** Upper Oxford and East Nottingham have approved PRP's and filed MS4 Annual Reports for the fiscal year ending June 30. Penn's PRP was approved May 1, 2023. Neither Honey Brook Borough, Honey Brook Township, nor Oxford Borough have permits or approved PRP's. The primary reason for these delays is lack of clarity and insufficient responsiveness from overtaxed DEP staff. Elk, Lower Oxford and West Nottingham have waivers that in theory have been extended to March 15, 2025.	

											East Nottingham has notification system in place for Illicit discharges. Upper Oxford has its PRP on its website. Oxford Borough has a stormwater management page on its website. Neither Elk, Lower Oxford, not West Nottingham have stormwater management pages, nor any IDD&E reporting structures in place. Penn Township has a stormwater management page, but no specific IDD&E structure. **2022** The vast majority of C3 municipalities (Chester County municipalities located in the Chesapeake Basin) have either not had their first MS4 permits approved or have received waivers, hence have not produced annual reports from which these data can be tracked.	
4.3	MS4 Circuit Rider	*Circuit Rider hired/secured (one full time staff equivalent)*	CCWRA, Environ. Advisory Committees (EACs), local municipalities, Oxford Reg. Planning Comm.	MS4 muni.	Ongoing once funding secured (ideally launch spring 2022)	PCSM BMPs inventory and verification processes If parameters for capture of underreported BMPs are known, process can commence at a limited version through catchment targeting under P.I. 1 and Action 4.5 Assist with coordinating and outreach efforts for	Local engineers/consultants, County DCIS (Dept. of Computer and Info. Services) Env. Finance Center (EFC)	NFWF	Centralized database platform Qualified individual that is familiar with MS4 program and Chester County	$75,000/yr: capture BMPs, build inventory and/or verify USGS inventory and conduct long-term verification processes	**2025** Brandywine Conservancy has a NFWF grant (with applications for supporting grants) to expand GSI siting and design outreach to landowners who don't fit into the MS4, ag conservation pigeon holes. Ray Fenstermacher started as the Octoraro Watershed Restoration Coordinator, and he has performed outreach to municipalities on MS4 BMP implementation	

						next MS4 permit cycle in 2023					opportunities. Ray will become even more involved as he gets more familiar with partners.	
											2024 Efforts continued to provide support as capable and requested by individual municipalities. The primary beneficiary has been Oxford Borough with development and implementation of a GI Plan.	
											2023 Efforts mostly focused on distribution of needed activities amongst various existing entities and resources.	
											There is a need to strengthening the capacity of this portion of the County in order to implement the C3AP municipal targets. A circuit rider in addition to DEP's clear completion of the 2018-2023 MS4 permit review process is essential to achieving our goals.	
											Additionally, CCCD and CCWRA do not have the staffing capacity to take on all of the C3AP goals at once.	
											This particular goal will have to put off at least to Spring of 2024.	
											2022 Efforts mostly focused on distribution of needed activities amongst various existing entities and resources.	

											There is a need to strengthening the capacity of this portion of the County in order to implement the C3AP municipal targets. A circuit rider in addition to DEP's clear completion of the 2018-2023 MS4 permit review process is essential to achieving our goals. Additionally, CCCD and CCWRA do not have the staffing capacity to take on all of the C3AP goals at once. This particular goal will have to put off at least to Spring of 2023.	
4.4	Existing BMPs Needs	*Database of implemented stormwater BMPs by 2025*	CCCD, CCWRA, local municipalities, EACs, County DCIS, County Planning (CCPC)	All areas	Ongoing, but follows initial circuit rider and BMP reporting reconciliation efforts	Potential HOA assistance entity Initiate with MS4 municipalities with intent to follow-up with non-MS4s (first step is BMPs dated to 2003) Result of BMP inventory generation, BMP reporting reconciliation, and initial verifications for the identification of BMPs requiring maintenance, rehabilitation, and similar.	County, CCPC, local engineers/ consultants, local maintenance contractors	NFWF, GG	Inventory of individual BMP needs (maint. needed, etc.) Potential HOA assistance entity MS4 GIS files	TBD (result of inventory and reconciliation processes) See Action 4.3 for Circuit Rider information	**2025** Oxford Borough is looking to hire a contractor to perform BMP maintenance. CCWRA is surveying municipalities about their interest in a county-wide stormwater authority. An inventory of stormwater maintenance needs would likely be a part of this effort if it comes to fruition. **2024** Do not anticipate a large-scale effort or revisioning of inventories for reporting BMPs until the new MS4 permit draft is released. **2023** Additional progress has been made in collecting information on proposed BMP's in municipal PRP's. A comprehensive inventory of all existing BMPs in need of repairs or maintenance is still needed, and will likely only be achieved in coordination with action item 4.3.	

									Annual Progress to Date (2023) *add new 2023 progress above the existing 2021 and 2022 progress. Date each entry	Reason for Change to Action Item (2023-2024 milestone period)
Action # Green Yellow Red	**Description**	**Performance Target(s)**	**Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships**	**Geographic Location**	**Expected Timeline**	**Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations**	**Resources Available**	**Resources Needed**		
			Chester County Conservation District (CCCD), Chester County Water Resources Authority (CCWRA)	Where basin and landowner receptiveness coincide	Late 2021 launch	Establish retrofits program that can be mimicked across the watershed A basin called out in an MS4 PRP could serve as the pilot	Local engineers/ consultants, CCWRA, Chester County Parks and Preserve. HOA Open Space GIS layer	NFWF, Growing Greener (GG) (assuming spring 2022 availability)		**2025** One basin retrofit was implemented in 2025 using CAP funding. Another is planned for 2026 depending on CAP funding availability. **2024** Basin Retrofits Project to serve as a pilot/model underway. **2023** One Basin Retrofit project is set to be implemented in late 2023 using CAP funding. **2022** Applied for funding from NFWF Small Watersheds Grant and were turned down. Looking to fund these projects another way. Municipal partners have been identified, sites have been selected, and project development is underway.	
4.1	Basin Retrofits Pilot Project									
									2022	

Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned   **Yellow** - action has encountered minor obstacles   **Red** - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier

											Some progress has been made in collecting information on proposed BMP's in municipal PRP's. A comprehensive inventory of all existing BMPs in need of repairs or maintenance is still needed, and will likely only be achieved in coordination with action item 4.3.	
4.5	Catchment Targeting Initiative	See Priority Initiative 1 for targets	Ag Action Team (AT), Data Management (DM) Action Team (AT), Catchment Targeting (CT) Action Team (AT), Muni Action Team (AT), watershed groups, local municipalities, Brandywine Conservancy, CCCD, CCWRA, EACs, CCPC	Prioritized Catchments (TBD)	Mid 2021 Launch with inherent tie to P.I. 1 (catchment targeting)	Partner with Catchment Targeting AT during catchment prioritization efforts to identify individual catchment needs, BMP probabilities, etc.			Centralized database platform (see P.I. 5)	See P.I. 1 for more information	**2025** Work in the Octoraro continues to be a priority with Ray's position and other prioritization strategies, including the CWIP overlapping priorities. Brandywine Conservative has an NFWF initiative to target GSI outside of the MS4 and ag communities, **2024** The natural and ag sector within the Octorara watershed remains the primary focus; but assistance and focus also exists with Oxford Borough with the development and implementation of their GSI Plan. **2023** EPA has begun the preliminary process of creating an Advanced Restoration Plan in one or two catchments above the Octoraro Reservoir. EPA is looking for input on catchment selection. We have asked EPA if they are able to provide some quantitative information about each potential catchment in Chester County. The Ag Team will be	

												tasked with giving a qualitative evaluation of the "human element" of each catchment to get a feel for openness to conservation the community is. One catchment has been looked at in this manner so far. **2022** Primary focus is currently in the Upper Oxford area. Intent is to flesh out details of the process (e.g. what does a partnership look like between multiple entities including local municipalities) for coordinating efforts.	
4.6	BMP Reporting Reconciliation			Muni AT, Data Mgmt AT, Catchment Targeting AT	All areas (Catchment targeting analyses will result in 2 data tables: 1) conservation needs/opps., and 2) existing BMPs for reconciliation	Launch late 2021 with inherent tie to Action 4.5 (limited activities until reporting platform is known or the parameters at a minimum)	Partner with Data Management AT for reconciliation of BMP reporting numbers (primarily through catchment targeting) Receive back organized data USGS has requested for Ch. 102/land development BMPs; may require Data Mgmt. AT to re-organize data and information All performance targets assume significant level of uncaptured BMPs in numbers. **Knowing parameters/ attributes that need captured for ultimate reporting would be ideal.***	Practice Keeper (PK) County Dept. of Computer and Info. Services (DCIS) EFC		Centralized database platform Circuit Rider MS4 reporting platform for Ch. 102/ PCSM BMPs	See Action 4.3 for more information	**2025** The draft MS4 permit was released, but progress on this item is still unlikely at this time. We have talked about using CAP Coordinator funds to complete this item, but the work group have many reasons why this isn't the right time for this effort to commence. One is that DEP is developing MS4 reporting, and that it will make it into the model. Another reason is that different townships are at very different points with their data management. **2024** Do not anticipate efforts continuing with this action until the new draft MS4 Permit is released. **2023** A comprehensive inventory of all existing BMPs in need of repairs or maintenance is still needed, and will likely only be achieved in coordination with action	

(yellow)										item 4.3. A separate funding source with a multi-year timeline to accommodate different counties for municipal BMP Reconciliation would help boost this action item. **2022** Efforts have mostly been centered around development of uniform data needs for collection and reporting.	
4.7 (green)	Existing Plans Alignment	*Game plan by late 2021*	Local municipalities, EACs, CCWRA, CCPC, CCCD	All areas	Ongoing with inherent tie to Action 4.5	Ensure efforts do not conflict and/or align with other efforts (e.g. county Act 167 plan) Game plan and coordination with Catchment Targeting AT (P.I. 1) for complete list of existing plans that need to be encompassed by the process	CCWRA, Brandywine Conservancy Oxford regional plans inventory completed with NFWF funding		Potentially new GIS layers for certain plans or information		**2024** Cursory plan cross-reference review conducted and no conflicting goals or focus areas identified. The Oxford Region Comprehensive Plan is scheduled to receive updates. **2023** Municipalities with PRPs continue to communicate with each other, Brandywine Conservancy, CCCD, CCPC, and the public (to varying degrees) in order to meet their pollutant reduction goals and to meet the goals of the C3AP. No concrete game plan document has been created to date. **2022** Municipalities with PRPs have been communicating with each other, Brandywine Conservancy, CCCD, CCPC, and the public (to varying degrees) in order to meet their pollutant reduction goals and to meet the goals of the C3AP. No concrete game plan document has been created to date.	

| 4.8 | PennDOT PRP Reductions | | EACs, CCWRA, CCCD, local municipalities, Environ. Finance Center (EFC) | PennDOT MS4 areas | Ongoing with inherent tie to Action 4.5 | Collaborative and joint project opportunities | Local engineers/ consultants, PennDOT | | | | **2025** The status of the PennDOT permit is unknown. **2024** Potential PennDOT projects as it relates to their PRP still under development and consideration. **2023** PennDOT's MS4 permit is still in review – it includes all projects statewide and has been delayed because of issues with their previous vendor in the Delaware Bay. RES has since taken the contract for that piece, so their PRP is going to be submitted in November, 2023 to start the review. An educational site visit to the completed RES project on Elk Creek took place in the summer of 2023 to open up a discussion about how this type of restoration works. Community members were able to ask specific questions about the science of the project which led to productive discussions. **2022** PennDOT PRP is currently under public comment. It includes two projects in Chester County in the CBW, each partnering with a municipality on stream restorations on Big Elk Creek. The project in East Nottingham is currently going through waiver review by the Waterways and Wetlands Program. At least two municipalities in | |

											Big Elk are in negotiation about meeting their Big Elk PRP obligations through that project. Some local residents have raised concerns about the science behind the projected sediment/nutrient reductions being estimated for this project.	
4.9	Joint PRP Projects		Local municipalities, EACs, EFC, local watershed groups, Oxford Reg. Planning Comm.	MS4 regulated areas	Ongoing (differing PRP cycles amongst MS4s)	Foster collaborative arena for multi-municipal projects providing regional benefits through cost-effective BMP implementation. Currently assuming this may be more applicable during the 2023-2027 permit cycle).	Local engineers/ consultants, Brandywine Conservancy MS4 PRPs EFC	NFWF, GG, CBT, PennVEST, American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Local Relief Fund, local municipal.			**2024** Do not anticipate additional collaboration efforts until the new draft MS4 permit is released with updated PRP requirements. **2023** Efforts currently centered around promoting joint projects. A number of PRPs have yet to be finalized and/or approved. Jamie Eberl at Central Office is RES's contact about the "credit sharing" piece and the understanding is that they have always encouraged collaboration and, although it is case by case, they have not denied any request to partner between municipalities in the same HUC 12. We have received feedback from municipalities that there has been a lack of clarity from DEP SERO over the conditions allowing municipalities to share	

											reduction credits within a watershed. **2022** Efforts currently centered around promoting joint projects. A number of PRPs have yet to be finalized and/or approved. We have received feedback from municipalities that there has been a lack of clarity from DEP SERO over the conditions allowing municipalities to share reduction credits within a watershed.	
4.10	Stormwater BMP Implementation	*Rate Reduction SWP Standards – 3,000 new acres treated* *Treatment SWP Standards – 89 new acres treated* *Wet Ponds and Wetlands – 50 new acres treated* *Infiltration Practices – 64 new acres treated* *Bioretention – 58new acres treated* *Bioswales – 25 new acres treated* *Vegetated Open Channels – 30 new acres treated* *Filtering Practices – 25 new acres treated* *Impervious Surface Reduction – 4 acres*	Local municipalities, developers, CCCD, CCWRA, EACs, Oxford Reg. Comm., CCPC	All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments	Ongoing (timing tied to catchment analyses funding and Actions 4.5 and 4.6)	MS4 PRP projects to be reported via annual reports Significant uncaptured and/or underreported BMPs are assumed in this category and difficult to project. Assume significant progress achieved through BMP reporting reconciliation occurs for revisions to BMP implementation scenario in 2023 to better reflect rates. BMP implementation values include projects outlined in PRPs (where available) Landowner resistance or buy-in	Local engineers/ designers, DEP, Stroud, CCWRA, Brandywine Conservancy, Penn State, EFC County DCIS data	Developers, local municipal., GG, NFWF, PennVEST, CBT		Capital Cost: ~$TBD (after reconciliation and BMP rates revisions) Current assumptions are roughly 50%-70% of BMP values are already in place and uncaptured for reporting.	**2025** New submerged gravel wetland created at Community of Love Church in Oxford Borough. Two basin retrofits installed – one in Upper Oxford Township and one in Penn Township. **2024** Additional BMPs have been implemented, but efforts to update and expand inventories are not expected until the new MS4 permit draft is released. **2023** Implementation is occurring, but data/info capture processes still under development (see Catchment Targeting Priority Initiative). A non-ag sub-grants program is on-going for non-ag BMP implementation (use of CAP implementation funds). This program was used for 2023 implementation funds, and may be used for 2024 funds depending on how the projects that apply rank against ag applications. We	

#											
											received 2 applications for the Non-Ag Subgrant for 2023. The 2024 non-ag sub-grant has been announced. Progress here depends on achieving 4.1, 4.3-4.5, 4.8, 4.9. **2022** Implementation is occurring, but data/info capture processes still under development (see Catchment Targeting Priority Initiative). A non-ag sub-grants program was developed for non-ag BMP implementation (use of CAP implementation funds). This program will be used for 2023 implementation funds. We received 2 applications for the Non-Ag Subgrant for 2023. Progress here depends on achieving 4.1, 4.3-4.5, 4.8, 4.9.	
4.11	Urban Landscape	*Conservation Landscaping – 100 total acres* *Urban Forest Planting – 20 new acres* *MS4 Tree Canopy – 10 new acres* *Urban Nutrient Management – 2,000 acres*	CCCD, CCWRA, EACs, local municipalities, Brandywine Conservancy	All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments	Ongoing with inherent tie to Action 4.5	**Urban nutrient management is tied to fertilizer legislation at the state level.*** Landowner resistance or buy-in	ACB, CBF, DCNR, CCPC, CCWRA, Stroud, Brandywine Conservancy County DCIS	DCNR, Keystone, NFWF, GG, CBT, local municipal.		Capital Cost: ~$45,000	**2025** The 2020 Oxford Borough plantings are now emerging from their 5 year initial monitoring — tubes removed. **2024** Implementation is occurring via multiple partners (including with non-CAP funds (e.g. NFWF)). **2023** Implementation is occurring, but data/info capture processes still under development (see Catchment Targeting Priority Initiative). A non-ag sub-grants program was developed for non-ag BMP implementation (use of CAP implementation funds).	

											Progress here depends on achieving 4.1, 4.3-4.5, 4.8, 4.9. **2022** Implementation is occurring, but data/info capture processes still under development (see Catchment Targeting Priority Initiative). A non-ag sub-grants program was developed for non-ag BMP implementation (use of CAP implementation funds). Progress here depends on achieving 4.1, 4.3-4.5, 4.8, 4.9.	
4.12	Septic Systems	*Conventional Septic Denitrification – 3,000 systems* *Septic System Pumping – 6,000 systems*	Local municipalities, CCWRA	All areas outside public sewage areas	On-going, with primary info capture and analysis in 2022 with developed game plan	Use County GIS/ Health Dept. information for septic systems tracking and convert to reportable data (capture of existing systems) Initial analysis reveals approximately 17,700 septic systems (currently assuming 50% compliant systems until further analysis in completed)	County DCIS, County Health Dept., local municipalities, CCPC		GIS support		**2025** The county health department is responsible for tracking pumping, and they don't track this by watershed. Pumping is occurring. **2024** Pumping is occurring and recorded via county health department, but upward reporting processes still need to be finalized. **2023** Applicable data and information reside with the County Health Dept. Efforts underway on defining processes to appropriately report the information. **2022** Applicable data and information reside with the County Health Dept. Efforts underway on defining processes to appropriately report the information.	

Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Progress and Milestones Template

Each county-based local area will use this template to identify:

1. Inputs – These are both existing and needed resources, public and private, to implement the identified priority initiative. These include both technical and financial resources, such as personnel, supplies, equipment and funding.

2. Process – what is each partner able to do where and by when. These are the action items listed under each priority initiative.

3. Outputs and outcomes – both short and long-term. These are the priority initiatives identified by each county.   The performance targets are the intermediate indicators that will measure progress.

4. Implementation challenges – any potential issues or roadblocks to implementation that could impede outputs and outcomes.

Asterisk: Place an asterisk next to the action number(s) for action items that appear in both the County Planning and Progress Template and the Programmatic Recommendations Template.

For each Priority Initiative or Program Element: Use the fields, as defined below, to identify the inputs and the process that will be followed to achieve each priority initiative. This is the "who, what, where, when and how" of the plan:

Description = What. This may include programs that address prevention, education, or as specific as planned BMP installations that will address the Priority Initiative. A programmatic or policy effort will require some ability to quantify the anticipated benefits which will allow calculation of the associated nutrient reductions.

Performance Target = How. This is an extension of the Description above. The Performance Target details the unique BMPs that will result from implementation of the Priority Initiative and serves as a benchmark to track progress in addressing the Priority Initiative. Performance Targets may be spread across multiple Responsible Parties, Geographies, and Timelines based on the specifics of the Initiative.

Responsible Party(ies) = Who. This is/are the key partner(s) who will implement the action items though outreach, assistance or funding, and who will be responsible for delivering the identified programs or practices.

Geographic Location = Where. This field identifies the geographic range of the planned implementation. This could extend to the entire county or down to a small watershed, based on the scale of the Priority Initiative, range of the Responsible Party, or planned funding/resources. *NOTE: Resource limitations alone should not limit potential implementation as additional funding may become available in the future.*

Expected Timeline = When. Provide the expected completion date for the planned activity. This should be a reasonable expectation, based on knowledge and experience, that will aid in tracking progress toward addressing the Priority Initiative.

Resources Available: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources secured/available to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the resources identified in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if available, to each action.

Resources Needed: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources needed/outstanding to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the additional resources projected and identified as needed in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if possible, to each action.

Potential Implementation Challenges/Issues = This field will note challenges and issues that may delay program implementation (Description).

Annual Progress to Date = This field will be used for annual reporting on priority initiatives. This is a description of the action(s) your county took toward achieving the priority initiative. Examples include education and outreach, programmatic changes, etc. For numeric priority initiatives your county can retrieve those numbers directly from *FieldDoc* or put in the column "See *FieldDoc*."

Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Annual Progress Update – Chester County

<u>Green</u> - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned   <u>Yellow</u> - action has encountered minor obstacles   <u>Red</u> - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier

Action # **Green** **Yellow** **Red**	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources <u>Available</u>	Resources <u>Needed</u>	Annual Progress to Date	Reason for Change to Action Item
5.1	Centralized GIS-based database/ platform and targeting tool	*Game plan 4th qtr. 2021*	Chester County Conservation District (CCCD), Octoraro Watershed Association (OWA), County, Chester County Water Resources Authority (CCWRA)	All areas (catchments)	Ongoing; game plan by late 2021	Engage Chesapeake Conservancy to potentially expand Lancaster County's platform (CWMT) into Chester County (Octoraro watershed already included in platform) to provide centralized data management platform for Catchment Management Database (CMD) inventory, opportunities	County DCIS (Dept. of Computer and Info. Services), OWA, Chesapeake Conservancy, Brandywine Conservancy, watershed groups, local engineers/ consultants, CCWRA	$25,000 - $40,000 (depends on extent existing platform requires modifications and/or needs to expand into Chester County) $TBD for long-term platform management	**2025** Ray tried out the Conowingo WIP BMP Opportunity Analysis Web Viewer, which may serve us in a similar way as the proposed mapping application. Also, one of our Ag Team members is working on a web map of existing BMPs for internal use. **2024** Octorara related ARP and Source Water Collaborative efforts are on-going and anticipated to serve as the primary model for any centralized database or	

Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned   Yellow - action has encountered minor obstacles   Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available		Resources Needed	Annual Progress to Date	Reason for Change to Action Item
						targeting, and BMP reconciliation				platform that may be expanded upon. **2023** It was determined that the database kept by OWA and the OSWC Monitoring Work Group is sufficient at this time, and work with Chesapeake Conservancy to expand the CWMT platform into Chester County has not progressed. **2022** Met with Chesapeake Conservancy to discuss expanding CWMT platform into Chester County. Analysis of Chester County is currently progressing for a variety of BMPs. Will focus on buffers first.	
5.2	Reporting QA/QC		CCCD, NRCS, County, local municipalities, OWA, local watershed groups	All areas	Ongoing	Develop and monitor flowchart representing different BMP/data reporting processes to help ensure all new BMPs, captured BMPs, etc. are reported through the right mechanisms	Practice Keeper (PK), FieldDoc, County DCIS		Inherent ties to PK manager (Action 2.4) and Circuit Rider (Action 4.3)	**2024** Data capture and reporting processes for PK data entry organized and underway. Additional reporting processes for urban/suburban BMPs will be visited upon release of the next MS4 permit. **2023** CCCD has ramped up reporting of planning and BMP information into PK for ag BMPs through increased collection of plans from landowners and consultants. Non-ag sectors (urban/suburban and natural sectors) still are under development.	

Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned   **Yellow** - action has encountered minor obstacles   **Red** - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available		Resources Needed		Annual Progress to Date	Reason for Change to Action Item
											Since 2022, CCCD has collected plan copies for 88 operations that have been entered into PK NRCS continues to add practices 390 and 391 when planning exclusion fencing. **2022** CCCD has ramped up reporting of planning and BMP information into PK for ag BMPs through increased collection of plans from landowners and consultants. Non-ag sectors (urban/suburban and natural sectors) still are under development. CCCD has collected plan copies for 36 operations and they are in the process of being entered into PK. NRCS has begun adding practices 390 and 391 when planning exclusion fencing.	
5.3	Catchment Targeting Initiative and BMP reconciliation	Tied to P.I. 1 metrics	CCCD, OWA, County, local municipalities, local watershed groups, Environ. Advisory Committees (EACs), Oxford Reg. Planning Comm., DEP, Chester County Water Resources	All areas (catchments)	Ongoing; tied to platform development and Priority Initiative 1 (Catchment Targeting)	Ensure centralized platform appropriately captures and displays individual catchment needs, captured unreported BMPs, etc. and aligns with reporting processes Identify other parameters, information, data, etc. appropriate for	County DCIS, County Planning (CCPC)				**2024** Collaborative efforts underway in the Octorara watershed that will determine future targeting and BMP capture processes. **2023** See Catchment Targeting Priority Initiative action items. **2022**	

Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Annual Progress Update – Chester County

<u>Green</u> - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned   <u>Yellow</u> - action has encountered minor obstacles   <u>Red</u> - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier

Action # Green Yellow Red	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources <u>Available</u>		Resources <u>Needed</u>		Annual Progress to Date	Reason for Change to Action Item
			Authority (CCWRA)			capture and display in centralized platform					See Catchment Targeting Priority Initiative action items.	

Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Progress and Milestones Template

Each county-based local area will use this template to identify:

1. Inputs – These are both existing and needed resources, public and private, to implement the identified priority initiative. These include both technical and financial resources, such as personnel, supplies, equipment and funding.

2. Process – what is each partner able to do where and by when. These are the action items listed under each priority initiative.

3. Outputs and outcomes – both short and long-term. These are the priority initiatives identified by each county.   The performance targets are the intermediate indicators that will measure progress.

4. Implementation challenges – any potential issues or roadblocks to implementation that could impede outputs and outcomes.

Asterisk: Place an asterisk next to the action number(s) for action items that appear in both the County Planning and Progress Template and the Programmatic Recommendations Template.

For each Priority Initiative or Program Element: Use the fields, as defined below, to identify the inputs and the process that will be followed to achieve each priority initiative. This is the "who, what, where, when and how" of the plan:

Description = What. This may include programs that address prevention, education, or as specific as planned BMP installations that will address the Priority Initiative. A programmatic or policy effort will require some ability to quantify the anticipated benefits which will allow calculation of the associated nutrient reductions.

Performance Target = How. This is an extension of the Description above. The Performance Target details the unique BMPs that will result from implementation of the Priority Initiative and serves as a benchmark to track progress in addressing the Priority Initiative. Performance Targets may be spread across multiple Responsible Parties, Geographies, and Timelines based on the specifics of the Initiative.

Responsible Party(ies) = Who. This is/are the key partner(s) who will implement the action items though outreach, assistance or funding, and who will be responsible for delivering the identified programs or practices.

Geographic Location = Where. This field identifies the geographic range of the planned implementation. This could extend to the entire county or down to a small watershed, based on the scale of the Priority Initiative, range of the Responsible Party, or planned funding/resources. *NOTE: Resource limitations alone should not limit potential implementation as additional funding may become available in the future.*

Expected Timeline = When. Provide the expected completion date for the planned activity. This should be a reasonable expectation, based on knowledge and experience, that will aid in tracking progress toward addressing the Priority Initiative.

Resources Available: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources secured/available to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the resources identified in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if available, to each action.

Resources Needed: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources needed/outstanding to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the additional resources projected and identified as needed in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if possible, to each action.

Potential Implementation Challenges/Issues = This field will note challenges and issues that may delay program implementation (Description).

Annual Progress to Date = This field will be used for annual reporting on priority initiatives. This is a description of the action(s) your county took toward achieving the priority initiative. Examples include education and outreach, programmatic changes, etc. For numeric priority initiatives your county can retrieve those numbers directly from *FieldDoc* or put in the column "See *FieldDoc*."