

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

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 # | 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 (2020 + 2021) <small>*add new 2021 progress above the existing 2020 progress. Date each entry</small> | Reason for Change to Action Item (2022-2023 milestone period) |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| Agriculture Action Team | | | | | | | Technical | Financial | Technical | Financial | | |
| Priority Initiative 1: Manure Management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Implement a suite of on-farm BMP's to address the manure so less of a need to spread during the winter, and introduce an end to winter spreading (5-8 year phase-in period) | Reduce manure being applied to farmland by 25% | Lancaster County Conservation District, Lancaster Clean Water Partners, all partners in the county, DEP, Dept of Ag | All of Lancaster County Projects to go in priority watersheds TBD based on results from community mapping tool | Initial tasks involve conversion of 25% to approximate pounds, and identification of distribution between manure and commercial fert. Research process and initial implementation done by 2025: vision is for a required ban to start in 2024 with full implementation by 2027 20 installs per year | Cultural shift is needed to accept that too much liquid manure is a problem instead of a resource; Extreme weather events cause damage and staff end up spending time/resources on repair instead of new implementation; Currently not enough on-farm 6-month storages Financial and technical support from municipalities as we all wade through new MS4 flexibility | Ag technician and Plain Sect Outreach coordinator-LCCD | NRCS | MORE contractors who are able to build manure storages and install BMPs to address the manure during winter months | Money for storages and alternative BMPs to address the manure during winter months | 2021: Implementation was slowed due to COVID but still progressing; material costs are rising thus further straining limited financial capacity for implementation; beginning to experience a lack of contractor capacity for implementation – delaying construction. <i>STORY LINK ></i> https://drive.google.com/file/d/1t88kTLo5W2VOo- AVaUcOI4dWzmhit15N/view?usp=sharing 2020: Controls and storage facilities are being built albeit at a slower pace than originally desired or planned due to limited capital and human resources. Game plan(s) for ensuring BMPs are captured in a central system (PracticeKeeper) are under development to assist with identification of human and capital needs for long-term verification processes. | The de-listing strategy provides a mechanism to target resources, focus, implementation activities, etc. with limited resources into manageable areas (catchments). Objective is to address a few catchments at a time and move on to a new group. Updated performance target to align known progress with new acres still needed to achieve final targets |
| | | Private sector consultants | | | | | NFWF grants | MORE Ag technician and Plain Sect Outreach coordinators who are all consistently trained to ensure BMPs are standardized and high quality | \$138,000 for barnyard runoff controls (for new BMP acres) | | | |
| | | Non-profit partners who do agricultural outreach and conservation projects | | | | | Plain-sect self-funding | MORE private sector consultants | Financial framework that includes research into nutrient credit trading, business models for manure-to-energy plants, etc. to support farms as local businesses | | | |
| | | | | | | | | MORE non-profit partners who do agricultural outreach and conservation projects | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | More coverage in national agriculture communications so this is widely viewed and accepted message (Farm Journal, etc.) | | | | |

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

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 # | 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 (2020 + 2021) <small>*add new 2021 progress above the existing 2020 progress. Date each entry</small> | Reason for Change to Action Item (2022-2023 milestone period) |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|---|
| Agriculture Action Team | | | | | | | Technical | Financial | Technical | Financial | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 1.1.1 | Explore digester or alternative manure treatment technologies (establish a business model that will work) | Manure treatment technologies – 20,000 tons | All partners | | | | | | | | 2021: Implications from COVID restricted progress during the 2021 calendar year. 2020: Potential regional digester in Cocalico Creek watershed area stalled. During preliminary exploratory and development phases, it became apparent the business model that will most likely succeed involves the ability for processing operations to result in a by-product (e.g. electricity, biochar, etc.) that can be sold to cover collection and processing costs. | |
| 1.2 | Livestock access management | Grass buffer with exclusion fencing 2,500 acres (largely underreported – PSU survey will capture new info) | All partners, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, LCCD | All of Lancaster County with direct farmer outreach happening in priority watersheds first | Research process and initial implementation done by 2025; vision is for a required ban to start in 2024 with full implementation by 2027 | Develop local incentive programs to promote the practice as a viable option for landowners; Add watering facilities or crossings; Current PA clean streams law restricts any local ability to require fencing livestock out of a stream or river; Financial and technical support from municipalities as we all wade through new MS4 flexibility; Extreme weather events cause damage and staff end up delayed or spending time/resources on repair instead of new implementation | Educational materials about herd health benefits of fencing herds out of streams | NRCS | More boots on the ground to do farmer outreach and implementation | Dollars to pay the outreach staff | 2021: Plain Sect acceptance of implementation is becoming more widespread; implementation proceeding a slower pace due to limited capital and human resources. Additional resources for moving into other catchments as part of the de-listing strategy may help accelerate implementation rates. STORY LINK > Millions in federal funding to cover costs of restoring 350 miles of Lancaster County streams 2020: Outreach and implementation of controls have been proceeding but at a slower pace than originally desired or planned due to limited capital and human resources. | |
| 1.3 | Increase the number of manure storages and better barnyard management | Animal Waste Management Systems – 321,609 total animal units/263,088 new animal units | All partners, LCCD, Private sector agriculture consultants | Projects to go in priority watersheds TBD based on results from community mapping tool | Built by 2025 | Dollars (funding); Financial and technical support from municipalities as we all wade through new MS4 flexibility; | LCCD | NRCS | More boots on the ground to do farmer outreach and implementation | Dollars to pay the outreach staff | 2021: Implementation was slowed due to COVID but still progressing; material costs are rising thus further straining limited financial capacity for implementation; beginning to | Updated performance target to align known progress with new acres still needed to achieve final targets |

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

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 # | 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 (2020 + 2021) *add new 2021 progress above the existing 2020 progress. Date each entry | Reason for Change to Action Item (2022-2023 milestone period) |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Technical | Financial | Technical | Financial | | |
| Agriculture Action Team | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|---|-------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | Extreme weather events cause damage and limit time staff/contractors have for new implementation | Dept. of Ag | NFWF grants that include imp. dollars | More coverage in national agriculture communications so this is widely viewed and accepted message (Farm Journal, etc) | For six months of waste storage accommodating 100,000 AUs, approximately \$80M would be needed for tank storage and engineering and construction | experience a lack of contractor capacity for implementation – delaying construction. 2020: Outreach and implementation of controls have been proceeding but at a slower pace than originally desired or planned due to limited capital and human resources. Game plan(s) for ensuring BMPs are captured in a central system (PracticeKeeper) are under development to assist with identification of human and capital needs for long-term verification processes. | |
| | | | | | | NRCS | DEP's small business grants for fence materials | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Private Consultants | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | NGO's | | | | | | |
| 1.4 | Create a more comprehensive reporting system for manure transport in and out of the county [host meetings of all brokers to understand what data is available] [reporting mechanism needed] | Manure transport out of the county – 149,536 total dry tons/138,035 new dry tons | LCCD, Manure haulers, DEP or Dept of Ag needs to be holder of this data for proper analysis and application to the model, SCC | All of Lancaster County | Meetings to start in fall 2018 and continue until accurate recording system is established and running by 2025 | No required reporting (data gap from planners/ farmers to brokers to state); PK is only available to LCCD and specific DEP employees so accessing the specifics of manure is limited; Act 49 does not require haulers/ brokers to submit data about tons moved and dest. (no data into Practice Keeper) Continued meetings/discussions may be appropriate as the Act 38 reporting changes are better understood. | Haulers and brokers | NFWF grants that include imp. dollars | Point person at DEP and/or Dept of Ag for the data and analysis | Incentive for haulers to submit data accurately and timely | 2021: Act 38 reporting changes may help the process, and will be assessed at a later date to ascertain the comprehensive reporting system and reporting mechanism components of the action description. 2020: Meetings and discussions have yielded fruitful results and established baseline agreements that a more comprehensive reporting system is needed but should be developed and implemented at the state level due to inter-county trading. | The Act 38 changes are welcomed, but a comparative analysis of data prior and post to changes will be necessary along with continued communications with applicable stakeholders if the changes have resulted in an adequate understanding of manure transport quantities. Updated performance target to align known progress with new acres still needed to achieve final targets |
| | | | | | | | Private consultants | | Incentive for haulers to submit data accurately and timely | \$2.6M to transport manure and farmer compensation | | |
| | | | | | | | Winter matrix | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | SWP teams | | Local lead | | | |

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

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 # | 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 (2020 + 2021) <small>*add new 2021 progress above the existing 2020 progress. Date each entry</small> | Reason for Change to Action Item (2022-2023 milestone period) |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|---|
| Agriculture Action Team | | | | | | | Technical | Financial | Technical | Financial | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|--------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| 1.5 | <p style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;">Write and implement 2,400 conservation plans for better nutrient management (improve consistent verification of BMPs done by any conservation professional)</p> | <p><i>Soil Conservation/Water Quality Plans – 247,167 total acres/176,792 new acres</i></p> | <p>LCCD, private agriculture consultants, NRCS, DEP</p> | <p>All of Lancaster County</p> | <p>2025</p> | <p>Assess the option of establishing minimum/baseline BMP's for all plan writers to suggest in order to achieve nutrient management and soil health;</p> <p>Financial and technical support from municipalities as we all wade through new MS4 flexibility;</p> <p>Limited resources stifle the District's ability to do sufficient compliance checks for current plans (need to be done more often than once a year and 3 strike rule)</p> <p style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;">Develop inventory of plan needs via de-listing strategy catchments.</p> <p style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;">Direct transfer of BMPs in NRCS generated plans to local PK platform would provide a better snapshot of progress and needs*</p> <p style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;">Clarification of appropriate procedure to report verifications per the BMP Verification Plan is needed*</p> | <p>USDA</p> | <p>NFWF grants that include imp. dollars</p> | <p>MORE compliance/enforcement staff</p> | <p>Funding (\$4.4M) for more plan writers and compliance staff to enforce current regulations, and plans for new acres</p> | <p>2021: Numerous plans submitted to the APRP but specific quantity is unknown (number of plans and where); beginning to experience TSP capacity issues to develop plans in a timely manner. Will continue priority focus on catchments targeted under the de-listing strategy,</p> <p>2020: Outreach and implementation of plans have been proceeding but at a slower pace than originally desired or planned due to limited capital and human resources. It is evident private consultants have plans that are not captured in PracticeKeeper, and efforts to capture plans will most likely require financial resources.</p> | <p>The de-listing strategy provides a mechanism to target resources, focus, implementation activities, etc. with limited resources into manageable areas (catchments). Objective is to address a few catchments at a time and move on to a new group.</p> <p>Additional resources for PK management is necessary to monitor progress and line-up long-term verification processes for implemented plans and BMPs in the ag sector.</p> <p>Updated performance target to align known progress with new acres still needed to achieve final targets</p> |
| | | <p><i>Nutrient management Core N – 215,324 total acres/147,118 new acres</i></p> | | | | | <p>Private Agriculture consultants</p> | <p>DEP's Ag. Planning Reimb. Program</p> | <p>MORE Ag technician and Plain Sect Outreach coordinators who are all consistently trained to ensure BMPs are standardized and high quality</p> | <p>Fast track option to get Ag/ environmental students certified to write plans</p> <p style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;">~\$1.6 million for Nutrient Management new acres</p> | | |
| | | <p><i>Nutrient Management Core P – 214,784 total acres/183,539 new acres</i></p> | | | | | <p>Plain sect church leaders</p> | <p></p> | <p>MORE private sector consultants</p> | <p>Bankers, insurance agents, etc. to give farmers incentive reasons to use conservation practices</p> | | |
| | | <p><i>Nutrient Management N Placement – 6661 total acres</i></p> | | | | | <p></p> | <p></p> | <p>MORE non-profit partners who do agricultural outreach and conservation projects</p> | <p></p> | | |
| | | <p><i>Nutrient Management N Rate – 6661 total acres/6,527 new acres</i></p> | | | | | <p></p> | <p></p> | <p>More coverage in national agriculture communications so this is widely viewed and accepted message (Farm Journal, etc</p> | <p></p> | | |

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

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 # | 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 (2020 + 2021) *add new 2021 progress above the existing 2020 progress. Date each entry | Reason for Change to Action Item (2022-2023 milestone period) |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Technical | Financial | Technical | Financial | | |
| Agriculture Action Team | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Nutrient Management N Timing – 6661 total acres | | | | | | | Dedicated individual at LCCD for PK management and data entry | \$60,000/yr (1 person and equipment) | | |
| | | Nutrient Management P Placement – 6661 total acres | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Nutrient Management P Rate – 6661 total acres | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Nutrient Management P Timing – 6661 total acres | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Dairy Precision Feeding – 500 total animal units | | | | | | | | | | |

Priority Initiative 2: Soil Health

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--------------------------|--|------|--|---------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| 2.1 | Create a system to verify and document use of cover crops, increasing the number acres at the same time (85% of farms will have cover crops during winter months) | Cover crops with fall nutrients – 100,000 total acres/95,049 new acres | LCCD, Ag Council, Stroud | All of Lancaster County with a focus on priority watersheds and plain sect community | 2025 | No current required documentation; No data system currently identified but Practice Keeper has potential; | NRCS and USDA | NFWF grants that include imp. dollars | Satellite imagery for verification using best technology available | Dollars (\$15.4M) for more equipment | 2021: Implementation continues and is a focus in outreach and engagement efforts 2020: Implementation of cover crop approaches have grown exponentially and been successful. However, not all approaches are counted or being counted due to slight variations from the three specific approaches that count as reductions. | Updated performance target to align known progress with new acres still needed to achieve final targets |
| | | Cover crop commodity – 11,241 total acres | | | | Bay Program cover crop definitions do not fit Lancaster County cultural practices very well – little credit because of manure application*; Financial and technical support from municipalities as we all wade through new MS4 flexibility; | Penn State | | Staff time to canvass the county | Industry leaders (supermarkets, food processor) to pay a higher premium for crops raised with conservation practices/cover crops | | |

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

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 # | 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 (2020 + 2021) *add new 2021 progress above the existing 2020 progress. Date each entry | Reason for Change to Action Item (2022-2023 milestone period) |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Technical | Financial | Technical | Financial | | |
| Agriculture Action Team | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|------|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | Traditional cover crop – 43,559 total acres/2,576 new acres | | | | Extreme weather events; Humid summers make seed less available for fall purchase (ref Lancaster Farming article) NRCS new satellite data not accepted in the model | Bay Program | | A better cover crop definition in CAST to give credit to cover crops that receive nutrients, are harvested in the spring as silage for animals on the same farm | | | |
| | | | | | | | Plain Sect church leaders | | More coverage in national agriculture communications so this is widely viewed and accepted message (Farm Journal, etc) | | | |
| | | | | | | | PraticeKeeper | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Conservation Plans | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Ag Technicians | | | | | |
| 2.2 | Increase no-till practices (specific request to the plain sect communities to identify 5-8 farm clusters who are sharing equipment or who could share equipment – we want to get them the equipment if it helps) | High residue till - 110,570 total acres/80,957 new acres (Spring 2020 transect survey revealed ~67% of the county is in no/low till) Conservation till – 78,129 total acres/13,872 new acres | LCCD, PA No-Till Alliance, Stroud | All of Lancaster County with a focus on priority watersheds and plain sect communities | 2025 | The governor’s push for PA to be the #1 state for organic production can be more integrated with water quality efforts and messaging overall (example: organic makes no-till a more difficult sell because they cannot use herbicides); Financial and technical support from municipalities as we all wade through new MS4 flexibility; Shifting dairy industry will likely drive more farmers to produce but we need to get the no-till message to them before they make the switch; | More no-till planters are available from local equipment manufacturers Host more movie premier events of Stroud’s soil health film and pair it with a panel of farmers | NFWF grants that include imp. and peer-to-peer outreach dollars to pay farmers for their time (Stroud) | Local benefits for no-till farmers More coverage in national agriculture communications so this is widely viewed and accepted message (Farm Journal, etc.) | Dollars (\$3.1M annually) for more equipment Industry leaders to pay a higher premium for crops raised with conservation tillage practices | 2021: Extremely difficult to measure progress (but we know implementation is occurring) as there is no required reporting; many partners focusing on/promoting soil health practices; emerging markets may enhance implementation. Communication of transect survey data for practices may help ascertain progress. 2020: No-till approaches are widely accepted. However, implementation has been proceeding at a slower pace than originally desired or planned due to limited capital | Progress is difficult to measure with delays in reporting mechanisms. Capturing numeric estimates via the transect survey should help the process. Updated performance target to align known progress with new acres still needed to achieve final targets |

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

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 # | 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 (2020 + 2021) <small>*add new 2021 progress above the existing 2020 progress. Date each entry</small> | Reason for Change to Action Item (2022-2023 milestone period) |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|---|
| Agriculture Action Team | | | | | | | Technical | Financial | Technical | Financial | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|------|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | Promoting soil health to horse farmers is especially difficult. Capture of practices via transect survey can help ascertain progress. | Peer-to-peer outreach from NTA members Municipalities who want to support this practice to protect their roads | | | | and human resources. Seed money for a local incentive program may accelerate implementation. | |
| 2.3 | Better pasture and crop management for healthier upland soils | <i>Prescribed grazing – 12,603 total acres/9,814 new acres</i> | LCCD, Private Ag. Consultants, Stroud | All of Lancaster County with a focus on priority watersheds and plain sect community | 2025 | Average farm size is small so enough pasture can be difficult; Manure injection equipment is expensive; Participation rates are currently low so peer-to-peer is difficult; Shifting dairy industry will likely drive more farmers to produce | LCCD | | More staff to do outreach to find willing land-owners | Incentive program to do soil health practices | 2021: Opportunities for implementation may be increasing as many farmers are transitioning away from dairy and reducing pressure on pasture areas; prototype of manure injection equipment for Plain Sect was developed <i>STORY LINK > Keep up the momentum, together! (campaign-archive.com)</i> 2020: Without an incentive program to cover start-up costs and offset other losses, this action has been difficult to achieve meaningful implementation rates. | With progress observed with manure incorporation practice during 2021, the action has been upgraded from red to yellow. Updated performance target to align known progress with new acres still needed to achieve final targets |
| | | <i>Manure Injection – Additional 10,000 acres (at least 1,876 injected in 2021 (per records))</i> | | | | | Private Consultants | | Farmers to do peer-to-peer conversations | \$800K for prescribed grazing (new acres) and \$339K for manure injection, with services provided largely by haulers | | |
| | | | | | | | NGO's | | More coverage in national agriculture communications (Farm Journal, etc.) | | | |
| | | | | | | | NRCS | | | | | |

Priority Initiative 3: Ag Community Education and Outreach

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|---|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3.1 | Education and Outreach (focus on flood control, public health benefits, herd health, building legacy options for families, economics, and achieving compliance; winter/spring 2020 Ag event organized by source water collaboratives) | | NGO's, LCCD, DEP, Dept of Ag, Penn State Extension, Lancaster Clean Water Partners, municipalities ELANCO and EAJA source water collaboratives | All of Lancaster County Focus on the plain sect communities in priority watersheds Drinking water in ELANCO | On-going | Time; Funding for staff time; So many landowners to reach; So many options that it gets confusing for landowners and conservation professionals; Plain Sect are traditionally nervous about govt funding | | | More coverage in national agriculture communications so this is widely viewed and accepted message (Farm Journal, etc) | \$400K per year for additional staffing (5 persons) and outreach | 2021: Both outreach and corresponding implementation funding need to increase substantially to meet goals by 2025; outreach has been successful but timing bottlenecks emerged with flow of implementation funding; risk of losing landowner interest if unable to implement BMPs in a timely manner. Pace currently dictated by catchments of focus in de-listing strategy. | The de-listing strategy provides a mechanism to target resources, focus, implementation activities, etc. with limited resources into manageable areas (catchments). Objective is to address a few catchments at a time and move on to a new group. |
|------------|--|--|--|---|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

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 # | 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 (2020 + 2021) <small>*add new 2021 progress above the existing 2020 progress. Date each entry</small> | Reason for Change to Action Item (2022-2023 milestone period) |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | Technical | Financial | Technical | Financial | | |
| Agriculture Action Team | | | | | | | Technical | Financial | Technical | Financial | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 2020: A significant amount of time and effort has been focused on outreach and has been very successful. However, activities have been proceeding at a relatively slow pace due to limited capital and human resources available for one-on-one or individual farm engagements | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Planning and Progress 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 through 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.*

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

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 # | 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 (2020 + 2021) <small>*add new 2021 progress above the existing 2020 progress. Date each entry</small> | Reason for Change to Action Item (2022-2023 milestone period) |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|--|---|
| Agriculture Action Team | | | | | | | Technical | Financial | Technical | Financial | | |

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).