

US EPA CONSIDERS THE FOLLOWING WHEN REVIEWING WBPS

A. IDENTIFICATION OF CAUSES AND SOURCES OF IMPAIRMENT

1. Sources of impairment are identified and described.
2. Specific sources of impairment are geographically identified (i.e. mapped).
3. Data sources are accurate and verifiable, assumptions can be reasonably justified.

B. EXPECTED LOAD REDUCTIONS

1. Load reductions achieve environmental goal (e.g. TMDL allocations).
2. Desired load reductions are quantified for each source of impairment (**SEE THE TABLE B ON THE NEXT PAGE**).
3. Expected load reductions are estimated for each management measure described in (C) and the overall watershed (**SEE THE TABLE A ON THE NEXT PAGE**).
4. Data sources and/or modeling processes are accurate and verifiable, assumptions can be reasonably justified.

C. PROPOSED MANAGEMENT MEASURES

1. Specific management measures are identified and rationalized.
2. Proposed management measures are strategic and feasible for the watershed.
3. Critical/priority implementation areas have been identified.
4. The extent of expected implementation is quantified (e.g. miles of streambank fenced etc.).

D. TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED

1. Cost estimates reflect all planning and implementation costs.
2. Cost estimates are provided for each management measure.
3. All potential Federal, State, Local and Private funding sources are identified.
4. Funding is strategically allocated; activities are funded with appropriate sources (e.g. NRCS funds for BMP cost share).

E. INFORMATION, EDUCATION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMPONENT

1. A stakeholder outreach strategy has been developed and documented.
2. All relevant stakeholders are identified, and procedures for involving them are defined.
3. Education/outreach materials and dissemination methods are identified.

F. SCHEDULE

G. MILESTONES

1. Implementation schedule includes specific dates and expected accomplishments.
2. Implementation schedule follows a logical sequence.
3. Implementation schedule covers a reasonable time frame.
4. Measurable milestones with expected completion dates are identified to evaluate progress.
5. A phased approach with interim milestones is used to ensure continuous implementation.

H. LOAD REDUCTIONS CRITERIA

1. Proposed criteria effectively measures progress toward load reduction goals.
2. Criteria includes: (1) quantitative measures of implementation progress and pollution reduction; and (2) qualitative measures of overall program success (including public involvement and buy-in).
3. Interim water quality indicator milestones are clearly identified; note: the indicator parameters may be different from water quality standards.
4. An adaptive management approach is in place with threshold criteria identified to trigger modifications.

I. MONITORING COMPONENT

1. Monitoring plan includes an appropriate number of monitoring stations.
2. Monitoring plan has an adequate sampling frequency.
3. Monitoring plan will effectively measure criteria identified in (H).

US EPA CONSIDERS THE FOLLOWING WHEN REVIEWING WBPs

EXAMPLES OF LOAD TRACKING TABLES

Table A. Tracking BMPs by goal year

Goal year	BMP	BMP goals (# of units)	Units	Cost per unit	# of units implemented
2011	Fencing	500	Linear feet	\$25/feet	
	Cover crop	100	Acers	\$500/acre	
	Forest buffer	200		\$1,000/acre	
2012	Fencing	250	Linear feet	\$25/feet	
	Cover crop	1000	Acers	\$500/acre	
	Forest buffer	200		\$1,000/acre	
2013	Fencing	1000	Linear feet	\$25/feet	
	Cover crop	400	Acers	\$500/acre	
	Forest buffer	500		\$1,000/acre	
2014	Fencing	1500	Linear feet	\$25/feet	
	Cover crop	300	Acers	\$500/acre	
	Forest buffer	600		\$1,000/acre	

Table B. Tracking load reductions by pollutant

Target pollutant	Required TMDL load reduction	Units	Goal year	WBP target load reduction	Load reduction achieved	%TMDL reduction
Sediment		Tons/year	2011			
			2012			
			2013			
			2014			
Nitrogen		Lbs/year	2011			
			2012			
			2013			
			2014			
Phosphorous		Lbs/year	2011			
			2012			
			2013			
			2014			