INTRODUCTION: SPECIFIC CRITERIA TO ADDRESS IN INFORMATION AND EDUCATION PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PLANS - 3/26/03

There are two primary categories of project-specific criteria that will be used in the EPA evaluation process: 1) project suitability; and 2) project proposal content. These criteria emphasize project appropriateness and areas to which special attention should be given as the proposal is developed.

A. Project Suitability

Projects to be funded as information and education activities need to be identified in the NPS Management Plan or the equivalent State information and education strategy (whichever is more current) as stipulated in the Region VIII policy paper. The goal of the project must focus on the identified State NPS Program goals.

The project needs to strengthen and/or balance the State NPS information and education program.

The project proposal needs to clearly describe the steps taken to coordinate with and involve potentially interested parties in formulating the work plan.

Duplication of BMP demonstration projects already funded by other agencies (e.g., abandoned well sealing) should be avoided unless well justified. Multiple demonstration projects which address the same topic should be distributed across the state according to a plan developed by the State. Justification must be provided if a proposed demonstration project is to be located near an existing project or site which addresses the same topic.

Collaborative projects are encouraged, but suitable use of 319 NPS funds for the project is required. Section 319 funds may be appropriate when the project meets EPA goals and priorities and the State NPS Management Program goals and priorities. However, Section 319 funds should not be the major funding source if other agencies would be more appropriate sources of funds based on their mandates and programs. Financial support for the primary responsibilities or mandates of other agencies is not an appropriate use of Section 319 funds. EPA may be willing to consider supporting other agency training programs subject to need.

The proposal should indicate that a review of existing relevant materials has been made and that these materials do not meet the needs identified by the NPS Management Program document and the proposed project.

B. Proposal Content

The target audience should be carefully identified and prioritized as to their need (e.g., school children versus landowners). The appropriateness of the medium being used for education and training should be evaluated as the proposal is being developed.

The distribution method for the proposed information and education products (e.g., videos, pamphlets, workshops, internet websites) needs to be suitable to ensure maximum distribution to the targeted audience. For example, taking advantage of routinely scheduled activities (e.g., annual meetings, task force meetings, association meetings) to present information and education products may prevent duplication of effort and reach more of the targeted audience rather than developing separate workshops.

Attention should be given to the most efficient use of funds. For example, funds may be more efficiently used if an instructor is brought to workshops located in targeted communities rather than sending a large number of participants to one workshop removed from the targeted area. However, EPA is not opposed to supporting lead personnel that are active in NPS activities by providing funding for them to attend conferences or workshops. The project sponsor has the responsibility to determine if the project funds are being applied in the most effective manner to accomplish the project goals.

During the planning and formulation of the project, the project sponsor should evaluate the cost-effectiveness of various approaches being considered. Questions such as: the number of people reached; modification of existing information; the location of training sites; distance to similar BMP demonstrations; the relative expense of various BMPs that achieve the same goal; and personnel costs need to be addressed.

EPA supports the concepts of holistic resource management and integrated resource management. However, both concepts include educational elements that do not directly relate to environmental issues (such as computerization of farm records, or livestock breed selection). Only the environmental portions of such training are considered eligible for Section 319 funding.

Specific justification will be needed if the project intends to: 1) demonstrate established BMPs which are commonly used or wide-spread within the proposed project area; or 2) conduct research to refine established BMPs.

C. Project Implementation Plan Format

The project implementation plan must be completed according to the following format for information and education project proposals.

REQUIRED FORMAT FOR INFORMATION AND EDUCATION PROJECT PROPOSALS

1.01 PROJECT PROPOSAL SUMMARY SHEET

A Project Proposal Summary page will precede each proposal. The format to be followed has been provided (Attachment 1).

2.0 STATEMENT OF NEED

2.1 Explain how this project is consistent with water quality priorities that are specified in the State NPS Management Program document or the equivalent State information and education strategy, and why this project is needed to strengthen the State Nonpoint Source program. EPA understands that the link between information and education projects and water quality benefit may be indirect and not immediate. Often it will not be possible to attribute actual changes in water quality to these projects. For example, we will assume that improved public awareness of the NPS problem, evaluated by some indirect measures, will lead to water quality benefits. However, the need for the project should be focused on water quality.

Examples of information and education projects that have been linked to water quality benefits are:

o A newsletter to improve understanding of NPS pollution control or pollution prevention.

o A new video to demonstrate wellhead protection techniques was developed and circulated;

o A better decision-making procedure for attaining or maintaining designated uses has been developed and shown during a pilot project.

o A new CD-rom with watershed simulation games and state-specific information is being developed for the Region.

<u>Demonstration Projects</u>

o A demonstration of nutrient management best management practices (BMPs) in an area where farmers have not used these practices.

o Restoration of degraded stream conditions by using grazing management systems.

o Demonstration of TMDL implementation.

The project proposal should describe the informational void that the project will fill. A needed project will not duplicate other efforts, instead it will enhance previous work by adapting existing materials to a targeted area, create new information/training or the project may continue previous efforts such as a State NPS newsletter. The need statement should indicate why the approach that is being proposed is the best method to meet the need, e.g., why a video is a better approach to reach the targeted audience than a series of workshops.

Proposals for on-the-ground demonstration projects need to provide information on the existing or potential water quality problems. Specific information on impairment of, and threats to, designated uses, sources, pathways, timing of pollution problems and history of the problems need to be included. Also, information relevant to the type of water quality problem being addressed should be included, for example: irrigated agriculture, animal feeding operations, rangeland, silviculture, construction, urban runoff, resource extraction, hydrologic or habitat modification. The project area should be shown on a map with important details delineated.

2.2 Describe and provide a justification for the selection of the audience being targeted and addressed. Provide information utilizing a targeting method such as: age (e.g., elementary school, adult); location (e.g., statewide, watershed); association (e.g., private land owners, trade organizations); and current knowledge base (e.g., aware but needs details, needs new methods).

3.0 **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

3.1 Describe the goals(s) for the project. Goals are broad statements linked to the project need and are achievable through measurable objectives. Goals may describe for example, changes in public attitudes or awareness of NPS problems and solutions; BMPs to be demonstrated and why; new tools to be developed and for whom; and the benefits to be derived in terms of water quality.

3.2 List and provide a narrative description of each objective and task. Objectives specify in more detail what is to be accomplished to help meet the goal, (e.g., educate the state legislators that represent areas having populations of greater than 50,000 regarding the sources and impacts of urban NPS pollution; reduce nutrient contributions from 10 animal feeding operations of 50-300 head of cattle in Weld and Larimer Counties).

Each objective should have at least one associated task to be performed to accomplish the objective. Tasks are specific activities that include

milestones, outputs, responsible parties, and costs. The costs presented in this section should be the total cost for each task, including §319, and all other sources of funding.

Following is an example of the format to present goals, objectives and tasks.

3.1 Goal

The goal of this project is to implement a comprehensive media campaign and supporting activities that will increase the awareness of the general public in Colorado about the causes and solutions to urban polluted runoff. This project will partially achieve all of the goals set forth in the Draft White Paper of the Information/Education subcommittee of the Nonpoint Task Force. It will fully achieve Goal Three of that document, which is to "proactively engage in public information relating to NPS issues." This project also will accomplish the first goal of the Urban/Construction Subcommittee — to educate the general public in urban areas about nonpoint source pollution.

This campaign will include basic information about urban runoff covering such topics as what behaviors lead to polluted runoff and how polluted runoff affects Colorado's water resources. Targeted audiences will be informed about the role of storm sewers in polluted runoff; what they are, what they do, and where they lead. A small number of easily-understood, highly-focused messages will provide non-technical, easily implemented solutions to the household-generated urban runoff problem. Consistency of the message will be maintained through the use of recognizable logos and graphics throughout the campaign. This project will provide baseline data about the public's awareness of household polluted runoff through the survey and will establish an ongoing, easily accessible clearinghouse of nonpoint source information.

3.2 Objectives

One of the overriding objectives of this project is to develop a statewide educational effort. To deliver this program to all parts of the state, volunteers from fifteen of the local Leagues of Women Voters in Colorado will be recruited to work in their communities. Local project managers will be designated to coordinate activities in each community. Training will be given to local project managers and volunteers. Stipends will be given to participating local Leagues to cover administrative expenses, such as office rent, utilities, equipment, supplies postage and administrative costs, and to provide an incentive to participate fully in the project.

The use of local Leagues will develop a cooperative working relationship with individuals, entities and agencies across the state to coordinate and advance the dissemination of information about urban polluted runoff. These relationships will create an infrastructure of interested organizations on which future partnership efforts can be based. Local League involvement will ensure that local programs implemented through this project reflect the cultural diversity represented within communities throughout the state.

The League's commitment to urban polluted runoff educational efforts will

continue beyond the two year grant period. The use of League volunteers will persist with the continuation, as appropriate of local community projects. Funds will be solicited from other organizations to maintain the nonpoint source information clearinghouse, the toll-free number and the home page after the initial project is completed. Again, League volunteers will be recruited to staff the clearinghouse.

Objective 1 ***Develop an assessment tool to determine current levels of awareness about urban polluted runoff.***

Task 1 *Contact colleges and universities about working with a graduate student or intern. Identify a student to compile data on existing assessment tools and develop pre- and post- surveys for this project. Work with the student and faculty advisor to develop an assessment tool and a procedure for conducting the survey. Assemble an advisory committee to evaluate the accuracy and usefulness of the survey as well as provide advice on the technical merit of the project. Evaluate the assessment tool. Tabulate the results of the survey with the student. Publish the results of the survey and notify interested parties of its availability.*

Product *Pre- and post-survey instrument, survey results, accurate assessment of current public awareness of urban polluted runoff.*

Estimated Cost *$8,200.00 ----- $2,000 - 319 Grant, $6,200 - In-kind match*
(Assessment development, student intern, advisory committee, administration, management and overhead)

Task 2 *Create a network of local League volunteers to administer the survey. Provide training for local League project managers and volunteers. Use local League volunteers to administer the survey through a telephone poll.*

Product *A network of local League volunteers, survey results, accurate assessment of current public awareness of urban polluted runoff.*

Estimated Cost *$21,000.00 — $7,200 - 319 Grant, $13,800 - In-kind match (Local League volunteers, student intern, local League stipend, travel expenses, administration, management and overhead).*

Objective 2 ***Develop and conduct a comprehensive urban polluted runoff media campaign***

In subsequent objectives, include applicable tasks in same format as shown for Objective 1. Number tasks in a continuous sequence. For example, under the previous Objective 1, there were two tasks identified. The next task identified under Objective 2 should be listed starting with Task 3 and followed sequentially. Following this format is necessary, as it will assist the State agency in entering project information into the Grants Tracking System.

3.3 Using a format similar to the attached milestone table, provide a project schedule that shows each task, output, quantities and timing of each output, agency(ies) responsible for each task and estimated project duration and milestone listed sequentially for each objective. Interim milestones need to be sufficiently frequent so that problems can be identified and corrected. Show milestones for mid-year, annual, and final project reports, and monitoring. Estimated costs for each task should be correlated with the project budget table, Section 6.0.

3.4 Briefly explain why the lead project sponsor is the appropriate entity to coordinate and/or carry out the project.

3.5 Describe the plans and roles/responsibilities for assuring proper operation and maintenance (O&M) of §319 funded BMPs. This is to include frequency of on-site O&M evaluations during the life of the BMP, entity to do the evaluations, frequency of on-site O&M reviews with project sponsors by the state/tribe, follow-up procedures with the landowner/user in case there are O&M problems (and the state/trib role), and actions to be taken if a landowner abandons a §319 funded BMP before the end of the BMP's lifespan. All or part of the above can be covered by written state/tribal procedures, but it needs to be referenced in the proposal.

4.0 **COORDINATION PLAN**

4.1 Identify the lead project sponsor and each cooperating organization. Discuss the responsibilities, roles and commitments assumed by the cooperators and/or contractors in the project planning and implementation. Also state the mode of agreement by which cooperating organizations will interact (e.g., MOU, MOA, contract or informal agreement).

4.2 Describe local support for the project. Some examples of local support are: requests from the local landowners, conservation district, or county for the project; results from town meetings; or favorable reactions to the description of the proposed project in a local newspaper.

Letters of commitment of resources are encouraged by the EPA. The State should certify that all the appropriate letters of commitment have been received rather than attaching the letters to the proposal.

EPA is concerned that use of 319(h) funds be well coordinated with other pertinent programs. Local project sponsors should obtain from their State NPS coordinator the information needed to address coordination and linkages.

4.3 Describe how the project will coordinate with pertinent, 319 and non-319 funded NPS education programs, watershed projects, demonstration sites, and training programs being conducted by other organizations. Other programs and agencies that may have comparable responsibilities and linkages are, USGS monitoring, other groundwater programs, drinking water programs, source water protection programs, projects conducted by water conservancy districts, regional council of governments, water quality and cost share programs assisted by the NRCS, resource restoration projects assisted by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, and educational activities conducted by the Cooperative Extension Service.

4.4 Describe similar activities that are being undertaken in the study region. Provide a description of how the proposed project complements the existing project and does not unnecessarily duplicate other 319 project activities.

This consideration differs from the coordination issue presented in section 4.3. If 319 funds are being proposed to support activities that are normally the responsibility of other organizations and/or funding sources, provide an explanation justifying the use of NPS funds. EPA is concerned that Section 319 funding not be used to replicate efforts or assume other agencies' responsibilities for activities being carried out in the project area.

Examples of other agencies and programs that may be conducting similar activities or producing similar materials are: Information and Education efforts funded by the EPA Pollution Prevention and Environmental Education Programs; projects funded by Clean Water Act 104(b)(3); Cooperative Extension Service; state water research centers; universities; state natural resources or wildlife agencies; and state funded groundwater programs.

5.0 **EVALUATION AND MONITORING PLAN**

5.1 Describe the plans for evaluating how well the project goals, objectives and tasks have been met. When appropriate, the plan should describe how changes in behavior as a result of the project will be evaluated. Include the different types of evaluation tools to be used, such as recording requests for NPS newspapers and videos, exit and follow-up surveys for training courses, and readers surveys. Include the entity(ies) responsible for the evaluations. Identify how the results from monitoring

and evaluation will be used to assist in developing future projects.

5.2 For demonstration projects, monitoring should be considered for determining project effectiveness (direct water quality and/or surrogate methods). Examples of demonstration projects for which monitoring should be considered would be animal waste facilities, remediation of hydrologic modification impacts, wetland detention basins, and TMDL implementation.

5.3 For those demonstration projects where monitoring will occur, it is a priority for the States, Tribes and EPA that data collected under the 319 program be useable and of high quality. Region 8 states and some tribes have EPA-approved Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs) for the nonpoint source program (or separate QAPPs for ground water monitoring and surface water monitoring). Quality Assurance Project Plans contain the 16 elements required by the EPA Region 8 Quality Assurance Program.

All projects using section 319 funds to collect "environmental data" are required to have a project-specific sampling and analysis plan (SAP). Sampling and Analysis plans must address the 16 elements required of the QAPP, and are approved by the State and EPA. Contact the State or Tribe for specific guidelines on preparing SAPs.

Project sponsors may either reference the State QAPP for the standard operating procedures (SOPs) for each type of monitoring to be performed (e.g., photo points, water sample collection, fish shocking, etc.), or attach them to the SAP. Identify any site-specific amendments required for this project that are not covered by the QAPP. A plan/schedule to develop the appropriate procedures must be identified in the proposal. States and Tribes will approve project-specific SOPs.

The project sponsor has the option of providing the SAP (and SOPs referenced) in this section of the project proposal, or including the development of the SAP and SOPs as project tasks with specific milestone dates. The SAP should reference any applicable information from the project proposal and the State's programmatic QAPP, where applicable, to avoid redundant information.

5.4 Describe the monitoring strategy for the demonstration project, including goals, objectives, and tasks proposed to evaluate whether project goals and objectives have been met. Describe sampling and analysis design and specify parameters to be measured e.g., up-stream/down-stream, paired watersheds, site trend, existing groundwater wells, up-gradient/down-gradient wells, geomorphology and/or riparian measurements, random, systematic, stratified random (e.g., by season or

discharge).

Locate on a map sampling sites in relationship to BMP applications and priority treatment areas.

5.5 Describe how and when data will be stored, managed and reported. All data collected using §319 funding must be entered into the EPA STORET database (Memorandum of Agreement for Storing Water Quality Data in STORET, October 20, 1998). While the State is responsible for assuring that the data is entered into the database, the project sponsor may do this if they have the capability. The sponsor should contact their State NPS coordinator to find out how to gain access to this database. This requirement should be addressed in this section.

5.6 Describe any models used, if applicable.

5.7 Describe the long-term funding plans for the operation and maintenance (O&M) of restoration activities.

6.0 **BUDGET**

6.1 Present the project budget in the format provided (Attachment 3). Part 1 should indicate the amount and source of all federal and non-federal funds that will be used during each year of the project. The budget table is to include personnel support, BMP and other expenses that are expected to be paid with Section 319 and State and local match sources. Cost by task will not be required. The federal fiscal year (October 1-September 30) should be used to discuss and display budget information.

ATTACHMENT 1

PROJECT SUMMARY SHEET

PROJECT TITLE _____

NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE AND E-MAIL OF LEAD PROJECT SPONSOR/SUBGRANTEE

_____
_____
_____

STATE CONTACT PERSON _____
PHONE_____FAX_____E-MAIL_____
STATE_____ WATERSHED _____
HYDROLOGIC UNIT CODE _____
HIGH PRIORITY WATERSHED (yes/no) _____

TMDL Development 9 and/or Implementation 9 (Check any that apply)

PROJECT TYPES	WATERBODY TYPES	NPS CATEGORY
[] STAFFING & SUPPORT	[] GROUNDWATER	[] AGRICULTURE
[] WATERSHED	[] LAKES/RESERVOIRS	[] URBAN RUNOFF
[] GROUNDWATER	[] RIVERS	[] SILVICULTURE
[] I&E	[] STREAMS	[] CONSTRUCTION
	[] WETLANDS	[] RESOURCE EXTRACTION
	[]OTHER	[] STOWAGE/LAND DISPOSAL
		[] HYDRO MODIFICATION
		[] OTHER

PROJECT LOCATION: LATITUDE___MIN._____LONGITUDE___MIN._____

SUMMARIZATION OF MAJOR GOALS:_____
_____
_____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: _____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

FY____319 funds requested (base) $ _____ (incremental) $_____
Match $ _____

Other Federal Funds $ _____ Total project cost $_____
§319 Funded Full Time Personnel _____

ATTACHMENT 2

MILESTONE TABLE FOR WET CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT
(COMPLETED FOR OBJECTIVE 1 ONLY)

TASK/RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATIONS	OUTPUT	QTY	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3
			01/94 12/94	01/95 12/95	01/96 12/96
OBJECTIVE 1 **Task 1 - Complete rangeland and pasture condition inventories.** **Group 1, 3, 4**	**Narrative inventory descriptions** **Aerial photography mapping**	**1** **1**			
Task 2 - Develop rangeland and pasture management plans. **Group 1, 2, 3, 4**	**Management plans**	**8**			
Task 3 - Implementation of BMPs. **Group 1, 2, 3, 4**	**Refer to Budget table for planned BMP types, quantities, and costs.**				

Group 1 -Natural Resources Conservation Service - Provide technical assistance to plan, design, and implement BMPs.
Group 2 -Landowners in Wet Creek drainage - Make land management decisions and provide cash and in-kind match for BMPs.
Group 3 -Resource Conservation District - Local project manager and sponsor, including responsibilities for project coordination, reimbursement payments, match tracking, and progress reporting to the State DEQ.
Group 4 -State Department of Environmental Quality - Statewide Section 319 program management including oversite of local 319 planning and expenditures.

ATTACHMENT 3

BUDGET TABLE FOR WET CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT

PART 1: FUNDING SOURCES	96	97	98	TOTAL
EPA SECTION 319 FUNDS				
1) FY96 Funds (FA)	$ 26,633	$46,583	$34,584	$107,800
Subtotals	$26,633	$46,583	$34,584	$107,800
OTHER FEDERAL FUNDS				
1) NRCS (TA&FA)	$36,500	$2,500	$2,500	$41,500
2) CFSA (FA-ACP)	$0	$8,000	$8,000	$16,000
3) BLM (TA)	$2,000	$1,000	$1,000	$4,000
4) BLM (FA)	$1,000	$2,000	$2,000	$5,000
5) USFWS (TA)	$1,000	$0	$1,000	$2,000
Subtotals	$40,500	$13,500	$14,500	$68,500
STATE/LOCAL MATCH				
1) Game & Fish Dept. (FA)	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$3,000
2) Local SCD (TA&FA)	$7,633	$7,633	$7,634	$22,900
3) Landowners (FA)	$8,000	$20,000	$11,800	$39,800
4) Cooperative Extension (TA&FA)	$4,000	$3,000	$3,000	$10,000
5) State DEQ	$500	$1,000	$500	$2,000
Subtotals	$21,133	$32,633	$23,934	$77,700
TOTAL BUDGET	$88,266	$92,716	$73,018	$254,000

FA: Financial Assistance
SCD: Soil Conservation District
TA: Technical Assistance
DEQ: Department of Environmental Quality
NRCS: Natural Resources Conservation Service
USFWS: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
CFSA: Consolidated Farm Services Agency
BLM: Bureau of Land Management

WET CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT BUDGET
Part 2 - Funding

Section 319/Non-federal Budget	'96	'97	'98	TOTAL COSTS	Cash Match*	In-kind Match*	§319 Funds
PERSONNEL/SUPPORT							
1) Salary/Fringe	$11,400	$12,600	$13,700	$37,700	$10,000	$ 0	$ 25,700
2) Office Rent/Utilities	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000	0	6,000	0
3) Travel	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000	0	0	6,000
4) Equipment/Supplies	1,000	500	500	2,000	1,000	1,000	0
5) Training	200	200	100	500	0	100	400
6) Telephone	200	200	200	600	0	600	0
Subtotals	$ 16,800	$ 17,500	$ 18,500	$ 52,800	$ 11,000	$ 7,700	$ 32,100
OBJECTIVE 1: Apply Grazing Management Practices							
BMPs							
- Range Management Systems	$ 10,000	$ 30,000	$ 14,000	$ 54,000	$ 14,000	$ 8,800	$ 32,400
- Pasture Management Systems	10,000	30,000	13,000	53,000	13,000	7,000	31,800
Subtotals	$ 20,000	$ 60,000	$ 27,000	$107,000	$ 27,000	$ 15,800	$ 64,200
OBJECTIVE 2: Information/Education							
Newsletter/Video	$ 4,000	$ 3,000	$ 3,000	$ 10,000	$ 4,500	$ 4,500	$ 1,000
Tours	500	500	500	1,500	500	500	500
Subtotals	$ 4,500	$ 3,500	$ 3,500	$ 11,500	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ 1,500
OBJECTIVE 3: Monitoring							
Sample Transportation	$ 2,000	$ 2,000	$ 2,000	$ 6,000	$ 1,000	$ 1,000	$ 4,000
Sample Analysis	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000	0	0	6,000
Subtotals	$ 4,000	$ 4,000	$ 4,000	$ 12,000	$ 1,000	$ 1,000	$ 10,000
ADMINISTRATIVE							
Secretary	$ 1,000	$ 1,000	$ 1,000	$ 3,000	$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 0
SCD/Coordination Meetings	400	400	400	1,200	200	1,000	0
Subtotals	$ 1,400	$ 1,400	$ 1,400	$ 4,200	$ 3,200	$ 1,000	0
TOTAL 319/NON-FEDERAL BUDGET	$ 46,700	$ 86,400	$ 55,400	$187,500	$ 47,200	$ 30,500	$107,800

* Includes match from both State and local sources