

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM OFFICE
2022 GRANT AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT GUIDANCE



Updated April 5, 2022

Substantive updates to this Guidance are indicated in bold



U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Chesapeake Bay Program Office
2022 Grant and Cooperative Agreement Guidance

The attached Chesapeake Bay Program Office Grant and Cooperative Agreement Guidance dated **April 5, 2022**, is hereby issued pursuant to EPA Delegation No. 2-46 Chesapeake Bay Program and EPA Region 3 Delegation No. 2-46, which, together, delegate to the Director of the Chesapeake Bay Program the authority to promulgate Agency Guidance for grants issued under Clean Water Act Section 117.

April 5, 2022

Date

Michelle Price-Fay, Acting Director
Chesapeake Bay Program Office

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	1
A. OVERVIEW OF THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM	2
B. AUTHORITIES AND DESCRIPTIONS	5
1. CWA SECTION 117(D) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND GENERAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS	5
2. CWA SECTION 117(E)(1)(A) – CHESAPEAKE BAY IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS (CBIG).....	6
3. CWA SECTIONS 117(E)(1)(A) – CHESAPEAKE BAY REGULATORY AND ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM GRANTS (CBRAP).....	7
4. CWA SECTION 117(E)(1)(B) MONITORING GRANTS	8
5. CWA SECTION 117(G)(2) SMALL WATERSHED GRANTS (SWG).....	8
C. FY 2022 CBIG & CBRAP GRANT FUNDING ALLOCATIONS	9
1. CHESAPEAKE BAY IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS (CBIG) FUNDING ALLOCATION	9
2. CHESAPEAKE BAY REGULATORY AND ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM (CBRAP) GRANTS FUNDING ALLOCATION	9
3. CONOWINGO WIP DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING.....	11
4. NON-COMPETITIVE LOCAL GOVERNMENT IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING ALLOCATION (TO CBIG AND/OR CBRAP)	11
5. MOST EFFECTIVE BASINS FUNDING ALLOCATION.....	11
D. PRE-AWARD INFORMATION AND APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	13
1. COMPETITION PROCESS.....	13
2. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.....	13
a. Agency Assistance Listings.....	14
b. Application Deadlines and Submission Process	14
3. MULTI-YEAR AWARDS.....	17
4. WORK PLAN REQUIREMENTS	18
a. General Information	18
b. Introduction Section Information by Grant Program	18
c. Environmental Data.....	19
d. Outputs	20
e. Outcomes – Linkage to 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement Goals.....	21
f. Addressing Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice (DEIJ) in Work Plans	22

g.	Linkage to EPA’s Strategic Plan	23
h.	Linkage to Jurisdiction’s Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Commitments, Two-Year Milestones and Conowingo WIP	24
i.	Linkage to Addressing Priority Practices, Watersheds, and Strategies.....	24
j.	Additional Work Plan Requirements	31
k.	Work Plan Content Specific to CBRAP Grants	32
l.	Additional Work Plan Content Specific to Local Government Implementation Funding.....	40
5.	FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS.....	43
a.	Cost-Share Requirements	43
b.	EPA In-kind and Supplies	45
c.	Indirect cost rates.....	45
d.	Allowability and Reasonability of Costs.....	45
E.	POST-AWARD REQUIREMENTS	46
1.	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS.....	46
2.	NEW OR REVISED GRANTS POLICIES	46
3.	QUALITY ASSURANCE	48
a.	Quality Management Plan (QMP).....	49
b.	Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP).....	50
4.	PROJECT PROGRESS REPORTS	51
5.	ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CBIG AND CBRAP GRANTS	51
a.	Data Submission Schedules.....	52
b.	Wetland Data.....	52
6.	UNLIQUIDATED OBLIGATIONS (ULOS).....	53
7.	FEDERAL FINANCIAL REPORT (FFR) – SF-425.....	54
8.	MONITORING AND GRANT ENFORCEMENT	54
9.	DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION	56
10.	MODIFICATIONS TO AWARD DOCUMENTS	57
11.	REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS.....	58
12.	SUBAWARDS.....	58
13.	AWARD CLOSEOUT REQUIREMENTS	59
	CONCLUSION.....	60

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement
- Attachment 2 Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000; Section 117 of Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act)
- Attachment 3 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement Goals and Outcomes
- Attachment 4 Work Plan Template
- Attachment 5 Budget Detail Template
- Attachment 6 Progress Report Template
- Attachment 7 Chesapeake Bay Program Wastewater Facility and BMP Implementation Data Submission Specifications and Requirements
- Attachment 8 Chesapeake Bay Program Guidance and Policies for Data, Information and Document Outputs Submission
- Attachment 9A Toxics Data Acquisition Specifications
- Attachment 9B Data Submission Questionnaire
- Attachment 10 Chesapeake Bay Program Administrative Cost Cap Worksheet Sample
- Attachment 11 Intergovernmental Review Process
- Attachment 12 EPA Guidance for Federal Land Management in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed
- Attachment 13 Grant Application Budget Detail Guidance
- Attachment 14 Guide for Chesapeake Bay Water Quality Two-Year Milestones
- Attachment 15 Funding Allocations for CBIG, CBRAP, Local Government Implementation, and Conowingo
- Attachment 16 Application Submission Methods
- Attachment 17 Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act (CBARA) State Budget Reporting
- Attachment 18 Most Effective Basins Funding Allocations

FOREWORD

This guidance describes how the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Region 3's Chesapeake Bay Program Office (CBPO) administers grant and cooperative agreement funds to focus on the restoration and protection of the Chesapeake Bay and its surrounding watershed. The success of this effort is directly linked to the success of the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) partners' ability to effectively utilize all resources in reducing the levels of nutrients and sediment in the Chesapeake Bay, restoring habitats and living resources, **bolstering benefits to underserved communities**, and facilitating increased stewardship of the citizens of the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

The purpose of this grant guidance is to present nonprofit organizations, state and local governments, federally recognized tribes, colleges, universities, and interstate agencies with the best possible information needed to apply for **and manage** grant and cooperative agreement funding. This document provides a sound framework to attain successful assistance agreements that work toward achieving the goals set forth in the first Chesapeake Bay Agreement of 1983 and subsequent agreements. EPA will revise and redistribute this guidance periodically to incorporate legislative, regulatory, programmatic and/or other relevant changes. Additional information about Chesapeake Bay Program funding is available at www.sam.gov under **Agency Assistance Listing 66.466 and 66.964**.

EPA revises this guidance and issues addenda periodically to incorporate requirements and explanations of new and existing EPA orders, directives, and policies. Recipients should check the following website for the most current grant guidance and applicable addenda: www.epa.gov/restoration-chesapeake-bay/chesapeake-bay-program-grant-guidance.

Changes from the previous version of this guidance are denoted by bold text for easier identification. If you have any questions regarding the changes, please contact your EPA project officer.

A. OVERVIEW OF THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM

The Chesapeake Bay Program is a unique regional, state, federal, and local partnership that has been directing and conducting the restoration **and protection** of the Chesapeake Bay since the signing of the historic [Chesapeake Bay Agreement of 1983](#). Considered a national and international model for estuarine research and watershed restoration **and protection** programs, the CBP partnership is led by the Chesapeake Executive Council – the governors of Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia; the mayor of the District of Columbia (D.C.); the administrator of EPA; and the chair of the Chesapeake Bay Commission, a tri-state legislative body. The Executive Council meets annually to establish the policy direction of the CBP partnership in implementing the Chesapeake Bay agreements. Also invited to participate in the Executive Council is the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

As the largest estuary in the United States and one of the most productive estuaries in the world, the Chesapeake Bay was this nation's first estuary targeted for restoration and protection. In the late 1970s, a congressionally funded \$27 million, five-year study was conducted when scientists began to observe the loss of living resources, and the public became concerned about environmental degradation in general. The study identified the main source of the Bay's degradation as an oversupply of nutrients entering the Bay and advocated programs that would limit nutrient loadings from point sources, such as wastewater treatment plants, and nonpoint sources, such as fertilizers running off farmland. The study pinpointed three areas requiring immediate attention: nutrient over-enrichment (specifically nitrogen and phosphorus), dwindling underwater Bay grasses, and toxic pollution. When the initial research was completed, the CBP partnership evolved as the means to restore this exceptionally valuable resource.

The term “Chesapeake Bay Agreement” means the formal, voluntary agreements executed to achieve the goal of restoring and protecting the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem and its living resources and signed by the Chesapeake Executive Council. All states in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, the District of Columbia, as well as the Chesapeake Bay Commission and EPA (representing the federal government) are signatories of the current Bay agreement. The current agreement is formally known as the [2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement](#). The following is an overview of the history of the Bay agreements and the CBP partnership.

The original Chesapeake Bay Agreement, a simple, one-page document pledging the partners to work together to restore the Chesapeake Bay, was signed in 1983 by the group that later became known as the Chesapeake Executive Council. **Since that time, three subsequent agreements have guided the work of the CBP partnership.**

The current *2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement* (2014 Agreement) was signed in June 2014 by authorized representatives of Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, Virginia, West Virginia, the Chesapeake Bay Commission, and EPA. This is the first Bay agreement to be signed by the Watershed states of Delaware, New York, and

West Virginia. This agreement identifies the CBP partnership’s collective commitments for restoring and protecting the watershed through 10 goals and 31 outcomes. The goals address the partners’ continuing efforts to improve water quality as well as promote sustainable fisheries, vital habitats, healthy watersheds, stewardship, land use and conservation, and public access. The goals also confront critical emerging issues, such as environmental literacy, toxic contaminants, and climate resiliency of the Bay ecosystem.

Goals articulate the high-level aspects of the CBP partners’ vision while outcomes express specific, time-bound, and measurable targets that directly contribute to achieving each goal. These goals and outcomes are clearer and better-defined than in previous agreements and allow for greater flexibility through the adoption of an adaptive management decision-making process—one based on the application of scientific processes and continual analyses of monitoring data.

To help implement the 2014 Agreement, the CBP partnership, through the CBP’s goal implementation teams (GITs) and workgroups, developed “management strategies” for each of the outcomes. The strategies, completed in June 2015, summarize the management process and the collective thinking of the CBP partnership for each outcome or related group of outcomes. They articulate the overarching actions needed to achieve the goals and outcomes by 2025, and summarize the means for accomplishing them, as well as methods for monitoring, assessing, reporting progress, and coordinating actions among partners and stakeholders.

The CBP partnership has developed two-year “[Logic & Action Plans](#)” that identify specific measures the partnership will take to reach the two-year targets for each outcome and management strategy. The first set of Logic & Action Plans were completed in April 2016.

In 2017, the CBP partnership instituted a Strategy Review System (SRS), which is the adaptive management-based review process by which the partnership seeks to meet the commitment in the 2014 Agreement to “re-evaluate biennially and update strategies [and two-year Logic & Action Plans] as necessary.” The SRS is a two-year process meant to improve our effectiveness in achieving our Goals and Outcomes. During this process, the partnership will review its progress toward the 2014 Agreement, identify the management approaches and actions that are or are not working, consider scientific, fiscal, and policy developments, adjust Management Strategies as appropriate, and develop the next set of two-year Logic & Action Plans. Each quarter, the Management Board reviews three to six 2014 Agreement Outcomes so that each Outcome is reviewed at least once every two years. New Logic & Action Plans will be developed for a two-year period following that outcome’s Management Board review.

In 2018, EPA conducted a partnership-approved¹ midpoint assessment of progress to determine if the seven Bay watershed jurisdictions put practices in place to achieve 60% of the necessary nutrient and sediment reductions to achieve applicable water quality standards in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal waters. As part of this midpoint assessment, the CBP

¹ Approved by the PSC on December 5, 2012 (see [Actions and Decisions document](#)).

partnership updated its suite of modeling tools – Phase 6 – to reflect the latest science and data and released Phase III Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) planning targets that were developed using the Phase 6 suite of modeling tools. Consistent with how grant allocations were established in the past, EPA used the new Phase 6 modeling tools and the partnership-approved² Phase III WIP planning targets to update the CBRAP grants allocation formula. Individual letters were sent out to each jurisdiction on December 7, 2018 from the Regional Administrator addressing the grant funding re-allocation for 2019 and beyond.

To achieve program goals and commitments, EPA awards assistance agreements (grants/cooperative agreements) to nonprofit organizations, state and local governments, federally recognized tribes, colleges, universities, and interstate agencies. The type of projects awarded range from the monitoring of underwater bay grasses to environmental education. These projects have helped support the commitments set forth in Executive Council agreements and amendments (*Chesapeake Bay Agreement of 1983* through the *2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement*) and subsequent directives, adoption statements, endorsements, and resolutions. This also supports [Executive Order 13508](#).

Seven tribes in Region 3, all located in Virginia within the Bay watershed, have received federal recognition. Federally recognized tribes have a special status in federal environmental law, including the Clean Water Act. See, e.g., CWA Section 518(e) (EPA “to treat an Indian tribe as a State” for various purposes under the statute). Federally recognized tribes are defined in the statute at CWA Section 518(h). Such tribes are also specifically included in the CWA’s definition of “municipality.” See CWA Section 503(4) (“municipality” includes “a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes, or an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian tribal organization.”)

Due to their CWA status, federally recognized tribes are eligible for Chesapeake Bay grants under CWA 117 on the same basis as local governments. Moreover, tribes are eligible to receive pass-through funding from prime recipients of Chesapeake Bay program funds.

² Approved by the PSC on July 9, 2018 (see [Actions and Decisions document](#)).

B. AUTHORITIES AND DESCRIPTIONS

This section describes the various CBPO grants and the authorities that allow EPA to provide these funds to nonprofit organizations, state and local governments, federally recognized tribes, colleges, universities, and interstate agencies.

In November 2000, the President signed the *Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000*, which included Title II-Chesapeake Bay Restoration (see Attachment 2). This Act amended Section 117 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly known as the Clean Water Act or CWA) and established new authorities for the Chesapeake Bay Program. These new legal authorities specify the type of work that can be performed with the funds appropriated for the Chesapeake Bay Program, the type of funding vehicles (e.g., assistance agreement) that can be used, and the types of governments and organizations eligible to receive funding. The purposes of these amended authorities are to expand and strengthen cooperative efforts to restore and protect the Chesapeake Bay, and to achieve the goals established in the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

CWA Grant Requirements

Project applications that involve work in the waters of the United States, such as certain stream restoration projects, may require federal and state permits. For purposes of assuring compliance – and minimizing potential conflicts – with permit requirements, applicants and subrecipients applying for funding under the authorities described below will be required to ascertain whether there is a need for a permit and document successful completion of pre-permit application consultation with the relevant regulatory agencies. Applicants who are awarded grants under any of these authorities must include this requirement in their **funding announcements** for subawards, and such pre-permit consultation must be completed prior to the submittal of the grant or subaward application. If requested by the permitting agency, pre-permit application consultation may need to include pre-permit application project site visits by the permitting and regulatory review agencies. In such cases, joint (i.e., simultaneous multi-agency) site visits are strongly encouraged. Applicants and subaward applicants should not assume after completing the pre-application conference the proposed project will receive authorization by the federal and state permitting agencies. To minimize potential conflicts with permit requirements, both the grant applicants and grantees issuing subawards are encouraged to consult with federal (e.g., EPA, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) and/or state permitting and regulatory reviewing agencies on proposed projects prior to the submission of grant workplans and prior to issuing subawards.

The following describes the various CBPO grants and their CWA authorities.

1. CWA Section 117(d) Technical Assistance and General Assistance Grants

EPA awards these grants competitively to nonprofit organizations, state and local governments, federally recognized tribes, colleges, universities, and interstate agencies through the RFA process (see the [Competition Process](#) section for further information). These grants are used by

recipients to implement the goals of the Chesapeake Bay agreements through activities that support:

- Sustainable Fisheries
- Vital Habitats
- Water Quality
- Toxic Contaminants
- Healthy Watersheds
- Stewardship
- Land Conservation
- Public Access
- Environmental Literacy
- Climate Resiliency

The Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction (INSR) grants program also falls under this CWA authority. The INSR grants program supports efforts within the Chesapeake Bay watershed that vastly accelerate sub-watershed and/or regional scale implementation of nutrient and sediment reductions with innovative, sustainable, and cost-effective approaches.

Additionally, the Conowingo WIP (CWIP) and related finance strategy being developed by the partnership also fall under this CWA authority. The CWIP grants provides funding support for the following activities:

- The development and implementation of the CWIP and associated two-year milestones to address increased pollutant loadings due to the Conowingo Dam infill,
- The development and implementation of a multijurisdictional financing strategy, and
- The development and maintenance of a system for tracking, verifying, and reporting progress on the CWIP and two-year milestones providing nutrient and sediment pollutant load reductions.

If EPA determines a recipient is not making sufficient progress, EPA may decide to exercise federal actions in accordance with the [Monitoring and Grant Enforcement](#) section and/or decide to not add additional funds to the grant.

2. CWA Section 117(e)(1)(A) – Chesapeake Bay Implementation Grants (CBIG)

The Chesapeake Bay implementation grants are authorized under CWA Section 117(e)(1)(A) to signatory jurisdictions. EPA awards these grants non-competitively to any jurisdiction that has signed the 2014 Agreement (signatory jurisdictions). Implementation grants are for the purpose of implementing the management mechanisms established under the *Chesapeake Bay Agreement*, with particular emphasis on state programs for control and abatement of nonpoint source nutrient and sediment pollution (including atmospheric deposition as a nonpoint source). Specifically, CBIG awards support the signatory jurisdictions' implementation of the management strategies and CBP's two-year [Logic & Action Plans](#) developed for each of the applicable outcomes identified in the 2014 Agreement. If the signatory jurisdictions do not use

CWA 117(e)(1)(A) grants for projects consistent with furthering the 2014 Agreement goals and outcomes, EPA may reallocate, conditionally award, or withhold funds.

CBIG awards may support the signatory jurisdictions' implementation of their WIP³ and milestone commitments, including addressing EPA's evaluation of the WIPs and milestones, and comparable actions that support nutrient and sediment load reduction goals. In addition, for those activities that support the Agreement's water quality goal, if the signatory jurisdictions do not use CWA 117(e)(1)(A) grants for projects consistent with furthering that jurisdiction's progress on meeting their two-year milestones and/or WIP commitments, EPA may reallocate, conditionally award, or withhold those water quality-related funds. **The funds may also be used to promote and support diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice (DEIJ) concerns.**

If EPA determines a recipient is not making sufficient progress, EPA may decide to exercise federal actions in accordance with the [Monitoring and Grant Enforcement](#) section and/or decide to not add additional funds to the grant.

3. CWA Sections 117(e)(1)(A) – Chesapeake Bay Regulatory and Accountability Program Grants (CBRAP)

CBRAP grants aid the signatory jurisdictions in implementing and expanding their respective regulatory, accountability, assessment, compliance, and enforcement capabilities in support of reducing nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment loads delivered to the Bay to meet the Water Quality Goal of the 2014 Agreement and the Bay TMDL. These grants are awarded non-competitively. CBRAP awards may support the jurisdictions' implementation of their WIP and related programmatic milestone commitments, including addressing EPA's evaluation of the WIPs and milestones, and comparable actions that support nutrient and sediment load reduction goals. EPA expects the CBRAP grant program, which has been funded every year since 2010, to continue to receive funding for the foreseeable future.

These grants help each of the signatory jurisdictions to:

- Develop/revise regulations/policies, and develop and implement WIPs and two-year milestones;
- Implement regulatory, tracking, verification, reporting, assessment, and/or monitoring commitments of the jurisdictions' WIPs and/or two-year milestones or in response to EPA's evaluation of these documents;
- Issue, reissue, and enforce permits and enforce regulations;
- Develop and implement verification programs following the CBP partnership's established verification protocols and policies;

³ Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs) are plans for how each of the Bay jurisdictions, in partnership with federal and local governments, will achieve their respective Chesapeake Bay TMDL allocations and planning targets. In 2010 and 2012, the seven jurisdictions finalized their Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (Bay TMDL) Phase I and II WIPs, respectively. The goal of the Phase III WIPs, finalized in August 2019, is to outline all necessary practices that will be in place by 2025 to fully restore the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal waters.

- Develop and implement nutrient and sediment credit trading and offset programs;
- Develop and implement technical assistance and guidance documents to support WIP and/or two-year milestone implementation;
- Provide technical and compliance assistance to landowners; and
- Provide compliance assistance to local governments and regulated entities.

If EPA determines a recipient is not making sufficient progress, EPA may decide to exercise federal actions in accordance with the [Monitoring and Grant Enforcement](#) section and/or decide to not add additional funds to the grant.

4. CWA Section 117(e)(1)(B) Monitoring Grants

The monitoring grants are authorized under CWA Section 117(e)(1)(B) for signatory jurisdictions. These grants support the characterization of water and habitat quality and benthic community conditions and related parameters for the main stem Chesapeake Bay and tidal tributaries; characterizing pollutant (including nutrients and sediment) loadings and habitat quality and benthic community conditions to the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries from the surrounding Chesapeake Bay watershed; assessing changes in pollutant (including nutrients and sediment) concentrations in local streams and rivers throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed; and providing data analysis and interpretation support for water quality and living resources status and trends. The work supports 2014 Agreement goal to “Reduce pollutants to achieve the water quality necessary to support the aquatic living resources of the Bay and its tributaries and to protect human health.” EPA may award these grants non-competitively to any signatory jurisdiction.

If EPA determines a recipient is not making sufficient progress, EPA may decide to exercise federal actions in accordance with the [Monitoring and Grant Enforcement](#) section and/or decide to not add additional funds to the grant.

5. CWA Section 117(g)(2) Small Watershed Grants (SWG)

The Small Watershed Grants Program was established under CWA Section 117(g)(2), which provides that grants can be awarded under Section 117(d) to local governments, federally recognized tribes, nonprofit organizations, and individuals in the Chesapeake Bay region working at a local level to protect and improve watersheds while building citizen-based resource stewardship. The purpose of this grant program is to demonstrate effective techniques and partnership-building to achieve CBP objectives at the small-watershed scale. The SWG Program has been designed to encourage the sharing of innovative ideas among the many organizations wishing to be involved in watershed protection activities. **Grants may be particularly supportive of small, underserved communities, and may advance DEIJ concerns.**

If EPA determines a recipient is not making sufficient progress, EPA may decide to exercise federal actions in accordance with the [Monitoring and Grant Enforcement](#) section and/or decide to not add additional funds to the grant.

C. FY 2022 CBIG & CBRAP GRANT FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

A description of the funding allocations for CBIG and CBRAP grants, as well as non-competitive local government implementation funding for these grants, is below. It should be noted, in all years, funding is subject to availability and appropriations from Congress. For instance, in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013, sequestration reduced total funding for CBRAP from \$11,200,000 to \$10,022,000. EPA allocated the FY 2013 reduction in CBRAP funding based on each state's share of unliquidated obligations. Additionally, EPA reserves the right to change these allocations at our sole discretion. Occasionally, additional funding is available for specific activities under these grants in a given year, i.e., WIP assistance. These additional funds are supplemental funds. As such, they should not be factored into multi-year budgets. Rather, they must be applied for through an amendment on an as-available basis. The allocations described below do not apply to these specific activities. The dollar amounts each jurisdiction received based on the allocations as well as local government funding by jurisdiction are available in Attachment 15, for **FY 2022**. EPA has not received **FY 2022** funding allocations. The proposed amounts found in the attachment are based on **FY 2021** funding allocations. EPA will notify the jurisdictions of their final allocations following receipt of the **FY 2022** budget and any changes to grant allocation formulae.

1. Chesapeake Bay Implementation Grants (CBIG) Funding Allocation

Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania each currently receives 20 percent of total CBIG funding while Delaware, the District of Columbia, New York, and West Virginia each receives 10 percent. Beginning in FY 2014, all jurisdictions received additional CBIG funding to help support implementation of the goals and outcomes of the 2014 Agreement. There will be no changes to the jurisdictions' CBIG funding levels due to the CBP partnership's Phase 6 suite of modeling tools and the CBP partnership-approved⁴ Phase III WIP planning targets since this grant is intended to address all the goals and outcomes under the 2014 Agreement, and not just water quality.

2. Chesapeake Bay Regulatory and Accountability Program (CBRAP) Grants Funding Allocation

Grantees within each watershed state and the District of Columbia receive a combination of CBRAP base and targeted funding. EPA determines the amount of targeted funds based on the relative effectiveness of nutrient reductions within a jurisdiction on water quality in the Bay and how readily nutrient sources within the jurisdiction can be controlled. EPA used these decision rules beginning in July 2010 to distribute the amount of nitrogen the Bay can receive from the watershed and still meet water quality standards among the jurisdictions. Therefore, states that received proportionally lower and more aggressive nitrogen targets because they have a greater impact on water quality in the Bay received proportionally more CBRAP grant dollars.

⁴ PSC approved Phase III WIP planning targets at their [July 9, 2018 meeting](#)

EPA reviewed the current allocation of the CBRAP funding amounts in FY 2018 and FY 2019 based on the CBP partnership's Phase 6 Watershed Model and the CBP partnership-approved Phase III WIP planning targets, working with the jurisdictions through the Grants Allocation Action Team (GAAT) on any potential changes to the CBRAP funding allocation as a result of the modeling and planning target revisions and possible use of both CBRAP and CBIG grants for funding of the Conowingo WIP. Similar to the previous CBRAP grant funding methodology, the FY 2019-2025 CBRAP grant funding will reflect a combination of both base funding and formula funds. However, the 2014 Agreement established all seven of the Bay watershed jurisdictions as signatories. For the FY 2019-2025 CBRAP allocations, the base funding will be adjusted to account for that transition. In addition, the formula funds will be revised and reflect the signatory jurisdictions' combined nitrogen reductions achieved through 2017 (35% of formula funds), and the remaining load reduction commitment between 2017 and 2025 (65% of formula funds). Each jurisdiction's CBRAP funding levels will be phased-in during a three-year period, and these changes will not begin until FY 2020. Beginning in FY 2020, each jurisdiction will have the flexibility to apply up to 50% funding increases or reductions resulting from the revised CBRAP allocations to either its CBRAP or CBIG annual grant award. For jurisdictions that would like to apply this option, a formal request must be submitted to the project officer with their revised grant application prior to the funds being awarded.

Beginning with the FY 2013 awards, and on an annual basis thereafter, signatory jurisdictions may request that a portion of their annual CBRAP allocation (up to 10 percent) be applied to their CBIG award for implementation activities that support their WIPs and two-year milestones. Beginning in FY 2018, jurisdictions may request a reallocation exceeding 10 percent as long as a justification is provided, and the request is approved by the CBPO Deputy Director. These reallocations must take place before the funds are awarded. Except as provided in applicable regulations regarding revision of budget and program plans (see [2 CFR 200.308](#)), the funding may not be transferred from one grant to another once awarded. This does not apply to previously awarded CBRAP funds. EPA will review each request on a case-by-case basis. EPA will only approve requests if the jurisdiction can demonstrate there are currently adequate resources and satisfactory progress for regulatory and accountability commitments in the WIPs, milestones, and as called for in EPA's evaluations and program assessments. Additionally, the shift from CBRAP to CBIG funding should not hinder the progress or commitments in the jurisdiction's CBRAP work plan. The recipient should submit such requests to their EPA project officer on an annual basis before submitting their CBIG and CBRAP grant applications to EPA. Such decisions are made at the sole discretion of EPA. All [match requirements](#) still apply to both grants. Additionally, jurisdictions should work with their EPA project officer to determine all necessary administrative requirements.

Jurisdictions can also direct a portion of their CBRAP grant allocation to EPA's contractors for assistance in carrying out applicable objectives of their CBRAP grant. Jurisdictions should work with their EPA project officer if they wish to use EPA's contractors.

EPA maintains its authority to review and revise CBRAP funding allocation formulas and will continue to consult with the jurisdictions in making such revisions as appropriate. Should EPA

receive additional funds for CBRAP and CBIG in future years, these additional funds also may be used to support local governments for Phase III WIP implementation (see “Non-Competitive Local Government Funding Implementation Allocation” below).

3. Conowingo WIP Development and Implementation Funding

The total CBP grant funding allocated to support the CBP partnership’s Conowingo WIP across all seven Bay watershed jurisdictions is \$325,530 for FY 2022. It is anticipated that grant funding will continue to be allocated to support the Conowingo WIP through 2025. This funding is intended to support the development and implementation of the Conowingo WIP and associated two-year milestones, financing strategy, and tracking and reporting systems. However, the jurisdictions’ funding contributions toward the Conowingo WIP may increase or decrease over time, depending on the availability of federal funds and the ability to identify alternative funding sources. Jurisdictions have the flexibility to apply all their funding adjustment for the Conowingo against either their CBRAP or CBIG grants. Jurisdictions will need to notify their project officer how they want to apply their Conowingo WIP funding adjustment with their revised grant application submission prior to their annual award.

4. Non-Competitive Local Government Implementation Funding Allocation (to CBIG and/or CBRAP)

Beginning in FY 2014, EPA is providing signatory jurisdictions with increased funding for local entities to reduce nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment loads to the Chesapeake Bay, consistent with the jurisdictions’ WIPs. EPA allocates the local government implementation funding to the Bay jurisdictions using the allocation formula for the targeted funds of the CBRAP grants. EPA is using this formula because it allocates CBRAP grants’ targeted funds based on the relative effectiveness of nutrient reductions within a jurisdiction on water quality in the Bay and how readily nutrient sources within the jurisdiction can be controlled. Under this formula, jurisdictions with a greater impact on nutrients in the Bay that are expected to make larger pollution reductions receive a greater share of the local government implementation funding. EPA may provide a portion of the local government implementation funding directly to local entities through competitive RFAs. EPA may also consider increasing these funds in future years if EPA receives additional funding for CBRAP and CBIG.

EPA will add the local government implementation funding to the Bay jurisdictions’ CBRAP or CBIG award. Jurisdictions need to notify their EPA project officer to which grant(s) they want EPA to add this funding prior to preparing their annual funding applications for their CBRAP and CBIG.

5. Most Effective Basins Funding Allocation

In the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Appropriations Conference Report, \$7.25 million was targeted to the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) Budget for “state-based implementation in the most effective basins.” EPA will use the same methodology and funding allocation that was used in FY 2021 for

FY 2022. The methodology used by EPA to determine the most effective basins (MEB) for use of these funds, the amounts allocated per jurisdiction, and the most effective basins in which funding will be utilized are described in [Attachment 18](#).

In FY 2022, EPA will provide \$6 million in most effective basins (MEB) funding for nitrogen reduction in the agricultural sector to the Chesapeake Bay watershed jurisdictions that have committed to reducing the agricultural contribution of nitrogen in their Phase III Watershed Implementation Plans (Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia). The District of Columbia does not have an agricultural commitment through 2025. To determine the allocation per jurisdiction, the total load of these obligations to reduce nitrogen from agriculture was added and then a percentage for each of those jurisdictions was determined.

EPA and the Chesapeake Bay Partnership have renewed their commitment and focus on inclusion and equity with regard to historically underrepresented communities, including communities of color and communities of lower socioeconomic status. In FY 2022, EPA is focusing the remaining \$1.25 million funding allocation on those areas that have been identified as being most effective for improving water quality while targeting underrepresented communities. The allocation for this funding followed the same funding allocation used for the CBIG grants, as described above.

EPA will add the MEB funding to the Bay jurisdictions' CBIG grant. EPA may consider adding this funding to a jurisdiction's CBRAP grant or may award the funds to a third party through a Request for Applications (RFA). **Jurisdictions seeking to add MEB funding to their CBRAP grant should consult with their EPA project officer.** Jurisdictions will need to incorporate the most effective basins funding into their grant work plans as a distinct objective (see Attachment 4, Work Plan Template).

6. Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

The bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117-58) was signed into law on November 15, 2021 and represents the single largest investment in water that the federal government has ever made. The IJA provides \$238 million over five years to ensure protection and restoration of the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including \$47.6 million for FY 2022. More information, including an Infrastructure Law Fact Sheet, is available on the [EPA website](#). EPA will provide further guidance on the availability, allowable use, and reporting requirements of IJA funds through an addendum to the [2022 CBPO Grant Guidance](#).

D. PRE-AWARD INFORMATION AND APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

Applying for assistance agreements involves developing a work plan and completing the federal application, which includes various certifications and budget information. The following section contains guidance on applying for CBPO assistance agreements.

1. Competition Process

Effective January 15, 2005, and updated February 6, 2014, EPA Order [5700.5A1, Policy for Competition of Assistance Agreements](#), establishes EPA's policy for the competition of assistance agreements. The authority for this order is the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977, as amended, 31 U.S.C. 6301(3).

It is EPA policy to promote competition to the maximum extent practicable in the award of assistance agreements under CWA Section 117(d). When assistance agreements are awarded competitively, EPA policy requires the competitive process be fair and impartial, all applicants be evaluated only on the criteria stated in the announcement, and no applicant receive an unfair competitive advantage.

[Grants.gov](#) is the required mechanism for submission of applications in response to requests for applications (RFA's) posted on or after October 1, 2018. The RFAs include details about eligible organizations, page limitations, funding ranges, cost-share requirements, additional requirements, submission instructions, and any other relevant information pertaining to the application requirements. Please follow the instructions in the RFAs for specific submission guidance.

All EPA RFAs issued by CBPO are announced in the following manner: posted to [www.grants.gov](#), posted on the [EPA Region 3 website](#), posted on [CBP partnership's website](#), listed in [Bay Brief newsletters](#), sent to those on CBPO's RFA mailing list, and emailed to those on CBPO's RFA email list. RFAs are posted at various times throughout the year.

If you are interested in receiving information on future RFAs, please contact CBPO at 1-800-YOUR-BAY (968-7229) and request to be added to the RFA distribution list(s).

2. Application Requirements

This section lists all the required documentation and information needed to provide EPA with a complete application. It includes time frames, contacts, address information, and recent application process changes.

Applications in response to RFAs must be submitted in accordance with the instructions in the RFA.

Beginning February 17, 2015, most applications must be submitted through [Grants.gov](#). Beginning in January 2018, Grants.gov began requiring that all applicants use their [Workspace](#)

feature. Workspace allows applicants to copy and reuse forms, significantly reducing the burden of form submission. Refer to Attachment 16 for detailed guidance on the appropriate application submission methods. Regardless of the manner used to apply, an electronic courtesy copy of the submitted application should also be sent to the EPA project officer.

a. Agency Assistance Listings

Assistance listings, formerly called CFDA, are the publicly available listing of Federal assistance programs. Prior to March 2021, CBP Assistance Listing 66.466 included (1) descriptions of both funding for technical assistance and similar activities that EPA awards competitively to a wide range of organizations and (2) descriptions of funding for implementation, regulatory and accountability, and monitoring activities that EPA awards without competition and only to signatory jurisdictions of the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Agreement. To better report results and differentiate between competitive and non-competitive funding, EPA established Assistance Listing 66.964 for CBIG, CBRAP, and monitoring CWA Sec. 117e grants.

Projects awarded competitively will continue to be identified by assistance listing 66.466. In addition, the assistance listing for CBIG, CBRAP, and monitoring awarded prior to March 2021 will remain 66.466 while the award is active, even if supplemental or incremental amendments are issued. New CBIG, CBRAP, and monitoring grants awarded after March 2021 will be identified by assistance listing 66.964, and the program code for these grants, which was previously CB for Chesapeake Bay, will change to C2.

b. Application Deadlines and Submission Process

For new and supplemental awards, the application must be submitted for review at least 60 days before the proposed start date. However, given time needed for technical review, recipients are encouraged to submit their applications at least 90 days in advance of anticipated award date, when possible. Grantees receiving funding must comply with 2 CFR Parts 200 and 1500.

An electronic version of the application, application forms, and checklists can be found online at: www.epa.gov/grants/epa-grantee-forms. Office of Management & Budget Circulars may be found at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/>. The OMB Uniform Grants Guidance (applicable December 26, 2014) is available at: <https://www.ecfr.gov/>.

To download the grant application package for a non-competitive award:

- 1) Go to: www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/download-application-package.html,
- 2) Type "EPA-CEP-02" into the "Funding Opportunity Number" field and click "Download Package,"
- 3) Download the package associated with **assistance listing 66.964**,
- 4) Complete the Grant Application Package. Attach the forms and information identified below, and

- 5) Submit your application. See the Grants.gov [How to Apply for Grants](#) website for more information on this process.

To download the grant application package for a competitive award:

- 1) Go to: [Search Grants | GRANTS.GOV](#)
- 2) Type in the “Opportunity Number” as it appears in the notice, e.g., EPA-R3-CBP-22-XX.
- 3) Follow Steps 3-5 above.

A complete application must include the following components to be considered for review. Recipients should consult their project officer for questions regarding completing a grant application.

- 1) Standard Form (SF) 424 – Application for Federal Assistance
 - **Assistance listings 66.466 and 66.964** are EPA programs eligible for intergovernmental review; therefore, the SF-424 must document the intergovernmental review process (Executive Order 12372 – Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs, issued under the authority of Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966) at Item 19 by recording the date on which application was made available. Please see [Attachment 11](#) for more information regarding the Intergovernmental Review process.
 - Areas affected by project is also required at Item 14. If your project will involve more than one site, please list up to five municipalities and their zip codes.
- 2) SF-424A – Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs
- 3) Budget detail
 - Please note that all costs associated with subawards and participant support costs, including agreements with federal agencies other than EPA, should be placed in the “Other” budget category, with sub-awards being specifically identified as such, whether in a sub-category or parenthetically. For assistance in distinguishing between subawards and contracts, please see the [Subawards section](#) or [EPA Subaward Policy](#).
 - The budget detail should add specific detail about each budget category instead of simply repeating the information found on the SF- 424A. Please see Attachment 13 for further guidance.
 - **An optional budget detail template is available in Attachment 5.**
- 4) A fully descriptive work plan, which includes the following (see [Work Plan Requirements](#) for additional information):
 - Completed Work Plan Template (see Attachment 4, a fillable version is available from your EPA project officer).
- 5) Quality Management and Quality Assurance Project Plans – required if application is accepted, **if applicable** (see the [Quality Assurance](#) section for more information).
- 6) Indirect cost rate agreement – Applicants and recipients should promptly inform EPA if they are in the process of negotiating an indirect cost rate agreement with their

cognizant agency to allow EPA the opportunity to recommend to the cognizant agency a special rate for assistance agreements where EPA will provide office space and/or equipment as a form of in-kind assistance. Additionally, recipients can voluntarily opt to charge a lower rate for a particular assistance agreement. If the recipient chooses to charge a lower rate, they must charge the lower rate for the “life” of the grant award.

- 7) Certification Regarding Lobbying
- 8) SF-LLL- Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (This form needs to be completed only if the applicant has lobbying activities to disclose.)
- 9) EPA Form 4700-4 Pre-award Compliance Review Report (Answer all questions even if the answer is “not applicable.”)
- 10) EPA Key Contacts Form 5700-54
- 11) The Budget Detail of your Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) must reflect how your administrative costs will comply with the cap. In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Administrative Cap Worksheet is no longer required to be submitted but is provided as Attachment 10 herein to assist in calculating allowable administrative costs.

As noted earlier, Grants.gov requires all mandatory forms to be submitted including:

- All initial applications for **competitive and** non-competitive awards must be submitted to EPA electronically through Grants.gov, using the Workspace feature.
- Applicants with limited or no internet access can apply for an exception and submit their application through another method if approved.

Once the original application is submitted through grants.gov, any revisions should be submitted through the R3 mailbox at R3_Grant_Applications@epa.gov with a copy to the project officer and grant specialist, if known.

Any incomplete application may delay processing. In addition, the recipient can expect an award only after all administrative and programmatic issues are resolved and the Intergovernmental Review comment period has been met, **if applicable**. EPA will not approve grant awards or amendments for additional funding until all deliverables from previous or current grants are completed unless your EPA project officer approves a specific written agreement to complete all previous overdue deliverables prior to the proposed award date.

It should be noted that EPA Form 5700-49 Debarment/Suspension Certification is no longer required. Instead, applicants are required to disclose certain information to EPA regarding eligibility prior to award. As found in 2 CFR Section 180.335, the recipient must disclose when there is an affirmative response to any of the following questions:

- Are you or any of the principals for this award presently suspended, debarred, or otherwise ineligible?

- Have you or any of the principals for this award been convicted within the preceding three years of any of the offenses listed in 2 CFR Section 180.800(a) or had a civil judgment rendered against you for one of those offenses?
- Are you or any of the principals for this award presently indicted or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with commission of any of the offenses listed in 2 CFR 180.800(a)?
- Have you had one or more public transactions terminated within the preceding three years for cause or default?

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA, Public Law 109-282, as amended) established reporting requirements for prime grant recipients on the following information: first-tier subawards; first-tier subrecipient executive compensation; and prime recipient executive compensation. This requirement is applicable to all new awards that equal or exceed \$25,000 and are awarded on or after October 1, 2010.

FFATA also requires registration in the **System for Award Management (SAM)** and a current **Unique Entity ID (UEI)**. Through a term and condition, grant recipients are required to ensure the currency of the information they report and that all subrecipients have an assigned **UEI** prior to receiving a subaward from grant recipients. **If not previously registered**, recipients have to create a new account in SAM. SAM.gov contains quick-start guides, webinars, a user guide, and other materials that provide all the information recipients need to get started. For more assistance using SAM, please contact the Federal Service Desk at fsd.gov.

Another requirement of FFATA is the reporting of where the work funded by a grant will take place (commonly referred to as “place of performance”). **Beginning in 2022, recipients must identify a maximum of five cities, towns, or zip codes where performance of the federally funded work will be carried out. If multiple performance locations are identified for the project, one location must be designated as the primary place of performance.** This requirement applies to all grants and cooperative agreements. OMB requires EPA to report this data for every grant within 30 days of award, and the information is displayed for the public at USAspending.gov.

3. Multi-year awards

Multi-year awards are defined as awards for which the project and budget periods are of the same length; the recipient requests full funding for the entire project/budget period in the initial application; and the recipient provides annual budget details for the outlying years. Recipients have only to submit a full application package prior to the first year of funding. Thereafter, the recipient is required to submit the following information annually to their EPA project officer (see the [Modifications to Award Documents section](#) for additional information):

- 1) If there are *no changes to the work plan or budget*, recipient simply confirms that fact and requests the approved funding for the coming year.
- 2) If there are changes to the *work plan*, then a revised work plan with tracked changes must accompany the request for funding.

- 3) If there are budget *changes* then a revised budget detail for the relevant years and a revised SF-424A must accompany the request for funding.

4. Work Plan Requirements

All applicants and recipients should use the work plan template included as Attachment 4 to this document. This template will be instrumental in linking work plans to EPA's Strategic Plan, 2014 Agreement goals and outcomes, WIPs, the Bay TMDL, two-year milestones, and EPA evaluations and assessments. Applicants and recipients should complete all areas of the work plan and they should label any area not applicable to a particular project as such.

a. General Information

For all proposed awards competed through the Chesapeake Bay Program Office, the work plan should be consistent with the original application submitted in response to the **funding opportunity announcement – whether competitive or non-competitive** (unless the EPA project officer and the grantee agreed in writing to changes to the scope).

If an assistance agreement application contains more than one objective, an introductory paragraph should describe the overall strategy your organization has developed for completing all the tasks.

Each objective of the work plan should be sufficiently detailed in the narrative, description, and task section with clearly defined deliverables or outputs for the EPA project officers to understand exactly what the grantee plans to do for each year under the agreement. All grantees, including subrecipients, with an outreach component identified in their work plan, should provide documentation of the outreach (e.g. link of a news release and/or media coverage) in the progress report. Further, it should be clear how the outputs relate to the tasks within each objective.

b. Introduction Section Information by Grant Program

1) 117(d) – Technical and General Assistance Grants (including INSR grants), 117(e)(1)(B) Monitoring Grants to Signatory Jurisdictions, and 117(g)(2) Small Watershed Grants

This narrative must include background of your organization and historical perspective, if any, of work contributing to the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay. In addition, if the application is being submitted in connection with an RFA, then the work plan should match the application the applicant submitted in response to the RFA.

2) 117(e)(1)(A) – Chesapeake Bay Implementation Grants (CBIG) to Signatory Jurisdictions

This narrative should identify significant state and federal funding programs used to implement the management mechanisms established in the 2014 Agreement. The narrative should include the linkages between these funding sources and the objectives/projects funded through the CBIG award. This narrative should also include, as appropriate, the state and federal point and

nonpoint source programs that are available to fund the jurisdiction's nutrient and sediment reduction efforts and explain how each program is used to address watershed implementation activities. Examples of state and federal programs include but are not limited to: Nonpoint Source Management Program (Clean Water Act, Section 319), Water Quality Cooperative Agreements Program (Clean Water Act, Section 104(b)(3)), Water Pollution Control Program (Clean Water Act, Section 106), State Revolving Funds (Clean Water Act, Section 602), USDA Environmental Quality Improvement Program (EQIP), Conservation Reserve Program (CRP); Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP); Conservation Innovation Grants (CIGs); and Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA, Section 6217).

The narrative should also provide a general description of the objectives covered by the grant and a description of the relationship to the WIP and/or two-year milestones where applicable or to Management Strategies and two-year Logic & Action Plans of other goals and outcomes from the 2014 Agreement.

3) 117(e)(1)(A) – Chesapeake Bay Regulatory and Accountability Program (CBRAP) Grants

This narrative should identify significant state and federal funding programs used to address nutrient and sediment reduction-related activities within the Chesapeake Bay watershed and the linkages between these funding sources and the objectives/projects funded through the CBRAP grants. The narrative should also provide a general description of the objectives covered by the grant and a description of the relationship to the WIP and/or two-year milestones.

After the introduction section, recipients will need to complete the following details for each objective. Additional details are contained in Attachment 4, Work Plan Template.

c. Environmental Data

In December 2012, EPA issued a new policy requiring organizations that generate or use environmental data under EPA-funded assistance agreements to submit documentation of their competency to do so. This applies to all CBPO grants and cooperative agreements that involve organizations generating environmental data through environmental sample collection, field measurements and/or laboratory analyses. When applicable, recipients must demonstrate competency prior to carrying out any activities under the award involving the generation or use of environmental data. Recipients shall maintain competency for the duration of the project period of the applicable agreement and this will be documented during the annual reporting process. A [copy of the policy is available online](#) or a copy may also be requested by contacting the EPA project officer.

For new grant applications whose work plan and objectives are similar to those under previously-awarded grants, please include in the introductory paragraph a statement to the effect that: *In accordance with EPA's Competency Policy, this confirms that work being conducted under this assistance agreement is similar in nature to work conducted under previous assistance agreements and aligns with our approved [or pending-approval] Quality Management Plan.*

d. Outputs

On January 1, 2005, EPA issued Order 5700.7, [Environmental Results Under EPA Assistance Agreements](#). The Order states that an assistance agreement work plan must be negotiated to ensure that the work plan contains well-defined outputs. The definition of output is as follows:

“Output” means an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work products related to an environmental goal or objective that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specific date. Outputs may be qualitative but must be measurable during an assistance agreement funding period.

1) Required Outputs

Progress and Final Reports

Quarterly or semi-annual and final progress reports document outputs that must be included in each work plan and must comply with EPA Order 5700.7. These reports must contain a project narrative that documents the progress made in achieving the objectives of work plans as presented in the application. A progress report template is located in Attachment 6. Each report will contain:

- A comparison of actual accomplishments with the anticipated outputs and outcomes;
- Reasons why anticipated outputs were exceeded or not met;
- Problems encountered during the performance period, that may have interfered with meeting program/project objectives;
- If applicable, proposed remedies;
- Information on the rate of expenditure versus progress on the project;
- If applicable, information on equipment purchased during the reporting period; and
- Any additional pertinent information, including, when appropriate, analysis of cost overruns or high unit costs or unanticipated economics.

As stated in EPA Order 5700.7, the agency’s project officer must ensure that interim (quarterly or semi-annual) and final performance reports submitted by the recipients adequately address progress in achieving agreed-upon outputs and outcomes. This includes, where necessary, ensuring performance reports provide a satisfactory explanation of why outcomes or outputs were not achieved.

Data/Information and Document Outputs

CBP has adopted a comprehensive set of guidelines and policies addressing the management and submission of data, information, and documents, which must be submitted electronically in a format identified in Attachments 7 and 8 unless otherwise stipulated in the work plan. The work plan must describe the data and information management procedures to be followed to ensure the quality and timely delivery of data and/or information. Specifically, the work plan must describe the plan for adhering to the CBP data management guidelines as documented in

Attachment 8. Please refer to Attachments 7, 8, 9A, and/or 9B for additional policies and guidelines, as well as specific formatting information for outputs.

In select cases where electronic submission of an output is not possible, the recipient and the project officer will determine an alternate form of submission in advance and document in the final work plan the exact format for submission of the outputs. Electronic outputs can include reports, graphics, spreadsheets, imagery, data files, audio, and digital video products. More detailed guidance regarding formats for submission of electronic outputs is provided in Attachment 8.

Outputs that are videos or printed material meant for the public, such as brochures, fact sheets, or publications, shall contain the following statement: "This project has been funded wholly or in part by the United States Environmental Protection Agency under assistance agreement (number) to (recipient). The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency, nor does the EPA endorse trade names or recommend the use of commercial products mentioned in this document." These items, once finalized, are to be an output within the work plan.

All data and information generated through grant funding, whether EPA funds or cost share, is considered public information and shall be made available to the public, unless there is a grant/cooperative agreement condition that specifies otherwise.

2) *Other Outputs*

A comprehensive schedule for submittal of progress reports, milestones, quality management plans, quality assurance project plans, data, information, document output submissions, and final reports is required within the work plan. The recipient agrees to deliver to EPA all products by the dates outlined in the work plan accompanying the application, following the procedures described in the work plan and the most recently approved version of the applicable quality assurance project plans. The recipient will deliver to EPA all outputs resulting from all programs (federally funded and non-federal match) described within the work plan.

e. Outcomes – Linkage to 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement Goals

EPA Order 5700.7 also states an assistance agreement work plan must contain, to the maximum extent practicable, well-defined outcomes. The definition of outcome is as follows:

"Outcome" means the result, effect, or consequence that will occur from carrying out an environmental program or activity that is related to an environmental programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes may be environmental, behavioral, health-related, or programmatic in nature, must be quantitative, and may not necessarily be achievable within an assistance agreement-funding period.

For Chesapeake Bay Program grants, this means all recipients are required to identify in the work plan the appropriate 2014 Agreement goal(s) and outcome(s) for each objective (refer to

Attachment 3 of this guidance). Any objective or project under the recipient's work plan that addresses the goals of the jurisdiction's WIP or two-year milestones must be linked to outcomes under the Water Quality Goal of the 2014 Agreement. Additionally, all CBRAP objectives must include outcomes related to the Water Quality Goal.

The Watershed Agreement has several overarching principles, including representing the interests of the people who live in the Bay watershed, engaging a diverse group of citizens, and promoting environmental justice principles. With this in mind, any objective or project under the recipient's work plan that addresses community outreach, education, and citizen engagement must be linked to outcomes under the stewardship and diversity outcomes of the 2014 Agreement.

Each work plan objective must link to each specific 2014 Agreement goal(s) and outcome(s) being achieved. If the work plan contains long-term objectives/projects that exceed one grant cycle, additional information is required. The applicant must provide information on what will be accomplished during the current grant cycle, whether the objective/project is on schedule, the ultimate goal of the objective/project, and what has been completed in previous years. Recipients are encouraged to provide progress on previous objectives/projects in a table format if possible.

Jurisdictions are not required to include information in their CBIG or CBRAP work plans on any 2014 Agreement outcomes and management strategies they are implementing with other sources of funding. Instead, the GITs will include this information in their Strategy Review System materials generated biennially including Management Strategies and Logic & Action Plans and progress reporting.

f. Addressing Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice (DEIJ) in Work Plans

The CBP partnership has taken deliberate steps to advance DEIJ in its work to conserve and restore the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

- **Since 2014, the CBP Diversity Workgroup has led the development and implementation of a [Management Strategy](#) and Logic and Action Plan to achieve the diversity outcome in the *Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement*.**
- **In 2018, jurisdictions provided EPA with a status update on how diversity and/or EJ is being addressed in their state grant guidance or related programs or policies for CBIG, CBRAP or other Bay Program funding.**
- **In 2018, the Chesapeake Bay Program's [Diversity Workgroup](#) started working with an independent consultant to develop a [Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice \(DEIJ\) Strategy](#) for the entire Chesapeake Bay Program partnership. This DEIJ Strategy, finalized in April 2020, contains recommendations that are grouped into four DEIJ framework focus areas. The consultant developed these recommendations based on interviews with Chesapeake Bay Program teams and leadership, a DEIJ readiness survey, two focus groups, a review of key partnership policy documents, and input from the Diversity Workgroup.**

- The [Chesapeake Executive Council](#), at its annual meeting in August 2020, announced a [DEIJ Statement](#) for the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership. This statement reaffirmed the Council’s commitment to embrace diversity, equity, inclusion and justice in all areas of the Chesapeake Bay Program. The first commitment in this statement reads: “Strengthen and improve diversity, equity, inclusion and justice in our organizational structure, leadership, policies, strategic goals, restoration and conservation activities, workplans and program delivery, including guidance on including DEIJ and environmental justice criteria in grant targeting and evaluations.”
- To accompany the Chesapeake Executive Council’s DEIJ Statement, in August 2020 the [Principals’ Staff Committee](#) announced a [DEIJ Action Statement](#) that articulates their commitment to implement the recommendations in the CBP DEIJ Strategy to the extent consistent with applicable state and federal law and policy. It also included actionable commitments with specific deadlines to implement the recommendations in the DEIJ Strategy. One of their commitments was to develop an implementation plan of the DEIJ Strategy. A DEIJ Action Team was formed in the fall of 2020 and has continued to meet throughout 2021 to develop this implementation plan.
- In October of 2020, jurisdictions and federal partners were asked at a CBP Management Board meeting to provide information on their existing programs and efforts to advance DEIJ under various categories (e.g., employee affinity groups, tools and processes for targeting restoration). This information can be found [at this link](#).

Consistent with the CBP DEIJ Statement and above efforts, it is strongly recommended that jurisdictions and other recipients review their work plans to ensure that they are inclusive of and working for all communities in the Bay watershed, and that they are aware of and addressing DEIJ and environmental justice (EJ) concerns. Beginning in 2022 for new awards, a section has been added to the Work Plan and Progress Report templates to articulate how grant outcomes are advancing the CBP DEIJ Statement. Jurisdictions, local partners, and other stakeholders are further encouraged to use USEPA’s environmental justice screening and mapping tool “EJSCREEN” as well as the [Chesapeake Bay Environmental Justice and Equity Dashboard](#). These tools are not decisional tools but provide desktop information that may help ensure that the diverse communities in the Bay watershed are considered for Bay restoration funding.

g. Linkage to EPA’s Strategic Plan

Prior to approving an assistance agreement work plan, EPA’s project officer must determine that the work plan links to EPA’s [FY 2022-2026 Strategic Plan](#). Recipients must include in their work plan the current CBPO linkage to EPA’s Strategic Plan at the time of their application.

The activities to be funded under Bay program grants are intended to further EPA’s current priorities under:

- **Goal 5: Ensure Clean and Safe Water for All Communities**
 - **Objective 5.2 Protect and Restore Waterbodies and Watersheds**

h. Linkage to Jurisdiction’s Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Commitments, Two-Year Milestones and Conowingo WIP

All seven jurisdictions developed Phase III WIPs to meet partnership-approved 2025 Bay TMDL planning targets, and implementation of those plans is currently underway. EPA released its evaluations of the plans and continues to assess progress on an annual basis. In addition, a separate WIP to address the nutrient and sediment loads resulting from infill of the Conowingo Dam is under development.

Recipients of CBIG awards must complete this section if the [Water Quality Goal](#) was chosen as a link above (see [Outcomes – Linkage to 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement Goals and Outcomes](#)), and all CBRAP grants must complete this section to include WIP and/or two-year milestone commitments, including any section, chapter, and/or page number. Recipients should mark this section “Not applicable” for grant objectives and projects that align with other 2014 Agreement goals, outcomes, and management strategies.

All CBRAP grant objectives must be linked to a water quality-related 2014 Agreement management strategy. They also must be linked directly to WIP and/or two-year milestone commitments, issues raised in EPA’s evaluation of the WIPs and two-year milestones, and the jurisdiction’s programs that relate to improved water quality in the Chesapeake Bay due to the load reductions of nutrients and sediment. Activities related to the implementation of WIPs and/or two-year milestones must be consistent with EPA’s expectations set forth in the:

- November 4, 2009 [WIP Expectations letter](#);
- April 2, 2010 [Guide for EPA’s Evaluation of Phase I Watershed Implementation Plans](#);
- March 30, 2011 [Guide for Chesapeake Bay Jurisdictions for the Development of Phase II Watershed Implementation Plans](#);
- July 6, 2011 [Guide for Chesapeake Bay Water Quality Two-year Milestones](#) (see Attachment 14) [In January 2020, the PSC approved an [updated schedule](#) for the two-year milestones and options for [submitting numeric milestones](#) for the 2020-2025 timeframe.];
- June 19, 2018 [Phase III WIP Expectations for the Bay jurisdictions](#);
- July 19, 2018 [Phase III WIP planning targets](#) issued to the Bay jurisdictions; and
- August 17, 2018 [Phase III WIP Expectations for Federal Agencies](#).

i. Linkage to Addressing Priority Practices, Watersheds, and Strategies

In May 2010, EPA issued the *Strategy for Protecting and Restoring the Chesapeake Bay Watershed* in fulfillment of Section 203 of Executive Order 13508. This section of the grant guidance is consistent with the EO 13508 Strategy targeting mission, which states, “in 2011 these grant funds are being targeted...to better protect the Chesapeake Bay and its tributary waters, including resources under the Clean Water Act.” The EO 13508 Strategy is available at: <https://federalleadership.chesapeakebay.net/>

Consistent with the EO 13508 Strategy, recipients of CBRAP grants must give preference to priority practices, watersheds, and strategies in their work plans that will result in the greatest benefits to water quality in the Bay. Recipients of CBRAP and CBIG grants are also encouraged to consider the co-benefit of practices that are targeted for implementation. Co-benefits are those that not only result in water quality improvements but could address other 2014 Watershed Agreement outcomes as well. The co-benefits that should be of the highest priority are those selected by the CBP partnership as having a direct relationship to the Phase III WIPs, including the Conowingo WIP. These are discussed further in the Phase III WIPs fact sheets at: https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/programs/watershed_implementation.

CBIG is intended to implement any of the goals and outcomes of the 2014 Agreement. Recipients of CBIG grants should also give preference to priority practices, watersheds, and strategies in their work plans that will result in the greatest benefit to multiple outcomes under the 2014 Watershed Agreement. This focus is consistent with CBPO's ongoing efforts to use the most accurate and appropriate science to identify priority practices, watersheds, and activities. Priority watersheds and activities apply to CBIG and CBRAP grants. EPA's environmental justice screening and mapping ("EJSCREEN") [tool](#) and/or [Chesapeake Bay Environmental Justice and Equity Dashboard](#) may also be helpful in identifying diverse communities that are often overlooked located in priority watersheds as well as and those potentially with environmental justice concerns where priority practices and activities could be implemented.

Likewise, the Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction grants (issued under Technical Assistance and General Assistance grants; CWA, Section 117(d)) should, to the greatest extent possible, target regional-scale partnerships that demonstrate:

- Innovative practices identified in the jurisdictions' WIPs, the Conowingo WIP, and/or two-year milestones;
- Innovative practices that reflect the priorities identified in the CBP management strategies and outcome biennial Logic & Action Plans;
- Opportunities for public-private partnerships that increase leveraged resources;
- Opportunities that increase the pace and scale of implementation in targeted regions and improve institutional coordination and partners among key organizations and agencies in each region;
- Urban areas with the highest nutrient and sediment loadings to the Chesapeake Bay;
- Communities experiencing rapid growth and new development and/or underserved communities and those with potential for environmental justice concerns; and/or
- Agricultural watersheds with the highest nutrient and sediment yielding areas to the tidal Chesapeake Bay based on USGS SPARROW (Spatially Referenced Regression on Watershed attributes) analyses and/or other data (e.g. the Chesapeake Watershed Data Dashboard).

Finally, to the greatest extent possible, any water quality improvement projects funded through the Small Watershed Grants should target:

- Practices identified in the jurisdictions' WIPs, the Conowingo WIP, and/or two-year milestones;
- Practices that reflect the priorities of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement outcome management strategies and Logic & Action Plans;
- Opportunities for public-private partnerships that increase leveraged resources;
- Areas with the highest nutrient and sediment loadings to the Chesapeake Bay; and/or
- Tools and practices that address nonpoint source pollution using EPA's *Guidance for Federal Land Management in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed* as a guide for tool and practice selection (www.epa.gov/nps/chesbay502).

Below is additional information about this sub-section of the work plan.

1) *General Priority Practices and Watersheds*

Priority practices are those approved, cost-effective practices that reduce or prevent the greatest nutrient and sediment loads to the Chesapeake Bay. Grant recipients should refer to the following resources for a representative list of proven, cost-effective practices that can reduce nutrients/sediment:

- Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership Approved Best Management Practices (BMPs) – provides a list of all practices approved by the partnership for credit in assessing progress towards milestones and other goals and objectives ([Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool \(CAST\) documentation](#)).
- Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership BMP Guide: "A Quick Reference Guide for Best Management Practices: Nonpoint source BMPs to Reduce Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Sediment in the Chesapeake Bay and its Local Waters" – provides summarized profiles for the most utilized CBP-approved BMPs in the CBP partnership's Phase 6 Watershed Model, https://www.chesapeakebay.net/documents/BMP-Guide_Full.pdf.
- EPA [Guidance for Federal Land Management in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed](#) – provides a list of proven, cost-effective tools and practices that can reduce water pollution from nonpoint sources (see [Attachment 12](#) for the summary document). Although this document was developed for federal lands, the same set of tools and practices are appropriate for nonfederal land managers to restore and protect the Chesapeake Bay.
- EPA report titled [The Next Generation of Tools and Actions to Restore Water Quality in the Chesapeake Bay \(202\(a\) Report\)](#) – provides a list of priority practices to address nutrient loads to the Chesapeake Bay.
- [Chesapeake Bay Watershed Data Dashboard](#) – consolidates and provides accessibility to a large amount of scientific and technical information at both the state and local levels to inform restoration efforts.
- Water Resource Registry used in conjunction with EPA's Recovery Potential Screening Tool at: <https://watershedresourcesregistry.org/>

While grant recipients should consider all these resources, EPA acknowledges grant recipients may include other partnership-approved BMPs in their work plan with appropriate justification that includes the following information:

- The priority practices that will be implemented with the grant funds;
- A short justification as to why each practice is a priority for the location in which it is to be implemented;
- A short justification of the nutrient and sediment reductions associated with the practice; and
- A brief description of the strategies being undertaken to ensure effective implementation of the practice.

CBRAP grants can only support implementation of practices the CBP partnership has determined result in nutrient and/or sediment reductions. However, CBIG grants can support implementation of practices the CBP partnership has determined result in nutrient and/or sediment reductions, contribute to the desired habitat and/or living resource restoration objectives. All projects must be consistent with the goals and outcomes of the 2014 Agreement. Jurisdictions are encouraged to include priority practices associated with federal, state, and/or local regulatory and related compliance assurance programs in their CBRAP work plan content.

Grant recipients should strongly consider whether their work addresses DEIJ concerns. This includes ensuring projects are being undertaken in environmental justice communities and historically underserved communities to address past and existing disparities. In the work to meaningfully engage with such communities, jurisdictions should consider the strategies articulated in the Diversity Outcome Management Strategy, the recommendations in the CBP DEIJ Strategy **and its implementation plan**, and the commitments made by the Executive Council and Principals' Staff Committee in their respective 2020 DEIJ Statements ([see Addressing Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice \(DEIJ\) in Work Plans](#)).

The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) issued new results on the sources of sediment within the Chesapeake Bay that also could be considered in helping to select areas on which to focus water-quality improvements. The new information, based on the Chesapeake Bay sediment SPARROW model, can be accessed [online](#). The user can find information showing areas of high sediment loads to local streams and areas of high sediment loads to the Bay and its tidal tributaries. Results of new SPARROW models for nitrogen and phosphorus can be found at: water.usgs.gov/nawqa/sparrow.

2) *Priority Urban Watersheds*

In urban watersheds, grant recipients may give preference to watersheds in areas of accelerated population and impervious cover growth as well as areas requiring extensive retrofits to address urban stormwater. These priority areas can be identified using local land use/land cover data as well as recent [land change data developed by USGS](#). Jurisdictions should rely on recent water quality monitoring and modeling data being used for development of their

WIPs and should also consider delivered loads of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment described in the [online USGS SPARROW website](#).

Changing hydrologic conditions due to climate change pose risks to stormwater infrastructure and public safety. To date, state and local governments have used a series of precipitation volume-based engineering design criteria to manage risks to public health as well as the performance of their stormwater infrastructure. However, the current practice of designing infrastructure using intensity-duration-frequency (IDF) curves based on historic precipitation analysis are [likely to underestimate future precipitation](#), leading to a [loss of stormwater BMP efficiency and increased risk of infrastructure failure](#).

While not a requirement, jurisdictions are encouraged to consider stormwater design using sizing criteria that provides an acceptable level of risk under future climate conditions. There are multiple approaches to resilient sizing criteria, that may include the use of projected IDF curves, adding a “factor of safety” to historic precipitation data, or establishing over-management criterion for quantity and rate control. [Future projected IDF curves](#) tailored for each county in the entire Chesapeake Bay Watershed and Virginia and an accompanying [web-based tool](#) are now available to assist jurisdictions with their resilient design considerations.

Jurisdictions **may** also utilize EPA’s environmental justice screening and mapping (“EJSCREEN”) tool and the [Chesapeake Bay Environmental Justice and Equity Dashboard](#) to assist them in identifying watersheds in communities that may have environmental justice concerns. **These tools are not decisional tools but provide desktop information that may help ensure that the diverse communities in the Bay watershed are considered for Bay restoration funding.**

3) *Priority Approaches and Practices for Stormwater*

Approaches to stormwater management have changed notably in the past few years from extended detention approaches (big basins) to onsite retention. EPA encourages grant recipients to consider the following sources of information when selecting their approaches and practices for addressing stormwater nutrient and sediment loads:

- National Research Council – [Urban Stormwater Management](#), 2008;
- EPA technical documents – [Guidance for Federal Land Management in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed](#), Chapter 3 Urban and Suburban, 2010;
- EISA technical guidance – [Technical Guidance on Implementing the Stormwater Runoff Requirements for Federal Projects under Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act](#), 2009;
- EPA green infrastructure [policy memos](#);
- EPA [Green Streets / G3 Program](#);
- EPA [Green Infrastructure website](#);
- [Green Infrastructure Modeling Toolkit](#);
- [Community Solutions for Stormwater Management](#);
- [Green Infrastructure Performance](#);

- EPA Region 3 July 2010 MS4 guidance – [Urban Stormwater Approach for the Mid-Atlantic Region and the Chesapeake Bay Watershed](#);
- [Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership Approved BMPs](#);
- Chesapeake Stormwater Network [BMP resources](#);
- [Municipal Online Stormwater Training \(MOST\) Center](#);
- [National Stormwater Calculator](#); and
- State Stormwater BMP and Erosion and Sediment Control Manuals.

4) *Priority Practices for Onsite Treatment Systems*

EPA's [Model Program for Onsite Systems Management in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed](#) is available to help the Bay jurisdictions more effectively prevent nutrients from entering the Bay from onsite or septic systems, which will improve water quality. EPA developed this model program to provide state-of-the-art treatment, management, and operational recommendations that the jurisdictions and their local communities can use if they are interested in reducing onsite system nitrogen impacts. EPA encourages grant recipients to consider the information provided in this document when selecting their approaches and technologies for addressing onsite treatment system nutrient loads. In addition, on April 16, 2015, the states of Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia and West Virginia signed a [Memorandum of Cooperation](#) to share data developed to document the performance of advanced onsite pretreatment units for nitrogen reduction and, therefore, to simplify and expedite the approval processes for these technologies in each individual state, as well as reduce costs to residents and manufacturers.

5) *Priority Agricultural Watersheds*

Priority agricultural watersheds are those watersheds that have the greatest influence on Chesapeake Bay water quality. Priority agricultural watersheds can include watersheds in greatest need of restoration where nutrient/sediment loads to the Bay are greatest, have the highest “delivery factors” for loads reaching the Bay, and/or the watershed is having a negative impact on water quality. EPA encourages grant recipients to consider the CBP partnership's [Priority Agricultural Watersheds Map](#) when selecting agricultural priority watersheds in need of restoration.

6) *Priority Strategies for Trading and Offset Programs*

Developing environmental markets, particularly for nutrient and sediment credit trading, can be an important supporting strategy for achieving water quality goals for the Chesapeake Bay.

In early 2012, EPA completed a comprehensive assessment of the Bay jurisdictions' trading and offset programs to determine whether they meet the criteria established in Section 10 and Appendix S of the Bay TMDL. These assessments identified a number of jurisdiction-specific and cross-jurisdictional common concerns. EPA requested the jurisdictions to prepare action plans by 2013 to address these areas. EPA updated its assessments and sent them to the jurisdictions

in November 2016. Information regarding these assessments is posted to [EPA's Trading and Offset website](#).

On February 6, 2019, EPA issued an updated [Water Quality Trading Policy Memo](#) to promote market-based mechanisms for improving water quality. This policy update includes additional flexibilities that state and local policy makers may consider incorporating into trading and other market-based programs to promote water quality improvements and may provide state and local policy makers with an opportunity to update or improve its current policies and regulations related to nutrient accounting and trading. Nutrient and sediment credit trading has the potential to reduce the costs of achieving the nutrient and sediment load reductions expected under the Bay TMDL and to generate revenue streams for some sectors. EPA supports trading programs that are consistent with the Clean Water Act and the Bay TMDL – specifically, programs in which appropriate baselines are used, the practices used to generate credits are verified, trading partners are accountable, and the process is open to all interested parties. A number of Bay jurisdictions already are implementing [water quality trading](#) programs.

Grant recipients may continue to use CBRAP funds to support the development and implementation of trading and offset programs as long as these programs are established and implemented in a manner consistent with the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, the Clean Water Act, and its applicable regulations. EPA expects grant recipients to use their CBRAP funds to continue to develop accountability and tracking systems for the appropriate sectors. EPA expects the continued development of these systems to be identified as a separate objective or task in CBRAP work plans (see [Additional Work Plan Content Specific to CBRAP Grants](#)).

Grant recipients using CBRAP grants to fund development and implementation of trading and offset programs need to consider the following:

- Authority,
- Baseline for credit generators,
- Minimum controls required for credit purchasers,
- Eligibility,
- Credit calculation and verification,
- Safeguards,
- Certification and enforceability,
- Accountability and tracking,
- Nutrient-impaired segments,
- Credit banking,
- Local water quality impacts,
- Accounting for credit uncertainty,
- Management of new nutrient and sediment loads, and
- Timing of credit generation and use.

For more details, grant recipients should refer to [Appendix S of the Bay TMDL](#). EPA developed a comprehensive work plan for EPA's work on trading and offsets, which was developed in

coordination with the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership's Trading and Offsets Workgroup (TOWG).

7) Guidance on the Use of this Sub-Section for Individual Grant Programs

While the resources identified in this sub-section should be considered by recipients of CBIG and CBRAP grants, EPA acknowledges the jurisdictions may include other priority watersheds in their work plan with appropriate justification that includes the following information:

- The priority watersheds that will be addressed with the grant funds;
- A short justification as to why each watershed is considered a priority;
- The amount of grant funding to be allocated to each priority watershed;
- The work to be accomplished in each priority watershed; and
- A brief description of the strategies being undertaken in this watershed.

j. Additional Work Plan Requirements

Summary of Staff Funded. All recipients should include under each objective in their work plan a summary of staff funded with federal dollars or recipient cost-share. At a minimum, this should include the personnel costs and number of staff for the objective(s).

Conferences/workshops/meetings. **Conferences may be funded with an assistance agreement if the principal purpose is not for the direct benefit of the government (see [Best Practices Guide for Conferences Funded with an Assistance Agreement](#)).** If a work plan includes conferences, workshops, or meetings that the recipient will conduct, the recipient must address the following questions in the narrative summary portion of the work plan. **Note that these requirements apply only to conferences being conducted by the recipient, not its subrecipients and subcontractors.**

- Who is initiating the conference, workshop, or meeting?
- How is the conference, workshop, or meeting being advertised?
- Whose logo will be on the agenda and conference, workshop, and meeting materials?
 - a) Supporting a Conference Sponsored by a Nonfederal Entity: Use of the EPA's logo in connection with promotion or sale of non-government produced goods or services is forbidden. Promotional material for conferences conducted under grants and cooperative agreements may acknowledge the conference receives financial support from the agency under an assistance agreement, but they cannot use the logo on a conference brochure in a manner that implies the conference is being conducted by EPA. These conferences should be described as the recipient's event, not EPA's.
 - b) Jointly Sponsored Conferences: The official logo may be used on promotional and conference materials for conferences EPA jointly sponsors with outside groups. The co-sponsor's logo should also be used on promotional and conference materials and should be displayed at least as prominently as the EPA's.

- What is the expected percentage distribution of the persons attending the conference, workshop, or meeting (i.e. percent of federal, state, local, or public participants)?
- Is the recipient going to conduct the proceedings or analysis/analyses and disseminate this information back to the appropriate state, local, and scientific community?
- Does the recipient anticipate any program income being generated from the conference, workshop, or meeting, including registration fees?

Light refreshments. In addition, if the work plan and/or budget detail includes activities during which light refreshments and/or meals will be provided recipients should consult the Office of Grants and Debarment [Guidance on Selected Items of Costs for Recipients](#), and additional information will be necessary prior to approving the work plan or incurring expenses for such costs. The General Services Administration has defined light refreshments to include but not be limited to coffee, tea, milk, juice, soft drinks, donuts, bagels, fruit, pretzels, cookies, chips, and/or muffins.

If a work plan and/or budget detail includes activities during which light refreshments and/or meals will be provided, the recipient must address the following in the narrative summary portion of the work plan:

- The estimated cost of the event associated with the light refreshments and/or meals.
- An adequate description of the event.
- A statement regarding whether those attending the event will receive a *per diem* financed with grant funds.
- A statement justifying why the provision of light refreshments and/or meals is necessary to achieve the objectives of the assistance agreement.
- A statement justifying why the provision of light refreshments and/or meals is necessary to achieve the objectives of the event.
- Information on the availability of the light refreshments and/or meals (i.e. before, during, or after the event).

k. Work Plan Content Specific to CBRAP Grants

Activities eligible for funding under the CBRAP grants differ from those funded by CBIG. CBRAP grants fund activities related to the water quality goal of the 2014 Agreement, whereas CBIG can fund all goals of the 2014 Agreement. Although there is some overlap among the eligible uses of these grants, recipients cannot fund the same activity or task with more than one of these grants.

CBRAP funds can be used to address issues identified by EPA in its program assessments and WIP and milestone evaluations. Recipients should work with EPA to address all issues raised during relevant EPA program assessments within their written response to EPA assessments and where appropriate within their CBRAP grant work plans. These assessments include, but are not limited to, agricultural, stormwater, offset and trading, and BMP verification program assessments.

EPA contractor assistance may be available to the Bay jurisdictions for this purpose in the form of direct assistance to support multi-jurisdictional work on common templates and/or common systems and in-kind assistance for addressing jurisdiction specific needs (see [FY 2022 Grant Funding Allocations](#)).

Each jurisdiction should work with their EPA project officer to determine what they need to include in their work plan related to tracking and accountability. Each Bay jurisdiction continues to maintain and enhance an operational tracking and accountability system consistent with [Appendix S of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL](#) and is expected to include the following as a separate objective in its CBRAP work plan:

Continue making improvements to existing tracking and accountability systems based on the CBP partnership's decision to use conditions forecasted through 2025 in the Phase III WIPs and two-year milestones. These growth projections will be updated on a two-year basis, to coincide with the two-year milestone submission schedule. Any refinements or updates to existing tracking and accountability systems that may be needed should be completed by the end of each milestone period as appropriate or as needed.

The following should also be included in this CBRAP work plan objective or task:

Consistent with Common Element 8 on pages 5-6 of [Appendix S of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL](#), the accountability and tracking system(s) will be able to track the offsetting of new or increased loadings of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment to the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Such systems are expected to focus on performance outcomes while providing maximum transparency, operational efficiency, and accessibility to all interested parties. Such system(s) should address the following:

- 1) An appropriate offset baseline is used to generate credits.
- 2) The offset is quantified and verified according to standards established by the jurisdiction.
- 3) The offset or credit is sold to no more than one purchaser at a time.
- 4) The nutrient delivery equivalency of the offset generated, and the offset consumed both in terms of the equivalency of pollutants and appropriate attenuation.
- 5) The location(s) of the offset, including where the offset or credit is generated.
- 6) Authentication of ownership.
- 7) The NPDES permit number or other identification of the purchaser of the offset or credit.
- 8) Documentation of agreements between parties to the offset transaction.
- 9) Whether sufficient offsets will be acquired over the period of the new or increased loading.
- 10) Compliance status of NPDES parties.
- 11) The results of monitoring and verification for each offset.
- 12) Time frames for regular review and evaluation of the offset program.

The Bay jurisdictions' accountability and tracking systems should have the ability to differentiate BMPs according to their benefits for meeting WIP commitments or for offset/trading. When the Bay jurisdictions report their implemented BMPs for the annual progress review, EPA expects that the Bay jurisdictions will identify which BMPs, and any other projects and practices, were used to generate nutrient credits. This information should be reported through the National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN). NEIEN has been modified to allow for the identification of BMPs that generate nutrient credits and the location where the associated load reduction is applied. Alternatively, a jurisdiction may demonstrate through the design of the program and the tracking of credits on its registry that new or increased loads are being offset and that both the BMPs in an offset or trading program and the associated nutrient reductions are accurately accounted for and publicly available. As part of the annual progress submissions, the CBP partnership calculates the pounds of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment reduction from those credit-generating projects and practices at the state-basin scale.

EPA also expects the Bay jurisdictions to sum the load reductions (i.e., pounds) used in trades and offsets by major river basin in each year for each of the three pollutants – nitrogen, phosphorus and, if relevant, sediment. This should not require additional calculations, instead merely summing already quantified pounds of credits used as reported in the state's registry/tracking system. This information will then be used as feedback as part of the annual progress submissions. Beginning in 2018, jurisdictions should report BMPs in this manner with their Progress input deck submissions. Finally, BMP data that is submitted by federal agencies must be entered by the jurisdictions into NEIEN and identified as federal with the appropriate agency code. Complete entry of federal facility BMP data (by federal agency) is critical to allow EPA to assess progress in meeting federal facility planning goals.

In September 2014, the CBP partnership's Principals' Staff Committee approved and adopted the *Chesapeake Bay Basinwide BMP Verification Framework*.⁵ This framework commits the partners to a set of five BMP verification principles and comprehensive sets of BMP verification guidance. Based on the schedule agreed to by the CBP partnership, all seven jurisdictions developed and submitted, and EPA reviewed and approved their enhanced BMP tracking, verification, and reporting program quality assurance plans. These programs were considered to be fully consistent with and supportive of the CBP partnership's adopted BMP verification principles. EPA will review updates to these verification QAPPs based on each jurisdiction's annual progress submissions. Starting with the 2018 progress submission, BMPs reported through NEIEN by jurisdictions that do not have and/or do not meet approved verification protocols may not be counted. Standard Operating Procedures for EPA's annual verification assessment of reported BMPs and wastewater data are [available online](#). CBRAP grant funding can be used directly by the jurisdictions to support the development, enhancement or expansion of their BMP verification programs and their continued operation.

⁵ Chesapeake Bay Program, 2014. [Strengthening Verification of Best Management Practices Implemented in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed: A Basinwide Framework](#). Annapolis, Maryland.

Examples of additional eligible CBRAP grant activities and tasks and their related outputs jurisdictions can include in their CBRAP work plan are identified below.

1) *Examples of eligible grant activities and tasks include:*

a. Development and Implementation of WIPs and Two-Year Milestones

- Gathering, analysis, and quality assurance of data related to: the sources and transport of nutrient and sediment loads to the Bay; the impact of future growth, changing land uses, and conservation strategies on water quality; and/or management of nutrient and sediment loads;
- Development of strategies to reduce nutrient and sediment loads delivered to the Bay;
- Implementation of the Phase III WIPs and drafting and implementation of two-year milestone commitments;
- Development and tracking of local⁶ and federal facilities planning goals; and/or
- Facilitation of stakeholder input into implementation of WIPs and development and implementation of two-year milestones.

b. Improved or Expanded Regulation of Sources of Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Sediment Delivered to the Bay Consistent with WIPs and/or Two-Year Milestones for Water Quality

- Development of new authorities, rules, or regulations to reduce nutrient and sediment loads delivered to the Bay through enforceable or otherwise binding commitments;
- Development or revision of state technical standards;
- Development of more stringent and clearly enforceable permits;
- Development of technical information to ensure permits contain necessary information to ensure consistency with TMDL wasteload allocations;
- Technical and/or compliance assistance for permit reviews;
- Technical and/or compliance assistance for landowners;
- Additional staff to develop permits and ensure consistency with water quality needs, including TMDL wasteload allocations;
- Designation for regulation of additional areas or operations as regulated under the Clean Water Act; and/or
- Development or implementation of trading programs to facilitate compliance with water quality goals.

c. Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Consistent with WIPs and/or Two-Year Milestones for Water Quality

- Develop and implement methods to assess compliance with existing or new regulations, such as those relating to municipal separate storm sewers (MS4s), construction storm water and animal feeding operations, and wastewater treatment

⁶ [Final Recommendations of the Local Planning Goals Task Force.](#)

plants, and pursue appropriate enforcement responses when violations are identified, with particular emphasis on permittees that are in Significant Noncompliance (SNC);

- Develop and implement methods to target and deliver enforcement follow-through or compliance assistance;
- Develop and implement transparent methods to track and publicly communicate compliance and enforcement efforts, including identifying serious noncompliance, compliance and enforcement efforts to address noncompliance, and resulting environmental benefits achieved;
- Technical compliance assistance to support enforcement and/or compliance assurance efforts;
- Training and outreach to local entities on nutrient and sediment reduction practices for MS4s;
- Increased staff resources for compliance monitoring, enforcement follow-up, reviews, reporting, inspections, investigations, audits, corrective actions, and assistance visits;
- Workshops for regulatory staff or permittees on new permit conditions, standards, or requirements; and/or
- Effectiveness monitoring for practices or management actions associated with permit conditions or contracts.

d. Improved Tracking, Reporting, Verification, and Accountability Consistent with WIPs and/or Two-Year Milestones for Water Quality

- Development and implementation of National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN) BMP data flows to report practices to the Chesapeake Bay Program;
- Development and enhancement of verification programs and policies (e.g., procedures for verifying agricultural conservation practices – both cost-shared and non-cost shared – are properly designed, installed, and maintained) are consistent with the November 4, 2009, December 29, 2009, and June 19, 2018 federal expectations letters and as well as the [Guide for EPA's Evaluation of Phase I Watershed Implementation Plans](#) issued April 2, 2010, as amended or clarified by subsequent EPA and CBP partnership communications, including the CBP partnership's October 2014 [Strengthening Verification of Best Management Practices Implemented in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed: A Basinwide Framework](#);
- Development and implementation of protocols and staff resources to report data that meet EPA expectations for tracking and verification into NEIEN and CAST, and are consistent with the November 4, 2009, December 29, 2009, and June 19, 2018 expectations letters, as well as the [Guide for EPA's Evaluation of Phase I Watershed Implementation Plans](#) issued April 2, 2010, and subsequent EPA and CBP communications, including the CBP partnership's October 2014 [Strengthening Verification of Best Management Practices Implemented in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed: A Basinwide Framework](#);
- Development and implementation of protocols, procedures and staff resources to report BMP data from federal facilities and federal lands as jurisdictions work towards their established pollutant load reduction targets and achievement of their two-year

milestones, consistent with the CBP partnership's June 2015 [Protocol for Setting Targets, Planning BMPs and Reporting Progress for Federal Facilities and Lands](#) and EPA's August 16, 2018 [Expectations for Federal Lands and Facilities in Supporting Chesapeake Bay Watershed Jurisdictions' Phase III Watershed Implementation Plans](#);

- Development and/or improvement of procedures for verifying practices that were designed, implemented, and maintained properly, including as specified in permit or contract conditions;
- Development and implementation of protocols, procedures and staff resources to improve NPDES data quality and data transfers to improve completeness and accuracy of compliance data in the Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS); and
- Securing any necessary data-sharing agreements with universities, industry associations or other appropriate entities consistent with the CBP partnership's approved approaches, protocols and requirements.

e. Improved Monitoring and Assessment of Compliance with Regulatory Loading Limits and Water Quality Standards Regulations

- Development and implementation of monitoring, assessment and/or data analysis techniques for determining and reporting progress toward achievement of Bay TMDL and WIP-based allocations; and/or
- Development and implementation of monitoring and assessment techniques for making regulatory decisions (consistent with state water quality standards) on listing and delisting Chesapeake Bay and tidal tributary and embayment waters.

Activities and tasks not listed above but in support of the development and/or implementation of the jurisdictions' WIPs and two-year milestones for water quality, or in response to EPA's evaluation of these documents or to EPA assessments of jurisdictions' programs, are also eligible for CBRAP grants. Activities and tasks should be targeted based on EPA evaluations of WIPs, milestones, trading offsets, and other program assessments. Jurisdictions should also give priority to addressing state regulatory programmatic deficiencies identified in EPA's State Review Framework, Permit Quality Review, Trading and Offset Program Assessments, Stormwater Assessments, Agricultural Assessments, and the WIP and Milestones Evaluations that can be an impediment in achieving their WIP and milestone commitments and goals.

The following related activities are not eligible under CBRAP:

- Cost-sharing implementation of voluntary controls or best management practices identified in the jurisdictions' WIPs and two-year milestones;
- Paying penalties and fines; and
- Costs resulting from non-Federal entity violations of, alleged violations of, or failure to comply with, Federal state, tribal, local or foreign laws and regulations are unallowable, except when incurred as a result of compliance with specific provisions of the federal award, or with prior written approval of the Federal awarding agency (in accordance with [2 CFR 200.441](#)).

2) *Examples of possible outputs within each of the above five categories of eligible grant activities and tasks include but are not limited to:*

a. Development and Implementation of TMDL WIPs and Two-Year Milestones

- Submission of draft and final WIPs by relevant deadlines;
- Submission of draft and final two-year milestones by relevant deadlines;
- Number of stakeholder or public meetings; and/or
- Number of stakeholder groups engaged.

b. Improved or Expanded Regulation of Sources of Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and/or Sediment Delivered to the Bay

- Number of new authorities, rules, or regulations adopted;
- Number of new authorities, rules, or regulations adopted pertaining to trading and offsets;
- Pounds of nitrogen and phosphorus and tons of sediment loads now subject to new, expanded, or improved regulatory controls;
- Nitrogen, phosphorus, and/or sediment load reductions due to improved or expanded regulations;
- Number of operations subject to new, expanded, or improved regulatory controls;
- Acreage of area subject to new, expanded, or improved regulatory controls;
- Percent of permits reviewed;
- Percent of permits that contain appropriate conditions, controls, limits and/or consistency with local water quality needs, including TMDL wasteload allocations;
- Number of permits issued;
- Number of new or improved management practices or procedures implemented; and/or
- Development of adequate accountability and tracking systems for tracking trading and offsets.

c. Enforcement and Compliance Assurance

- Percent of permits in compliance with permit conditions;
- Percent of permits in Significant Noncompliance (SNC);
- Number of inspections of NPDES permittees in SNC;
- For those permits where serious noncompliance is identified (including instances where an NPDES permit was not applied for but should have been), indicate estimated nitrogen, phosphorus, and/or sediment loads associated with the noncompliance and the type of action taken to address the noncompliance;
- Percent of permits inspected;
- Percent of permits inspected for compliance assurance/enforcement due to impact on Bay water quality within a target area;
- Percent of permittees in compliance with permit conditions in an area targeted for compliance assurance/enforcement due to impact on water quality in the Bay;

- Percent of targeted areas where all sources potentially contributing to the impairment have been inspected;
- Number of workshops for regulatory staff and/or permittees;
- Percent of regulatory staff and/or permittees that attend permitting workshops;
- Percent of sites with available monitoring;
- Number of enforcement actions (with locations, and types of violations addressed);
- Number of corrective actions;
- Percent of noncompliant permittees brought into compliance;
- Nitrogen, phosphorus, and/or sediment load reductions that will be required due to injunctive relief;
- Dollars spent on installing and operating required remedies;
- Penalties and/or supplemental environmental projects;
- Number of new or improved management practices or procedures implemented;
- Number of new compliance assistance outreach and educational materials available
- Audience reached by new compliance assistance outreach and educational materials; and/or
- Number of new or improved management practices resulting from compliance assistance.

Upon request, EPA can provide methodologies and tools for estimating nitrogen, phosphorus, and/or sediment load reductions from BMPs and/or corrective actions associated with improved or expanded regulatory, enforcement, and compliance assurance actions.

d. Improved Tracking, Verification, and Accountability

- Improved pollutant identification;
- Percent of sites with effectiveness monitoring;
- Percent of state tracking and verification systems compatible with Chesapeake Bay Program Office tools (NEIEN and CAST) and consistent with the November 4, 2009, December 29, 2009, and June 19, 2018 expectations, as well as the [Guide for EPA's Evaluation of Phase I Watershed Implementation Plans](#) issued April 2, 2010 – as amended or clarified by subsequent CBP partnership communications, including the CBP partnership's October 2014 [Strengthening Verification of Best Management Practices Implemented in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed: A Basinwide Framework](#);
- Number of state tracking and verification systems compatible with Chesapeake Bay Program Office tools (NEIEN and CAST) and consistent with the November 4, 2009, December 29, 2009, and June 19, 2018 expectations, as well as the [Guide for EPA's Evaluation of Phase I Watershed Implementation Plans](#) issued April 2, 2010 – as amended or clarified by subsequent CBP partnership communications, including the CBP partnership's October 2014 [Strengthening Verification of Best Management Practices Implemented in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed: A Basinwide Framework](#). For example, verification systems for ensuring agricultural conservation practices (both cost-shared and non-cost shared) are properly designed, installed and maintained);

- Percent and number of sites, sources, and/or permittees captured by tracking and verification systems compatible with CBPO systems;
- Percent and units of BMPs verified under annual progress submissions to the Chesapeake Bay Program Office, in accordance with each jurisdiction’s EPA-approved verification program and plan; and/or
- Submission of state data for each of the 12 outcome measures.

e. Improved Monitoring and Assessment of Compliance with Regulatory Loading Limits and Water Quality Standards Regulations

- Number of watersheds assessed for compliance with Bay TMDL/WIP allocations; and/or
- Number of Chesapeake Bay tidal segments assessed for attainment of Chesapeake Bay water quality standards.

EPA may work with grant recipients to select appropriate programmatic and environmental outputs related to WIPs, regulatory programs, enforcement, compliance assurance, and accountability. Grant recipients should continue to refer to Attachment 3 when submitting outcomes.

I. Additional Work Plan Content Specific to Local Government Implementation Funding

Since FY 2014, EPA has been committed to providing increased funding for local governments to reduce nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment loads to the Chesapeake Bay, consistent with the Bay jurisdictions’ WIPs. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014 provided additional state funding for CBPO, and EPA provided \$5 million for this commitment. EPA is hopeful funding for local government implementation will continue in future years. Jurisdictions have the option of having EPA add their share of local government implementation funding to their CBRAP and/or CBIG.

Local government implementation funding is intended for use by local entities. For purposes of this guidance, “local entity” may include counties, municipalities, cities, towns, townships, or federally recognized tribes, as well as local public authorities or districts (including conservation districts or regional planning districts), organizations representing local governments, or watershed organizations that support local government implementation. If EPA awards a Bay jurisdiction local government implementation funding, they are expected to provide this funding through contracts or subgrants to local entities based on the local entities’ ability to reduce nutrient and sediment loads through key sectors, such as land development and agriculture. Jurisdictions must make subrecipient and contractor determinations in accordance with [2 CFR 200.330](#). If a jurisdiction plans to make subgrants, then they must follow the requirements of [2 CFR 200.331](#).⁷ Jurisdictions can provide this funding to a different state agency, which will then provide the funding to local entities through subgrants or contracts. EPA can also provide this funding directly to entities through competitive RFAs (see [Competition Process](#)).

⁷ This only applies to CBIG and CBRAP awards that receive any funding on or after December 26, 2014.

Local government implementation funding added to CBRAP and CBIG awards needs to be incorporated in these grants' work plans. Jurisdictions should include this funding as a new objective(s) in the work plan for the grant vehicle they choose for the local government funding. This part of the grant guidance describes the information EPA expects jurisdictions to include in the local government implementation objective of their work plan, as well as the expected uses of these funds. Information about necessary work plan content for local government funding awarded directly to local entities by EPA through a competitive RFA will be contained in the specific RFA.

The Narrative Summary of Outputs for this objective should briefly describe the local government implementation work that will be accomplished with this funding and how the funding will be used in a timely manner. Jurisdictions should also describe how they will distribute this funding to local entities. This includes describing what criteria or mechanisms they will use to select local entities for funding through subgrants or contracts and whether they will provide these funds to another state agency to distribute to local entities. If jurisdictions know the local entities they will fund when they are preparing this work plan objective, then they should include them under the new work plan objective and explain why they were chosen. **Where appropriate, jurisdictions should describe how funds will address needs in underserved communities, improving protections and/or accruing environmental benefits to these communities.**

EPA expects work plans to include well-defined and measurable outputs related to meeting WIP commitments and, where applicable, to addressing issues raised by EPA in its evaluations of the jurisdictions' two-year milestones. The work plan should include near-term outputs for local government implementation activities that produce nutrient and sediment reduction. However, some activities jurisdictions fund may not lead to quantifiable pounds of nutrients or sediment reduced, such as those related to development of local ordinances. For these activities, jurisdictions should still include outputs and deliverables that are quantifiable while describing the activity's connection to nutrient and sediment reduction. Other areas of the local government implementation objective should follow the guidance in the [Work Plan Requirements section](#) and Attachment 4, Work Plan Template.

The local government implementation activities will be in support of the Bay jurisdictions' WIPs. For **FY 2022**, local entities may use these funds to help track local planning goals and/or to support their participation in Phase III WIP implementation.

Jurisdictions should consider funding activities that address the issues raised by EPA in its evaluations of the jurisdictions' WIPs and milestones if local government implementation activities can address one or more of the issues. As noted in the [Monitoring and Grant Enforcement](#) section of this grant guidance, the failure of a jurisdiction to address these issues may impact future CBIG or CBRAP funding. Jurisdictions should give priority to funding those activities that will address missed water quality milestones, accelerate the pace for meeting WIP commitments, and/or have the greatest impact on reducing nutrient and sediment loads.

In deciding which local activities to fund, jurisdictions should also consider the timeliness and cost-effectiveness of the activities in contributing to nutrient and sediment reduction.

As such, the allowable uses of the local government implementation funding are a subset of the eligible uses of the CBRAP and CBIG awards that address EPA's evaluations of jurisdictions' WIPs and milestones. Jurisdictions should choose to which grant vehicle to apply their local government implementation funds based on the types of activities they plan to fund with this money. Jurisdictions should choose their CBIG if they plan to provide their funding to local entities for direct implementation of nutrient and sediment reduction. Examples of direct implementation include the expansion of BMP implementation as well as improvements to wastewater treatment and stormwater management, including green infrastructure projects. They should choose their CBRAP grants if they plan to distribute their funding to local entities to expand local entities' regulatory and accountability capabilities related to nutrient and sediment loads. This funding should consider transferability of these tools to other local jurisdictions. Examples of CBRAP-eligible activities and related outputs by local entities can be found in this guidance under the [Work Plan Content Specific to CBRAP Grants](#) section. These activities include improving the regulation of sources of nutrients and sediment as well as expanding capacity to enforce and ensure compliance. With the exception of training requested by local entities, jurisdictions that need to improve training and outreach to local entities on nutrient and sediment reduction practices should use their other CBRAP funding.

Additional examples of possible uses of this funding by local entities for reducing nutrient and sediment loads that would also support WIP implementation are below:

- Local implementation of priority, structural agricultural, urban/suburban, and/or resource BMPs identified in the jurisdictions' WIPs and two-year milestones.
- Optimization studies and subsidies for operation and maintenance of wastewater treatment plants.
- Local stormwater program improvements.
- Training sponsored by local governments for local governments (e.g., peer-to-peer) focused on addressing barriers to and innovative ideas for implementation of nutrient and sediment reduction programs. Training conducted by jurisdictions that was specifically requested by local entities is also eligible.
- Filling gaps and technical assistance to develop and implement environmental financing revenue streams, including stimulation and leveraging of private capital, to pay for nutrient and sediment reduction projects.
- Compliance monitoring and assistance, and inspections and enforcement of MS4s, construction stormwater, animal feeding operations, and wastewater treatment plants.
- Development of new, or improvement of, existing authorities, rules, codes, zoning, and/or regulations to reduce nutrient and sediment loads delivered to the Bay through enforceable or otherwise binding commitments.
- Green Infrastructure projects including Chesapeake Bay Green Street-Green Jobs-Green Towns (G3) Initiative: The G3 Initiative supports community-based green stormwater infrastructure in urbanized watersheds for water quality benefits. Local government

implementation funds can be used for “green streets,” specifically for the design and implementation of green infrastructure-based stormwater management practices, increasing urban tree canopy in conjunction with stormwater management practices, and replacing impervious surfaces with more permeable materials. Additional information about the G3 Initiative and other green infrastructure funding opportunities, which might offer options for coordination, can be found at:

<https://cbtrust.org/green-streets-green-jobs-green-towns/> and <https://www.epa.gov/green-infrastructure/green-infrastructure-funding-opportunities>

- Projects that emphasize nutrient and sediment load reduction efforts with co-benefits, such as source water protection and local hazard mitigation planning.
- Development and implementation of protocols and procedures and provision of staff resources to track, verify and report BMP data from local governments, conservation districts, non-governmental organizations and other local partners implementing BMPs.

Jurisdictions may request EPA in-kind services by having EPA contractors assist local entities with implementation needs identified by EPA in its milestone evaluations.

Jurisdictions are expected to be able to track wastewater facility, stormwater management, and other BMP implementation activities they fund with this money. They should submit these practice implementation data to CBPO through NEIEN, in accordance with Attachment 7 of this guidance. The CBP partnership’s *Chesapeake Bay Basinwide BMP Verification Framework*⁸ clearly states jurisdictions are ultimately responsible for providing the necessary documentation of verification of all practices implemented within their part of the Chesapeake Bay watershed and submitted through each respective state’s NEIEN node for crediting of nutrient and sediment pollutant load reductions. They are responsible for documenting – in detail or by reference – the verification programs, protocols and procedures for all agencies, organizations, institutions and businesses contributing to the collective set of tracked, verified and reported practices for nutrient and sediment load reductions credit. Jurisdictions should use their CBRAP funding if they need to improve tracking, verification, and reporting of local implementation actions.

5. Financial Requirements

This section provides information regarding cost-share requirements, in-kind calculations for EPA onsite grantees, and information regarding the Federal Financial Report requirements.

a. *Cost-Share Requirements*

As stated previously, CBPO is funded under the Clean Water Act, Section 117. For funds awarded prior to December 26, 2014, state and local governments receiving assistance from EPA under any of the provisions of Section 117 must comply with 40 CFR Section 31.24; all other applicants must comply with 40 CFR Section 30.23. For funds awarded on or after

⁸ Chesapeake Bay Program, 2014. *Strengthening Verification of Best Management Practices Implemented in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed: A Basinwide Framework*. Annapolis, Maryland.

December 26, 2014, all EPA recipients must comply with [2 CFR 200.306](#) for cost-sharing or matching. Recipients must spend cost-share funds on activities or projects in direct support of the Chesapeake Bay Agreements, such as staff working on Bay-related projects. Cost-share sources must be from non-federal sources. Recipients can use in-kind services, such as volunteer hours, in-lieu of a cash match, as long as the recipient maintains a record of these hours. The rates associated with these volunteer hours must be similar to those of related work efforts and be approved by your project officer.

The table below summarizes the cost-share requirements by grant program:

Grant Program	CWA Section	Cost-Share Percentage
CBIG	117(e)(1)(A)	50%
CBRAP	117(e)(1)(A)	50%
Monitoring grants	117(e)(1)(B)	50%
Small watershed grants	117(g)(2)	25%
Other competitive grants	117(d)	5% – 50%, see RFAs

To calculate the specific cost-share amount, follow these two-step equations:

- For 5% cost-share:
 1. EPA amount (including any in-kind) \div 95% = 100% of Total Grant Amount
 2. 100% of Total Grant Amount \times 5% = Recipient's Cost-Share Amount
(e.g. $\$425,000 \div 95\% = \$447,368$; $\$447,368 \times 5\% = \$22,368$, which is the recipient's cost-share amount)

- For 25% cost-share:
 1. EPA amount (including any in-kind) \div 75% = 100% of Total Grant Amount
 2. 100% of Total Grant Amount \times 25% = Recipient's Cost-Share Amount
(e.g. $\$375,000 \div 75\% = \$500,000$; $\$500,000 \times 25\% = \$125,000$, which is the recipient's cost-share amount)

If a jurisdiction chooses to use part of their CBRAP funding to obtain contractual services through EPA's contract (as an in-kind service), their cost-share amount is based on their full grant amount including the contractual service. For example, if EPA awards the jurisdiction \$2,758,047 and it decides to use \$1,000,000 to obtain services from EPA's contract (in-kind services), then the recipient would receive \$1,758,047 in cash. However, the recipient will still be required to match the full award amount of \$2,758,047.

In addition to the cost-share requirement, recipients must adhere to the requirement in the Clean Water Act, Section 117(e)(6) – "Administrative Costs." This section requires a 10% cap on grant administration costs. The costs of administering the grant (e.g. salaries and fringe benefits) shall not exceed 10% of the total project costs. The budget detail of your application for federal assistance (SF-424) should reflect how your administrative costs will comply with the

cap. The worksheet in Attachment 10 is provided to assist you in calculating allowable administrative costs.

b. EPA In-kind and Supplies

The dollar value associated with providing space, supplies, etc., for grantees located onsite at EPA is considered EPA in-kind. If your grant/cooperative agreement supports staff housed at the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office, the project budget within your application must include the cost to house the employee(s) at the EPA office. For FY 2012 and beyond (until amended), the EPA in-kind amount is \$9,400 per person per year. Recipients must include in-kind funding in the federal share of funding when calculating their cost-share amount. Additionally, grantee staff located onsite at CBPO must obtain a Personal Identity Verification (PIV) card. Recipients should contact their EPA project officer for information about obtaining a PIV card.

c. Indirect cost rates

Under [2 CFR Part 200](#), there are separate appendices for determining indirect cost rates for institutions of higher education ([Appendix III](#)), non-profit organizations ([Appendix IV](#)), state and local governments ([Appendix V](#)), and tribes ([Appendix VII](#)).

d. Allowability and Reasonability of Costs

For grants awarded on or after January 1, 2011, EPA provided project officers and grant specialists with guidance on determining the allowability and reasonableness of certain cost items under assistance agreements. Funding for evening banquets and receptions are prohibited in most cases. Costs for light refreshments and meals at meetings, conferences, training workshops, and outreach activities (events) are allowable if necessary to complete the objective but must be justified in the work plan and in the budget detail. EPA will not approve the use of grant funds for any portion of an event where alcohol is served, purchased, or otherwise available even if grant funds are not used to purchase the alcohol. See the [General Terms and Conditions](#) for more information.

E. POST-AWARD REQUIREMENTS

1. Applicable regulations

For a list of applicable regulations, please consult the chart below.

2 CFR Parts 200 and 1500 are available at: www.ecfr.gov. The recipient should select Title 2 – Grants and Agreements, Subtitle A or Subtitle B.

40 CFR Parts 30 and 31 are available at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys/browse/collectionCfr.action?collectionCode=CFR. The recipient should enter the year of their grant award and then expand Title 40, Chapter I, Subchapter B.

Applicable to Funding Awarded on or After December 26, 2014

Applicant/ Recipient Type	OMB Grant Guidance, Administrative Requirements	OMB Grant Guidance, Cost Principles	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Regulation	Suspension and Debarment Regulation	Intergovernmental Review Regulation
Nonprofit Organization	2 CFR Part 1500 and 2 CFR Part 200, Subparts A through D	2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E	40 CFR Part 33	2 CFR Part 180, and 2 CFR Part 1532	40 CFR Part 29
Educational Institutions	2 CFR Part 1500 and 2 CFR Part 200, Subparts A through D	2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E	40 CFR Part 33	2 CFR Part 180, and 2 CFR Part 1532	40 CFR Part 29
State, local, and Indian Tribal governments	2 CFR Part 1500 and 2 CFR Part 200, Subparts A through D	2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E	40 CFR Part 33	2 CFR Part 180, and 2 CFR Part 1532	40 CFR Part 29

Additional information about the Uniform Grants Guidance is available at cfo.gov/cofar.

2. New or Revised Grants Policies

EPA grant policies may affect how recipients manage and administer EPA assistance agreements. A full library of EPA policy and guidance documents is available on the EPA [Grant Policy Resources website](#). Excerpts from recently revised grants policies are as follows:

- 1) EPA issued [RAIN-2020-G01](#), "Standard Form 424B No Longer Required," which informs applicants and recipients that the EPA will no longer collect Standard Form 424-B, Assurances for Non-Construction Programs, as part of grant application packages.
- 2) EPA issued [RAIN-2020-G02](#), "EPA Frequent Questions on Grant Issues in Response to the Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) Public Health Emergency." These Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) provide guidance to applicants and recipients regarding the process and EPA policies for requesting waivers, due date extensions, extraordinary cost allowability, and application submission issues during the public health emergency.
- 3) EPA issued [RAIN-2020-G03](#), "EPA Implementation of Executive Order 13798 "Promoting Free Speech and Religious Liberty" and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-20-09, Guidance Regarding Federal Grants and Executive Order 13798, which informs recipients and applicants that EPA has revised Appendix B, National Subaward Term and Condition, of EPA's Subaward Policy (EPA Subaward Policy Appendix B) to prohibit state or other public recipients of EPA funds from conditioning subawards in a manner that would disadvantage applicants for subawards based on their religious character, as well as revised the General award Terms and Conditions to include references to Executive Order 13798 and 2 CFR 200.300.
- 4) EPA issued [RAIN-2020-G04](#), "Establishment of Standards for Submission of Administrative and Financial Assistance Agreement Forms/Documents with Electronic or Digital Signatures by Email." This notice establishes a process recipients and applicants may use to electronically sign and submit forms/documents to the EPA that provides reasonable safeguards to ensure the validity of signatures.
- 5) The Office of Management and Budget published final guidance in the Federal Register to revise sections of the OMB guidance on Grants and Agreements in Title 2 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Revisions to the guidance are effective November 12, 2020, except for the amendments to 2 CFR 200.216 and 200.340, which became effective on August 13, 2020. The [Guidance for Grants and Agreements](#) is available through the Federal Register. Both regulations are also available at www.ecfr.gov.
- 6) EPA issued [RAIN-2020-G05](#), EPA Implementation of Prohibition on Certain Telecommunication and Video Surveillance Services or Equipment and Termination Provisions from Office of Management and Budget Final Guidance." This notice implements the OMB Final Guidance requirements that became effective August 13, 2020 regarding (1) Prohibition of Certain Telecommunication and Video Surveillance Services or Equipment and (2) Termination Provisions.
- 7) EPA issued [RAIN-2021-G01](#), Status of Implementation of Government-wide DUNS/UEI Transition. This notice informs applicants and recipients of the status of EPA's implementation of the Government-wide transition from using DUNS as a Unique Entity**

Identifier (UEI) to a SAM.gov created UEI. (See [Application Requirements](#) for more information.)

8) EPA issued [RAIN-2021-G02](#), EPA Intergovernmental Review, which informs applicants and recipients about how to determine which EPA financial assistance programs and activities are subject to Intergovernmental Review requirements. (See [Application Requirements](#) and Attachment 11 for more information.)

9) EPA issued [RAIN-2022-G02](#), Rescission of Grants Policy Issuance 04-04 Consultant Fees Under EPA Assistance Agreements and Related Revision to Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements. This notice rescinds GPI-04-04 and directs recipients to sources that provide more current guidance on the Consultant Cap, including the [EPA General Terms and Conditions](#), the [Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements](#), and the [Interim General Budget Development Guidance for Applicants and Recipients of EPA Financial Assistance](#).

10) EPA issued [RAIN-2021-G03](#), 2021-2024 Information Collection Request Renewal of EPA Assistance Agreement Forms. This notice implements revisions to the EPA's assistance agreement forms used by applicants and recipients.

3. Quality Assurance

This section describes specific technical documentation and reporting requirements for assistance agreements that involve the collection or use of environmental data. This includes a description of Quality Management Plans (QMPs) and Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs).

Environmental data include direct measurements of environmental conditions or releases and data compiled from pre-existing sources of information, such as computer databases, computer models, literature files, and historical databases. Direct measurements of surface waters, sediment, atmospheric conditions, living resources, and land cover are examples of data collected for the CBP partnership. Pre-existing data related to BMP implementation, wastewater treatment and the development, calibration, verification, and application of environmental models are subject to quality assurance requirements.

Quality assurance requirements for EPA grants and cooperative agreements are mandated in [2 CFR 1500.11](#). The regulations state:

- (a) Quality assurance applies to all assistance agreements that involve environmentally related data operations, including environmental data collection, production, or use.
- (b) Recipients shall develop a written quality assurance system commensurate with the degree of confidence needed for the environmentally related data operations.
- (c) If the recipient complies with EPA's quality policy, the system will be presumed to be in compliance with the quality assurance system requirement. The recipient may also comply with the quality assurance system requirement by complying with American

National Standard ANSI/ASQ E4:2014: Quality management systems for environmental information and technology programs.

(d) The recipient shall submit the written quality assurance system for EPA review. Upon EPA's written approval, the recipient shall implement the EPA-approved quality assurance system.

(e) EPA Quality Policy is available at: www2.epa.gov/quality.

If required, a recipient must establish, document, and implement a quality system that applies to all work within the scope of the agreement. The recipient's quality system is documented in a Quality Management Plan (QMP) and a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) and must be approved by EPA prior to initiating work. See the [EPA website](#) for additional information on the quality assurance requirements for organizations receiving EPA financial assistance. Further information on the Chesapeake Bay Program Office quality assurance planning process may be found at www.chesapeakebay.net/about/programs/qa/planning.

The jurisdictions are required to annually update their quality assurance project plans documenting any substantive changes or other enhancements to their BMP verification programs as committed to within the CBP partnership's October 2014 [Strengthening Verification of Best Management Practices Implemented in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed: A Basinwide Framework](#). These quality assurance project plans will also be consistent with EPA quality assurance guidelines referenced herein.

a. Quality Management Plan (QMP)

Recipients of assistance agreements having environmental data operations shall submit a Quality Management Plan (QMP) prepared in accordance with the specifications in [EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans, EPA QA/R-2](#). The specifications include organizational structure; quality system description; personnel qualifications and training; policies for procurement, documentation and records; computer hardware and software standards; and procedures for planning, implementing, and evaluating work. One QMP may apply to several assistance agreements if administered under the same management system. Laboratory Quality Manuals are required for ongoing monitoring programs.

A QMP must be approved by the organization's quality assurance and senior managers, and then submitted to the EPA project officer at least 45 days prior to the initiation of data collection or data compilation. QMPs are approved by the U.S. EPA Region 3 Quality Assurance Manager (or designee).

An approved Quality Management Plan is valid for up to five years unless there is a major reorganization that affects quality assurance functions and structures in the organization. Senior managers and/or QA officers are required to review their QMP annually. If an approved plan is expected to expire during the course of the agreement, include a deliverable for the submission of a revised plan.

Organizations may be granted an exception or modification to the QMP requirement if they meet certain criteria, which may include but not be limited to the following:

- One-time, short-term, and special projects or projects of limited scope; and/or
- Organizations generating, collecting, compiling, and/or using environmental data for public education purposes.

b. Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP)

Recipients of assistance agreements having environmental data operations shall also submit a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) prepared according to the specifications in [EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans, QA/R-5](#). A QAPP documents the technical and quality control aspects of an individual project, such as sampling design, sample collection, analytical methods, quality control, and data management activities. In developing this plan, all efforts must be made to produce data that is comparable to data collected previously and currently by other CBP grant recipients and partners.

Recipients of assistance agreements for data analysis projects involving the gathering and/or use of existing environmental data for purposes other than those for which they were originally collected shall also submit a QAPP. For these projects, recipients shall prepare a QAPP to include the requirements identified in **Chapter 3** of the [Quality Assurance Project Plan Requirements for Secondary Data Research Projects](#) document. **Additional guidance for projects with modeling and geospatial needs can be accessed at the EPA Region 3 QAPP website.** If primary data will also be generated as part of the project, then the information required in this document can be incorporated into the associated QAPP to address the secondary data.

Protocols for CBP water quality monitoring and guidance for reporting best management practice data may be found in the following documents:

- [Methods and Quality Assurance for Chesapeake Bay Water Quality Monitoring Program](#)
- Guidance for Revising the Jurisdictions' Chesapeake Bay Implementation Grant Quality Assurance Project Plans for Tracking, Verifying, and Reporting Nutrient and Sediment Pollutant Load Reducing Practices, Treatments, and Technologies – Appendix Q in [Strengthening Verification of Best Management Practices Implemented in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed: A Basinwide Framework](#) (Oct. 2014).

A QAPP must be approved by the CBP **Delegated Approving Official (DAO)** before the recipient commences associated data collection, compilation, or use. The QAPP may be submitted to the project officer along with the draft application at least **45** days prior to the initiation of each data collection or data compilation activity or when requested by CBPO.

For ongoing monitoring programs, the QAPP should be reviewed annually and updated, if necessary, for changes to field, laboratory, quality control or data management procedures. Updates to jurisdictions' BMP Verification Program Plans (QAPPs) describing new data sources

and changes to methods of tracking, reporting, and verification are by **September 1st (this deadline has been changed from December 1st to September 1st beginning with the 2022 Grant Guidance)**. EPA's Office of Environmental Information requires QAPPs to be reviewed annually. If there are no changes, the recipient must provide written documentation (e.g., a letter) to the project officer confirming a review was conducted and no changes have occurred. The recipient must notify the project officer prior to changing the number of samples, the number of sites, or parameters measured.

4. Project Progress Reports

After the assistance agreement has been awarded, the recipient will need to complete the entire progress report template (see Attachment 6) and submit it to the project officer when due (i.e., quarterly or semi-annually, and final). There will be a programmatic grant condition in your assistance agreement award document that specifies the reporting period.

The progress report template will enable the recipient to document the outputs and outcomes that are included in the application work plan; the recipient must provide information on the progress of all the outputs and outcomes for each objective. The electronic copy of this completed template will be used during the project to make revisions, as necessary, to the work plan. Revisions will require the approval of the project officer. Using this template will eliminate the need to repeatedly type the same information each time an interim (quarterly or semi-annually) performance report is due.

5. Additional Requirements for CBIG and CBRAP Grants

It is assumed the results achieved by coordinating CBIG and CBRAP grant activities with other available state and federal programs produces cost-effective solutions that meet the current nutrient and sediment allocations in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, WIP commitments, two-year milestones for water quality, and respond to EPA's evaluations of the WIPs and milestones and assessments of jurisdictions' programs. It is also noted this coordination will support the jurisdictions' implementation of the management strategies developed for each of the applicable outcomes identified in the 2014 Agreement. The expenditure of public funds requires accountability and transparency through periodic cost-effectiveness evaluations.

EPA expects the Bay jurisdictions and federal agencies to submit, on January 15 of each year, written progress reports for the two-year milestones. **Please note that this requirement is separate from the project progress reports discussed above.** Even numbered years should include a written status update on each of the milestones to demonstrate the progress achieved during the milestone period. In odd numbered years, the Bay jurisdictions and federal agencies may choose from two options to provide a status update. Under option 1, Bay jurisdictions and federal agencies may choose to provide a written status update for each milestone, as is submitted in even numbered years. Under option 2, Bay jurisdictions and federal agencies may provide a written update to EPA using the most recent EPA evaluation. The progress report would include written updates on the "Key Areas of Concern" from the

latest evaluation and any additional successes or challenges encountered during the milestone period. Option 2 is available to reduce reporting burdens in the interim years.

EPA may require or we may revise grant terms and conditions to require more frequent written progress reporting based upon the Bay jurisdictions progress in achieving the WIP and milestone goals. All progress reports should be submitted to the appropriate EPA State WIP Lead.

a. Data Submission Schedules

Annual progress reporting is an output of grants. Additional information about data submission schedules is contained in Attachment 7. Grant recipients are expected to provide point source and nonpoint source nutrient and sediment load reduction implementation progress data on the following schedule every year:

Submission	Date Range of Data	Submission Schedule
Initial (except Virginia wastewater)	July 1 – June 30	September 1 – November 30
Final (except Virginia wastewater)	July 1 – June 30	By December 1
Final (Virginia wastewater)	January 1 – December 31	By January 31

EPA expects data submitted to CBPO to be complete, quality assured, and in proper formats. This will allow CBPO to begin immediate processing of the recipients’ data in a CBP WSM annual progress scenario (see Attachment 7 for data specifications and requirements and additional details for submission schedules).

This schedule may not apply to the wastewater sector for the Commonwealth of Virginia, which may submit its data in accordance with the Nutrient Allocation Compliance and Reporting requirements under Section 62.1-44.19:18 of the Virginia Code. Those data that are submitted to CBPO need to meet the requirements mentioned above.

For the wastewater sector, while DOEE is the grant recipient, DC Water Authority is responsible for reporting the point source nutrient and sediment load reduction implementation progress data directly to CBPO.

In the event data are not submitted in time, are inaccurate, or do not use the appropriate NEIEN or wastewater format for CBPO to calculate annual progress toward the Reducing Pollutions Indicators, CBPO will use the most recent quality-assured data submitted by the jurisdiction.

b. Wetland Data

Wetland restoration, creation and rehabilitation are credited as BMPs in the CBP partnership’s Phase 6 Watershed Model, and wetland restoration is also an indicator for the annual Bay

Barometer as well as the online accountability tool Chesapeake Progress. CBP therefore needs annual wetland BMP data (in all three categories) from the state partners to update the model and the indicator. Accordingly, the seven Bay jurisdictions will submit wetland BMP information via the NEIEN as a deliverable of their grant according to the Data Submission Schedule identified in this guidance. Each jurisdiction should submit requested wetland data; in doing so, jurisdictional leads for the model Input-Decks are strongly encouraged to communicate with their natural resource agency wetland program managers to ensure accuracy of reporting and to avoid any double-counting of projects. At a minimum, jurisdictional leads should request wetland BMP data from the USDA, Natural Resource Conservation Service and Farm Service Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, state conservation departments, state agriculture departments, Ducks Unlimited, The Nature Conservancy, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, and other local conservation organizations involved in non-tidal and tidal wetland conservation.

The Wetland Workgroup will continue to advise the CBP modeling team and other relevant CBP staff to clarify existing and updated wetland BMP definitions and data fields. New guidance on these terms and definitions will be provided to the jurisdictions as necessary to facilitate accurate reporting of progress toward wetland-related outcomes.

6. Unliquidated Obligations (ULOs)

EPA assistant administrators and regional administrators are required to certify annually to the EPA administrator that unneeded funds are de-obligated from EPA assistance agreements in order to implement the Government Accountability Office's Policy and Procedures Manual for Guidance of Federal Agencies, Title 7; the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; and OMB Circular A-123. To accomplish this task, EPA reviews all unliquidated obligations on assistance agreements.

ULOs are the unexpended balance remaining from the total amount of federal funds obligated to an EPA assistance agreement. EPA is committed to ensuring the money EPA obligates to recipients is being utilized properly and in a timely manner. As part of this commitment, EPA project officers review ULO balances on grants, and EPA may use these balances to determine funding levels for future awards. For example, in FY 2013 EPA used ULOs to allocate reductions to CBRAP, Small Watershed, and some Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 117(d) grants. Circumstances will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. We intend to work with the recipient whenever we identify ULOs of concern and when making funding decisions based on ULO balances. In situations where recipients have sustained ULOs, EPA may choose to take other actions to reduce ULOs including redirecting federal funds.

To strengthen the identification and prevention of the unwarranted accumulation of ULOs, EPA project officers and grant specialists are required, as part of current monitoring activities, to monitor the disbursement of funding awarded to the recipient. Each project officer and grant specialist must validate the necessity of the remaining monies and document their files accordingly. This will require ongoing dialogue between the recipient and the project officer.

In addition, EPA adds a term and condition to all awards that establishes clear progress expectations. If a recipient has a history of accumulating unliquidated obligations without adequate justification, EPA may include a term and condition requiring the recipient to submit quarterly budget reports. More information regarding EPA's procedures for managing ULOs can be found in [GPI 11-01](#) – Managing Unliquidated Obligations and Ensuring Progress under EPA Assistance Agreements.

7. Federal Financial Report (FFR) – SF-425

All recipients must use SF-425, Federal Financial Report (FFR), to report the financial status of their grant(s). **A blank, fillable FFR, as well as instructions for how to complete the form, are available on the EPA [Financial Services website](#).**

Only financial status information is required by EPA. Recipients are no longer required to submit Federal Cash Transaction information formerly reported on the SF-272 (FFR lines 10a through 10c). Therefore, all fields on the FFR need to be filled out except for 10a, 10b, and 10c. However, it should be noted that cost-share ratios stated in the application and budget must be included in the final FFR.

Final FFRs are due to EPA no later than 90 days after the end of the grant budget/project period. If your assistance agreement requires submission of an annual interim FFR, please submit the SF-425 form (FFR) following the schedule stipulated in the terms and conditions of the agreement. **All FFRs should be sent to the Research Triangle Park Finance Center (RTPFC) at rtpfc-grants@epa.gov.**

If you have any questions, please contact your RTPFC financial specialist, Sarah Olive for EPA Region 3 (olive.sarah@epa.gov), or, if you do not know your specialist, contact customer service at 919-541-1550 or rtpfc-grants@epa.gov.

8. Monitoring and Grant Enforcement

After the assistance award is approved, the EPA project officer must ensure federal funds are being spent appropriately. To do this, the EPA project officer must:

- 1) Review the progress reports and other work outputs to ensure the recipient is fulfilling the obligations as outlined in the work plan, applicable regulations, and programmatic terms and conditions in the agreement;
- 2) Conduct mid-year and closeout monitoring reviews in accordance with EPA Order 5700.6A2; and
- 3) Work with the EPA grants office to make modifications as needed to the assistance agreement based on the recipient's request and EPA's discretion.

When an EPA project officer observes through any type of periodic monitoring activity that the recipient is failing to meet pre-approved programmatic timelines or milestones, the EPA project

officer will require the recipient to update the work plan accordingly (see [Modifications to Award Documents](#)). In addition, EPA may take action as described below.

It is important to get changes to the assistance agreements in writing. A recipient's written request for a change must be accompanied by a narrative justification for the proposed revision and must be submitted to the project officer. The project officer will then forward this change request to the grants office along with their recommendation.

Under the Uniform Grants Guidance, if a recipient fails to comply with federal statutes, regulations, or the terms and conditions of an award, EPA may impose one or more additional conditions, as described in [2 CFR 200.208](#). Further, EPA may impose one or more of the conditions from [2 CFR 200.208](#) under the following circumstances:

- e. Based on the criteria set forth in [2 CFR 200.206](#) (“Federal awarding agency review of risk posed by applicants”);
- f. When an applicant or recipient has a history of failure to comply with the general or specific terms and conditions of a federal award;
- g. When an applicant or recipient fails to meet expected performance goals as described in [2 CFR 200.211](#) (“Information contained in a Federal award”). These include specific performance goals, indicators, milestones, or expected outcomes (such as outputs or services performed or public impacts of any of these) with an expected timeline for accomplishment; or
- h. When an applicant or recipient is not otherwise responsible.

The conditions from [2 CFR 200.208\(c\)](#) include:

- a. Requiring payments as reimbursements rather than advance payments;
- b. Withholding authority to proceed to the next phase until receipt of evidence of acceptable performance within a given period of performance;
- c. Requiring additional, more detailed financial reports;
- d. Requiring additional project monitoring;
- e. Requiring the recipient to obtain technical or management assistance; or
- f. Establishing additional prior approvals.

Prior to adding one or more of these conditions, EPA will notify the recipient in writing of the additional requirements, the reasons for the conditions, the steps it must take to have EPA remove the conditions, and the method for requesting reconsideration of the additional requirements.

If EPA determines noncompliance cannot be remedied by imposing one or more of the above conditions, then EPA may take one or more of the following actions found in [2 CFR 200.339](#). EPA will notify the recipient in writing of the action taken, the reasons for the action, the steps it must take to come into compliance, and their appeal rights. The potential additional actions are:

- Temporarily withhold cash payments pending correction of the deficiency by the recipient or the recipient may risk more severe enforcement action by EPA.
- Disallow (that is, deny both use of funds and any applicable matching credit for) all or part of the cost of the activity or action not in compliance.
- Wholly or partly suspend or terminate the current award.
- Initiate suspension or debarment proceedings as authorized under 2 CFR Parts 180 and 1532.
- Withhold further awards for the project or program.
- Take other remedies that may be legally available.

EPA can also terminate an award in whole or in part if the recipient fails to comply with the terms and conditions of an award or for cause ([2 CFR 200.340\(a\)\(1\) and \(2\)](#)).

EPA may exercise other options, if a Bay jurisdiction fails to meet EPA's expectations for WIPs and milestones or does not demonstrate satisfactory progress toward achieving nutrient and sediment allocations established by EPA in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. This only applies to CBIG and CBRAP grants.

These options were communicated to all the states and the District of Columbia in the [December 29, 2009 letter](#) from the Regional Administrator of EPA Region 3. According to this letter, EPA may condition or redirect CBRAP and/or CBIG funds if a jurisdiction committed to incorporate the elements of their WIP or milestones into the grant work plan and does not adequately perform the activities identified in the EPA-approved work plan. Potential funding actions by EPA may be targeted to improve the existing program or work plan deliverables within the jurisdiction. Likewise, jurisdictions should give priority to addressing state regulatory programmatic deficiencies identified in EPA's State Review Framework, Permit Quality Review, Trading and Offset Program Assessments, Stormwater Assessments, and Agricultural Assessments that can be an impediment in achieving their WIP and milestone commitments and targets.

Additionally, if EPA determines a recipient is not making satisfactory progress with their CBIG or CBRAP grants, EPA may decide not to provide additional funding or reduce future funding. Jurisdictions should also refer to the [November 4, 2009 letter](#) concerning EPA's expectations on the first two elements of the Chesapeake Bay accountability framework: the WIPs and the two-year milestones.

9. Debarment and Suspension

Recipients are required to ensure contracts or subawards are only awarded to responsible entities. Therefore, recipients must verify prior to award that such entities are eligible in accordance with the methods located in 2 CFR Part 180. EPA strongly encourages recipients to check the Excluded Parties List System, which recently migrated over to the System for Award Management (<https://www.sam.gov/SAM/>). In addition, recipients are responsible for

requiring contractors and subrecipients to comply with Subpart C of 2 CFR Part 180 regarding suspension and debarment and passing the same requirement down, as appropriate.

If, at any point after the award, the recipient learns it failed to notify EPA prior to award with suspension and debarment information as noted in the last paragraph under the [Application Requirements](#) section of this guidance, or if circumstances have changed regarding the required information to be disclosed, then the recipient must provide EPA with immediate written notification.

10. Modifications to Award Documents

Please refer to the information below regarding revisions, amendments, and prior approvals. Recipients should send written notification of changes to their EPA project officer, with a copy to the grant specialist of record, as soon as the recipient becomes aware of the necessary change(s). All budgetary changes should be submitted using SF-424A as well as a revised budget detail. In addition, any change requiring a formal amendment must also be sent to the EPA Grants and Audit Management Branch at R3_grant_applications@epa.gov. Recipients should contact their project officer regarding further information about the process for modifying awards.

Changes not Requiring EPA Project Officer Approval or Formal Amendment:

Minor changes that are consistent with the project objective and within the scope of the agreement or minor adjustments to the project budget, provided funds are used in accordance with the approved work plan or application, do not require project officer approval. For example, a recipient may make minor changes to the approach or other aspects of the project to meet objectives sooner or to expedite completion.

For grants where the federal share is equal to or below \$150,000, recipients may transfer funds among cost categories, objectives, functions and activities without seeking prior approval.

Even though these changes do not require project officer approval, EPA requests notification as a courtesy.

2) Changes That Require EPA Project Officer Approval (No Formal Amendment):

- A change in key personnel;
- The absence for more than three months or a 25% reduction in time devoted to the project by the approved project director or principle investigator;
- The transfer of funds allotted for training allowances to other categories;
- The transfer of funds budgeted for participant support costs;
- Unless described in the application and funded in the approved award, the subaward, transfer, or contracting out of any work under an award; and/or
- Contracting out or otherwise obtaining services of a third party to perform activities central to the purpose of the award not already approved in the work plan/narrative.

3) *Changes That Require a Formal Amendment:*

- Any revision resulting in the increase or decrease in funds;
- Major revisions to the objectives or scope of the project (PLEASE NOTE: The recipient cannot request revisions that substantially change the original project objectives selected under the competitive process);
- Extensions to the **budget and project** period (PLEASE NOTE: The recipient must notify the EPA project officer in writing with supporting reasons and a revised expiration date at least 10 **business** days before the expiration date specified in the award, **as well as provide a revised work plan addressing work to be completed through the duration of the extension period**. To merely exhaust unobligated balances is not a valid justification for an extension.); and
- Re-budget of funds (PLEASE NOTE: This applies to grants where the federal share is above \$150,000, and the cumulative amount of the funds to be re-budgeted is or is expected to exceed 10 percent of the total budget).

11. Reasonable accommodations

Recipients and subrecipients are subject to the program accessibility provisions of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, codified in [40 CFR Part 7](#), which includes an obligation to provide individuals with disabilities reasonable accommodations and an equal and effective opportunity to benefit from or participate in a program, including those offered through electronic and information technology (“EIT”). In compliance with Section 504, EIT systems or products funded by EPA awards must be designed to meet the diverse needs of users (e.g., U.S. public, recipient personnel) without barriers or diminished function or quality. Systems shall include usability features or functions that accommodate the needs of persons with disabilities, including those who use assistive technology. At this time, EPA will consider a recipient’s websites, interactive tools, and other EIT as being in compliance with Section 504 if such technologies meet standards established under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, codified at 36 CFR Part 1194. While Section 508 does not apply directly to grant recipients, we encourage recipients to follow either the 508 guidelines or other comparable guidelines that concern accessibility to EIT for individuals with disabilities. Recipients may wish to consult the latest [Section 508 guidelines](#) issued by the U.S. Access Board or W3C’s [Web Content Accessibility Guidelines \(WCAG\) 2.0](#).

12. Subawards

Recipients may subaward funds to other organizations to carry out a portion of the federal award. A subaward is a legal agreement between the pass-through entity issuing the subaward and the subrecipient organization. Subawards are distinct from contracts even if the pass-through entity uses the term “contract” internally to describe the subaward arrangement. In particular, subawards are distinct from contracts in several ways:

Subaward:	Contract:
Public purpose	Provides goods and services to the recipient
Subrecipient may not profit from the award	Reasonable profit is allowable
May be awarded without competition, unless competition is required by state, regulation, or the terms and conditions of the award	Requires full and open competition, except for amounts below the micro-purchase threshold or when sole source procurement is justified

If a recipient chooses to pass-through funds to another organization via a subaward, the recipient is responsible for complying with the applicable regulatory and policy requirements, as outlined in [2 CFR Part 200](#) and the [EPA Subaward Policy](#). Subrecipients are subject to the same Federal requirements as the pass-through entity, including all Terms and Conditions contained in the assistance agreement.

13. Award Closeout Requirements

Closeout is the process by which the EPA determines that all applicable administrative actions and all required work of the award have been completed. The closeout process generally begins once the period of performance for the award ends, but it may begin sooner if all project requirements have been met prior to the award expiration date.

No later than 120 days after the end of the period of performance, the recipient must:

- Perform all final drawdowns related to the award (All costs must be incurred prior to the budget and project period end date);
- Submit the final financial report (FFR) (SF-425) to RTP with a copy to the GS;
- Submit the final progress report to PO;
- Submit the final MBE/WBE report (EPA Form 5700-52A) to the GS; and
- Submit a Property Report (SF-428), if applicable.

Copies of the required forms can be found at <https://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-grantee-forms>. The final progress report must use the template provided in Attachment 6 of this Guidance (identify the report type as 'Final').

Generally, recipients must retain grant files for at least three years after the date of submission of the final FFR. The retention period may be extended in certain circumstances, as outlined in [2 CFR 200.334](#).

Additional information and resources can be found on the EPA's [Closeout FAQ webpage](#). Questions regarding closeout should be directed to your EPA Project Officer and/or Grant Specialist, as appropriate.

CONCLUSION

As you tackle the challenges of applying for assistance agreements, grants, or cooperative agreements from the federal government, we encourage you to call your EPA project officer for assistance. Project officers are here to help you submit the best possible application. The ultimate goal is to support the CBP partnership and restoration of the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed.