Guidance for Reporting Watershed Improvement under Measure SP-12 – FY 2009

Measure Text

By 2012, improve water quality conditions in 250 impaired watersheds nationwide using the watershed approach (cumulative). (2002 baseline: 0 watersheds improved of an estimated 4,767 impaired watersheds of focus having one or more water bodies impaired. The watershed boundaries for this measure are those established at the "12-digit" scale by the U.S. Geological Survey [USGS]. Watersheds at this scale average 22 square miles in size. "Improved" means that one or more of the impairment causes identified in 2002 are removed for at least 40 percent of the impaired water bodies or impaired miles/acres, or there is significant watershed-wide improvement, as demonstrated by valid scientific information, in one or more water quality parameters associated with the impairments.)

Type

Targeted Measure
Cumulative Measure

Who Reports in ACS

Regions

Introduction

This measure will establish and demonstrate a capacity for watershed-scale restoration and protection throughout the country using the "watershed approach." It is not designed to be a measure of what portion of the 12-digit watersheds in the country have improved or meet water quality standards. See below for a description of how the program will focus its attention on these watersheds.

Definitions

Watershed means (a) a watershed or hydrologic unit at the scale of 12-digit hydrologic unit codes, or HUC-12, as determined by the draft or final Watershed Boundary Dataset (WBD), or (b) a regionally defined hydrologic unit of appropriate scale. Option (b) is provided since some waters, such as coastal and estuary waters, fall outside the WBD, and may or may not be hydrologically definable at a scale comparable to inland HUC-12s. Although watersheds or hydrologic units at the 12-digit scale are technically termed "sub-watersheds" by USGS, the Strategic Plan will use the term "watershed" for simplicity.

An *impaired watershed* is a watershed containing one or more impaired water bodies.

Impaired water bodies are those identified by states and EPA in the 2002 universe (fixed base) for measure SP-10.

Watershed approach is a coordinating process for focusing on priority water resource problems that:

- Is focused on hydrologically defined areas,
- Involves key stakeholders,
- Uses an iterative planning or adaptive management process to address priority water resource goals, and
- Uses an integrated set of tools and programs.

Functionally, the watershed approach is a problem-solving tool for protecting water quality and aquatic resources. It recognizes that factors affecting the health of our nation's waters should be understood within their watershed context. It includes assessment of relevant watershed processes and socioeconomic factors, identification of priority issues and most promising corrective actions, involvement by affected parties throughout the process, and implementation at the required scale. See EPA's Web site at http://www.epa.gov/owow/watershed/approach.html for more information. Also, see Demonstrating Use of the Watershed Approach below.

The watershed approach can be applied at any appropriate scale, including scales smaller or larger than the HUC-12 watersheds described above. Thus, for this measure, one watershed effort could result in improvements in one or in many HUC-12 watersheds, depending on its scale. For consistency, however, all successes under this measure will be reported as numbers of HUC-12 watersheds.

Improved means either that:

- One or more of the waterbody/impairment causes identified in 2002 are removed, as reflected in EPA-approved state assessments, for at least 40% of the impaired water bodies or impaired stream miles/lake acres in the watershed (see Option 1 below); OR

- There is significant watershed-wide improvement, as demonstrated by valid scientific information, in one or more water quality parameters or related indicators associated with the impairments (see Options 2a and 2b below).

Watersheds of focus are watersheds in which Regions and states will be focusing application of the watershed approach to attain this measure. Regions and states have identified an estimated 4,767 watersheds of focus. Regions and states will maintain lists of the watersheds of focus. The watersheds of focus include watersheds that may be amenable to water quality improvement in the near term (five years), as well as watersheds where improvement may take much longer. In many cases, the time frame cannot be predicted without more information gathered for watershed planning. EPA envisions flexibility in identifying the watersheds of focus over time. EPA and the

states may add, change, or remove watersheds they are focusing on as new information becomes available or as resources are reallocated. The measure thus envisions "living" lists of watersheds.

Overview of Implementation

This guidance provides information needed for states and EPA to implement the measure. For a watershed to be counted under SP-12, the state and Region must demonstrate that the watershed approach was applied, and that water quality improved. Either Option 1, Option 2a, or Option 2b described below may be used for demonstrating water quality improvement.

Supporting information should be provided using the appropriate attached template. A separate template is available for each reporting option below (1, 2a, or 2b).

An individual watershed may be counted only once under this measure. That is, a watershed may be counted only when it initially meets the definition. Subsequent actions, such as having additional impairment causes removed or additional water quality parameters showing watershed-wide improvement, would not enable the watershed to be counted again in a subsequent reporting period.

Under some circumstances, water quality improvements may result in the same watershed being eligible for reporting under both measure SP-12 and measure WQ-10 (nonpoint source waters restored). Consult the detailed definitions for both measures to determine whether a particular watershed is eligible. See additional discussion under Optional Narratives below.

Demonstrating Use of the Watershed Approach

This measure requires a demonstration that the watershed approach was utilized and helped lead to the water quality improvement being recognized. One of the primary objectives of this measure is to demonstrate and model the watershed approach by linking the activities of key partners in a manner that results in sustainable watershed management and improved water quality at the watershed scale.

For the purposes of this measure, Regions will provide the following information to demonstrate that the watershed approach, as defined in the Definitions section above, was used to help achieve the water quality improvement reported:

- Information identifying the HUC-12 or regionally defined watershed(s) in which the watershed approach was applied.
- Information identifying key stakeholders involved. The number of key stakeholders is not important as long as they are connected to the watershed approach. Participation can be voluntary or as a result of regulatory efforts, and need not be limited to the watershed's geographic area.

- Information about the role of each key stakeholder in applying the watershed approach to achieve the water quality improvements reported. If this information is available in a detailed work plan, that portion of the work plan may be incorporated by reference.
- Information describing the watershed plan that was developed and how it was implemented to achieve the water quality improvements reported. Note that the watershed plan may be a comprehensive plan, for example, one that contains the nine elements of a NPS program watershed plan. It may also be a less rigorous planning or adaptive management approach that is scaled to address the problem(s) affecting waters within the watershed. This could include different planning approaches, ranging from formal agreements to informal meeting minutes. Whether comprehensive or limited, or formal or informal, the approach should clearly demonstrate problem identification and prioritization, stakeholder involvement, integrated application of the voluntary and regulatory tools and programs available to correct the problem, outcome objectives, and monitoring and assessment to gauge improvement and identify appropriate adjustments.
- Information about the restoration work – BMPs or other actions – that resulted in the watershed's improvement. The restoration work can take place within the improved watershed(s), or in a nearby watershed(s) affecting the water quality of the improved watershed(s). If no restoration activities occurred within the boundaries of the improved watershed, the Region must supply information in the template describing how restoration activities in nearby watersheds had an impact on the reported water quality improvement.

The above information need not be lengthy, but should provide the minimum detail needed for understanding by a general audience.

Guidance for Option 1 – Reporting Watershed Improvement Based on Impairment Removal

> *"Improved" means that one or more of the impairment causes identified in 2002 are removed for at least 40 percent of the impaired water bodies or impaired miles/acres*

Option 1, corresponding to the first definition of improvement under this measure, in italics above, is designed to track watershed improvements based on removal of waterbody/impairment causes in subsequent EPA-approved 303(d) lists and Integrated Reports. It is based on existing state reporting to EPA. It is perhaps the most rigorous of the three options.

Removal of an impairment cause for a waterbody in the 2002 baseline must be demonstrated in a post-2002 EPA-approved 303(d) list or Integrated Report. Further , the removal must be as a result of restoration activities. The following table shows how this relates to "Delisting Reasons" reported in the Assessment, TMDL Tracking, and Implementation System (ATTAINS).

Delisting Reason in ATTAINS	Can Removal of Impairment Cause Be Used in Reporting Under SP-12?
8. Applicable WQS attained; due to restoration activities	**YES**
9. Applicable WQS attained; due to change in WQS	No
10. Applicable WQS attained; according to new assessment method.	No
11. Applicable WQS attained; threatened water no longer threatened.	**POSSIBLY,** if Region has reason to believe restoration and/or protection activities played a significant role
12. Applicable WQS attained; reason for recovery unspecified.	**POSSIBLY**, if Region has reason to believe restoration activities played a significant role
13. Applicable WQS attained; original basis for listing was incorrect.	No
14. Data and/or information lacking to determine water quality status; original basis for listing was incorrect.	No

The Region must demonstrate that the removal of impairment causes meets the 40% threshold. That is, one or more of the waterbody impairment causes identified in 2002 are removed, as reflected in EPA-approved state assessments, for at least 40% of the impaired water bodies or impaired stream miles/lake acres in the watershed. A Region may report on the basis of either the number of waters or the miles/acres that those waters represent. The Region must provide the following information from EPA-approved state 303(d) lists or Integrated Reports:

- The baseline condition, i.e., the number (or miles/acres) of waters in the watershed listed in 2002; and

- The improved condition, i.e., the number (or miles/acres) of waters in the watershed for which one or more impairment causes are removed.

The following examples illustrate how a watershed could meet the 40% threshold under Option 1:

- A watershed has 5 segments listed as impaired for impairment cause A, none listed for impairment cause B. In 2008, 2 of the 5 are restored for A and removed from the 303(d) list. Thus, 2 out of 5 segments (40%) have an impairment cause removed.
- A watershed has 5 segments listed as impaired, 2 for A only, 1 for B only, and 2 for both A and B. In 2008, the B impairment was removed for the 2 segments listed for both A and B; all other segments remain on the list. Thus, 2 out of 5 segments (40%) have any cause removed.

The following example illustrates a watershed that would not meet the 40% threshold in Option 1:

- A watershed has 5 segments listed as impaired, 2 for A and 3 for B, no segments listed for both A and B. In 2008, 1 of the 2 segments listed for A is restored and removed from the 303(d) list; all other segments remain on the list. Thus, only 1 of 5 segments (20%) has any cause removed, so the watershed cannot be listed even though half of the A impairments have been removed.

Note that for the purposes of this measure we track changes against only the 2002 baseline condition. For example, if a waterbody impairment that was 303(d)-listed in 2002 is removed in a subsequent listing cycle for either of the two reasons above as a result of the watershed approach, it may be counted for this measure. In contrast, if an impairment that was originally 303(d)-listed after 2002 is removed in a subsequent listing cycle, it may not be counted for this measure. For example, if an impairment cause is initially identified in a particular waterbody in 2004 and subsequently restored in 2010, it cannot be counted for this measure. Similarly, a waterbody impairment initially listed for an impairment cause after 2002 does not count in the baseline when determining if the 40% threshold is achieved for improvement for that impairment cause in the watershed.

A watershed can be counted in ACS under Option 1 if the Region has approved the appropriate delisting actions for that watershed and agrees that the needed number of impairments have been removed. The impairment removals should also be counted in ACS under SP-11 (and SP-10 where applicable).

Guidance for Option 2 – Reporting Watershed-wide Improvement

> *Improved means there is significant watershed-wide improvement, as demonstrated by valid scientific information, in one or more water quality parameters associated with the impairments.*

Option 2, corresponding to the second definition of improvement under this measure, in italics above, provides an alternative reporting mechanism for demonstrating progress at the watershed scale. It is designed to use water quality monitoring data to track improvements occurring across the watershed that have not yet resulted in an impairment cause being removed. If multiple watersheds are reported as improving, monitoring data must be provided for each.

Watershed-wide means that the monitoring design is representative of spatial variability within each watershed appropriate to the water quality listing(s) within the watershed and the selected parameter(s), loadings or indices. Examples of monitoring designs that might be appropriate depending on the issue being addressed include statistically valid, watershed-scale results (e.g. census or probability-design), watershed outlet (pour point) monitoring to capture cumulative impacts, or spatially distributed sampling considered to be representative of the watershed by the State and Regional office. Documentation for the improvement would need to explain how the monitoring design is representative.

Valid scientific information means that information supporting watershed-wide improvements is based on objective, accepted monitoring and assessment approaches. The monitoring/assessment process includes adequate documentation of data, observations, and method of investigation sufficient to allow for independently reproducible results (such as information covered in quality assurance management plans). Data used in assessment are available either in an appropriate EPA database or other accessible formats (e.g., websites, published documents, technical memos, etc.)

To meet this second (Option 2) definition of improved, a watershed assessment must demonstrate evidence of a positive trend/change that accounts for a significant portion of the nonattainment gap for the key parameter(s)/indicator(s).

Parameters or related indicators refer to either:

- The specific parameters listed as causes of impairment on the 2002 303(d) list or Integrated Report. They are associated with waters that qualify under Categories 5, 4a, 4b, or 4c in the Integrated Report Guidance; or
- Parameters, loadings, and/or indices directly related to the designated use impairment (e.g., phosphorus loadings might be reduced to address a low dissolved oxygen listing).

One of the two following sub-options must be used to demonstrate watershed-wide improvement: using accepted statistical procedures, or evaluating and documenting multiple lines of evidence. The baseline for the trend or change may start as far back as 1992. The evidence must be supported by an analytical plan, and may be peer-reviewed within EPA.

Option 2a –Using statistical procedures to demonstrate that significant improvement has occurred with a 90 percent or greater level of confidence. For purposes of this measure, **"**statistical procedures" are those procedures capable of showing statistically significant change in the water quality parameters or related indicators (e.g., seasonal Kendall trend test, Wilcoxon sign rank). Supporting documentation should describe the environmental significance of any reported changes in water quality.

Option 2b – Using a multiple lines of evidence approach to demonstrate watershed improvement. A "multiple lines of evidence approach" means that the cumulative weight of several lines of evidence is used to assess whether a watershed-wide improvement has occurred. If, taken together, the amount and consistency of evidence are judged sufficient to indicate improvement, we will count this toward the measure. Evidence for Option 2b must include the following:

A. Evidence of an improving trend in a water quality parameter (physical or chemical) based on empirical data which may or may not be statistically significant (e.g., descriptive statistics) but nevertheless supports improvement[1].

AND at least one of the following three lines of evidence

B1. Evidence of an improving trend in a related biological indicator/index.
B2. Evidence of an improving trend in water quality based on predictive/ modeled data, with field level ground truthing.
B3. Evidence of widespread, significant load reductions.

AND

C. Evidence of widespread nonpoint source or point source implementation, or other evidence of watershed implementation actions.

AND

D. No evidence of significant deteriorating trends in related parameters as called for in the analytical plan. A lack of evidence (data) for other parameters identified in the analytical plan is not adequate to support this line of evidence.

To document watershed-wide improvement using the watershed approach, information must be made available to demonstrate how either Option 2a or 2b is met. If an improvement occurs in a parameter/indicator which the Region and State believe should be counted toward the measure but which differs somewhat from this guidance, an explanation must be provided in the documentation and agreed to by Headquarters.

Supporting documentation must also be provided to demonstrate that the improvement is watershed-wide, uses valid scientific information, and includes parameters or other indicators associated with the impairment (see definitions for these terms below). In addition, information provided must specifically identify:

- A clear written rationale that describes how a determination of improved water quality is supported – including the type, quality, and amount of

[1] For those impairments where a chemical or physical parameter is not relevant, such as invasive species, this line of evidence can be met by showing an improvement in the biological indicator. Information must accompany the documentation explaining why chemical/physical parameter(s) are not relevant and why the specific biological indicator was chosen.

environmental data, and decision criteria. The rationale must identify the specific parameters used to assess improvements, and must also describe the efforts made to locate and analyze any evidence of deteriorating trends in these or related parameters. Sufficient information must be provided to give readers an understanding of the approach used to assess data, but the level of detail may vary. Relevant information may be found in state-wide quality plans, standard operating procedures, project-specific quality assurance project plan, or other analogous forms. Other information may be written to describe how data were used or to document the analyses performed that demonstrate improved water quality.

- A description of the problem and the link to the impairment causes identified in 2002,
- Data used in the assessment, and
- The results which demonstrate improvement.

Results and documentation must be reviewed and accepted by the Regional office. The results and documentation for at least one submission from each Region will be reviewed by an EPA SP-12 Review Panel. The Panel will consist of at least two reviewers from Regions other than the reporting Region, and at least one reviewer from EPA Headquarters. The Panel will give particular attention to reports that use options 2a and 2b. Response to the review must accompany the documentation. The Review Panel will recommend whether to accept the watershed(s) to be counted, and may develop recommendations for improving the measure definition to ensure consistency. Regional consistency in reporting on the measure may also be ensured by periodic Headquarters audits of other submissions.

Templates

Supporting information for results reported under measure SP-12 must be provided using the appropriate template on the following pages. A separate template is available for each reporting option described above (1, 2a, or 2b).

Regions can count a watershed whenever they have made a clear determination that the watershed fully meets the measure definition under this guidance. When reporting results to ACS, the Region must provide the appropriate template as soon as possible, preferably by the time results are reported to ACS, but in no case any later than 45 days after entering results in ACS.

Headquarters will provide an electronic storage location for the templates. Currently this location is the EPA Portal at http://portal.epa.gov, using the Watershed Managers Forum project in the Environmental Science Connector (ESC). This location may change in the future. Headquarters prefers that the Region post the template (and optional narrative – see below) to the ESC site, and simultaneously notify Christopher Zabawa at Zabawa.Christopher@epa.gov by email.

Optional Narratives ("Success Stories")

Regional Offices may choose to develop narrative descriptions of the watershed improvements. Regions may choose any format for these narratives. For improvements that also satisfy the requirements for Measure WQ-10 (nonpoint source waters restored), the Region may choose to use the format required for WQ-10 success stories.

Information in the narrative does not need to be repeated in the template. That is, the template may refer to elements of the narrative and incorporate them by reference.

If a narrative is used, it must be provided with the template to the electronic storage location as described above.

Reporting of Water Quality Data (supporting Options 2a and 2b)

Any water quality data developed to support Options 2a or 2b should be provided in a timely fashion into EPA's STORET warehouse, using the WQX data transfer protocol, or otherwise be made available in a STORET-compatible format. Data used to support the measure for which WQX-templates are still under development should be provided in a timely fashion once the WQX templates are completed.

Supporting water quality data are not needed if results are reported under Option 1.

EPA's intention would be to make the evidence for Options 2a and 2b available publicly in some form. In the future, EPA anticipates that the Watershed Assessment, Tracking & Environmental ResultS (WATERS) system will provide access for much of the information/data needed to support this demonstration of watershed-wide improvement.

Future Measure Improvements

EPA intends to further improve this measure in succeeding strategic plans to refine and expand incremental measures of water quality "improvement" in watersheds, and possibly to reflect maintenance of water quality.

Contact for More Information

- Christopher Zabawa, EPA's Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, (202) 566-1222, Zabawa.christopher@epa.gov.

- Fred Leutner, EPA's Office of Science and Technology, (202) 566-0378, Leutner.fred@epa.gov.

TEMPLATE 1 October 2008

REPORTING WATERSHED IMPROVEMENT

Based on Impairment Removal (Option 1)

Watershed Identification

a	Organization	*Name and type of organization reporting for the watershed*
b	Point of Contact	*Name, title, address, telephone number and e-mail address of individual responsible for this report*
c	Project Title	*Short descriptive title, e.g., "Reducing bacterial contamination in the Long Creek watershed, Indiana"*
d	No.Watersheds Improved	*Number of watersheds achieving improvement, and associated HUC-12 codes*

Description of 2002 Baseline Condition

e	Watershed(s)	*Enter list of one or more 12-digit HUC watersheds. Note: if 12 digit HUCs are not delineated, describe the regionally-defined watershed(s) of appropriate scale.*
f	2002 Impairments	*Enter HUC, waterbody ID, and impairment cause*
		Enter HUC, waterbody ID, and impairment cause
		Enter HUC, waterbody ID, and impairment cause
		Additional lines as needed
g	Map (optional)	*Attach map(s) showing watershed(s) and impaired waterbodies*

Evidence of Watershed Approach

h	Area of Effort	*Describe geographic area - may be larger than the watershed(s) with documented improvement*
i	Key Stake-holders Involved and Their Roles	*Identify key partners responsible for planning and implementation. Describe each kay partner's role, or cite detailed work plan having this information..*
j	Watershed Plan	*Description of, or reference to, a watershed plan that identifies problems and proposes solutions to implement*
k	Restoration Work	*Describe BMPs or other actions taken to improve watershed condition. Should provide a clear, succinct summary in plain language understandable to the general public. Avoid technical terms without a plain language description or definition (or photo) that demonstrates the meaning.*

Evidence of Impairment Removal

l	Impairments Removed	*List waterbody IDs sufficient to demonstrate that one or more impairment causes identified in 2002 (see "e" above) have been removed from at least 40% of the impaired waterbodies or impaired miles/acres in the watershed. Include the date of the state WQ assessment that reported the impairment removal. Include the date of the IR or approved 303(d) list that reflects the removed waterbodies.*
m	Photos/Graphics (optional)	*Attach available photos or graphics, with captions, illustrating the local problem or project, and results.*

Refer to "Guidance on Reporting Watershed Improvement under Measure SP-12" for more complete descriptions of information requested in this template.

TEMPLATE 2a October 2008

REPORTING WATERSHED IMPROVEMENT

Based on Statistical Evidence of Watershed-wide Improvement (Option 2a)

Watershed Identification

a	Organization	*Name and type of organization reporting for the watershed*
b	Point of Contact	*Name, title, address, telephone number and e-mail address of individual responsible for this report*
c	Project Title	*Short descriptive title, e.g. "Reducing bacterial contamination in the Long Creek watershed, Indiana"*
d	No.Watersheds Improved	*Number of watersheds achieving improvement, and associated HUC-12 codes*

Description of 2002 Baseline Condition

e	Watershed(s)	*Enter list of one or more 12-digit HUC watersheds. Note: if 12 digit HUCs are not delineated, describe regionally-defined watershed(s) of appropriate scale.*
f	2002 Impairments	*Enter HUC, waterbody ID and impairment cause*
		Enter HUC, waterbody ID and impairment cause
		Enter HUC, waterbody ID and impairment cause
		Additional lines as needed
g	Map (optional)	*Attach map(s) showing watershed(s) and impaired waterbodies*

Evidence of Watershed Approach

h	Area of Effort	*Describe geographic area - may be larger than the watershed(s) with documented improvement*
i	Key Stake-holders Involved and Their Roles	*Identify key partners responsible for planning and implementation. Describe each key partner's role, or cite detailed work plan having this information..*
j	Watershed Plan	*Description of, or reference to, a watershed plan that identifies problems and proposes solutions to implement*
k	Restoration Work	*Describe BMPs or other actions taken to improve watershed condition. Should provide a clear, succinct summary in plain language understandable to the general public. Avoid technical terms without a plain language description or definition (or photo) that demonstrates the meaning.*

Evidence of Watershed-wide Improvement

l	Impairments Removed (if applicable)	*List waterbody IDs where one or more impairment causes identified in 2002 have been removed, if any. Include the date of the IR or approved 303(d) list that reflects the removed waterbodies.*
m	Statistical Results	*Summarize statistical analysis demonstrating that significant improvement has occurred in each improved watershed with a 90 percent or greater level of confidence. See guidance.*
n	Environmental Significance	*Relate statistical results to goals of the watershed plan*
o	Photos/Graphics (optional)	*Attach available photos or graphics, with captions, illustrating the local problem or project, and results.*

Refer to "Guidance on Reporting Watershed Improvement under Measure SP-12" for more complete descriptions of information requested in this template.

TEMPLATE 2b October 2008

REPORTING WATERSHED IMPROVEMENT

Based on Multiple Evidence of Watershed-wide Improvement (Option 2b)

Watershed Identification

a	Organization	*Name and type of organization reporting for the watershed*
b	Point of Contact	*Name, title, address, telephone number and e-mail address of individual responsible for this report*
c	Project Title	*Short descriptive title, e.g. "Reducing bacterial contamination in the Long Creek watershed, Indiana"*
d	No.Watersheds Improved	*Number of watersheds achieving improvement, and associated HUC-12 codes*

Description of 2002 Baseline Condition

e	Watershed(s)	*Enter list of one or more 12-digit HUC watersheds. Note: if 12 digit HUCs are not delineated, describe regionally-defined watershed(s) of appropriate scale.*
f	2002 Impairments	*Enter HUC, waterbody ID and impairment cause*
		Enter HUC, waterbody ID and impairment cause
		Enter HUC, waterbody ID and impairment cause
		Additional lines as needed
g	Map (optional)	*Attach map(s) showing watershed(s) and impaired waterbodies*

Evidence of Watershed Approach

h	Area of Effort	*Describe geographic area - may be larger than the watershed(s) with documented improvement*
i	Kay Stake-holders Involved and Their Roles	*Identify key partners responsible for planning and implementation. Describe each key partner's role, or cite detailed work plan having this information..*
j	Watershed Plan	*Description of, or reference to, a watershed plan that identifies problems and proposes solutions to implement*
k	Restoration Work	*Describe BMPs or other actions taken to improve watershed condition. Should provide a clear, succinct summary in plain language understandable to the general public. Avoid technical terms without a plain language description or definition (or photo) that demonstrates the meaning.*

Evidence of Watershed-wide Improvement

l	Impairments Removed (If applicable)	*List waterbody IDs where one or more impairment causes identified in 2002 have been removed. Include the date of the IR or approved 303(d) list that reflects the removed waterbodies..*
m	Improving Trend in Water Quality	*Describe the physical or chemical trend in each improved watershed, based on empirical data which may or may not be statistically significant (e.g., descriptive statistics) but nevertheless supports improvement.*
n	Supporting Trends (one or more)	*1. Evidence of improving trend in related biological indicator/index* *2. Evidence of improving trend in water quality based on predictive/modeled data, with field level ground thruthing* *3. Evidence of widespread significant load reductions*
o	Evidence of implementation	*Evidence of widespread nonpoint source, point source, or other implementation actions*

p	No deteriorating trends	*No evidence of significant deteriorating trends in related parameters as called for in the analytical plan. A lack of evidence (data) for other parameters identified in the analytical plan is not adequate to support this line of evidence.*
q	Photos/Graphics (optional)	*Attach available photos or graphics, with captions, illustrating the local problem or project, and results.*

Refer to "Guidance on Reporting Watershed Improvement under Measure SP-12" for more complete descriptions of information requested in this template.