



POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT COST-SHARE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUNDING ALLOCATIONS (FISCAL YEAR 2015)

VIRGINIA SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION BOARD

(Approved by Board May 21, 2014)

(Revised June 30, 2014 in accordance with Board authorization to “adjust fiscal amounts and budget language to conform with final State budget appropriations and language or to other official budget direction offered to the Agency”.)

1. Policy Purpose:

This Policy and Procedures document specifies the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board’s (Board) process by which funds are to be allocated by the Department of Conservation and Recreation (Department) to the Commonwealth’s 47 local Soil and Water Conservation Districts (Districts) for cost-share and technical assistance (Fiscal Year 2015 or FY15). The Policy also highlights the water quality emphasis of the Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-share Program and the targeted use of allocated cost-share funding. A separate Board Policy governs the FY15 distribution of administrative and operational support funds to Districts.

2. Cost-share Program Mission and Eligibility:

The Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-share Program (VACS) is administered by the Board and Department through the Districts. The Program’s goal is to improve water quality in the state's streams, rivers, and the Chesapeake Bay. VACS offers cost-share assistance as an incentive to carry out construction or implementation of selected Best Management Practices (BMPs). The basis of VACS is to encourage the voluntary installation of agricultural BMPs to meet Virginia's non-point source pollution reduction water quality objectives. Although resource based problems affecting water quality occur on all land uses, VACS promotes efforts for corrective action on agricultural lands only. VACS emphasizes the implementation of agricultural BMPs in locations that provide the greatest nutrient and sediment reductions for the taxpayer’s dollars spent. Cost-shared BMPs must maximize nutrient and sediment reductions and also protect the taxpayer’s interest, by implementing the most cost-effective BMPs possible in locations that achieve the greatest pollutant reductions on a field by field basis. VACS objectives include special emphasis on the reduction of nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), and sediment delivered to the Chesapeake Bay; by preventing additional pollution from entering state waters; and meeting the criteria for Virginia's compliance with Section 319 of the Clean Water Act. VACS implementation should be based upon sound conservation planning and best professional judgment.

For the purposes of VACS, agricultural land means land being used in a bona fide program of agricultural management and engaged in the production of agricultural, horticultural, or forest products for market. In order to be considered agricultural land, the real estate must consist of a minimum of five contiguous acres and there must be verifiable gross receipts in excess of \$1,000 per year from the production or sale of agricultural, horticultural or forest products produced on the applicant’s agricultural land for each of the past five years. The greater than \$1,000 threshold may be documented by using crop type acres and livestock numbers collected as part of the conservation planning inventory or other acceptable forms of proof including Internal Revenue Service (IRS) forms or other accounting records certified by a tax preparer that show profit or loss from farm operations. Non-industrial private forest lands are exempt from the \$1,000 requirement. (See Part 4: Definitions for further explanation.)

Readers should refer to the *Program Year 2015 Virginia Agricultural Cost Share (VACS) BMP Manual* for additional requirements associated with the implementation of the Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-share Program.

3. Authority:

This funding distribution Policy has been developed to provide transparency, predictability, and consistency to the processes by which the cost-share and technical assistance funding set out in Items 357 B and D of Chapter 2 of the 2014 Virginia Acts of Assembly, Special Session 1 (the 2014 Appropriation Act) is allocated and distributed to Districts. Funds subject to this Policy are set out in Sub-programs 50322 (Technical Assistance to Soil and Water Conservation Districts) and 50323 (Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost Share Assistance) and are guided by the following specific budget provisions within Item 357:

B.1. Notwithstanding § 10.1-2129 A., Code of Virginia, \$23,897,500 the first year from the general fund shall be deposited to the Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund established under the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1997. Of this amount, \$1,150,000 shall be appropriated to the Department for Nonpoint Pollution Prevention for the following specified uses: \$100,000 shall be utilized as cost-share for the development of nutrient management plans for golf courses, \$250,000 shall be provided to the Department of Forestry for water quality grants, and \$800,000 shall be used for the Commonwealth's match for participation in the federal Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). Pursuant to paragraph B of Item 356, \$2,965,612 is designated for deposit to the reserve within the Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund. Of the remaining amounts, \$19,781,888 is authorized for transfer to the Virginia Natural Resources Commitment Fund, a subfund of the Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund. The monies transferred to the Virginia Natural Resources Commitment Fund shall be distributed upon approval by the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board in accordance with the Board's developed policies and in accordance with the allocation percentages in § 10.1-2128.1 B., Code of Virginia. Of the \$19,781,888, a total of eight percent, \$1,582,551 shall be appropriated for Technical Assistance for Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Districts and \$18,199,337 for Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Assistance.

2. This appropriation, together with the amount listed in Item 363 of this act, meets the mandatory deposit requirements associated with the FY 2013 excess general fund revenue collections and discretionary year-end general fund balances.

C. It is the intent of the General Assembly, that notwithstanding the provisions of § 10.1-2132, Code of Virginia, the Department of Conservation and Recreation is authorized to make Water Quality Improvement Grants to state agencies.

D.1 Out of this appropriation, \$10,000,000 the first year and \$10,000,000 the second year from nongeneral funds to be deposited to the Virginia Natural Resources Commitment Fund, a subfund of the Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund, as established in § 10.1-2128.1, Code of Virginia. The funds shall be dispersed by the Department pursuant to § 10.1-2128.1, Code of Virginia.

2. The source of an amount estimated at \$10,000,000 the first year and \$10,000,000 the second year to support the nongeneral fund appropriation to the Virginia Natural Resources Commitment Fund shall be the recordation tax fee established in Part 3 of this act.

3. Out of this amount, a total of eight percent, or \$1,200,000, whichever is greater, shall be appropriated to Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Districts for technical assistance to farmers implementing agricultural best management practices, and \$8,800,000 for Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Assistance. Of the amount deposited for Cost-Share Assistance, distributions between watersheds shall be in accordance with the allocation percentages set out in § 10.1-2128.1 B., Code of Virginia.

E.1. It is the intent of the General Assembly that all interest earnings of the Water Quality Improvement Fund shall be spent only upon appropriation by the General Assembly, after the recommendation of the Secretary of Natural Resources, pursuant to § 10.1-2129, Code of Virginia.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of §§ 10.1-2128, 10.1-2129 and 10.1-2128.1, Code of Virginia, it is the intent of the General Assembly that the Department of Conservation and Recreation use interest earnings from the Water Quality Improvement Fund and the Virginia Natural Resources Commitment Fund to support one position to administer grants from the fund.

In addition to the authorities set out in the 2014 Appropriation Act, the Code of Virginia contains the following Board and Department duties applicable to this Policy:

§ 10.1-104.1. Department to assist in the nonpoint source pollution management program.

A. The Department, with the advice of the Board of Conservation and Recreation and the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board and in cooperation with other agencies, organizations, and the public as appropriate, shall assist in the Commonwealth's nonpoint source pollution management program.

B. The Department shall be assisted in performing its nonpoint source pollution management responsibilities by Virginia's soil and water conservation districts. Assistance by the soil and water conservation districts in the delivery of local programs and services may include (i) the provision of technical assistance to advance adoption of conservation management services, (ii) delivery of educational initiatives targeted at youth and adult groups to further awareness and understanding of water quality issues and solutions, and (iii) promotion of incentives to encourage voluntary actions by landowners and land managers in order to minimize nonpoint source pollution contributions to state waters.

The provisions of this section shall not limit the powers and duties of other state agencies.

§ 10.1-546.1. Delivery of Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Program.

Districts shall locally deliver the Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Program described under §10.1-2128.1, under the direction of the Board, as a means of promoting voluntary adoption of conservation management practices by farmers and land managers in support of the Department's nonpoint source pollution management program.

§ 10.1-2128. Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund established; purposes.

A. There is hereby established in the state treasury a special permanent, nonreverting fund, to be known as the "Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund." The Fund shall be established on the books of the Comptroller. The Fund shall consist of sums appropriated to it by the General Assembly which shall include, unless otherwise provided in the general appropriation act, 10 percent of the annual general fund revenue collections that are in excess of the official estimates in the general appropriation act and 10 percent of any unrestricted and uncommitted general fund balance at the close of each fiscal year whose reappropriation is not required in the general appropriation act. The Fund shall also consist of such other sums as may be made available to it from any other source, public or private, and shall include any penalties or damages collected under this article, federal grants solicited and received for

the specific purposes of the Fund, and all interest and income from investment of the Fund. Any sums remaining in the Fund, including interest thereon, at the end of each fiscal year shall not revert to the general fund but shall remain in the Fund. All moneys designated for the Fund shall be paid into the state treasury and credited to the Fund. Moneys in the Fund shall be used solely for Water Quality Improvement Grants.

§ 10.1-2128.1. Virginia Natural Resources Commitment Fund established.

A. There is hereby created in the state treasury a special nonreverting fund to be known as the Virginia Natural Resources Commitment Fund hereafter referred to as "the Subfund," which shall be a subfund of the Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund and administered by the Department of Conservation and Recreation. The Subfund shall be established on the books of the Comptroller. All amounts appropriated and such other funds as may be made available to the Subfund from any other source, public or private, shall be paid into the state treasury and credited to the Subfund. Interest earned on moneys in the Subfund shall remain in the Subfund and be credited to it. Any moneys remaining in the Subfund, including interest thereon, at the end of each fiscal year shall not revert to the general fund but shall remain in the Subfund. Moneys in the Subfund shall be used as provided in subsection B solely for the Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Program administered by the Department of Conservation and Recreation.

B. Beginning on July 1, 2008, and continuing in each subsequent fiscal year until July 1, 2018, out of such amounts as may be appropriated and deposited to the Subfund, distributions shall be made in each fiscal year for the following purposes:

1. Eight percent of the total amount distributed to the Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Program shall be distributed to soil and water conservation districts to provide technical assistance for the implementation of such agricultural best management practices. Each soil and water conservation district in the Commonwealth shall receive a share according to a method employed by the Director of the Department of Conservation and Recreation in consultation with the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board, that accounts for the percentage of the available agricultural best management practices funding that will be received by the district from the Subfund;

2. Fifty-five percent of the total amount distributed to the Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Program shall be used for matching grants for agricultural best management practices on lands in the Commonwealth exclusively or partly within the Chesapeake Bay watershed; and

3. Thirty-seven percent of the total amount distributed to the Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Program shall be used for matching grants for agricultural best management practices on lands in the Commonwealth exclusively outside of the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

C. The Department of Conservation and Recreation, in consultation with stakeholders, including representatives of the agricultural community, the conservation community, and the Soil and Water Conservation Districts, shall determine an annual funding amount for effective Soil and Water Conservation District technical assistance and implementation of agricultural best management practices pursuant to § 10.1-546.1. Pursuant to § 2.2-1504, the Department shall provide to the Governor the annual funding amount needed for each year of the ensuing biennial period. The Department shall include the annual funding amount as part of the reporting requirements in § 62.1-44.118.

§ 10.1-2132. Nonpoint source pollution funding; conditions for approval.

A. The Department of Conservation and Recreation shall be the lead state agency for determining the appropriateness of any grant related to nonpoint source pollution to be made from the [Water Quality Improvement] Fund to restore, protect and improve the quality of state waters.

C. Grant funding may be made available to local governments, soil and water conservation districts, institutions of higher education and individuals who propose specific initiatives that are clearly demonstrated as likely to achieve reductions in nonpoint source pollution, including, but not limited to, excess nutrients and suspended solids, to improve the quality of state waters. Such projects may include, but are in no way limited to, the acquisition of conservation easements related to the protection of water quality and stream buffers; conservation planning and design assistance to develop nutrient management plans for agricultural operations; instructional education directly associated with the implementation or maintenance of a specific nonpoint source pollution reduction initiative; the replacement or modification of residential onsite sewage systems to include nitrogen removal capabilities; implementation of cost-effective nutrient reduction practices; and reimbursement to local governments for tax credits and other kinds of authorized local tax relief that provides incentives for water quality improvement. The Director shall give priority consideration to the distribution of grants from the Fund for the purposes of implementing tributary strategy plans, with a priority given to agricultural practices. In no single year shall more than 60 percent of the moneys be used for projects or practices exclusively within the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

D. The Director of the Department of Conservation and Recreation shall manage the allocation of Water Quality Improvement Grants from the Virginia Natural Resources Commitment Fund established under § 10.1-2128.1.

4. Definitions:

“Agricultural products” means crops, livestock and livestock products, including but not limited to: field crops, forage, fruits, vegetables, horticultural specialties, cattle, sheep, hogs, goats, horses, poultry, furbearing animals, milk, eggs and furs.

“Agricultural production” means the production for commercial purposes of crops, livestock and livestock products, and includes the processing or retail sales by the producer of crops, livestock or livestock products which are produced on the parcel or in the District.

“Animal Type” means the type of livestock the BMP is being installed to treat. For reporting in the BMP Tracking Program, the following animal types are used.

Beef	Dairy	Swine	Layer	Sheep	Goat
Horse	Turkey	Broiler	Pullets	Other	

“Applicant” means a landowner, agent, or operator of record as long as the individual has control of the property. An applicant may be any corporation, association, partnership, or one or more individuals. Various companies, corporations, and partnership arrangements exist for farm ownership. Farm corporations (signing under Federal Tax Identification number) or partnerships operating under a farm name are classified as a single "applicant." Applicants are identified by a unique social security number and/or Federal Tax Identification number.

“Conservation Efficiency Factor (CEF)” means a factor calculated by the BMP tracking program to serve as a ranking tool and provide some guidance for ranking applications that would implement different BMPs. This tool is designed to assist SWCDs with the ranking of their cost share practice applications. The CEF uses ten different components, including soil loss data that is inputted by the SWCD, as well as the environmental information associated with the location of the practice on the earth to generate a factor used to rank the proposed practice compared with other like BMPs as well as different BMPs.

“District” or “local soil and water conservation district” or “SWCD” means a political subdivision of the Commonwealth organized in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Virginia contained in Chapter 5 of Title 10.1 (§ 10.1-500 et seq.) and with the powers and duties set out in Chapters 1, 5, 6, and 21.1 of Title 10.1 of the Code of Virginia.

“Drainage basins” for the purposes of funding allocations means the lands within the Chesapeake Bay watershed (CB – Chesapeake Bay) and the lands in the Commonwealth exclusively outside of the Chesapeake Bay watershed (OCB – Outside of Chesapeake Bay).

“Forestral production” means the production for commercial purposes of forestal products, and includes the processing or retail sales by the producer, of forestal products that are produced on the parcel. Forestal products include, but are not limited to; saw timber, pulpwood, posts, firewood, Christmas trees and other tree and wood products for sale or for farm use.

“Horticultural production” means the production for commercial purposes of horticultural products, and includes the processing or retail sales, by the producer, of horticultural products that are produced on the parcel. Horticultural products include, but are not limited to, fruits of all kinds, grapes, nuts, and berries, nursery and floral products for sale or for farm use.

“Total Maximum Daily Load” or “TMDL” means a calculation of a maximum amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can receive and still meet water quality standards.

5. Allocation Process for Cost-share:

The process for determining the allocation of new cost-share includes the following steps:

A) Review the Appropriation Act language and determine the distribution of amounts deposited to the Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund (WQIF) from state surplus allocations.

(See **TABLE 1**)

B) Review the Appropriation Act language and determine the total amount available for cost-share and technical assistance in the given fiscal year provided from the:

1. Close of fiscal year general fund surplus appropriated to the Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund (WQIF) and the amounts available for cost-share and technical assistance.
2. Special WQIF deposits from the general Fund
3. Nongeneral fund appropriation to the Virginia Natural Resources Commitment Fund from the recordation tax fee.
4. WQIF and Virginia Natural Resources Commitment Fund Interest.
5. The Reserve within the WQIF.

(SEE **TABLE 2**)

C) Allocate portions of the funding to the CB and to OCB.

(SEE **TABLE 3**)

D) Develop a cost-share spending plan that allocates appropriated funds to Program elements. (Determine uses of cost-share in CB and OCB Areas.)

1. RMP – Resource Management Plans
2. SL-6 – Stream Exclusion Special Earmark
3. Central Service Adjustments
4. VACS – Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Program

(SEE **TABLE 4**)

E) Use the Agricultural Nonpoint Source Hydrologic Unit (HU) Ranking Process to determine cost-share allocations to Districts.

(SEE **TABLES 5-7 and Attachments A-E**)

Review of Appropriation Act Language (Allocation Steps A and B)

For FY15, \$23,897,500 in new funding is being deposited to the Water Quality Improvement Fund in accordance with Item 357 B.1. of the 2014 Appropriation Act (See Part 2, Authority). Of this amount, distributions are directed as follows:

TABLE 1: FY14 Appropriation Act Distributions for WQIF Surplus (Item 357 B.1.)

Water Quality Program	Program Distributions
WQIF (Total Surplus Deposit)	\$23,897,500
• Earmark for Nutrient Management Plans for Golf Courses*	\$100,000
• Earmark for Department of Forestry for Water Quality Grants*	\$250,000
• Earmark for Commonwealth’s match to federal Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP)*	\$800,000
• Deposit to WQIF Reserve	\$2,965,612
• Transfers to the Virginia Natural Resources Commitment Fund	\$19,781,888
○ Technical Assistance for Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Districts	\$1,582,551
○ Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Assistance	\$18,199,337

* Earmarks shall be distributed in accordance with § 10.1-2132, Code of Virginia. This includes ensuring that “[i]n no single year shall more than 60 percent of the moneys be used for projects or practices exclusively within the Chesapeake Bay watershed”.

For FY15, \$27,781,888 in new funding (Item 357 B. and D. – see Part 2, Authority) is available for allocations to the Districts for cost-share and technical assistance.

TABLE 2: FY15 Cost-share and Technical Assistance Allocations by Fund Source

Funding Source	Total	Cost-share Portion of Total	Technical Assistance Portion of Total
WQIF (surplus deposit)	\$19,781,888	\$18,199,337	\$1,582,551
WQIF (special GF deposit)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recordation Fee*	\$8,000,000	\$6,800,000	\$1,200,000
Fund and Subfund Interest	\$0	\$0	\$0
WQIF Reserve	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	\$27,781,888	\$24,999,337	\$2,782,551

* The 2014 Appropriation Act (Item 357 D. – see Part 2, Authority) provides for \$10,000,000 in Appropriation from the recordation tax fee. Because of reduced actual revenue being recognized in Fiscal Year 2014 and the potential for the shortfall to continue into Fiscal Year 2015, a conservative approach is being taken towards allocations and only \$8,000,000 is being utilized for budgeting purposes.

Allocation of Funding to the CB and to OCB Areas (Allocation Step C)

Sub-section 10.1-2128.1. B. of the Code of Virginia specifies that after technical assistance is removed that:

- Fifty-five percent of the total amount distributed to the Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Program shall be used for matching grants for agricultural best management practices on lands in the Commonwealth exclusively or partly within the CB watershed; and
- Thirty-seven percent of the total amount distributed to the Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Program shall be used for matching grants for agricultural best management practices on lands in the Commonwealth exclusively outside of the CB watershed.

This equates to a multiplier applied to the Cost-share Portion of Total of:

0.597826087 for CB [55/ (55+37)]; and

0.402173913 for OCB [37/ (55+37)]

For FY15, distributions within the CB and OCB shall be as follows:

TABLE 3: FY15 Cost-share Allocations by Drainage Basin and Fund Source

Funding Source	Total	Cost-share Portion of Total	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively or Partly Within the CB*	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively OCB*
Surplus	\$19,781,888	\$18,199,337	\$10,880,038	\$7,319,299
Special GF Deposit	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recordation Fee	\$8,000,000	\$6,800,000	\$4,065,217	\$2,734,783
TOTAL	\$27,781,888	\$24,999,337	\$14,945,255	\$10,054,082

* Amounts rounded to the nearest dollar.

Spending Plan: Allocation of Appropriated Funds (Allocation Step D)

Out of the amounts available for cost-share, the Spending Plan shall allocate funding to BMP practices associated with specific program elements as follows:

TABLE 4: FY15 Cost-share Spending Plan by Drainage Basin and Fund Source

Program Element	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively or Partly Within the CB (Surplus)	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively or Partly Within the CB (Special GF Deposit)	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively or Partly Within the CB (Recordation Fee)	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively OCB (Surplus)	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively or Partly Within the OCB (Special GF Deposit)	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively OCB (Recordation Fee)	Totals
Total Available	\$10,880,038	\$0	\$4,065,217	\$7,319,299	\$0	\$2,734,783	\$24,999,337
Spending Plan Distribution:							
RMP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$60,000
SL-6	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,000,000
Central Service Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
VACS	\$10,880,038	\$0	\$4,065,217	\$4,259,299	\$0	\$2,734,783	\$21,939,337

NOTE: Funding provided to applicants for program elements outlined in the spending plan (See TABLE 4) other than VACS have no affect on applicant cost-share caps within VACS.

Specifics regarding the process by which such allocations are determined for each Program element within the spending plan are as follows:

Explanation of Spending Plan Distribution Components:

RMP – Resource Management Plans (Allocation Step D1)

In FY14, \$100,000 (\$60,000 CB; \$40,000 OCB) was allocated to provide cost-share for Resource Management Plan (RMP) development (RMP-1) and implementation (RMP-2) to Districts for the new Resource Management Plan Program. These funds were not expended due to a delay in the program and will be available for this purpose in FY15. Additional funding for RMP development and implementation in the CB only is available from federal grants. Accordingly, an additional \$60,000 in the OCB is being provided from FY15 cost-share for this purpose. A fundamental goal of the Program pursuant to § 10.1-104.8 of the Code of Virginia is for the RMP plans to include “agricultural best management practices sufficient to implement the Virginia Chesapeake Bay TMDL Watershed Implementation Plan and other local TMDL water quality requirements of the Commonwealth”. The intent of the program is to encourage farm owners and operators to voluntarily implement a high level of BMPs on their farmlands in order to be protective of water quality.

Soil and Water Conservation Districts are authorized to develop plans and recover costs from the cost-share applicant in accordance with Item 357 G of the 2014 Appropriation Act.

G. Notwithstanding § 10.1-552, Code of Virginia, Soil and Water Conservation Districts are hereby authorized to recover a portion of the direct costs of services rendered to landowners within the district and to recover a portion of the cost for use of district-owned conservation equipment. Such recoveries shall not exceed the amounts expended by a district on these services and equipment.

SL-6 (Allocation Step D2)

In the FY14 Policy, Districts were authorized to provide 100% cost-share for the stream exclusion practice SL-6 in FY14 and FY15 and it was stipulated that all participant enrollments received during this two-year period would be honored as cost-share funds become available even if enrollment outpaces available funding during that time. In accordance with this commitment, SL-6 cost-share shall remain at 100% for FY15 as well. Based on the substantial interest generated in receiving cost-share under this practice, over \$10 million in pending CEF ranked FY14 SL-6 applications were available in the Agricultural BMP Tracking Database on May 2, 2014. At that time, a query of the pending applications was run by watershed and District and \$3,000,000 in cost-share was allocated to those top CEF rated applications in the OCB in order to reduce the outstanding applications. Since that time, the Department has been working with Districts to refine the current distribution outlined in **TABLE 7**, Column 5, based on producer interest (reflects June 12, 2014 information). Federal grant funds available for expenditure in the CB only are being targeted towards pending applications in the CB.

As no additional technical assistance is provided with these special SL-6 allocations in both the CB and OCB, it is recognized that allocations could provide a challenge to a District’s ability to deliver the cost-share upon award in a timely fashion. Districts shall advise the Department by August 1, 2014 as to whether they can complete identified projects by June 30, 2015. The Department shall monitor District progress on satisfying FY14 and FY15 applications and provide engineering services support where feasible to do such. The Department is authorized to continue to work with the Districts to maximize the expenditure of the SL-6 funding and may modify the current allocations set out in **TABLE 7**, Column 5, or adjust allocations assigned to federal funds provided to address SL-6 pending applications. To the greatest extent possible, it is the Board’s desire not to see producers temporarily by-passed due to cost-share delivery pipeline limitations. Distribution of SL-6 cost-share amounts shall be specifically noted in cost-share disbursement letters to Districts and shall become part of the financial record.

Any portion of the \$3,000,000 in SL-6 OCB left uncommitted towards an identified project on April 1, 2015, shall become subject to reallocation within the OCB.

Districts may also utilize their regular FY15 cost-share allocation to address SL-6 projects at their discretion. Additionally, it is left to the District's to determine whether they target the retirement of FY14 SL-6 commitments prior to satisfying new FY15 SL-6 commitments with their regular FY15 cost-share allocation.

Also, at the end of FY14, should any additional funding be available from unallocated recordation fee revenue or other unobligated sources, the Department may apply these funds towards addressing FY14 SL-6 pending applications as well.

NOTE: In the development of the 2016 Policy, consideration should be given to reinstating a producer match component for SL-6 and to the inclusion of a "hardship" exception provision.

Central Service Adjustments (Allocation Step D3)

The Appropriation Act (Part 3: Miscellaneous) annually applies charges (interfund transfers) to each Agency for expenses incurred by central service agencies associated with Agency funds. For FY15, charges for nongeneral funds are \$90,143. If a portion of this needs to be paid from cost-share amounts provided in the 2014 Appropriation Act, it should be allocated from non-budgeted "cash transfer in (CTI)" funds or non-budgeted recordation fee tax deposits available at the beginning of the 4th quarter before reallocations are made.

VACS – Virginia Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Share Program Allocations (Allocation Step D4)

For FY15, after the other noted distributions have been met in the spending plan (SEE TABLE 4), there is \$21,939,337 available for distribution as VACS cost-share. (Table 4 outlines the drainage basin split and fund sources.) Specific allocations to Districts in FY15 shall be made using science-based targeting of funds so that areas with the greatest potential to contribute agricultural nonpoint source pollution have the financial resources to implement BMP to reduce nutrient and sediment contamination of surface and ground waters. The process utilized to make these allocations is called the Agricultural Nonpoint Source Hydrologic Unit (HU) Ranking Process.

Agricultural Nonpoint Source Hydrologic Unit (HU) Ranking Process (Step E)

The Department utilizes a component of Virginia's Nonpoint Source Assessment to focus its cost-share allocations where funds can produce the greatest reductions in surface and ground water contamination. Every two years, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) prepares a Virginia Water Quality Assessment Report, also known as the 305(b) report for submission to the Environmental Protection Agency that typically includes an updated Nonpoint Source Assessment. In 2012, no new Nonpoint Source Assessment was conducted as part of that report. In 2014, a new Nonpoint Source Assessment was generated that does result in changes in cost-share allocations to Districts. The Department utilizes the agricultural component of the most current and approved NPS assessment to focus agricultural cost-share funds.

Hydrologic unit assessment scores are calculated using a nonpoint pollutant load simulation model and data developed by the Department and the Virginia Tech, Department of Biological Systems Engineering. The model includes statewide data from:

- Detailed land use from interpreted imagery supplemented with tillage practice data
- Census of Agriculture data
- Virginia Agriculture Statistics
- Grazing and manure application practices
- Hydrologic soil groups
- Average water content and K factors of all soils
- Stream flows from gauge stations

- Climate records from a multi-state area, growing seasons
- Dominant crop types by hydrologic unit
- CB Watershed Model output
- Animal numbers by type and location
- Distribution and extent of agricultural conservation practices
- Slope and manure application schedules by manure types

Additional technical information regarding modeling processes are set out in Department documents titled: *2014 NPS Assessment and Prioritization Primer* and *Nonpoint Source Assessment and Prioritization: 2010 Prioritization Documentation*

The computer model estimates and ranks the pollutant loads of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment in each of the 1,247 6th-order hydrologic units of the National Watershed Boundary Dataset (NWBD). Each of the three pollutant loads are sorted High to Low and assigned their sort order for each HU. The rank score of a HU is the sum of these three values. For example:

Hydrologic Unit (HU) – (VAHU6)	Pollutant Load –Nitrogen (NSEQ)	Pollutant Load – Phosphorus (PSEQ)	Pollutant Load – Sediment (SSEQ)	Sum (NSEQ + PSEQ + SSEQ)	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank
AS15	1221	1221	1214	3656	High (H)
RA34	1017	920	888	2825	Medium (M)
TC14	546	533	755	1834	Low (L)

The higher the composite ranking score, the higher its potential to contribute agricultural NPS pollution (based on Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Sediment loads). In accordance with this process, **Attachment A** includes the Unit Area Loads for Nitrogen (kg/ha-yr), Phosphorus (kg/ha-yr), and Sediment (mt/ha-yr); the Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each pollutant’s load; a Sum Order for each HU; and the resulting Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank for each HU to be utilized in FY15 cost-share allocation computations.

The Department has designated the highest 20% of the ranked composite scores as High (H) potential, the middle 30% as Medium (M), and the lowest 50% are ranked Low (L) for their potential to contribute agricultural NPS pollution (natural breaking points in the data are looked for around these percentiles).

For FY15 (see **Attachment A**) the data breaks were as follows:

TABLE 5: Agricultural Pollutant Potential Ranking

Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	# of HUs included	% of HUs included	Sum Order Range
H	247	19.80754	2828 - 3656
M	374	29.99198	1843 - 2825
L	626	50.20048	3 - 1834
Total	1247	100.00000	

NOTE: Since the installation and distribution of BMPs implemented is part of the calculation of the agricultural NPS ranking, the hydrologic units tend to change rankings if a large number of BMPs are implemented in a particular HU between assessments. This tends to shift the funds between the HUs. Hydrologic units ranked H in one NPS assessment may receive a rank of M or L in the next NPS assessment due to the large number of BMPs implemented in the H ranked hydrologic units.

The next step is to compile the HU area (hectares or ha) designated as H, M, and L by county and then District geographic areas. Hydrologic unit boundaries are based upon naturally occurring drainage divides and do not often reflect county boundaries. As a result, any HU may be fully contained within a county or divided between two or more counties. Geographic Information System analysis allows the area (acres) of each ranked HU (H, M, and L) within a county boundary to be calculated and compared to the total number of acres of that pollutant ranking (H, M, and L) within each drainage basin (CB or OCB). The county area (acres) designated as H, M, and L are then rolled up to the 47 Districts. (Those HUs not within a District boundary have been removed from the analysis and do not contribute to the acreage total utilized in calculating the Cost-share Multiplier.)

Some Districts reside in the CB, some are located in only OCB areas, and some contain acreage in each. District drainage basin assignments are outlined in **Attachment B**.

Once a composite area (acres) for H, M, and L HUs has been calculated for each District by drainage basin, a H, M, and L cost-share multiplier based on percentage of acres in the District (for H, M, and L) compared to the drainage basin total (for H, M, and L) is calculated and then applied respectively to the amount of cost-share funding allocated to the H, M, and L pollutant load categories in the CB and OCB areas. This analysis is set out in **Attachment C**. **Attachment C** provides data by Drainage Basin (CB and OCB), District, Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank (H, M, and L), Total Area (acres) of Hydrologic Units in each District by Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank and Drainage Basin, and the resulting Percentage Rank (Cost-share Multiplier).

NOTE: In the development of the 2016 Policy and **Attachment C**, consideration should be given to utilizing total agricultural land area in the HU rather than total land area when calculating the cost-share multiplier.

Attachment D provides a full-page version of the image below depicting the statewide distribution of H, M, and L HUs by District and Drainage Basin.




FIGURE 1: Virginia's Agricultural BMP Cost-share Funding Priorities

Utilizing the information in **Attachment C**, the next step is to determine how much of the available cost-share by drainage basin and funding type will be proportioned to H, M, and L HU areas. Percentage allocations are based on providing a high percentage of the funding to the waters with the most pollutant load based on nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment. For FY15, the H ranked HUs are assigned 50 percent of the cost-share funds. The M ranked HUs are assigned 30 percent of the cost-share funds while the L ranked HUs are assigned 20 percent of the cost-share funds.

TABLE 6: FY15 Cost-share Allocations by Drainage Basin; Fund Source; and H, M, and L HU Areas

Program Element	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively or Partly Within the CB (Surplus)	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively or Partly Within the CB (Special GF Deposit)	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively or Partly Within the CB (Recordation Fee)	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively OCB (Surplus)	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively or Partly Within the OCB (Special GF Deposit)	Cost-share Portion Allocated to Lands Exclusively OCB (Recordation Fee)	Totals
VACS (after spending plan distributions – see TABLE 4)	\$10,880,038	\$0	\$4,065,217	\$4,259,299	\$0	\$2,734,783	\$21,939,337
H (50%)	\$5,440,019	\$0	\$2,032,609	\$2,129,649	\$0	\$1,367,392	\$10,969,669
M (30%)	\$3,264,011	\$0	\$1,219,565	\$1,277,790	\$0	\$820,435	\$6,581,801
L (20%)	\$2,176,008	\$0	\$813,043	\$851,860	\$0	\$546,956	\$4,387,867

The H, M, and L multipliers for each District are then applied to the amount of cost-share funds being made available in each drainage basin (CB and OCB) and funding source (Surplus, Special GF Deposit, Recordation fee) as set out in **TABLE 6**. Each District’s drainage basin’s H, M, and L funds are then accumulated to provide a total funding amount for the cost-share allocation. **Attachment E** shows the resulting District allocations by drainage basin and funding source.

The following table shows FY15 District cost-share allocations further compiled by drainage basin and under the cost-share total column, provides the cumulative cost-share allocations to each of the Districts. Additionally, an additional column is appended that shows the FY15 District cost-share allocations for the \$3,000,000 being allocated to SL-6 pending allocations in the OCB (See Discussion in Step D2).

TABLE 7: FY15 District Cost-share Allocations by Drainage Basin

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
SWCD	CB Total	OCB Total	FY15 Cost-Share Total	SL-6 \$3M OCB Allocation*
APPOMATTOX RIVER	\$33,403	\$120,729	\$154,132	\$0
BIG SANDY	\$0	\$88,429	\$88,429	\$0
BIG WALKER	\$0	\$220,525	\$220,525	\$57,599.00
BLUE RIDGE	\$6,696	\$470,836	\$477,532	\$261,496.40
CHOWAN BASIN	\$0	\$991,049	\$991,049	\$0
CLINCH VALLEY	\$0	\$170,704	\$170,704	\$88,478.00
COLONIAL	\$510,711	\$0	\$510,711	\$0
CULPEPER	\$1,458,704	\$0	\$1,458,704	\$0
DANIEL BOONE	\$0	\$255,447	\$255,447	\$337,032.50
EASTERN SHORE	\$507,491	\$432,041	\$939,532	\$0
EVERGREEN	\$0	\$124,340	\$124,340	\$21,670.50
HALIFAX	\$0	\$201,701	\$201,701	\$0
HANOVER-CAROLINE	\$455,846	\$0	\$455,846	\$0
HEADWATERS	\$959,113	\$0	\$959,113	\$0
HENRICOPOLIS	\$111,328	\$0	\$111,328	\$0
HOLSTON RIVER	\$0	\$149,456	\$149,456	\$171,466.00
JAMES RIVER	\$267,514	\$66,924	\$334,438	\$0

JOHN MARSHALL	\$682,911	\$0	\$682,911	\$0
LAKE COUNTRY	\$0	\$251,271	\$251,271	\$0
LONESOME PINE	\$0	\$134,032	\$134,032	\$0
LORD FAIRFAX	\$1,002,404	\$0	\$1,002,404	\$0
LOUDOUN	\$623,983	\$0	\$623,983	\$0
MONACAN	\$179,129	\$0	\$179,129	\$0
MOUNTAIN	\$442,638	\$0	\$442,638	\$0
MOUNTAIN CASTLES	\$280,072	\$28,399	\$308,471	\$0
NATURAL BRIDGE	\$461,318	\$0	\$461,318	\$0
NEW RIVER	\$0	\$383,161	\$383,161	\$238,215.75
NORTHERN NECK	\$1,229,928	\$0	\$1,229,928	\$0
NORTHERN VIRGINIA	\$111,322	\$0	\$111,322	\$0
PATRICK	\$0	\$169,046	\$169,046	\$83,610.00
PEAKS OF OTTER	\$39,013	\$164,223	\$203,236	\$1,258,596.84
PEANUT	\$724,578	\$597,751	\$1,322,329	\$0
PETER FRANCISCO	\$240,732	\$0	\$240,732	\$0
PIEDMONT	\$297,412	\$29,109	\$326,521	\$0
PITTSYLVANIA	\$0	\$256,837	\$256,837	\$0
PRINCE WILLIAM	\$113,912	\$0	\$113,912	\$0
ROBERT E. LEE	\$342,692	\$137,247	\$479,939	\$97,475.00
SCOTT COUNTY	\$0	\$274,216	\$274,216	\$183,814.00
SHENANDOAH VALLEY	\$1,172,389	\$0	\$1,172,389	\$0
SKYLINE	\$9,019	\$479,945	\$488,964	\$49,841.50
SOUTHSIDE	\$71	\$189,096	\$189,167	\$0
TAZEWELL	\$0	\$218,843	\$218,843	\$138,212.50
THOMAS JEFFERSON	\$939,983	\$0	\$939,983	\$0
THREE RIVERS	\$827,994	\$0	\$827,994	\$0
TIDEWATER	\$502,432	\$0	\$502,432	\$0
TRI-COUNTY/CITY	\$321,308	\$0	\$321,308	\$0
VIRGINIA DARE	\$89,209	\$388,725	\$477,934	\$0
Grand Total	\$14,945,255	\$6,994,082	\$21,939,337	\$2,987,507.99

* See Allocation Discussion in Step D2 (numbers may be subject to change)

NOTE: The distribution of cost-share allocations is dependent on income and state finances. See the procedure outlined in Part 13: Criteria for Cost-share and Technical Assistance for what procedures are implemented should funding availability fall short of appropriation projections.

6. Director Approved Transfer of Cost-share Prior to Reallocation

After Grant Agreement issuance but prior to reallocation, Districts may choose to work with the Department to determine if cost-share allocations should be transferred from one District to another District to maximize water quality improvements. Cost-share shall not be transferred between CB and OCB drainage allocations. Recommended adjustments shall be advanced by Department field personnel through the Division's Central Office to the Director or his designee for consideration as District contract adjustments. Written correspondence from the affected Districts will be required to document their approval of the recommended transaction. Adjustments should await the March 31, 2015 reallocation process unless lack of technical delivery staffing, limited cost-share award opportunities, or other beneficial water quality objectives within a District or between Districts merits an earlier reallocation. Written correspondence regarding reallocations shall be routed to the Comptroller to update the Department's records. For amounts already distributed to Districts, funds shall be reverted back to the Department for redistribution to the approved receiving District (accordingly such funds shall not be directly sent between Districts).

Additionally, should a District decline a recommended cost-share allocation, technical assistance allocations may also be reduced accordingly if such an allocation has been recommended. Otherwise, no other movements of cost-share or technical assistance funding may occur between Districts.

7. Targeting the Expenditure of Cost-share Funds in each District to Maximize Water Quality Improvements

Once cost-share has been allocated to Districts, cost-share expenditures within Districts, in accordance with the VACS mission (See Part 2), should be targeted towards maximizing nutrient and sediment reductions by implementing the most cost-effective BMPs possible in locations that achieve the greatest pollutant reductions on a field by field basis. The VACS Program gives Districts the responsibility to determine the recipients of state cost-share funds. The better the Districts recruit and evaluate applications, the more successful the local program will be at improving local water quality. Participants are to be recruited based upon those primary and secondary factors, which most influence their existing land uses impact upon water quality. The objective of the VACS Program is to solve water quality problems by fixing the worst problems first on a field by field basis. The 2014 agricultural non-point source ranking of the National Watershed Boundary Database (VAHU6) currently provides the most accurate identification at a landscape scale, of the lands with the greatest potential to contribute agricultural non-point source pollution into Virginia's rivers and streams.

Statewide water quality considerations must be used by all Districts to qualify cost-share applications for District Board consideration for funding. Districts should prioritize the implementation of appropriate BMPs that will reduce the greatest amount of nutrient and sediment contamination while utilizing the least amount of cost-share funds to address site-specific water quality problems in identified H priority watersheds with all program cost-share funds. Any application that does not meet at least one of these priority considerations listed below shall not receive funding:

- The project is located in one of the District's highest ranked hydrologic units unless the project is for animal waste management practices and actions to protect groundwater, gully erosion, or critical areas utilizing one of the following practices:
 - Animal Waste Control Facilities (WP-4)
 - Loafing Lot Management System (WP-4B)
 - Composter Facilities (WP-4C)
 - Permanent Vegetative Cover on Critical Areas (SL-11)
 - Stream Protection (WP-2)
 - Vegetative Stabilization of Marsh Fringe Area (SE-1)
 - Nutrient Management Plan Writing (NM-1A)
 - Water Table Control Structure (WQ-5)

Sod Waterway (WP-3)
 Small Grain Cover Crop for Nutrient Management (SL-8B)
 Stream Exclusion with Grazing Land Management (SL-6)
 Grass Filter Strips (WQ-1)
 Sediment Retention, Erosion or Water Control Structure (WP-1)

- The project is located within or upstream of an identified TMDL stream segment and the project will assist in reducing the identified pollutant.
- The project is located on fields that are at least 1/3 HEL (Highly Erodible Land) soils.
- The project is for a specified BMP(s) within an approved state resource management plan.

A further set of Secondary considerations that identify the local District Board’s water quality improvement focus shall be developed by the District Board and shall be approved by the Department prior to the beginning of the fiscal year. These secondary considerations should be easily understood by any potential participant. Districts should focus on describing the Boards desired local water quality improvements. Secondary considerations should be narrative statements that assist District Boards in ranking cost-share applications based upon which practice implementation will provide the greatest amount of local water quality improvement. The District shall be expected to abide by these policies throughout the entire program year so that each application is ranked to receive funding based upon the anticipated water quality benefits. Examples of potential secondary considerations may be found in the *Program Year 2015 Virginia Agricultural Cost Share (VACS) BMP Manual*.

One key secondary consideration that shall be considered by each District when comparing projects for cost-share funding as a component of their decision process is the CEF. A CEF is calculated by the Agricultural BMP Tracking program and uses nine different components, including soil loss data that is input by the District, as well as the environmental information associated with the location of the practice to generate a factor that can be used to rank the proposed practice compared with other like BMPs as well as different BMPs (See **TABLE 8**). Although the CEF can be used to rank different BMPs it will more accurately rank different BMPs that are oriented toward reduction of the same contaminate with the lower the value the more preferred the project.

Additionally, for Districts within the CB, Districts shall give priority to BMPs addressed within the Virginia Chesapeake Bay Watershed Implementation Plan and for Districts OCB, priority shall be given to BMPs in the highest priority agricultural TMDL watersheds (as ranked by the Department; H, M, and L).

The relative weights of **TABLE 8** reflect the weight distribution of the CEF components for practices where every component is used in the final CEF calculation. For many practices one or more of these components is not used and the relative weights of the point variables that are used will therefore be proportionally increased. Details on this procedure may be found in a Department discussion document titled *Assignment of Priority Values to BMP Instances at the Time of District ACSTP Data Entry*.

TABLE 8: CEF Ranking Components and Values

Ranking Component	Relative Weight	Value Range	Point or Credit Variable	Assigned Rank Points
Deliverable Sediment Reduction Cost Efficiency	13.33	not calculated / equation results	DSEDXCE_P	0 / 1 - 10
Priority Practice	17.33	yes / maintenance / no	PRIPRAC_P	1 / 9 / 13
NPS Priority Hydrologic	17.33	not used / Ag Priorities	NPSAG_P	0 / 1 - 13

Unit		SUM Order		
NPS Bio Priority HU	5.33	2+ flags / 1 flag / none	NPSBIO_C	-4 / -2 / 0
Bacteria TMDL Area	7.93	not used / 3 / 1 / 0	BTMDL_P	0 / 1 / 1 / 6
Nutrient TMDL Area	7.93	not used / 3 / 2 / 0	NTMDL_P	0 / 1 / 1 / 6
Chesapeake Bay Program Efficiency	4.00	>50% / 35-50% / <35% / not reportable	CBEFF_C	-3 / -2 / -1 / 0
Practice Contract Period	6.61	1 - 10	PCP_P	1 - 5
Installation Cost Efficiency	20.00	not calculated / equation results	ICE_P	0 / 1 - 15
Environmental Preferences	see discussion document	not calculated / equation results	ENV_C	0 / -7 - 0

NOTE: In the development of the 2016 Policy, consideration should be given to modifying the CEF to account for animal numbers and to recommending other potential refinements to the Board.

Final approval of practice funding is the responsibility of the local District Board of Directors. All actions taken must be voted upon and the outcome recorded in the minutes of the meeting where such action is taken. Districts should be prepared to verify and document that their cost-share allocations are being spent in accordance with their priority and secondary considerations and in accordance with the *Program Year 2015 Virginia Agricultural Cost Share (VACS) BMP Manual*.

Any application must meet appropriate technical agency standards and specifications of that practice before cost-share payment is made. Payment is issued after the participant and technical representative have certified practice installation in their Virginia BMP Incentives Contract. The amount of the cost-share payment is calculated based upon the estimated cost or total actual cost whichever is less. When completed practices are scheduled for combined funding from a District and other sources, the District cost-share payment must reflect the balance due (not to exceed the amount approved by the District for the cost-share payment) after payment has been approved or issued by the other sources. Total combined state VACS, federal, and any other funding source cost-share payments must not exceed 90% of the actual eligible total cost unless otherwise explicitly allowed within the *Program Year 2015 Virginia Agricultural Cost Share (VACS) BMP Manual*, this Policy, or by written directive of the Director.

Department personnel will confer with District staff at least quarterly to determine their projected needs for cost-share payments for completed and certified BMPs. Department personnel will generate a disbursement letter based upon the projected needs and Agricultural BMP Tracking program data showing approved and completed practices.

8. Cost-share Funding Caps

For FY15, the VACS applicant cost-share limit or “cap” is \$50,000/applicant/year. This cap is automatically monitored for any applicant across Districts based upon data available from within the Agricultural BMP Tracking program.

- Except that WP-4 and/or WP-4B either as a single large practice or as an aggregation of smaller practices may be approved to receive up to \$70,000 in cost share funds in any given program year. For any single or aggregation of WP-4 and/or WP-4B practices that receive greater than \$50,000 in cost share funds but less than \$70,000, the unused cap amount may not be used to fund any other additional practices.

- Each District Board may establish an applicant cost-share limit or “cap” for the program year which may not exceed the program applicant cost-share limit. Applicants may receive the amount of the District established cost-share limits or “caps” for implemented BMPs as long as the amount does not exceed the established programmatic cost-share limit or “cap”. This cap is automatically monitored for any applicant across Districts based upon data available from within the Agricultural BMP Tracking program. Districts may view all approved cost-share funds for a participant by utilizing the “participant’s contracts” button. This authority to set District cost-share limits in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph does not extend to SL-6, RMP-1, and RMP-2 practices.
- SL-6 is not subject to the \$70,000 cap as the practice shall be paid at 100%; however, participants receiving cost-share funds for SL-6 in excess of \$70,000 in FY15, shall not be eligible for any additional cost-share funds for any other cost-share practices.
 - Examples:
 - If SL6 payment is equal to or greater than \$70,000 then no additional VACS is allowed.
 - If SL6 is \$60,000, then \$10,000 would remain available for WP-4 and/or WP-4B but \$0 for other VACS practices.
 - If SL6 is \$40,000, then \$10,000 would remain available for agronomic practices or up to \$30,000 for WP-4 and/or WP-4B.
- Cost-share funds received for RMP-1 and RMP-2 practices do not count against or otherwise affect an applicant’s annual cost-share cap for other specified practices.

State participant caps are based upon the fiscal year that the practice is approved rather than the fiscal year in which the cost-share payment is distributed. This allows each participant to maximize the amount of cost-share that they may receive in each fiscal year.

The Department is marketing the SL-6 program at 100% for FY14 and FY15 after which time the cost-share percentage may be reduced. All participant enrollments received during this two-year period will be honored as cost-share funds become available even if enrollment outpaces available funding during that time.

9. Reallocation of Cost-share

On April 1, 2015, following the end of the third quarter, the Department shall reallocate (redistribute) unobligated VACS allocations (keeping cost-share within the drainage basin it was originally allocated within) in an effort to satisfy existing unfunded cost-share applications statewide. VACS funds that have not been approved by the District’s Board of Directors at the end of the third quarter of the fiscal year (March 31, 2015) to fund an existing cost-share application are considered to be unobligated.

Data collected from the budget summary page of the Virginia Agricultural BMP Tracking Program (Tracking Program) on April 1, 2015 will be analyzed to identify those Districts that have obligated ninety percent (90%) or more of their Total VACS allocation. The percent of their VACS allocation obligated will be identified by dividing the “Allocation” amount by the “Approved” amount. For those Districts that did not obligate at least ninety percent (90%) of their Total VACS allocation by April 1, 2015, unobligated cost-share funds will be summed and all of a District’s unobligated VACS funds will be reallocated, except that ten (10%) of the unobligated balance shall remain with the District (unless waived by the District) to approve small practices or to make adjustments to existing cost-share practices. This includes amounts already distributed to Districts for which a project has since been discontinued (which shall be reverted back to the Department; such funds shall not be directly sent between Districts) as well as VACS funds still being held by the Department for which there are no pending obligations against it. Technical assistance funding shall not be reallocated and shall remain with the District to which it was originally allocated.

All reallocated cost-share funds shall be allocated to BMP Tracking Program identified **priority** agricultural BMP practices with the lowest CEF factors within the original drainage allocations. Should a CEF factor tie result when selecting projects, the Department will select the practice(s) with the greater longevity to break any ties.

Reallocated cost-share funds will not have technical assistance attached. Reallocation cost-share amounts shall be specifically noted in cost-share disbursement letters to Districts and become part of the financial record.

10. Allocation Process for Technical Assistance:

Technical Assistance funds are made available to Districts by the Department for VACS Program implementation by District technical staff. FY13 technical assistance fund allocations approved in the amount \$1,843,154 represent a base allocation for FY15 for technical assistance. This base (or constant) represents the FY13 level at which Districts delivered services. The base amount of \$1,843,154 is subtracted from the total technical assistance available in FY15 (\$2,782,551) and results in a technical assistance balance of \$939,397. This remaining balance is distributed proportionally to the allocation of 2015 cost-share to Districts. This utilizes the cost-share version without the \$3 Million in SL-6 OCB removed so that OCB Districts are not penalized for the SL-6 earmark and so that there is some recognition that moving the SL-6 funds requires some additional technical assistance. Results for FY15 (Total Technical assistance allocations by District) are presented in **TABLE 9**. In future years, should technical assistance amounts available fall below the \$1,843,154 base level, total technical assistance to Districts would be proportionally reduced.

TABLE 9: FY15 Technical Assistance Computations and District Allocations

SWCD	FY15 CS SCENARIO (without the \$3 M in SL-6 OCB removed)	Proportional Multiplier	FY15 TA ADDITION TO THE FY13 TA BASE	FY13 TA BASE	FY15 Total Technical Assistance Allocated
APPOMATTOX RIVER	\$205,915	0.0082566349	\$7,756	\$25,899	\$33,655
BIG SANDY	\$126,359	0.0050666543	\$4,760	\$8,723	\$13,483
BIG WALKER	\$315,116	0.0126352998	\$11,870	\$34,600	\$46,470
BLUE RIDGE	\$679,490	0.0272457123	\$25,595	\$50,000	\$75,595
CHOWAN BASIN	\$1,416,144	0.0567835464	\$53,342	\$30,369	\$83,711
CLINCH VALLEY	\$243,925	0.0097807331	\$9,188	\$70,000	\$79,188
COLONIAL	\$510,712	0.0204781707	\$19,237	\$40,000	\$59,237
CULPEPER	\$1,458,704	0.0584900874	\$54,945	\$105,000	\$159,945
DANIEL BOONE	\$365,017	0.0146361950	\$13,749	\$49,800	\$63,549
EASTERN SHORE	\$1,124,849	0.0451034043	\$42,370	\$51,000	\$93,370
EVERGREEN	\$177,674	0.0071242471	\$6,692	\$19,300	\$25,992
HALIFAX	\$288,217	0.0115567226	\$10,856	\$32,600	\$43,456
HANOVER-CAROLINE	\$455,845	0.0182781523	\$17,170	\$74,250	\$91,420
HEADWATERS	\$959,113	0.0384578387	\$36,127	\$38,297	\$74,424
HENRICOPOLIS	\$111,328	0.0044639519	\$4,193	\$7,570	\$11,763
HOLSTON RIVER	\$213,563	0.0085632990	\$8,044	\$69,000	\$77,044
JAMES RIVER	\$363,143	0.0145610527	\$13,679	\$16,372	\$30,051
JOHN MARSHALL	\$682,912	0.0273829252	\$25,724	\$32,000	\$57,724
LAKE COUNTRY	\$359,050	0.0143969345	\$13,525	\$17,000	\$30,525
LONESOME PINE	\$191,523	0.0076795546	\$7,214	\$27,329	\$34,543
LORD FAIRFAX	\$1,002,404	0.0401936908	\$37,758	\$100,000	\$137,758

LOUDOUN	\$623,983	0.0250200316	\$23,504	\$46,000	\$69,504
MONACAN	\$179,129	0.0071825887	\$6,747	\$16,000	\$22,747
MOUNTAIN	\$442,638	0.0177485873	\$16,673	\$0	\$16,673
MOUNTAIN CASTLES	\$320,652	0.0128572784	\$12,078	\$35,000	\$47,078
NATURAL BRIDGE	\$461,319	0.0184976449	\$17,377	\$32,221	\$49,598
NEW RIVER	\$547,511	0.0219537111	\$20,623	\$50,000	\$70,623
NORTHERN NECK	\$1,229,928	0.0493167882	\$46,328	\$100,742	\$147,070
NORTHERN VIRGINIA	\$111,321	0.0044636712	\$4,193	\$0	\$4,193
PATRICK	\$241,556	0.0096857427	\$9,099	\$13,500	\$22,599
PEAKS OF OTTER	\$273,678	0.0109737480	\$10,309	\$28,742	\$39,051
PEANUT	\$1,578,725	0.0633026050	\$59,466	\$69,000	\$128,466
PETER FRANCISCO	\$240,732	0.0096527025	\$9,068	\$23,601	\$32,669
PIEDMONT	\$339,006	0.0135932242	\$12,769	\$23,790	\$36,559
PITTSYLVANIA	\$367,003	0.0147158283	\$13,824	\$29,300	\$43,124
PRINCE WILLIAM	\$113,912	0.0045675633	\$4,291	\$6,343	\$10,634
ROBERT E. LEE	\$538,809	0.0216047844	\$20,296	\$11,930	\$32,226
SCOTT COUNTY	\$391,837	0.0157116045	\$14,759	\$45,800	\$60,559
SHENANDOAH VALLEY	\$1,172,389	0.0470096298	\$44,161	\$45,600	\$89,761
SKYLINE	\$694,829	0.0278607647	\$26,172	\$55,433	\$81,605
SOUTHSIDE	\$270,276	0.0108373370	\$10,181	\$24,790	\$34,971
TAZEWELL	\$312,713	0.0125389460	\$11,779	\$30,122	\$41,901
THOMAS JEFFERSON	\$939,982	0.0376907373	\$35,407	\$97,399	\$132,806
THREE RIVERS	\$827,993	0.0332002812	\$31,188	\$70,375	\$101,563
TIDEWATER	\$502,432	0.0201461651	\$18,925	\$27,595	\$46,520
TRI-COUNTY/CITY	\$321,309	0.0128836224	\$12,103	\$25,200	\$37,303
VIRGINIA DARE	\$644,672	0.0258496046	\$24,283	\$35,562	\$59,845
Grand Total	\$24,939,337	1.0000000000	\$939,397	\$1,843,154	\$2,782,551

NOTE: In 2015, the Department, pursuant to the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board's May 21, 2014 Policy on Soil and Water Conservation District Administration and Operations Funding Allocations for FY15 and the associated Grant Agreement will analyze base-budget technical assistance information submitted on the Grant Agreement's Attachment D (Itemized District Budget Request Form) to see if District base technical assistance needs further adjustments. Absent a re-benchmarking, technical assistance in future years would be distributed in the manner established within this Policy.

FY15 Technical Assistance allocations (See **TABLE 9**) shall be disbursed to Districts in accordance with the following procedures. During the first quarter of FY15, after the Fourth Quarter FY14 reports have been submitted to the Department and the Grant Agreement has been executed and the original signed Agreement returned to the Department, twenty-five percent of the Technical Assistance allocations shall be awarded; with an additional twenty-five percent awarded in each of the second, third, and fourth quarters provided updates to the BMP cost-share tracking database are being regularly made to the satisfaction of the Department. Except due to extenuating circumstances or as otherwise set out in the Grant Agreement, disbursements to Districts will be executed within 30 calendar days following the beginning of a quarter contingent upon the satisfactory completion of database updates.

During cost-share reallocation, unexpended technical assistance shall remain in the District to which it was first allocated and shall not be subject to reallocation.

11. Noncompliance with this policy:

In the event any District fails to comply with the provisions of this Policy, the Department reserves the right to require repayment of previously issued funds and/or direct further appropriate actions based upon noncompliance circumstances. Should an issue arise that impacts funding, the affected District(s) will be apprised of the issue(s) and provided an opportunity to address the concerns to the Department prior to Department action.

12. Unexpended State Funds Maintained by Districts:

Cost-share funds issued to Districts that remain unobligated at the close of FY14 will remain in the District's account(s). FY15 cost-share distributions to a District shall be reduced by the amount of unobligated cost-share and the resulting balance shall become available during FY15 reallocation or through other addendum agreements. FY14 Technical Assistance shall not be subject to reversion or reallocation. However, it is inadvisable for any District to accumulate more than about six months of Technical Assistance funds in accordance with advice from District auditors. Public funds from local, state and federal sources are provided to Districts not for savings, but for performance of conservation. The Department will monitor the growth of unexpended funds through grant agreement required audit reports and report situations. The Department may reduce future funding to Districts that fail to act upon guidance and recommendations from auditors and the Department. Decisions and Department actions will be addressed on a case-by-case basis working with the affected District.

13. Criteria for Cost-share and Technical Assistance:

Funding allocated to Districts as cost-share and technical assistance is contingent upon appropriations by the General Assembly. Should funding availability fall short of appropriation projections during the course of FY15, every District will receive an equal percent reduction which will be calculated and deducted from each District's unobligated total approved cost-share and technical assistance funding specified within the Department/District Grant Agreement. When a reduction of funds is necessary, the Department will make reductions from available unobligated cost-share first and reduce technical assistance last. Should a reduction of funds occur, every District must return funding within 30 days of receiving notice of such reduction from the Department. Should all cost-share and technical assistance funding within a District be obligated and it becomes necessary to reduce such funds, then adjustments will be made to the next fiscal year's spending plan to honor existing commitments from the prior fiscal year first or during reallocation as determined by the Department. See **Attachment E** for fund source allocations for cost-share and **TABLE 9** working papers for fund source allocations for technical assistance.

In the event a new District is formed or an existing District alters its boundaries, the Board will examine the total financial resources under its control and its priorities for use of these funds and adhere to its Policy titled Financial Commitments For Establishment of a New Soil & Water Conservation District (SWCD/district), or Realignment of an Existing District on all funding decisions in this Policy. The newly created or altered District may be funded at a reduced level, or may be required to share funding in an arrangement determined by the Board until sufficient funding is made available to fulfill provisions of this Policy and priorities of the Board.

Expenditure of District funds, regardless of source, will be made without regard to any person's race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, handicap, or political affiliation.

All funds received by Districts are public funds and provisions of the Freedom of Information Act shall apply to financial records, unless otherwise specified within the Act. Each District shall safeguard, provide accountability, and expend funds only for approved purposes.

14. Electronic Copy:

An electronic copy of this policy guidance in PDF format is available on the Regulatory Town Hall under the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board at <http://townhall.virginia.gov/L/GDocs.cfm>.

15. Contact Information:

Please contact the Department of Conservation and Recreation’s Policy Office at regcord@dcr.virginia.gov or by calling 804-786-6124 with any questions regarding the application of this Policy.

16. Authorization

Upon the approval of this Policy, the Department shall, in accordance with its fiduciary powers and responsibilities, make and enter into any and all Grant Agreements and contracts, and take all actions necessary, to fully implement and administer this Policy.

17. Adoption, Amendments, and Repeal:

This document supersedes the Policy titled Policy and Procedures on Soil and Water Conservation District Cost-Share and Technical Assistance Funding Allocations (Fiscal Year 2014) adopted July 26, 2013 and will remain in effect until rescinded or superseded.



Herbert L. Dunford
Chair



Clyde E. Cristman
DCR Director

June 30, 2014
Date

Attachment A

Computer Model Estimates and Ranks Based on the 2014 305(b) Report Data of the Agricultural Pollutant Loads of Nitrogen (N), Phosphorus (P), and Sediment (S) in Each of the 1,247 6th-order Hydrologic Units (HU)

(kg/ha-yr – kilograms per hectare – year; mt/ha-yr – metric tons per hectare – year)

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha-yr)	Ag P (kg/ha-yr)	Ag S (mt/ha-yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
AS15	27.1220	6.0470	0.8130	1221	1221	1214	3656	H	1
AS10	23.8740	5.2490	0.7860	1219	1220	1209	3648	H	2
AS17	17.3720	3.6130	0.6370	1212	1213	1193	3618	H	3
AS19	17.4830	3.6430	0.6190	1213	1215	1188	3616	H	4
PS41	15.1260	2.8470	0.6620	1206	1203	1198	3607	H	5
CU60	14.1690	3.5600	0.5840	1201	1211	1178	3590	H	6
AS11	15.6570	3.3620	0.5600	1208	1210	1169	3587	H	7
CU59	15.1240	3.7660	0.5420	1205	1216	1165	3586	H	8
AS16	15.1620	3.2100	0.5510	1207	1207	1166	3580	H	9
CM32	10.1450	2.7290	0.5770	1188	1202	1173	3563	H	10
AS20	16.0030	3.2620	0.4730	1211	1208	1128	3547	H	11
PS24	12.1970	1.5550	0.7080	1199	1132	1203	3534	H	12
PS39	8.6600	1.9720	0.7020	1160	1168	1202	3530	H	13
JL39	9.2750	2.3710	0.5150	1173	1197	1154	3524	H	14
PS56	9.9330	1.5430	0.7520	1184	1131	1206	3521	H	15
AO18	15.9710	4.2160	0.4190	1210	1218	1092	3520	H	16
PS26	10.3940	1.6350	0.6100	1190	1140	1185	3515	H	17
CU57	9.4360	2.2520	0.4950	1179	1193	1140	3512	H	18
PS23	9.6410	1.5120	0.6510	1183	1128	1197	3508	H	19
JL36	8.6050	2.2090	0.5150	1158	1190	1153	3501	H	20
PS10	20.3310	1.7020	0.4860	1215	1147	1137	3499	H	21
PS15	9.3050	1.3120	0.9050	1174	1107	1218	3499	H	22
PS21	17.7460	1.2940	0.5950	1214	1105	1180	3499	H	23
PS87	21.2290	1.1900	0.6450	1217	1086	1195	3498	H	24
PL73	8.2110	2.0420	0.5950	1140	1174	1181	3495	H	25
AO21	14.9160	4.0350	0.4060	1204	1217	1073	3494	H	26
AS08	15.8440	3.5700	0.4060	1209	1212	1072	3493	H	27
CB01	8.4570	2.0820	0.5280	1151	1177	1161	3489	H	28
PS40	11.4130	2.3440	0.4180	1194	1196	1089	3479	H	29

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
AS07	20.6670	4.5300	0.3800	1216	1219	1040	3475	H	30
PS01	11.6750	1.3000	0.5660	1195	1106	1170	3471	H	31
RA20	11.9290	1.2110	0.5830	1197	1088	1177	3462	H	32
CL02	9.3820	2.2350	0.4090	1177	1192	1082	3451	H	33
PS37	8.5670	1.8120	0.5020	1156	1154	1141	3451	H	34
JL46	8.8570	2.2230	0.4170	1167	1191	1088	3446	H	35
JL33	8.1510	2.0680	0.4770	1138	1176	1131	3445	H	36
TP16	7.5730	1.2860	1.1540	1120	1103	1220	3443	H	37
CM26	6.2080	2.0460	0.7800	1059	1175	1208	3442	H	38
RA74	8.4740	2.1550	0.4280	1153	1183	1102	3438	H	39
PL72	7.5150	1.8680	0.5200	1118	1162	1157	3437	H	40
PS11	22.9810	1.8900	0.3890	1218	1164	1054	3436	H	41
PS07	8.5150	1.3430	0.5690	1154	1110	1171	3435	H	42
CU47	6.7830	2.0180	0.5250	1093	1172	1158	3423	H	43
PS04	7.5380	1.2630	0.6780	1119	1097	1199	3415	H	44
PS08	8.6080	1.2230	0.5390	1159	1092	1164	3415	H	45
CU50	8.7910	2.2070	0.3900	1166	1189	1057	3412	H	46
PS27	8.3040	1.4090	0.5100	1145	1115	1149	3409	H	47
CB46	14.6480	3.6230	0.3440	1203	1214	990	3407	H	48
CU67	8.2270	2.0860	0.4050	1143	1179	1069	3391	H	49
PS05	8.2110	1.2130	0.5110	1141	1089	1151	3381	H	50
CU69	8.9750	2.1810	0.3710	1168	1185	1027	3380	H	51
CU66	9.1440	2.2910	0.3600	1170	1195	1014	3379	H	52
JL42	8.5530	2.1900	0.3770	1155	1186	1038	3379	H	53
PL09	9.4910	0.8380	0.6000	1181	1012	1183	3376	H	54
CU43	6.7370	1.8280	0.4700	1090	1156	1127	3373	H	55
PS59	6.6510	1.2630	0.6350	1084	1096	1192	3372	H	56
PS35	9.9350	1.9840	0.3610	1185	1170	1016	3371	H	57
CU41	6.3820	1.7090	0.5050	1068	1148	1142	3358	H	58
PS61	6.6840	1.2150	0.5820	1087	1090	1175	3352	H	59
AO15	12.6180	3.3380	0.3120	1200	1209	942	3351	H	60
CM31	6.6180	1.8030	0.4560	1082	1153	1116	3351	H	61
RA33	6.9390	0.9630	0.7290	1097	1042	1204	3343	H	62
PS57	8.5700	1.0530	0.4590	1157	1058	1119	3334	H	63
CL01	11.1760	2.5610	0.3090	1193	1200	938	3331	H	64
NE56	9.2580	0.6860	0.6220	1172	969	1189	3330	H	65

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
PS42	9.4030	1.8340	0.3450	1178	1158	994	3330	H	66
PS58	6.9720	1.0270	0.5830	1099	1054	1176	3329	H	67
RA69	7.4050	1.8540	0.3900	1112	1160	1056	3328	H	68
PS86	10.1070	0.8020	0.4810	1187	1004	1134	3325	H	69
RL24	5.6810	1.1400	0.7980	1034	1079	1211	3324	H	70
NE36	8.3860	0.6660	0.8040	1148	963	1212	3323	H	71
RA37	8.2250	0.7700	0.6190	1142	993	1187	3322	H	72
CB45	12.1160	2.9600	0.2970	1198	1205	918	3321	H	73
CB04	7.6770	1.8780	0.3720	1124	1163	1030	3317	H	74
JL40	8.3200	2.1120	0.3400	1146	1181	986	3313	H	75
PS55	5.9490	1.0980	0.6490	1048	1069	1196	3313	H	76
CB11	6.6210	1.6720	0.4120	1083	1144	1084	3311	H	77
RA72	7.1170	1.6970	0.3930	1102	1146	1060	3308	H	78
PL71	7.2890	1.8280	0.3750	1108	1157	1036	3301	H	79
AS09	14.5580	3.1540	0.2850	1202	1206	891	3299	H	80
AO09	7.8750	2.0890	0.3440	1127	1180	989	3296	H	81
JL47	9.0170	2.2050	0.3070	1169	1188	935	3292	H	82
PS09	9.3430	1.4450	0.3470	1176	1119	997	3292	H	83
CU55	6.6530	1.5940	0.4060	1085	1135	1071	3291	H	84
PS19	6.6000	1.1070	0.4940	1080	1072	1139	3291	H	85
PU02	10.5120	0.5620	0.5550	1191	922	1167	3280	H	86
AO10	9.3400	2.4880	0.2900	1175	1199	904	3278	H	87
CU61	8.7420	2.1290	0.3060	1163	1182	933	3278	H	88
PU05	6.8450	0.7600	0.6380	1095	989	1194	3278	H	89
AS05	10.5140	2.4020	0.2830	1192	1198	885	3275	H	90
CB44	11.7370	2.8670	0.2760	1196	1204	870	3270	H	91
RA29	8.0690	0.7940	0.4840	1134	1000	1136	3270	H	92
PS25	8.4700	1.0600	0.3890	1152	1062	1053	3267	H	93
RA38	8.1410	0.9360	0.4130	1137	1036	1087	3260	H	94
RA26	8.0380	0.9250	0.4200	1132	1033	1094	3259	H	95
RA32	6.5410	0.8340	0.5700	1076	1011	1172	3259	H	96
JL15	5.3810	1.4770	0.4390	1022	1124	1111	3257	H	97
NE04	4.8250	1.0570	0.8090	983	1060	1213	3256	H	98
AO08	7.4800	1.9140	0.3300	1115	1166	973	3254	H	99
RA40	8.4500	0.7720	0.4300	1150	994	1105	3249	H	100
PL07	8.1950	0.6350	0.5280	1139	949	1160	3248	H	101

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
VAHU6	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ	Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
TP13	7.2140	0.6010	0.7760	1105	936	1207	3248	H	102
CL03	7.5000	1.7790	0.3310	1117	1152	975	3244	H	103
CB05	6.6960	1.5420	0.3700	1088	1129	1026	3243	H	104
PS33	6.3600	1.0610	0.4370	1067	1063	1109	3239	H	105
TP14	6.7600	0.5870	0.8960	1091	930	1217	3238	H	106
CU65	8.0700	1.9840	0.3020	1135	1169	926	3230	H	107
PS83	10.0790	0.8290	0.3740	1186	1008	1032	3226	H	108
CU68	7.2600	1.8200	0.3260	1107	1155	959	3221	H	109
CU49	7.1210	1.8390	0.3190	1103	1159	951	3213	H	110
PL69	4.4480	1.2930	0.5190	952	1104	1156	3212	H	111
AO11	10.2190	2.6720	0.2490	1189	1201	813	3203	H	112
RA15	5.3400	0.7290	0.6850	1019	983	1201	3203	H	113
RA54	6.0160	1.6050	0.3550	1052	1136	1009	3197	H	114
PS62	6.4120	1.2510	0.3740	1069	1094	1033	3196	H	115
RA62	7.0850	1.8640	0.3070	1101	1161	934	3196	H	116
RA30	7.2930	0.6650	0.4650	1109	961	1125	3195	H	117
PS06	5.0090	0.8910	0.5560	998	1024	1168	3190	H	118
TP15	5.6290	0.5750	0.8700	1032	926	1216	3174	H	119
RA39	8.2390	0.9280	0.3450	1144	1034	993	3171	H	120
NE48	7.1230	0.6070	0.4640	1104	939	1124	3167	H	121
TH22	5.1620	0.7180	0.5890	1006	979	1179	3164	H	122
RA36	7.6110	0.7040	0.4000	1122	975	1064	3161	H	123
RA58	6.3450	1.6080	0.3210	1066	1137	955	3158	H	124
RA68	5.7580	1.4160	0.3500	1039	1117	1001	3157	H	125
PL03	7.4270	0.5470	0.4690	1113	917	1126	3156	H	126
RA19	8.0010	0.6950	0.3840	1130	973	1047	3150	H	127
PL08	8.7220	0.6390	0.3750	1162	951	1034	3147	H	128
CU64	6.5180	1.6270	0.3040	1075	1139	930	3144	H	129
TP10	6.3260	0.4860	0.6840	1064	877	1200	3141	H	130
TH19	5.1020	0.7640	0.5080	1003	992	1145	3140	H	131
PL68	6.5490	1.6540	0.2990	1077	1141	920	3138	H	132
NE37	5.9140	0.4950	0.7950	1046	881	1210	3137	H	133
TP17	3.9210	0.8320	1.2360	904	1010	1221	3135	H	134
CB38	8.7000	2.2830	0.2340	1161	1194	777	3132	H	135
NE10	5.2980	0.5210	0.8470	1016	898	1215	3129	H	136
CU18	4.7710	1.1550	0.4010	978	1082	1067	3127	H	137

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
VAHU6	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ	Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
PS20	6.7280	1.1020	0.3280	1089	1071	963	3123	H	138
NE11	5.5320	0.5300	0.6320	1028	903	1191	3122	H	139
CB43	7.4530	1.9120	0.2600	1114	1165	840	3119	H	140
JL45	9.5680	2.1780	0.2260	1182	1184	751	3117	H	141
CM30	5.4650	1.4110	0.3300	1026	1116	972	3114	H	142
NE15	5.7790	0.5130	0.5990	1040	891	1182	3113	H	143
TH45	3.8970	0.7820	0.9280	899	995	1219	3113	H	144
RA55	5.8750	1.4640	0.3120	1043	1123	941	3107	H	145
JL37	4.8040	1.2660	0.3670	982	1098	1023	3103	H	146
RD01	5.1080	0.6070	0.5280	1004	938	1159	3101	H	147
PL15	6.8120	0.5560	0.4100	1094	921	1083	3098	H	148
JU73	5.3700	0.5420	0.5300	1021	914	1162	3097	H	149
RU22	4.7700	0.6790	0.5080	977	968	1144	3089	H	150
JL41	6.2950	1.5800	0.2830	1062	1133	884	3079	H	151
NE07	5.2500	0.4610	0.7320	1012	859	1205	3076	H	152
JL10	5.9550	1.4540	0.2900	1049	1122	903	3074	H	153
CB42	7.7300	1.9850	0.2340	1126	1171	776	3073	H	154
PS85	8.1230	0.6930	0.3270	1136	972	961	3069	H	155
CU38	4.5580	0.7270	0.4610	965	980	1122	3067	H	156
PL13	8.4450	0.6200	0.3300	1149	944	971	3064	H	157
AS18	8.0530	1.5880	0.2430	1133	1134	796	3063	H	158
AS02	9.4600	2.0850	0.2090	1180	1178	704	3062	H	159
PL11	8.7890	0.6160	0.3210	1165	943	954	3062	H	160
PL10	6.9650	0.6600	0.3530	1098	956	1005	3059	H	161
RA16	6.2810	0.6250	0.3840	1061	947	1046	3054	H	162
RA53	4.1570	1.0980	0.4000	921	1068	1065	3054	H	163
PL31	7.9770	0.5900	0.3450	1129	931	992	3052	H	164
TP12	4.8660	0.4940	0.6010	988	880	1184	3052	H	165
TC29	9.1540	0.4070	0.4090	1171	799	1080	3050	H	166
AO14	8.7500	2.1910	0.2040	1164	1187	692	3043	H	167
JU78	5.0940	0.6260	0.4190	1001	948	1091	3040	H	168
RA07	7.6090	0.5450	0.3530	1121	915	1004	3040	H	169
JU86	4.2260	0.6690	0.5090	927	964	1146	3037	H	170
PL70	7.9580	2.0280	0.2210	1128	1173	736	3037	H	171
PS60	3.5010	0.9250	0.5110	848	1032	1150	3030	H	172
RA71	4.3840	0.9690	0.3750	944	1043	1035	3022	H	173

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
VAHU6	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ	Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
PS84	6.3030	0.6610	0.3460	1063	957	996	3016	H	174
RA70	4.4870	0.9690	0.3600	957	1044	1013	3014	H	175
PL12	5.3830	0.5190	0.4130	1023	897	1086	3006	H	176
TH43	6.1060	0.4380	0.4480	1054	835	1113	3002	H	177
PS67	6.1240	0.7440	0.3230	1057	986	957	3000	H	178
JL11	5.0070	1.2590	0.2910	997	1095	905	2997	H	179
RU24	4.4070	0.6140	0.4350	949	941	1107	2997	H	180
JL14	6.1230	1.5430	0.2460	1056	1130	805	2991	H	181
RA18	8.3780	0.6980	0.2760	1147	974	869	2990	H	182
CU58	5.4850	1.3680	0.2640	1027	1111	850	2988	H	183
RA73	4.5650	1.1300	0.3130	966	1077	945	2988	H	184
JL49	7.6170	1.7300	0.2120	1123	1150	711	2984	H	185
CU62	6.9970	1.7110	0.2200	1100	1149	732	2981	H	186
RA21	6.4490	0.8080	0.2880	1073	1005	901	2979	H	187
RA04	4.7320	0.5750	0.4070	975	925	1077	2977	H	188
PL04	6.4480	0.4850	0.3670	1071	876	1022	2969	H	189
RA27	5.2330	0.7090	0.3330	1010	977	978	2965	H	190
TH44	3.5570	0.5540	0.6310	855	919	1190	2964	H	191
RA56	5.2740	1.3820	0.2550	1014	1113	834	2961	H	192
RU53	6.2630	0.4300	0.4060	1060	827	1070	2957	H	193
CB39	7.3760	1.9380	0.1990	1111	1167	675	2953	H	194
PS63	4.9300	0.7640	0.3290	994	991	968	2953	H	195
CM25	4.0220	0.6460	0.4070	914	952	1078	2944	H	196
CU63	6.0800	1.4520	0.2320	1053	1120	769	2942	H	197
JL13	5.3220	1.2660	0.2520	1018	1099	822	2939	H	198
CU70	5.9080	1.4090	0.2340	1045	1114	775	2934	H	199
CL05	6.3280	1.5030	0.2240	1065	1126	742	2933	H	200
PL02	5.6910	0.5400	0.3400	1035	913	985	2933	H	201
CU48	4.7800	1.2780	0.2640	980	1100	849	2929	H	202
JL25	4.4970	1.1000	0.2870	959	1070	897	2926	H	203
CU42	4.3880	1.1170	0.2880	947	1076	902	2925	H	204
CU51	6.6110	1.6170	0.2090	1081	1138	703	2922	H	205
RA28	4.0110	0.5370	0.4210	912	907	1096	2915	H	206
CU24	4.3180	1.0280	0.3010	936	1055	921	2912	H	207
JL06	4.8810	1.2160	0.2530	992	1091	827	2910	H	208
YA03	4.0350	0.4630	0.4810	915	862	1133	2910	H	209

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
TC06	6.5700	0.3490	0.4560	1078	715	1115	2908	H	210
CU56	5.9470	1.4530	0.2230	1047	1121	739	2907	H	211
NE08	3.7560	0.4390	0.6170	884	837	1186	2907	H	212
CB41	6.7650	1.7790	0.1940	1092	1151	662	2905	H	213
TH24	6.5820	0.4030	0.3720	1079	795	1029	2903	H	214
RD19	3.2150	0.5700	0.5310	813	924	1163	2900	H	215
JL32	3.8930	1.0130	0.3190	898	1051	950	2899	H	216
JL51	7.6990	1.6690	0.1860	1125	1143	630	2898	H	217
CB14	4.1600	1.0010	0.3020	922	1049	925	2896	H	218
TH23	3.2100	0.8430	0.4010	812	1014	1066	2892	H	219
CB02	4.3180	0.9940	0.2930	935	1047	909	2891	H	220
CM27	4.8740	1.0590	0.2560	990	1061	836	2887	H	221
TC01	4.5220	0.3840	0.5100	961	773	1147	2881	H	222
PL05	6.4540	0.4700	0.3100	1074	866	939	2879	H	223
PU19	7.3170	0.6660	0.2460	1110	962	804	2876	H	224
RA66	5.6180	1.4280	0.2190	1030	1118	728	2876	H	225
JU59	3.2420	0.5380	0.5100	816	910	1148	2874	H	226
NE55	3.8480	0.4910	0.4270	894	879	1101	2874	H	227
CM28	3.9040	0.9100	0.3140	901	1026	946	2873	H	228
AS13	5.8950	1.2050	0.2240	1044	1087	741	2872	H	229
RU30	4.4890	0.5920	0.3370	958	932	981	2871	H	230
NE49	5.3580	0.4440	0.3490	1020	842	1000	2862	H	231
YO62	4.2290	1.0070	0.2830	929	1050	882	2861	H	232
TC16	4.6960	0.3790	0.4600	972	768	1120	2860	H	233
RA59	4.1920	1.0230	0.2830	923	1053	883	2859	H	234
YO31	6.4360	1.5120	0.1940	1070	1127	661	2858	H	235
JM24	5.2490	0.4190	0.3730	1011	813	1031	2855	H	236
RA67	4.7710	1.1450	0.2430	979	1080	795	2854	H	237
PS69	3.2220	0.5950	0.4290	815	933	1104	2852	H	238
CB36	6.4490	1.6830	0.1860	1072	1145	631	2848	H	239
TC33	2.4830	0.8900	0.5180	659	1023	1155	2837	H	240
CU52	4.6810	1.1750	0.2350	971	1085	779	2835	H	241
JU74	4.3860	0.4090	0.4130	945	805	1085	2835	H	242
PU18	6.6750	0.6120	0.2480	1086	940	809	2835	H	243
TC08	4.9760	0.3880	0.3910	995	778	1058	2831	H	244
CU34	3.9470	0.9800	0.2790	907	1045	877	2829	H	245

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
YO55	4.7230	1.1500	0.2340	974	1081	774	2829	H	246
TC11	4.3910	0.3680	0.4800	948	748	1132	2828	H	247
RA34	5.3020	0.5540	0.2840	1017	920	888	2825	M	248
TP18	3.5510	0.4350	0.4910	854	831	1138	2823	M	249
NE58	3.8290	0.4080	0.4750	891	801	1130	2822	M	250
PL37	7.2370	0.5820	0.2390	1106	928	787	2821	M	251
JR07	3.6630	0.4350	0.4610	867	832	1121	2820	M	252
RU23	3.7140	0.5170	0.3850	877	894	1049	2820	M	253
RU33	3.7360	0.5060	0.3870	880	886	1051	2817	M	254
PS16	6.0050	0.7850	0.2310	1051	997	767	2815	M	255
TH15	5.6920	0.4220	0.3270	1036	818	960	2814	M	256
PL36	6.8630	0.5390	0.2460	1096	912	803	2811	M	257
NE33	3.8470	0.3900	0.4830	892	782	1135	2809	M	258
PL67	3.9840	1.0390	0.2610	909	1057	842	2808	M	259
NE35	3.4050	0.4520	0.4580	840	849	1118	2807	M	260
AS14	5.8020	1.1380	0.2020	1041	1078	682	2801	M	261
NE13	5.1840	0.3270	0.4400	1009	679	1112	2800	M	262
RA06	4.3610	0.5170	0.3280	941	895	962	2798	M	263
RA57	4.1260	1.0220	0.2530	920	1052	826	2798	M	264
TH18	5.5530	0.4080	0.3290	1029	802	966	2797	M	265
CB31	6.1270	1.6610	0.1770	1058	1142	596	2796	M	266
NE32	4.8270	0.3940	0.3700	984	786	1025	2795	M	267
RD53	3.5860	0.4680	0.3980	858	863	1062	2783	M	268
JU76	3.9220	0.4330	0.3830	905	829	1045	2779	M	269
CU25	3.9210	0.9150	0.2630	903	1028	846	2777	M	270
NE52	3.2900	0.4590	0.4210	823	856	1095	2774	M	271
PL14	4.0990	0.4790	0.3350	918	870	979	2767	M	272
YO16	4.3860	0.5370	0.2940	946	908	913	2767	M	273
RL02	2.8890	0.4830	0.5070	748	873	1143	2764	M	274
YO29	4.7420	1.0710	0.2150	976	1065	720	2761	M	275
TC30	3.2690	0.4290	0.4520	821	825	1114	2760	M	276
TC27	3.4280	0.4540	0.3990	843	852	1063	2758	M	277
NE54	3.5320	0.5070	0.3610	851	887	1015	2753	M	278
PL38	5.4240	0.6910	0.2280	1024	971	758	2753	M	279
AO04	4.8410	1.3270	0.1920	987	1109	656	2752	M	280
PL35	4.3260	0.4340	0.3400	937	830	984	2751	M	281

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
RA35	3.6670	0.4840	0.3520	868	874	1003	2745	M	282
RA24	3.6920	0.5080	0.3380	873	888	982	2743	M	283
RU35	4.0070	0.5360	0.3030	911	905	927	2743	M	284
TC13	4.4690	0.3300	0.4230	955	688	1099	2742	M	285
CM29	5.1020	1.3160	0.1840	1002	1108	626	2736	M	286
NE17	3.8100	0.3680	0.4240	888	747	1100	2735	M	287
JL44	6.1140	1.3740	0.1700	1055	1112	566	2733	M	288
RU20	3.2980	0.4690	0.3820	824	864	1042	2730	M	289
TP11	2.9960	0.3950	0.5810	768	787	1174	2729	M	290
JM16	4.3660	0.4850	0.2930	942	875	908	2725	M	291
NE53	3.0960	0.4440	0.4190	792	841	1090	2723	M	292
PL33	5.2810	0.4820	0.2560	1015	872	835	2722	M	293
JU55	3.1200	0.4500	0.4090	794	846	1081	2721	M	294
JU80	4.2350	0.4420	0.3160	930	839	948	2717	M	295
TH13	8.0180	0.3310	0.2850	1131	691	890	2712	M	296
PL42	5.9940	0.5170	0.2300	1050	896	764	2710	M	297
RA17	7.4950	0.6240	0.1890	1116	945	642	2703	M	298
CB30	4.8760	1.2830	0.1800	991	1101	610	2702	M	299
TC25	3.1090	0.4270	0.4080	793	824	1079	2696	M	300
PS82	4.1000	0.5080	0.2840	919	889	887	2695	M	301
CU46	5.0430	1.2440	0.1780	999	1093	602	2694	M	302
TH20	4.6960	0.3670	0.3320	973	745	976	2694	M	303
RU68	3.9370	0.4560	0.3040	906	855	929	2690	M	304
NE20	3.3420	0.4060	0.3930	831	798	1059	2688	M	305
CU28	3.8630	0.8850	0.2310	895	1022	768	2685	M	306
CU39	3.7440	0.8620	0.2380	881	1018	785	2684	M	307
TH07	5.4600	0.3480	0.3170	1025	710	949	2684	M	308
YO09	3.7190	0.5150	0.2940	879	892	912	2683	M	309
NE76	25.1270	0.4240	0.1880	1220	821	640	2681	M	310
YO61	4.0130	0.9970	0.2130	913	1048	714	2675	M	311
YO17	3.6590	0.4730	0.3100	866	868	940	2674	M	312
RU11	2.9770	0.4080	0.4380	760	800	1110	2670	M	313
RU57	3.3220	0.4210	0.3690	828	815	1024	2667	M	314
RU46	3.0790	0.4100	0.4050	789	807	1068	2664	M	315
CB03	3.6990	0.9310	0.2270	874	1035	754	2663	M	316
RA63	5.6190	1.1550	0.1650	1031	1083	544	2658	M	317

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
CU35	3.7620	0.8810	0.2260	885	1021	750	2656	M	318
PS64	4.2640	0.6160	0.2350	931	942	778	2651	M	319
RD34	3.5290	0.4120	0.3440	850	810	988	2648	M	320
YO02	4.2270	0.5280	0.2500	928	902	816	2646	M	321
RD68	3.6680	0.4260	0.3210	869	823	952	2644	M	322
RD75	3.6480	0.4510	0.3040	865	848	928	2641	M	323
YO63	3.7550	0.9500	0.2130	883	1040	713	2636	M	324
PL01	3.6450	0.4090	0.3290	864	804	967	2635	M	325
YO57	3.9180	0.9490	0.2040	902	1039	691	2632	M	326
CB32	5.8070	1.4840	0.1420	1042	1125	461	2628	M	327
RU48	2.8390	0.3990	0.4200	741	792	1093	2626	M	328
RU21	2.9710	0.4720	0.3480	759	867	998	2624	M	329
RD54	3.6240	0.4550	0.2920	863	853	906	2622	M	330
TH14	5.7350	0.3710	0.2540	1038	755	829	2622	M	331
PS68	3.8110	0.4870	0.2660	889	878	854	2621	M	332
JL30	2.9610	0.7920	0.2730	756	999	864	2619	M	333
YO54	3.8840	0.9200	0.2050	897	1029	693	2619	M	334
PS75	5.6490	0.4700	0.2150	1033	865	718	2616	M	335
JM46	3.3520	0.3760	0.3660	833	762	1020	2615	M	336
YO60	3.8980	0.9900	0.1970	900	1046	669	2615	M	337
AO13	4.8820	1.2840	0.1550	993	1102	513	2608	M	338
TC28	4.6590	0.3110	0.3450	970	647	991	2608	M	339
TC09	4.5510	0.3030	0.3660	964	624	1019	2607	M	340
NE51	2.8880	0.4360	0.3650	747	834	1018	2599	M	341
RA61	4.4180	1.0540	0.1750	950	1059	588	2597	M	342
RA10	3.4160	0.3960	0.3290	842	789	965	2596	M	343
RU62	3.8190	0.4460	0.2720	890	844	861	2595	M	344
CB06	4.6010	1.1120	0.1670	968	1074	550	2592	M	345
NE61	4.8300	0.3860	0.2550	985	774	833	2592	M	346
NE39	2.8460	0.3540	0.4640	743	722	1123	2588	M	347
RA13	5.6940	0.2640	0.3590	1037	540	1011	2588	M	348
YO66	3.4610	0.8530	0.2180	845	1017	726	2588	M	349
CU53	4.3590	1.0720	0.1720	940	1066	577	2583	M	350
JM44	4.3580	0.4520	0.2430	939	850	794	2583	M	351
CM21	4.2040	0.9540	0.1810	926	1041	614	2581	M	352
RD41	2.6420	0.4360	0.3870	698	833	1050	2581	M	353

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
VAHU6	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ	Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
RA01	3.0640	0.3700	0.3810	787	750	1041	2578	M	354
PL66	3.0000	0.7280	0.2530	769	981	825	2575	M	355
CU54	4.3420	1.0650	0.1710	938	1064	570	2572	M	356
RD56	3.7140	0.4320	0.2730	876	828	863	2567	M	357
TC12	4.5460	0.2960	0.3460	963	608	995	2566	M	358
RD46	3.5440	0.4210	0.2860	853	816	895	2564	M	359
RU32	3.5670	0.4530	0.2650	857	851	851	2559	M	360
TH12	5.1660	0.3130	0.2880	1007	651	899	2557	M	361
RU36	3.2520	0.4120	0.3020	817	809	924	2550	M	362
PS70	2.8250	0.4610	0.3210	736	858	953	2547	M	363
JL27	2.5510	0.5640	0.3130	678	923	944	2545	M	364
RD07	3.6170	0.3930	0.2880	861	784	900	2545	M	365
TH33	5.1760	0.2900	0.3080	1008	601	936	2545	M	366
NE16	2.5940	0.3560	0.4740	689	726	1129	2544	M	367
CB10	3.4940	0.8460	0.2010	847	1015	680	2542	M	368
RD71	2.4180	0.4040	0.4220	645	796	1098	2539	M	369
NE82	2.7530	0.3870	0.3790	717	775	1039	2531	M	370
PS43	3.6750	0.7290	0.2010	870	982	679	2531	M	371
YO37	3.2020	0.8300	0.2120	811	1009	710	2530	M	372
CU33	3.7480	0.9410	0.1800	882	1038	609	2529	M	373
RA64	4.3100	1.0370	0.1630	934	1056	534	2524	M	374
CB08	3.9990	0.9390	0.1720	910	1037	576	2523	M	375
RU77	3.5860	0.4130	0.2660	859	811	853	2523	M	376
CU11	3.3670	0.4810	0.2490	838	871	812	2521	M	377
NE28	4.7860	0.3700	0.2400	981	751	789	2521	M	378
JR13	2.8980	0.3560	0.3830	749	727	1044	2520	M	379
TH27	2.6450	0.3550	0.4220	699	724	1097	2520	M	380
CM24	3.3040	0.5050	0.2480	826	885	808	2519	M	381
JL07	3.7910	0.9140	0.1780	887	1027	601	2515	M	382
RU29	3.2580	0.4200	0.2830	819	814	881	2514	M	383
NE14	2.6560	0.3440	0.4330	701	706	1106	2513	M	384
PS22	2.7850	0.5790	0.2690	724	927	859	2510	M	385
TH42	4.4840	0.2810	0.3330	956	576	977	2509	M	386
RD55	3.3350	0.3920	0.2860	830	783	894	2507	M	387
JA04	3.3590	0.3950	0.2780	836	788	875	2499	M	388
PS02	3.1540	0.5840	0.2310	804	929	766	2499	M	389

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
PS44	3.2180	0.7070	0.2120	814	976	709	2499	M	390
RL01	2.7540	0.3800	0.3570	718	770	1010	2498	M	391
NE65	4.1950	0.2580	0.3900	924	516	1055	2495	M	392
TH16	4.5420	0.3220	0.2730	962	670	862	2494	M	393
JL08	3.2530	0.7840	0.1980	818	996	672	2486	M	394
JU84	2.5360	0.3770	0.3850	673	764	1048	2485	M	395
YO15	3.4600	0.4410	0.2460	844	838	802	2484	M	396
NE40	3.0430	0.3890	0.2970	782	779	917	2478	M	397
RU47	2.9030	0.3710	0.3310	750	753	974	2477	M	398
CU17	3.4920	0.5380	0.2150	846	911	719	2476	M	399
PU16	5.0600	0.5220	0.1720	1000	900	575	2475	M	400
CU29	3.6080	0.8670	0.1770	860	1019	595	2474	M	401
JM82	3.1610	0.4500	0.2520	806	847	821	2474	M	402
JR02	3.0640	0.3410	0.3420	786	700	987	2473	M	403
NE12	2.4830	0.3440	0.4370	658	705	1108	2471	M	404
PS28	4.8360	0.7500	0.1500	986	987	495	2468	M	405
TC34	2.1670	0.3590	0.5130	580	732	1152	2464	M	406
PL39	4.4680	0.5160	0.1810	954	893	612	2459	M	407
RD59	3.3310	0.3900	0.2630	829	781	845	2455	M	408
RA60	3.3560	0.8210	0.1810	834	1007	613	2454	M	409
YO32	3.1340	0.7560	0.1960	798	988	665	2451	M	410
JU72	2.2420	0.3840	0.4070	603	772	1075	2450	M	411
JU85	2.5080	0.3770	0.3670	665	763	1021	2449	M	412
YO01	3.8470	0.4560	0.2080	893	854	702	2449	M	413
YA01	1.7450	0.5350	0.4070	468	904	1076	2448	M	414
TH41	2.5810	0.3540	0.3830	682	721	1043	2446	M	415
RD49	3.1380	0.3830	0.2780	800	771	874	2445	M	416
YA04	2.3470	0.3490	0.4290	628	711	1103	2442	M	417
JL05	3.5660	0.8460	0.1690	856	1016	561	2433	M	418
JR06	2.9360	0.3270	0.3510	754	677	1002	2433	M	419
TC07	4.4180	0.2360	0.3490	951	474	999	2424	M	420
RU25	2.6830	0.3800	0.3160	707	769	947	2423	M	421
CM20	3.0200	0.6630	0.2030	773	960	687	2420	M	422
PL17	4.2010	0.4740	0.1840	925	869	625	2419	M	423
RL03	2.7090	0.3590	0.3300	712	733	970	2415	M	424
YO65	3.1230	0.7620	0.1850	796	990	629	2415	M	425

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
JA26	3.1630	0.5110	0.2140	807	890	716	2413	M	426
CB15	4.4490	1.0750	0.1240	953	1067	392	2412	M	427
NE79	2.6770	0.3210	0.3760	705	669	1037	2411	M	428
NE50	2.6910	0.3780	0.3060	709	765	932	2406	M	429
JM49	2.9690	0.3550	0.3020	757	725	923	2405	M	430
AO02	3.0080	0.8920	0.1800	771	1025	608	2404	M	431
PS79	5.2670	0.4290	0.1690	1013	826	559	2398	M	432
RA14	3.0260	0.3250	0.3130	776	675	943	2394	M	433
JL09	3.6760	0.8390	0.1530	871	1013	509	2393	M	434
CB35	4.5150	1.1740	0.1130	960	1084	347	2391	M	435
RU31	3.1880	0.3890	0.2460	810	780	801	2391	M	436
PS03	2.9210	0.5370	0.2190	753	906	727	2386	M	437
RU42	4.8670	0.3170	0.2200	989	662	731	2382	M	438
RD02	2.6640	0.3490	0.3290	703	713	964	2380	M	439
JM23	2.4870	0.3430	0.3550	661	703	1008	2372	M	440
RU93	2.9770	0.4010	0.2510	761	793	818	2372	M	441
CU30	4.0710	0.9200	0.1320	917	1030	424	2371	M	442
CU32	3.9510	0.9230	0.1340	908	1031	432	2371	M	443
RD57	3.1200	0.3750	0.2500	795	759	815	2369	M	444
AS01	5.1200	1.1160	0.0920	1005	1075	286	2366	M	445
CU36	3.6210	0.8700	0.1480	862	1020	484	2366	M	446
RD11	2.6830	0.3080	0.3630	706	638	1017	2361	M	447
JU42	4.5990	0.2500	0.2860	967	499	892	2358	M	448
RD52	3.0630	0.3570	0.2570	785	728	838	2351	M	449
JR10	3.5370	0.3970	0.2110	852	790	707	2349	M	450
JU53	2.8140	0.3660	0.2780	732	743	873	2348	M	451
NE46	3.4100	0.3620	0.2300	841	740	763	2344	M	452
YO10	3.1800	0.4230	0.2140	809	820	715	2344	M	453
CL04	3.1610	0.8000	0.1640	805	1002	536	2343	M	454
RU92	3.2990	0.4030	0.2160	825	794	724	2343	M	455
JR11	2.7930	0.3280	0.3050	727	680	931	2338	M	456
CB19	4.6170	1.1080	0.0940	969	1073	293	2335	M	457
RD04	2.3400	0.3420	0.3550	625	702	1007	2334	M	458
TP06	2.4540	0.3110	0.3720	652	645	1028	2325	M	459
JR05	2.8450	0.3300	0.2850	742	686	889	2317	M	460
NE19	2.3680	0.3070	0.3880	632	632	1052	2316	M	461

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
RD03	2.3820	0.3200	0.3540	638	665	1006	2309	M	462
RA48	2.5620	0.3600	0.2840	679	736	886	2301	M	463
CB12	3.3620	0.7990	0.1380	837	1001	449	2287	M	464
CB13	2.6600	0.6380	0.1870	702	950	634	2286	M	465
PL06	2.7630	0.3320	0.2780	722	692	872	2286	M	466
JM26	2.8280	0.3450	0.2610	737	707	841	2285	M	467
RU26	2.2010	0.3880	0.2990	589	777	919	2285	M	468
TH02	3.7160	0.3150	0.2270	878	655	752	2285	M	469
TH08	2.9790	0.3460	0.2500	763	708	814	2285	M	470
RU76	3.1790	0.3510	0.2280	808	717	757	2282	M	471
TH17	2.5000	0.3500	0.2870	664	716	896	2276	M	472
RA65	3.1450	0.7870	0.1450	802	998	474	2274	M	473
RA05	2.7920	0.3260	0.2760	726	676	868	2270	M	474
TH26	2.5770	0.3050	0.3250	681	627	958	2266	M	475
JU75	2.3540	0.3490	0.3020	630	712	922	2264	M	476
JL29	3.4050	0.8160	0.1310	839	1006	417	2262	M	477
RD35	2.8020	0.3250	0.2710	728	673	860	2261	M	478
TP09	1.9270	0.3040	0.4570	518	625	1117	2260	M	479
YO64	2.9780	0.7180	0.1560	762	978	516	2256	M	480
RD50	3.2630	0.3680	0.2030	820	746	686	2252	M	481
YO27	3.0820	0.6490	0.1530	790	953	508	2251	M	482
NE09	2.1180	0.2950	0.4070	566	607	1074	2247	M	483
RA52	2.5100	0.5480	0.1950	666	918	663	2247	M	484
YO58	2.9700	0.7360	0.1510	758	984	502	2244	M	485
RD70	2.6540	0.3620	0.2440	700	739	799	2238	M	486
RU71	2.7040	0.3170	0.2740	711	661	865	2237	M	487
PS81	3.6760	0.3510	0.1900	872	718	646	2236	M	488
YO11	3.1520	0.4250	0.1790	803	822	604	2229	M	489
RU70	3.3420	0.3590	0.1930	832	735	659	2226	M	490
TH21	3.8720	0.2540	0.2520	896	509	820	2225	M	491
NE30	3.3200	0.3160	0.2240	827	657	740	2224	M	492
RA25	3.0320	0.3790	0.2010	778	766	678	2222	M	493
YO18	2.4050	0.3170	0.2960	643	660	915	2218	M	494
RU66	2.7430	0.3150	0.2630	716	654	844	2214	M	495
YO35	2.6360	0.6620	0.1690	696	958	560	2214	M	496
PL59	2.6730	0.2910	0.2930	704	602	907	2213	M	497

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
AS12	3.7640	0.8010	0.1050	886	1003	322	2211	M	498
RU67	2.9820	0.3300	0.2270	764	687	753	2204	M	499
RU60	3.0560	0.3360	0.2160	784	696	723	2203	M	500
JL04	2.9390	0.7400	0.1410	755	985	459	2199	M	501
JR08	2.5190	0.2970	0.2960	668	611	914	2193	M	502
RU74	2.8200	0.3200	0.2410	735	666	792	2193	M	503
RA41	3.0370	0.3750	0.1910	781	758	651	2190	M	504
RD43	2.5930	0.3290	0.2510	688	682	817	2187	M	505
RU65	3.5010	0.3790	0.1710	849	767	569	2185	M	506
CU31	2.8290	0.6510	0.1490	739	954	491	2184	M	507
JM62	2.0950	0.3420	0.2940	562	701	911	2174	M	508
PS31	3.7060	0.6770	0.1090	875	967	332	2174	M	509
RD74	2.3810	0.3230	0.2690	637	672	858	2167	M	510
NE57	2.8510	0.3010	0.2460	744	620	800	2164	M	511
CB09	2.8540	0.6740	0.1390	745	966	452	2163	M	512
CM03	3.0200	0.3650	0.1900	772	742	647	2161	M	513
NE31	4.3700	0.3000	0.1780	943	619	599	2161	M	514
CU21	2.0860	0.3750	0.2620	557	756	843	2156	M	515
JR17	2.8030	0.3100	0.2380	729	642	784	2155	M	516
PS36	3.1390	0.6020	0.1310	801	937	416	2154	M	517
RD08	2.5490	0.2940	0.2770	677	605	871	2153	M	518
NE66	4.2750	0.2590	0.2080	932	519	699	2150	M	519
RU91	3.0890	0.3520	0.1880	791	720	638	2149	M	520
CM18	2.7600	0.3940	0.1880	721	785	639	2145	M	521
JL22	2.6850	0.6620	0.1460	708	959	478	2145	M	522
RU69	2.9140	0.3310	0.2080	751	689	701	2141	M	523
CU40	2.6120	0.6250	0.1510	692	946	501	2139	M	524
JA01	3.0350	0.3490	0.1900	780	714	645	2139	M	525
NE64	4.2820	0.2190	0.2340	933	433	772	2138	M	526
JM48	2.9930	0.3200	0.2080	767	667	700	2134	M	527
JU58	2.0790	0.3090	0.3080	556	640	937	2133	M	528
YO14	3.0240	0.3590	0.1840	775	734	624	2133	M	529
NE21	2.4690	0.3300	0.2400	656	685	788	2129	M	530
NE47	2.6050	0.3110	0.2410	691	646	791	2128	M	531
JR18	3.0330	0.3200	0.1990	779	668	674	2121	M	532
TH40	1.9290	0.2860	0.3600	520	587	1012	2119	M	533

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
VAHU6	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ	Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
PL65	2.1540	0.5280	0.1880	575	901	641	2117	M	534
RD48	2.7590	0.3180	0.2210	720	663	734	2117	M	535
YO45	2.2980	0.4470	0.1910	612	845	652	2109	M	536
JA27	2.8290	0.4120	0.1660	740	808	546	2094	M	537
JM78	2.4650	0.3160	0.2360	655	656	781	2092	M	538
RD44	2.8280	0.3290	0.1970	738	683	668	2089	M	539
NE06	2.0930	0.2650	0.3370	560	542	980	2082	M	540
JL12	2.6970	0.6880	0.1260	710	970	401	2081	M	541
TC32	1.9280	0.2950	0.3220	519	606	956	2081	M	542
RU88	3.0280	0.3270	0.1840	777	678	623	2078	M	543
JM67	2.8140	0.4390	0.1520	731	836	506	2073	M	544
RU37	2.5240	0.2930	0.2440	669	604	798	2071	M	545
TC20	1.6780	0.3170	0.3300	443	658	969	2070	M	546
BS32	1.3510	0.3150	0.3970	356	652	1061	2069	M	547
TH38	2.1560	0.2840	0.2940	576	580	910	2066	M	548
YO12	2.7910	0.3430	0.1880	725	704	637	2066	M	549
RD45	2.5880	0.3050	0.2260	686	628	749	2063	M	550
RU41	3.3570	0.3600	0.1490	835	737	489	2061	M	551
YO51	2.3740	0.4960	0.1650	633	882	543	2058	M	552
JM02	3.2810	0.3710	0.1470	822	754	481	2057	M	553
RU79	2.5240	0.2880	0.2410	670	593	790	2053	M	554
RD36	2.5920	0.2980	0.2260	687	614	747	2048	M	555
JU01	2.5320	0.3030	0.2260	671	622	748	2041	M	556
NE26	2.9860	0.3340	0.1740	765	693	582	2040	M	557
RD69	2.2610	0.3170	0.2340	607	659	773	2039	M	558
RU54	4.0490	0.3570	0.1240	916	729	391	2036	M	559
JM18	3.1360	0.3280	0.1680	799	681	555	2035	M	560
NE25	3.1270	0.2880	0.1900	797	594	644	2035	M	561
RD73	2.2060	0.3130	0.2430	591	650	793	2034	M	562
YO52	2.4230	0.5470	0.1430	646	916	468	2030	M	563
RD77	2.2800	0.2820	0.2580	611	578	839	2028	M	564
YO03	2.5440	0.3350	0.1930	676	694	658	2028	M	565
RA08	2.4000	0.2740	0.2530	641	561	823	2025	M	566
YO68	2.4840	0.5970	0.1290	660	935	413	2008	M	567
RD37	2.4250	0.2980	0.2260	647	613	746	2006	M	568
TC22	2.0170	0.2770	0.2860	539	569	893	2001	M	569

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
NE43	2.2410	0.2760	0.2550	602	566	831	1999	M	570
RU34	2.5830	0.2850	0.2180	684	584	725	1993	M	571
JA24	2.8200	0.4600	0.1260	733	857	400	1990	M	572
JL48	3.0720	0.6720	0.0740	788	965	231	1984	M	573
JA33	2.8740	0.4040	0.1360	746	797	440	1983	M	574
RU89	2.0540	0.2900	0.2550	551	598	832	1981	M	575
RU52	3.0060	0.3310	0.1570	770	690	520	1980	M	576
YO36	2.5980	0.5960	0.1140	690	934	350	1974	M	577
RU19	1.9360	0.2880	0.2690	524	591	857	1972	M	578
NE03	1.8610	0.2360	0.3390	497	472	983	1952	M	579
JR01	2.4930	0.2590	0.2330	663	518	770	1951	M	580
PS50	1.5310	0.4090	0.2210	407	803	735	1945	M	581
NE22	2.4270	0.2890	0.2060	648	597	696	1941	M	582
RD58	2.6180	0.2980	0.1870	693	615	633	1941	M	583
TC02	2.7340	0.2130	0.2490	715	416	810	1941	M	584
RU87	2.9910	0.3250	0.1510	766	674	500	1940	M	585
TH31	2.1770	0.2600	0.2550	584	524	830	1938	M	586
CU22	2.3810	0.3690	0.1650	636	749	542	1927	M	587
RU18	2.0630	0.2740	0.2490	553	560	811	1924	M	588
RA51	2.3800	0.4440	0.1380	635	840	448	1923	M	589
RU78	2.5840	0.2820	0.1920	685	579	655	1919	M	590
JA38	2.2260	0.3390	0.1830	600	699	619	1918	M	591
RD62	2.4730	0.2720	0.2100	657	554	705	1916	M	592
RD66	2.5140	0.2780	0.2000	667	570	676	1913	M	593
PS74	2.7570	0.3040	0.1700	719	626	565	1910	M	594
RU59	2.3450	0.2980	0.1970	627	612	667	1906	M	595
RD63	2.8070	0.3000	0.1690	730	618	557	1905	M	596
RL13	2.5400	0.3030	0.1800	675	623	606	1904	M	597
CU27	2.2690	0.3750	0.1630	610	757	533	1900	M	598
TH39	1.8860	0.2560	0.2820	506	514	880	1900	M	599
NE38	2.1640	0.2630	0.2390	579	534	786	1899	M	600
PU03	2.3770	0.3230	0.1770	634	671	594	1899	M	601
JM29	2.2500	0.2510	0.2370	605	502	782	1889	M	602
CU37	2.2080	0.3300	0.1800	593	684	607	1884	M	603
JM27	2.1740	0.2730	0.2260	582	556	745	1883	M	604
RD21	1.7690	0.2690	0.2690	478	548	856	1882	M	605

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
RA43	1.7850	0.2880	0.2480	481	590	807	1878	M	606
JL20	2.3040	0.5380	0.1140	614	909	349	1872	M	607
AS04	3.0460	0.6550	0.0430	783	955	133	1871	M	608
NE23	2.1810	0.2700	0.2210	585	551	733	1869	M	609
NE63	1.8360	0.2280	0.2970	493	459	916	1868	M	610
RD65	2.3440	0.2650	0.2070	626	545	697	1868	M	611
RU83	2.7650	0.3050	0.1560	723	630	515	1868	M	612
RD72	2.4060	0.3020	0.1780	644	621	600	1865	M	613
RU03	1.6810	0.2860	0.2530	445	585	824	1854	M	614
JM47	2.2580	0.2840	0.1970	606	581	666	1853	M	615
NE86	2.0360	0.2180	0.2810	545	428	878	1851	M	616
JM12	2.3880	0.2840	0.1850	639	582	628	1849	M	617
CU23	2.1740	0.3470	0.1690	581	709	558	1848	M	618
NE24	2.1470	0.2710	0.2160	573	552	722	1847	M	619
YO56	2.1810	0.5220	0.1170	586	899	359	1844	M	620
CM19	1.9050	0.3120	0.2030	509	649	685	1843	M	621
TC14	2.0370	0.2630	0.2280	546	533	755	1834	L	622
JU54	1.9230	0.2410	0.2540	517	486	828	1831	L	623
PS78	2.3130	0.2810	0.1880	619	574	636	1829	L	624
JA15	2.5330	0.3070	0.1580	672	633	523	1828	L	625
JM13	1.7530	0.2540	0.2640	472	505	848	1825	L	626
RD31	2.3160	0.2900	0.1790	621	599	603	1823	L	627
RA49	2.1310	0.3760	0.1490	569	761	490	1820	L	628
NE67	2.1750	0.2650	0.2040	583	544	690	1817	L	629
CU26	2.6220	0.3630	0.1190	694	741	368	1803	L	630
PL32	2.7210	0.3090	0.1370	713	641	443	1797	L	631
CU44	2.2270	0.5040	0.0970	601	884	301	1786	L	632
RU73	2.0160	0.2630	0.2130	538	532	712	1782	L	633
TH29	2.0530	0.2410	0.2260	550	488	744	1782	L	634
JM72	1.8810	0.3000	0.1930	504	617	657	1778	L	635
RL15	1.5220	0.2480	0.2820	405	494	879	1778	L	636
JR12	2.4410	0.2630	0.1750	649	536	587	1772	L	637
YO06	2.5820	0.3060	0.1410	683	631	458	1772	L	638
RL08	1.3860	0.2620	0.2790	367	528	876	1771	L	639
RL10	2.2250	0.2890	0.1720	599	596	574	1769	L	640
RU86	2.0880	0.2760	0.1900	559	565	643	1767	L	641

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
VAHU6	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ	Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
JA02	2.1000	0.2820	0.1840	563	577	622	1762	L	642
PS30	2.8200	0.3350	0.1090	734	695	331	1760	L	643
RA09	2.1020	0.2180	0.2310	564	429	765	1758	L	644
JM22	2.4550	0.2860	0.1560	653	588	514	1755	L	645
TH36	1.4760	0.2480	0.2750	393	493	867	1753	L	646
CB17	1.6600	0.3080	0.2000	436	636	677	1749	L	647
YO50	2.0320	0.4620	0.1110	544	861	340	1745	L	648
JM79	2.3540	0.2970	0.1520	629	610	505	1744	L	649
RD23	1.7460	0.2130	0.2680	469	415	855	1739	L	650
YO59	1.7650	0.4450	0.1310	475	843	415	1733	L	651
PL40	3.0220	0.2900	0.1130	774	600	346	1720	L	652
RL12	2.0030	0.2610	0.1920	533	527	654	1714	L	653
RU63	2.6240	0.2740	0.1410	695	562	457	1714	L	654
RU75	2.1830	0.2710	0.1720	587	553	573	1713	L	655
RD67	2.4870	0.2680	0.1510	662	547	499	1708	L	656
JU71	1.5530	0.2640	0.2280	414	537	756	1707	L	657
JR09	2.3190	0.2810	0.1520	622	575	504	1701	L	658
NE62	1.9070	0.2360	0.2150	511	473	717	1701	L	659
YO53	1.7330	0.3880	0.1420	463	776	460	1699	L	660
CM15	1.7750	0.2770	0.1910	479	568	650	1697	L	661
CU19	2.0260	0.3110	0.1550	541	644	512	1697	L	662
TH03	2.7280	0.3050	0.1150	714	629	352	1695	L	663
CU07	2.5740	0.2870	0.1320	680	589	423	1692	L	664
JL24	1.8940	0.4620	0.1060	508	860	323	1691	L	665
NE60	2.0270	0.2410	0.1940	542	487	660	1689	L	666
RU64	2.6370	0.2750	0.1320	697	564	422	1683	L	667
NE01	1.2950	0.2230	0.2880	340	443	898	1681	L	668
NE73	1.6720	0.1930	0.2750	441	370	866	1677	L	669
RU51	2.3090	0.2540	0.1680	616	507	554	1677	L	670
JU52	1.5920	0.2260	0.2440	421	451	797	1669	L	671
RU72	2.3200	0.2500	0.1670	623	497	549	1669	L	672
RU04	1.7870	0.2210	0.2260	482	438	743	1663	L	673
PS34	2.3000	0.4180	0.0770	613	812	237	1662	L	674
RL07	2.2200	0.2630	0.1590	598	535	527	1660	L	675
JU51	1.4940	0.2350	0.2380	399	468	783	1650	L	676
PU20	5.0030	0.3070	0.0020	996	635	17	1648	L	677

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
CM09	2.2070	0.2600	0.1600	592	525	530	1647	L	678
JM42	2.4470	0.2550	0.1480	651	512	483	1646	L	679
JM75	1.7830	0.2860	0.1730	480	586	580	1646	L	680
YO22	1.8050	0.2360	0.2040	487	471	688	1646	L	681
JM39	1.6820	0.2350	0.2200	446	469	730	1645	L	682
RD64	2.0940	0.2330	0.1830	561	465	618	1644	L	683
RA02	2.3050	0.2220	0.1750	615	442	586	1643	L	684
YO47	1.9610	0.4230	0.0950	528	819	296	1643	L	685
JL52	2.3110	0.5000	0.0460	617	883	140	1640	L	686
RD15	1.6900	0.2190	0.2290	449	430	760	1639	L	687
TH10	1.8460	0.2200	0.2120	495	435	708	1638	L	688
JR21	2.1530	0.2400	0.1730	574	483	579	1636	L	689
TC10	1.4990	0.2180	0.2470	402	427	806	1635	L	690
RA12	2.3120	0.2210	0.1710	618	440	568	1626	L	691
YO42	1.6730	0.3710	0.1340	442	752	431	1625	L	692
TH37	1.4770	0.2310	0.2300	395	463	762	1620	L	693
TC31	1.7380	0.2170	0.2200	465	425	729	1619	L	694
YO25	2.2450	0.2690	0.1430	604	549	466	1619	L	695
RA03	1.9170	0.2030	0.2110	516	392	706	1614	L	696
NE34	1.9660	0.2280	0.1840	529	460	621	1610	L	697
RU90	1.6640	0.2400	0.2040	438	481	689	1608	L	698
RD13	1.3530	0.2070	0.2660	357	398	852	1607	L	699
JA06	2.5370	0.2780	0.1170	674	571	358	1603	L	700
NE71	1.5200	0.1890	0.2570	404	362	837	1603	L	701
CU13	1.9690	0.2880	0.1470	530	592	480	1602	L	702
JU83	1.4770	0.2510	0.2060	394	500	695	1589	L	703
RL11	2.1280	0.2550	0.1530	568	510	507	1585	L	704
CB16	1.7310	0.3120	0.1430	461	648	467	1576	L	705
JM30	1.5750	0.2060	0.2300	417	395	761	1573	L	706
PU04	1.8280	0.2580	0.1700	491	515	564	1570	L	707
CB18	1.5810	0.3090	0.1540	418	639	511	1568	L	708
YO48	1.6200	0.3670	0.1250	427	744	396	1567	L	709
PS32	2.0590	0.4100	0.0640	552	806	201	1559	L	710
NE45	2.2190	0.2640	0.1320	597	539	421	1557	L	711
YO33	1.6800	0.3980	0.1050	444	791	321	1556	L	712
PL16	2.0490	0.2150	0.1750	549	420	585	1554	L	713

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
RD14	1.2730	0.1920	0.2640	331	368	847	1546	L	714
PS45	1.7330	0.2630	0.1650	462	531	541	1534	L	715
JM65	2.4000	0.2990	0.0890	640	616	271	1527	L	716
RD38	1.9510	0.2270	0.1640	525	457	535	1517	L	717
YO46	1.6460	0.3590	0.1150	433	731	353	1517	L	718
JR04	1.7610	0.2230	0.1780	474	444	598	1516	L	719
RU58	1.9880	0.2230	0.1650	531	445	540	1516	L	720
RD47	2.1630	0.2290	0.1440	578	462	470	1510	L	721
CU06	2.4610	0.3080	0.0680	654	637	210	1501	L	722
JM77	1.8670	0.2740	0.1370	499	559	442	1500	L	723
JL28	1.6020	0.3390	0.1210	423	698	378	1499	L	724
CM10	2.3280	0.2550	0.1180	624	511	363	1498	L	725
RD32	1.7660	0.2340	0.1690	476	466	556	1498	L	726
RU17	2.1390	0.2390	0.1380	571	479	447	1497	L	727
PU06	1.2600	0.2410	0.2030	328	484	684	1496	L	728
CM02	1.8800	0.2470	0.1510	503	492	498	1493	L	729
CU14	2.0700	0.2730	0.1220	555	555	382	1492	L	730
PS46	1.4920	0.1940	0.2160	398	372	721	1491	L	731
RD12	1.6910	0.2000	0.1920	450	386	653	1489	L	732
TH35	1.8150	0.2040	0.1800	489	393	605	1487	L	733
JA40	1.7470	0.3620	0.0900	470	738	275	1483	L	734
JM68	2.0140	0.3520	0.0730	537	719	227	1483	L	735
RA42	1.8670	0.2270	0.1580	500	456	522	1478	L	736
RU61	2.2620	0.2370	0.1230	609	477	389	1475	L	737
YO69	1.7670	0.4220	0.0580	477	817	181	1475	L	738
RU56	1.8720	0.2150	0.1680	502	419	552	1473	L	739
RD16	1.2850	0.1900	0.2340	336	364	771	1471	L	740
RU43	2.4420	0.2540	0.0990	650	508	308	1466	L	741
JU81	1.5120	0.2100	0.1910	403	410	649	1462	L	742
PU09	2.1350	0.2320	0.1340	570	464	428	1462	L	743
CM23	1.6840	0.2610	0.1490	447	526	488	1461	L	744
PS48	1.2890	0.1660	0.2520	337	305	819	1461	L	745
TC26	1.2800	0.2020	0.2220	335	388	737	1460	L	746
JA22	2.0130	0.2370	0.1380	536	476	446	1458	L	747
JA31	2.1870	0.2730	0.0990	588	557	309	1454	L	748
RD30	1.5640	0.1860	0.2020	416	353	681	1450	L	749

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
VAHU6	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ	Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
JM59	2.1280	0.2540	0.1200	567	506	375	1448	L	750
JM32	1.9350	0.2220	0.1480	523	441	482	1446	L	751
CU04	2.2040	0.2640	0.1020	590	538	314	1442	L	752
JA20	1.4690	0.2850	0.1440	388	583	471	1442	L	753
JA13	1.8710	0.2790	0.1190	501	573	367	1441	L	754
NE05	1.6350	0.1800	0.1980	430	338	670	1438	L	755
CM01	1.6970	0.2160	0.1680	453	422	553	1428	L	756
RU44	2.2620	0.2420	0.1090	608	490	329	1427	L	757
RU02	1.3540	0.2020	0.1990	359	389	673	1421	L	758
PL62	1.2550	0.2530	0.1760	325	504	591	1420	L	759
YO20	1.3970	0.2080	0.1910	370	402	648	1420	L	760
YO34	1.7220	0.2620	0.1340	460	529	430	1419	L	761
PL43	2.1040	0.2120	0.1360	565	413	439	1417	L	762
RD60	1.8400	0.2270	0.1430	494	455	465	1414	L	763
JM36	2.0670	0.2260	0.1270	554	453	405	1412	L	764
RA11	1.9130	0.1820	0.1680	513	346	551	1410	L	765
JL21	1.6570	0.3760	0.0700	434	760	215	1409	L	766
RD28	1.4490	0.1780	0.2060	382	331	694	1407	L	767
CU12	2.0310	0.2660	0.1030	543	546	317	1406	L	768
JA14	2.1620	0.2650	0.0920	577	543	285	1405	L	769
JU70	1.2520	0.2100	0.1980	324	409	671	1404	L	770
JA05	2.2130	0.2500	0.0990	595	496	307	1398	L	771
RD27	1.6060	0.1880	0.1830	425	356	617	1398	L	772
CU03	1.9320	0.2210	0.1350	522	439	436	1397	L	773
PU14	2.9180	0.3070	0.0010	752	634	11	1397	L	774
YO08	1.8890	0.2600	0.1180	507	522	364	1393	L	775
JM64	2.0030	0.2600	0.1090	532	523	330	1385	L	776
RD51	1.9050	0.2190	0.1370	510	432	441	1383	L	777
NE29	1.7140	0.2090	0.1570	458	404	519	1381	L	778
JA16	2.1400	0.2700	0.0840	572	550	255	1377	L	779
JU30	1.3830	0.1760	0.2030	366	326	683	1375	L	780
JU64	1.1890	0.2650	0.1590	304	541	528	1373	L	781
RU40	1.7380	0.1980	0.1600	464	380	529	1373	L	782
JM45	1.6020	0.2160	0.1590	424	421	526	1371	L	783
JM80	1.7170	0.2250	0.1430	459	448	464	1371	L	784
JA18	1.9130	0.3110	0.0690	512	643	211	1366	L	785

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
JM06	1.6610	0.1880	0.1720	437	357	572	1366	L	786
RU50	2.4050	0.2500	0.0730	642	498	226	1366	L	787
JU04	1.7050	0.2070	0.1520	456	400	503	1359	L	788
JM83	1.7500	0.2430	0.1250	471	491	395	1357	L	789
RD61	1.6690	0.2170	0.1500	439	424	494	1357	L	790
JA08	2.2140	0.2340	0.0940	596	467	292	1355	L	791
RD40	1.1390	0.1890	0.2080	295	358	698	1351	L	792
RD06	1.5350	0.1880	0.1740	411	355	581	1347	L	793
JA07	1.9160	0.2380	0.1150	514	478	351	1343	L	794
CM16	1.7960	0.2400	0.1200	484	482	374	1340	L	795
NE02	1.0650	0.1650	0.2290	279	302	759	1340	L	796
JA23	1.8560	0.2500	0.1120	496	495	345	1336	L	797
CU45	1.4710	0.3580	0.0700	391	730	214	1335	L	798
JM61	1.6360	0.2420	0.1310	431	489	414	1334	L	799
RA23	1.6700	0.2100	0.1460	440	411	477	1328	L	800
RU80	1.8610	0.2190	0.1260	498	431	399	1328	L	801
PL64	1.2410	0.2360	0.1620	319	470	531	1320	L	802
CU05	2.2130	0.2510	0.0720	594	501	224	1319	L	803
PS80	1.8000	0.2090	0.1340	486	405	427	1318	L	804
RL16	1.4980	0.2170	0.1500	401	423	493	1317	L	805
CM13	1.7950	0.2600	0.1000	483	521	312	1316	L	806
JR16	1.8280	0.2090	0.1290	490	406	412	1308	L	807
YA07	1.6570	0.1820	0.1590	435	345	525	1305	L	808
JM14	1.5440	0.1940	0.1570	412	373	518	1303	L	809
PS54	1.5290	0.3150	0.0800	406	653	243	1302	L	810
RD05	1.5950	0.2010	0.1500	422	387	492	1301	L	811
RU49	2.3130	0.2270	0.0720	620	458	223	1301	L	812
PL44	2.0190	0.1730	0.1360	540	320	438	1298	L	813
CB07	1.4710	0.3390	0.0650	390	697	205	1292	L	814
YO40	1.4720	0.1980	0.1580	392	378	521	1291	L	815
YO07	2.0080	0.2250	0.0990	535	449	306	1290	L	816
RL14	1.6950	0.2020	0.1380	452	390	445	1287	L	817
TC18	1.3940	0.1790	0.1750	369	335	583	1287	L	818
TH11	1.2710	0.1810	0.1820	330	340	616	1286	L	819
BS16	0.7500	0.1700	0.2360	192	312	780	1284	L	820
JA21	1.6980	0.2740	0.0880	454	558	269	1281	L	821

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
JU60	1.4260	0.2140	0.1490	376	417	486	1279	L	822
RU55	2.3650	0.2390	0.0550	631	480	168	1279	L	823
YA05	1.4450	0.1840	0.1670	380	351	547	1278	L	824
CM22	1.8090	0.2410	0.0980	488	485	304	1277	L	825
JR20	1.7990	0.2060	0.1250	485	397	393	1275	L	826
JU25	1.3450	0.2210	0.1490	352	436	487	1275	L	827
JU28	1.9310	0.2370	0.0910	521	475	279	1275	L	828
RU94	1.1990	0.1990	0.1750	307	384	584	1275	L	829
RD76	1.3590	0.1890	0.1660	362	361	545	1268	L	830
RU13	1.3490	0.1640	0.1810	355	301	611	1267	L	831
JM15	1.3410	0.1890	0.1670	351	360	548	1259	L	832
JM84	2.0380	0.2280	0.0820	547	461	247	1255	L	833
CM06	1.4880	0.1980	0.1460	396	379	476	1251	L	834
JA29	2.0450	0.2520	0.0630	548	503	199	1250	L	835
JM19	1.6980	0.2070	0.1250	455	399	394	1248	L	836
PS14	1.4670	0.2890	0.0870	387	595	262	1244	L	837
RA22	1.6190	0.2050	0.1320	426	394	420	1240	L	838
JU65	1.1860	0.2030	0.1650	302	391	539	1232	L	839
RU39	2.0070	0.2080	0.0950	534	403	295	1232	L	840
RD10	1.2330	0.1630	0.1820	317	299	615	1231	L	841
JA44	1.4270	0.2930	0.0830	377	603	250	1230	L	842
RD29	1.0950	0.1490	0.1960	286	274	664	1224	L	843
JL23	1.3540	0.3200	0.0630	358	664	200	1222	L	844
RU01	1.0750	0.1820	0.1770	283	342	593	1218	L	845
YO41	1.4610	0.2260	0.1210	385	450	377	1212	L	846
JA25	1.5340	0.2590	0.0920	410	517	284	1211	L	847
JA32	1.7070	0.2750	0.0600	457	563	188	1208	L	848
JU56	1.0270	0.1680	0.1850	270	309	627	1206	L	849
YO26	1.3730	0.2770	0.0900	364	567	274	1205	L	850
CU20	1.4100	0.2240	0.1220	374	446	381	1201	L	851
YO39	1.5500	0.1960	0.1280	413	375	410	1198	L	852
JA09	1.6840	0.2110	0.1100	448	412	335	1195	L	853
CB33	1.3560	0.3550	0.0360	360	723	111	1194	L	854
JR22	1.6940	0.1920	0.1200	451	369	373	1193	L	855
YO49	1.2920	0.2790	0.0910	339	572	280	1191	L	856
RD33	1.1560	0.1650	0.1760	297	303	590	1190	L	857

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
RU38	1.3230	0.1730	0.1590	347	319	524	1190	L	858
YO24	1.8280	0.2260	0.0820	492	452	246	1190	L	859
CM12	1.6260	0.2140	0.1120	428	418	343	1189	L	860
JM09	1.5330	0.1760	0.1390	408	328	451	1187	L	861
PL60	0.8040	0.1310	0.2230	209	239	738	1186	L	862
JU32	1.1300	0.1440	0.1840	294	270	620	1184	L	863
RU81	1.6440	0.1800	0.1270	432	339	402	1173	L	864
TH09	1.3180	0.1830	0.1460	346	349	475	1170	L	865
CM11	1.8840	0.1980	0.0920	505	381	283	1169	L	866
PU07	0.8720	0.2560	0.1340	226	513	429	1168	L	867
RU28	0.8800	0.1600	0.1870	229	296	632	1157	L	868
JA30	1.9580	0.2240	0.0580	527	447	180	1154	L	869
JM08	1.7450	0.1710	0.1200	467	316	371	1154	L	870
JA17	1.4050	0.2210	0.1120	372	437	344	1153	L	871
RD09	1.5330	0.1810	0.1270	409	341	403	1153	L	872
JM28	1.4460	0.1970	0.1230	381	376	388	1145	L	873
RL22	1.2250	0.1960	0.1400	314	374	456	1144	L	874
PU12	1.7420	0.1780	0.1110	466	332	338	1136	L	875
PL34	1.9540	0.1780	0.0880	526	333	268	1127	L	876
YO44	1.4540	0.1820	0.1240	383	344	390	1117	L	877
RU85	1.5850	0.1740	0.1200	420	322	372	1114	L	878
NE88	1.0990	0.1360	0.1700	287	256	563	1106	L	879
YO23	1.3400	0.1840	0.1270	350	350	404	1104	L	880
RD25	1.0490	0.1330	0.1730	274	245	578	1097	L	881
CM14	1.5820	0.2060	0.0910	419	396	277	1092	L	882
CM08	1.4550	0.1900	0.1110	384	366	339	1089	L	883
RA45	1.1620	0.1890	0.1330	298	359	425	1082	L	884
TH06	1.2240	0.1580	0.1470	312	286	479	1077	L	885
PS38	1.1640	0.2600	0.0850	299	520	257	1076	L	886
NE18	1.0550	0.1590	0.1540	275	289	510	1074	L	887
YO30	1.3010	0.1830	0.1220	342	348	380	1070	L	888
PL61	0.5480	0.1580	0.1880	146	285	635	1066	L	889
NE87	0.9450	0.1310	0.1710	255	240	567	1062	L	890
YO28	1.2630	0.1760	0.1280	329	324	409	1062	L	891
YO05	1.6300	0.2000	0.0820	429	385	245	1059	L	892
NE78	1.2770	0.1720	0.1280	333	317	408	1058	L	893

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
BS22	0.8360	0.1320	0.1770	219	243	592	1054	L	894
RL09	0.9310	0.1470	0.1630	249	272	532	1053	L	895
AS06	1.3700	0.2970	0.0250	363	609	76	1048	L	896
JR14	1.1980	0.1220	0.1570	306	223	517	1046	L	897
CM17	1.4430	0.1940	0.0950	378	371	294	1043	L	898
PU17	1.4060	0.1320	0.1320	373	244	418	1035	L	899
NE27	1.3140	0.1820	0.1120	345	343	342	1030	L	900
JA03	1.4010	0.1770	0.1090	371	329	328	1028	L	901
RU16	1.1020	0.1510	0.1430	288	277	463	1028	L	902
YO43	1.1830	0.1590	0.1350	301	290	435	1026	L	903
YA06	1.2410	0.1590	0.1290	320	294	411	1025	L	904
RL18	1.3860	0.1670	0.1140	368	307	348	1023	L	905
JM70	1.5620	0.2200	0.0560	415	434	173	1022	L	906
JL35	0.9310	0.2270	0.1040	247	454	319	1020	L	907
JM81	1.4670	0.1790	0.0960	386	336	298	1020	L	908
YO21	1.4180	0.1870	0.0940	375	354	291	1020	L	909
NE85	0.7130	0.1280	0.1780	183	236	597	1016	L	910
JM43	1.3800	0.1740	0.1080	365	321	326	1012	L	911
JA19	1.3480	0.2180	0.0730	353	426	225	1004	L	912
RU82	1.2130	0.1590	0.1260	310	292	398	1000	L	913
RU05	0.8080	0.1240	0.1700	210	225	562	997	L	914
TC23	1.2260	0.1590	0.1230	315	293	387	995	L	915
PS49	0.8300	0.2100	0.1190	217	407	366	990	L	916
RA44	0.9730	0.1360	0.1440	261	254	469	984	L	917
JU69	0.9240	0.1590	0.1390	244	288	450	982	L	918
YO04	1.3250	0.1640	0.1100	348	300	334	982	L	919
CU16	1.0060	0.1830	0.1190	266	347	365	978	L	920
JM58	1.4440	0.1900	0.0750	379	365	232	976	L	921
BS31	0.9190	0.1530	0.1400	239	281	455	975	L	922
YO38	1.2280	0.1980	0.0920	316	377	282	975	L	923
RU06	2.0880	0.2070	0.0010	558	401	10	969	L	924
JR15	1.0610	0.1240	0.1430	276	229	462	967	L	925
JU10	1.3380	0.1250	0.1230	349	232	385	966	L	926
CM05	1.3100	0.1550	0.1110	343	283	337	963	L	927
JM37	1.4690	0.1840	0.0720	389	352	222	963	L	928
BS29	0.6750	0.1340	0.1650	176	246	538	960	L	929

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
JM25	1.4880	0.1760	0.0720	397	327	221	945	L	930
JL34	0.9340	0.2100	0.0910	252	408	278	938	L	931
BS08	0.4840	0.1260	0.1720	132	233	571	936	L	932
JM17	1.1160	0.1500	0.1200	290	276	370	936	L	933
YO13	1.2950	0.1700	0.0920	341	314	281	936	L	934
PL48	0.6590	0.0950	0.1760	173	173	589	935	L	935
RL06	0.7680	0.1290	0.1510	198	238	497	933	L	936
CU09	1.2910	0.1760	0.0880	338	325	267	930	L	937
JL53	1.2090	0.2630	0.0280	309	530	85	924	L	938
TH01	1.7530	0.1670	0.0470	473	308	143	924	L	939
RL05	0.7330	0.1350	0.1490	189	249	485	923	L	940
JU63	0.9550	0.1670	0.1170	259	306	357	922	L	941
PS47	1.2760	0.1410	0.1090	332	262	327	921	L	942
RD18	0.8610	0.1450	0.1340	224	271	426	921	L	943
JU66	1.0080	0.1160	0.1350	267	214	433	914	L	944
JU82	0.8770	0.1420	0.1320	228	263	419	910	L	945
NE59	1.9160	0.1980	0.0010	515	382	9	906	L	946
RU27	1.1230	0.1520	0.1100	293	278	333	904	L	947
TC03	0.8840	0.1090	0.1450	230	199	473	902	L	948
PL63	0.9540	0.1800	0.0990	258	337	305	900	L	949
JM69	1.2470	0.1900	0.0700	322	363	213	898	L	950
PU15	1.0740	0.1370	0.1170	282	257	356	895	L	951
TH32	0.9470	0.1360	0.1230	256	253	386	895	L	952
PU10	1.2420	0.1380	0.1000	321	259	310	890	L	953
NE84	0.5850	0.1090	0.1650	156	196	537	889	L	954
PU11	1.3580	0.1430	0.0840	361	268	254	883	L	955
RL20	1.2390	0.1660	0.0870	318	304	261	883	L	956
PS77	1.1030	0.1710	0.0910	289	315	276	880	L	957
TC05	1.0260	0.1360	0.1120	269	255	341	865	L	958
JM55	1.2190	0.1520	0.0900	311	279	273	863	L	959
JU02	1.1160	0.1540	0.0940	291	282	290	863	L	960
JA28	1.3490	0.1790	0.0570	354	334	174	862	L	961
CU15	1.1190	0.1700	0.0850	292	313	256	861	L	962
RA31	1.1880	0.1590	0.0880	303	291	266	860	L	963
JM20	1.0640	0.1440	0.1000	278	269	311	858	L	964
RL23	1.0760	0.1470	0.0970	284	273	300	857	L	965

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
RL04	0.7260	0.1270	0.1350	187	235	434	856	L	966
JM66	1.3120	0.1910	0.0470	344	367	144	855	L	967
TC24	1.0230	0.1390	0.1070	268	261	325	854	L	968
JA37	1.1910	0.1730	0.0740	305	318	230	853	L	969
PL19	1.4980	0.1380	0.0610	400	260	190	850	L	970
NE74	0.9200	0.1150	0.1260	242	209	397	848	L	971
JR19	1.2790	0.1350	0.0870	334	252	260	846	L	972
BS33	0.7730	0.1050	0.1400	199	192	454	845	L	973
RD22	0.9020	0.1100	0.1280	236	203	406	845	L	974
RD26	0.8330	0.1010	0.1360	218	188	437	843	L	975
RD24	0.9970	0.1030	0.1210	265	190	376	831	L	976
JU34	0.9310	0.1150	0.1180	248	211	362	821	L	977
JM50	1.2040	0.1380	0.0830	308	258	249	815	L	978
JU37	0.8150	0.1230	0.1220	212	224	379	815	L	979
JM63	1.2570	0.1760	0.0540	326	323	161	810	L	980
TP02	0.7020	0.1170	0.1280	181	215	407	803	L	981
JA10	1.2590	0.1490	0.0620	327	275	194	796	L	982
JA45	0.8490	0.1990	0.0600	223	383	187	793	L	983
JU40	0.9190	0.1340	0.0980	240	248	303	791	L	984
RU84	0.9330	0.1220	0.1030	251	222	316	789	L	985
RA46	0.9840	0.1090	0.1050	263	200	320	783	L	986
PL58	0.5940	0.0930	0.1400	158	168	453	779	L	987
BS09	0.5080	0.1070	0.1380	139	194	444	777	L	988
NE70	0.9330	0.1250	0.0960	250	230	297	777	L	989
BS21	0.4000	0.0930	0.1510	111	167	496	774	L	990
JL01	0.9230	0.2130	0.0370	243	414	114	771	L	991
JM35	1.2510	0.1520	0.0550	323	280	167	770	L	992
PU13	1.0610	0.1260	0.0860	277	234	259	770	L	993
JU29	1.0870	0.1570	0.0590	285	284	184	753	L	994
RD20	0.7580	0.1090	0.1170	195	197	355	747	L	995
BS17	0.3830	0.0930	0.1450	108	166	472	746	L	996
JM73	1.2250	0.1420	0.0550	313	266	166	745	L	997
JA34	1.1830	0.1680	0.0430	300	310	132	742	L	998
JM53	1.0680	0.1420	0.0610	280	264	191	735	L	999
PU08	0.9490	0.1120	0.0890	257	206	270	733	L	1000
JL26	0.7010	0.1690	0.0780	180	311	241	732	L	1001

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
VAHU6	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ	Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
TC19	0.6390	0.1060	0.1180	169	193	361	723	L	1002
NE41	0.9360	0.1210	0.0830	253	220	248	721	L	1003
JU03	0.8180	0.0970	0.1040	213	182	318	713	L	1004
JL31	0.7980	0.1780	0.0560	208	330	172	710	L	1005
TC21	0.9050	0.1150	0.0880	237	208	265	710	L	1006
JM71	1.1480	0.1420	0.0490	296	265	146	707	L	1007
RL21	0.8210	0.1220	0.0900	214	221	272	707	L	1008
JM74	1.0390	0.1250	0.0650	272	231	203	706	L	1009
JU12	0.8240	0.0990	0.0970	216	184	299	699	L	1010
CM07	0.9200	0.1180	0.0770	241	218	236	695	L	1011
JM54	1.0400	0.1240	0.0620	273	228	193	694	L	1012
JM52	1.0700	0.1350	0.0540	281	251	160	692	L	1013
PS72	0.8920	0.1120	0.0840	233	205	253	691	L	1014
JL19	0.9560	0.1190	0.0670	260	219	208	687	L	1015
JA39	0.8910	0.1350	0.0650	231	250	204	685	L	1016
CM04	0.8410	0.1100	0.0840	221	201	252	674	L	1017
JL17	0.8390	0.1630	0.0530	220	298	156	674	L	1018
JM76	0.9140	0.1340	0.0610	238	247	189	674	L	1019
JL03	0.7270	0.1290	0.0790	188	237	242	667	L	1020
JM38	0.9280	0.1150	0.0700	245	210	212	667	L	1021
BS01	0.5670	0.0790	0.1200	151	145	369	665	L	1022
NE68	0.9450	0.1240	0.0580	254	227	179	660	L	1023
RU45	0.9840	0.1150	0.0580	264	212	177	653	L	1024
NE81	0.6740	0.0910	0.1020	175	164	313	652	L	1025
RD39	0.6290	0.0850	0.1070	166	157	324	647	L	1026
JL16	0.8950	0.1240	0.0600	234	226	186	646	L	1027
PS51	0.7590	0.1600	0.0530	196	295	155	646	L	1028
BS23	0.4660	0.0820	0.1180	129	152	360	641	L	1029
PS53	0.7780	0.1590	0.0490	203	287	147	637	L	1030
TC15	0.5120	0.0890	0.1110	140	161	336	637	L	1031
TP19	0.3440	0.0820	0.1230	102	151	384	637	L	1032
JM31	0.9760	0.1140	0.0550	262	207	165	634	L	1033
JM85	0.8750	0.1110	0.0650	227	204	202	633	L	1034
BS24	0.5670	0.0890	0.1030	152	162	315	629	L	1035
BS26	0.3240	0.0820	0.1230	96	150	383	629	L	1036
TH28	0.8960	0.0950	0.0710	235	175	219	629	L	1037

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
VAHU6	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ	Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
BS18	0.3760	0.0920	0.1170	106	165	354	625	L	1038
PS29	1.0380	0.1430	0.0290	271	267	87	625	L	1039
CU02	0.7820	0.1090	0.0720	204	198	220	622	L	1040
JM34	0.8700	0.1180	0.0580	225	217	178	620	L	1041
RU08	0.6980	0.0970	0.0860	179	180	258	617	L	1042
JU33	0.6540	0.0840	0.0940	171	155	289	615	L	1043
JA12	0.7210	0.0950	0.0840	186	174	251	611	L	1044
PS65	0.7910	0.1320	0.0540	206	242	159	607	L	1045
JM60	0.6870	0.0970	0.0820	177	179	244	600	L	1046
NE77	0.8140	0.1180	0.0560	211	216	171	598	L	1047
RA47	0.7190	0.1160	0.0630	185	213	198	596	L	1048
JM51	0.7920	0.1000	0.0630	207	187	197	591	L	1049
JU31	0.6260	0.0870	0.0880	165	160	264	589	L	1050
RD17	0.6580	0.0930	0.0780	172	169	240	581	L	1051
NE72	0.7540	0.1050	0.0590	194	191	183	568	L	1052
TC17	0.4340	0.0750	0.0980	118	141	302	561	L	1053
JL43	0.6530	0.1610	0.0300	170	297	93	560	L	1054
JA11	0.7640	0.0960	0.0600	197	177	185	559	L	1055
JM57	0.7750	0.1000	0.0560	202	186	170	558	L	1056
JM33	0.6370	0.0940	0.0710	168	171	218	557	L	1057
CU01	0.8460	0.1100	0.0410	222	202	124	548	L	1058
JM11	0.7070	0.0720	0.0740	182	135	229	546	L	1059
JU50	0.5870	0.0800	0.0780	157	148	239	544	L	1060
JU46	0.9280	0.0990	0.0350	246	185	106	537	L	1061
PL56	0.6030	0.0720	0.0770	160	134	235	529	L	1062
JM56	0.7520	0.1030	0.0460	193	189	138	520	L	1063
NE83	0.5960	0.0630	0.0760	159	122	233	514	L	1064
TH25	0.6950	0.1070	0.0460	178	195	139	512	L	1065
BS12	0.3200	0.0700	0.0930	95	129	287	511	L	1066
PS73	0.6150	0.0740	0.0680	162	139	209	510	L	1067
BS10	0.3590	0.0710	0.0880	105	131	263	499	L	1068
JU09	0.5140	0.0610	0.0770	142	120	234	496	L	1069
BS25	0.3320	0.0560	0.0940	100	107	288	495	L	1070
JU17	0.7740	0.0940	0.0410	200	172	123	495	L	1071
JM07	0.6190	0.0640	0.0660	163	124	207	494	L	1072
JA41	0.7440	0.0990	0.0380	191	183	116	490	L	1073

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
PS76	0.5690	0.0970	0.0540	154	178	158	490	L	1074
YO19	0.6100	0.0820	0.0580	161	153	176	490	L	1075
JM03	0.5830	0.0740	0.0630	155	138	196	489	L	1076
TP05	0.5580	0.0800	0.0620	149	147	192	488	L	1077
RD42	0.7740	0.0860	0.0420	201	159	127	487	L	1078
CU10	0.7370	0.0970	0.0350	190	181	105	476	L	1079
JM10	0.6220	0.0590	0.0630	164	117	195	476	L	1080
PL18	0.8230	0.0740	0.0360	215	140	110	465	L	1081
PL20	0.6620	0.0850	0.0430	174	158	131	463	L	1082
BS02	0.4900	0.0570	0.0710	135	111	216	462	L	1083
CU08	0.7910	0.0890	0.0310	205	163	94	462	L	1084
BS30	0.4450	0.0590	0.0710	124	115	217	456	L	1085
RU15	0.5280	0.0680	0.0590	144	127	182	453	L	1086
JU36	0.5600	0.0680	0.0550	150	128	164	442	L	1087
CB34	0.4600	0.1320	0.0240	127	241	73	441	L	1088
JM41	0.5340	0.0730	0.0520	145	137	154	436	L	1089
NE44	0.5550	0.0770	0.0490	147	144	145	436	L	1090
NE69	0.7180	0.0930	0.0260	184	170	81	435	L	1091
JU38	0.4870	0.0730	0.0500	134	136	150	420	L	1092
JA35	0.5670	0.0750	0.0410	153	142	121	416	L	1093
JM05	0.4670	0.0640	0.0550	130	123	163	416	L	1094
JU20	0.5060	0.0590	0.0550	138	116	162	416	L	1095
BS19	0.2550	0.0490	0.0780	79	97	238	414	L	1096
JU44	0.6310	0.0820	0.0300	167	154	92	413	L	1097
PS52	0.4940	0.0960	0.0330	137	176	100	413	L	1098
JU27	0.5570	0.0800	0.0370	148	146	113	407	L	1099
JA36	0.5130	0.0770	0.0410	141	143	122	406	L	1100
BS20	0.2330	0.0430	0.0740	75	91	228	394	L	1101
JM40	0.5230	0.0650	0.0420	143	125	126	394	L	1102
RU07	0.8910	0.0810	0.0010	232	149	8	389	L	1103
JU05	0.4420	0.0560	0.0500	122	108	149	379	L	1104
JU49	0.3880	0.0570	0.0540	110	110	157	377	L	1105
TH04	0.4470	0.0710	0.0380	125	133	115	373	L	1106
JU06	0.2440	0.0390	0.0660	78	84	206	368	L	1107
TC04	0.4190	0.0460	0.0520	114	95	153	362	L	1108
PL51	0.3190	0.0400	0.0580	94	87	175	356	L	1109

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
VAHU6	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ	Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
RL17	0.4270	0.0530	0.0460	115	103	137	355	L	1110
JA43	0.4690	0.0610	0.0350	131	119	103	353	L	1111
JM21	0.4550	0.0620	0.0350	126	121	104	351	L	1112
JU19	0.4440	0.0490	0.0420	123	98	125	346	L	1113
PS71	0.4380	0.0710	0.0300	121	132	91	344	L	1114
NE80	0.4190	0.0600	0.0360	113	118	109	340	L	1115
YO67	0.3260	0.0510	0.0470	98	100	141	339	L	1116
PS66	0.2620	0.0580	0.0470	80	112	142	334	L	1117
JU41	0.4330	0.0590	0.0350	117	114	102	333	L	1118
RA50	0.4350	0.0850	0.0150	119	156	58	333	L	1119
RU14	0.3810	0.0460	0.0430	107	94	130	331	L	1120
JU62	0.3270	0.0590	0.0390	99	113	118	330	L	1121
JU48	0.4840	0.0540	0.0300	133	105	90	328	L	1122
JU26	0.4060	0.0700	0.0270	112	130	83	325	L	1123
JU45	0.4650	0.0560	0.0260	128	109	80	317	L	1124
JU22	0.3860	0.0500	0.0360	109	99	108	316	L	1125
PL41	0.2940	0.0330	0.0510	87	77	151	315	L	1126
BS28	0.2770	0.0410	0.0440	83	90	134	307	L	1127
JA42	0.4330	0.0510	0.0300	116	101	89	306	L	1128
JU68	0.3540	0.0540	0.0330	103	104	99	306	L	1129
RU12	0.2900	0.0390	0.0430	85	85	129	299	L	1130
PL45	0.4930	0.0400	0.0250	136	88	74	298	L	1131
RU10	0.2930	0.0430	0.0410	86	92	120	298	L	1132
PL23	0.2630	0.0340	0.0450	81	79	136	296	L	1133
JU11	0.3180	0.0360	0.0400	93	82	119	294	L	1134
PL46	0.3150	0.0320	0.0430	90	76	128	294	L	1135
BS11	0.1410	0.0350	0.0510	60	80	152	292	L	1136
AS03	0.2970	0.0680	0.0250	88	126	75	289	L	1137
CB24	0.3260	0.0550	0.0290	97	106	86	289	L	1138
RU09	0.3380	0.0380	0.0350	101	83	101	285	L	1139
PL57	0.1110	0.0230	0.0560	52	58	169	279	L	1140
TH34	0.3580	0.0460	0.0270	104	93	82	279	L	1141
JU18	0.4380	0.0520	0.0130	120	102	56	278	L	1142
NE75	0.2700	0.0410	0.0330	82	89	98	269	L	1143
BS34	0.1060	0.0280	0.0500	50	65	148	263	L	1144
PL22	0.3160	0.0240	0.0370	91	60	112	263	L	1145

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
BS27	0.1260	0.0300	0.0450	56	70	135	261	L	1146
TH30	0.2390	0.0340	0.0320	76	78	95	249	L	1147
JU43	0.3170	0.0390	0.0160	92	86	61	239	L	1148
TP01	0.1200	0.0290	0.0390	54	67	117	238	L	1149
JM01	0.3060	0.0290	0.0160	89	69	60	218	L	1150
BS13	0.1060	0.0250	0.0360	49	61	107	217	L	1151
PL53	0.1560	0.0210	0.0330	62	57	97	216	L	1152
JU15	0.2410	0.0280	0.0220	77	66	71	214	L	1153
CB28	0.2220	0.0490	0.0090	73	96	43	212	L	1154
JR03	0.2130	0.0290	0.0240	72	68	72	212	L	1155
CB21	0.2310	0.0350	0.0130	74	81	55	210	L	1156
JU79	0.1990	0.0310	0.0210	70	72	68	210	L	1157
JU61	0.1740	0.0320	0.0190	68	74	67	209	L	1158
JU39	0.1570	0.0260	0.0260	64	62	79	205	L	1159
PU01	0.1880	0.0270	0.0220	69	63	70	202	L	1160
AO23	0.0710	0.0320	0.0300	40	73	88	201	L	1161
JU47	0.2780	0.0320	0.0090	84	75	42	201	L	1162
JL55	0.1500	0.0310	0.0180	61	71	66	198	L	1163
JL38	0.2010	0.0270	0.0130	71	64	54	189	L	1164
PL47	0.1350	0.0140	0.0280	58	46	84	188	L	1165
JU21	0.1610	0.0180	0.0220	66	51	69	186	L	1166
BS04	0.0850	0.0210	0.0260	45	55	78	178	L	1167
JU13	0.1590	0.0200	0.0160	65	54	59	178	L	1168
PL54	0.0590	0.0150	0.0330	35	47	96	178	L	1169
JU07	0.1360	0.0200	0.0180	59	53	65	177	L	1170
JL18	0.1570	0.0230	0.0130	63	59	53	175	L	1171
YA02	0.1280	0.0210	0.0140	57	56	57	170	L	1172
JL02	0.1680	0.0150	0.0120	67	48	49	164	L	1173
BS35	0.0670	0.0160	0.0260	37	49	77	163	L	1174
NE42	0.1130	0.0200	0.0130	53	52	52	157	L	1175
PL49	0.1070	0.0100	0.0180	51	38	63	152	L	1176
JU67	0.1240	0.0180	0.0110	55	50	46	151	L	1177
PL50	0.0680	0.0120	0.0180	38	44	64	146	L	1178
PL29	0.1050	0.0090	0.0170	48	35	62	145	L	1179
PL55	0.0840	0.0120	0.0130	44	45	51	140	L	1180
JM04	0.0760	0.0110	0.0110	43	42	45	130	L	1181

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
JU57	0.0690	0.0110	0.0130	39	41	50	130	L	1182
PL27	0.0860	0.0080	0.0120	46	31	47	124	L	1183
JU14	0.0720	0.0090	0.0090	42	34	40	116	L	1184
CB25	0.0550	0.0110	0.0090	34	40	41	115	L	1185
PL21	0.0940	0.0080	0.0080	47	32	36	115	L	1186
TC35	0.0400	0.0100	0.0120	26	37	48	111	L	1187
JU24	0.0610	0.0070	0.0090	36	30	39	105	L	1188
PL52	0.0460	0.0060	0.0110	29	28	44	101	L	1189
JL50	0.0420	0.0110	0.0060	28	39	33	100	L	1190
JU77	0.0400	0.0100	0.0080	25	36	37	98	L	1191
AO03	0.0520	0.0120	0.0030	32	43	21	96	L	1192
CB23	0.0710	0.0090	0.0030	41	33	20	94	L	1193
BS14	0.0300	0.0060	0.0090	22	27	38	87	L	1194
TH05	0.0340	0.0070	0.0080	23	29	35	87	L	1195
JM86	0.0540	0.0050	0.0040	33	25	27	85	L	1196
PL30	0.0510	0.0040	0.0060	31	22	32	85	L	1197
BS05	0.0250	0.0060	0.0080	19	26	34	79	L	1198
JU23	0.0380	0.0050	0.0050	24	23	28	75	L	1199
PL28	0.0260	0.0040	0.0040	21	21	26	68	L	1200
TP03	0.0210	0.0040	0.0060	18	19	31	68	L	1201
CB22	0.0410	0.0050	0.0020	27	24	16	67	L	1202
PL26	0.0480	0.0030	0.0040	30	13	24	67	L	1203
TP04	0.0180	0.0040	0.0060	16	18	30	64	L	1204
JU08	0.0250	0.0040	0.0030	20	20	19	59	L	1205
BS07	0.0120	0.0040	0.0060	11	14	29	54	L	1206
CB26	0.0170	0.0040	0.0040	13	15	25	53	L	1207
PS17	0.0180	0.0040	0.0020	15	17	15	47	L	1208
BS15	0.0110	0.0030	0.0040	9	12	23	44	L	1209
JL54	0.0180	0.0040	0.0020	14	16	14	44	L	1210
BS03	0.0110	0.0030	0.0040	8	11	22	41	L	1211
PL24	0.0130	0.0010	0.0030	12	7	18	37	L	1212
JU35	0.0110	0.0020	0.0020	10	10	13	33	L	1213
RL19	0.0190	0.0010	0.0000	17	8	4	29	L	1214
TP07	0.0060	0.0010	0.0020	6	6	12	24	L	1215
PS12	0.0090	0.0020	0.0010	7	9	7	23	L	1216
PS13	0.0060	0.0010	0.0010	5	5	6	16	L	1217

2014 Report Dataset	Unit Area Loads			Sorted Sequence (Rank Order) between HUs for each Pollutant's Load			Sum Order	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Row #
	Ag N (kg/ha- yr)	Ag P (kg/ha- yr)	Ag S (mt/ha- yr)	NSEQ	PSEQ	SSEQ			
JL58	0.0050	0.0010	0.0000	4	4	3	11	L	1218
BS06	0.0030	0.0010	0.0010	2	3	5	10	L	1219
PL25	0.0030	0.0000	0.0000	3	2	2	7	L	1220
AO01	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1221
AO05	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1222
AO06	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1223
AO07	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1224
AO12	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1225
AO16	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1226
AO17	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1227
AO19	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1228
AO20	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1229
AO22	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1230
AO24	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1231
AO25	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1232
AO26	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1233
CB20	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1234
CB27	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1235
CB29	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1236
CB37	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1237
CB40	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1238
CB47	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1239
JL56	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1240
JL57	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1241
JL59	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1242
JU16	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1243
PL74	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1244
PS18	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1245
TH46	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1246
TP08	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1	1	1	3	L	1247

Attachment B

Drainage Basins in Each Soil and Water Conservation District

SWCD	Location
APPOMATTOX RIVER	Both
BIG SANDY	OCB
BIG WALKER	OCB
BLUE RIDGE	Both
CHOWAN BASIN	OCB
CLINCH VALLEY	OCB
COLONIAL	CB
CULPEPER	CB
DANIEL BOONE	OCB
EASTERN SHORE	Both
EVERGREEN	OCB
HALIFAX	OCB
HANOVER-CAROLINE	CB
HEADWATERS	CB
HENRICOPOLIS	CB
HOLSTON RIVER	OCB
JAMES RIVER	Both
JOHN MARSHALL	CB
LAKE COUNTRY	OCB
LONESOME PINE	OCB
LORD FAIRFAX	CB
LOUDOUN	CB
MONACAN	CB
MOUNTAIN	CB
MOUNTAIN CASTLES	Both
NATURAL BRIDGE	CB
NEW RIVER	OCB
NORTHERN NECK	CB
NORTHERN VA	CB
PATRICK	OCB
PEAKS OF OTTER	Both
PEANUT	Both
PETER FRANCISCO	CB
PIEDMONT	Both
PITTSYLVANIA	OCB
PRINCE WILLIAM	CB
ROBERT E. LEE	Both
SCOTT COUNTY	OCB
SHENANDOAH VALLEY	CB

SKYLINE	Both
SOUTHSIDE	OCB
TAZEWELL	OCB
THOMAS JEFFERSON	CB
THREE RIVERS	CB
TIDEWATER	CB
TRI-COUNTY/CITY	CB
VIRGINIA DARE	Both

Attachment C

This attachment provides data by Drainage Basin (CB and OCB), District, Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank (H, M, and L), Total Area (acres) of Hydrologic Units in each District by Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank and Drainage Basin, and the resulting Percentage Rank (Cost-share Multiplier).

Drainage Basin	SWCD Number	District Name	Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank	Total Area (acres) of Hydrologic Units in each District by Agricultural Pollutant Potential Rank and Drainage Basin	Percentage Rank (Cost-share Multiplier)
CB	1	TIDEWATER	H	96785.4503	0.03250
CB	1	TIDEWATER	L	66577.4140	0.00896
CB	1	TIDEWATER	M	191422.6223	0.05192
CB	2	THOMAS JEFFERSON	H	14012.1338	0.00471
CB	2	THOMAS JEFFERSON	L	790188.7963	0.10632
CB	2	THOMAS JEFFERSON	M	482742.7710	0.13093
CB	3	SOUTHSIDE	L	177.1335	0.00002
CB	4	NATURAL BRIDGE	H	92289.4571	0.03099
CB	4	NATURAL BRIDGE	L	162102.1593	0.02181
CB	4	NATURAL BRIDGE	M	135298.7385	0.03670
CB	5	PIEDMONT	L	459198.3423	0.06178
CB	5	PIEDMONT	M	92708.4754	0.02514
CB	6	BLUE RIDGE	L	16650.0828	0.00224
CB	6	BLUE RIDGE	M	0.0000	0.00000
CB	7	CULPEPER	H	372172.1045	0.12498
CB	7	CULPEPER	L	205576.0974	0.02766
CB	7	CULPEPER	M	363534.1147	0.09860
CB	8	NORTHERN NECK	H	428421.5491	0.14387
CB	8	NORTHERN NECK	L	1970.8178	0.00027
CB	8	NORTHERN NECK	M	126657.4057	0.03435
CB	9	SHENANDOAH VALLEY	H	363631.9157	0.12212
CB	9	SHENANDOAH VALLEY	L	269387.6143	0.03625
CB	9	SHENANDOAH VALLEY	M	124603.6280	0.03379
CB	10	ROBERT E. LEE	L	376287.6215	0.05063
CB	10	ROBERT E. LEE	M	157365.5429	0.04268
CB	12	JAMES RIVER	H	34801.1107	0.01169
CB	12	JAMES RIVER	L	276773.7615	0.03724
CB	12	JAMES RIVER	M	56636.3223	0.01536
CB	13	LORD FAIRFAX	H	223773.3898	0.07515
CB	13	LORD FAIRFAX	L	397889.9853	0.05354
CB	13	LORD FAIRFAX	M	230939.8593	0.06264
CB	14	SKYLINE	L	22425.4680	0.00302
CB	15	PEANUT	H	258300.9860	0.08674

CB	15	PEANUT	L	32724.9579	0.00440
CB	15	PEANUT	M	51984.6971	0.01410
CB	16	MOUNTAIN	H	20135.4251	0.00676
CB	16	MOUNTAIN	L	831275.6059	0.11185
CB	16	MOUNTAIN	M	47527.7670	0.01289
CB	17	TRI-COUNTY/CITY	H	887.6466	0.00030
CB	17	TRI-COUNTY/CITY	L	456027.9656	0.06136
CB	17	TRI-COUNTY/CITY	M	111576.8142	0.03026
CB	18	COLONIAL	H	74627.8197	0.02506
CB	18	COLONIAL	L	207629.0872	0.02794
CB	18	COLONIAL	M	197308.1054	0.05351
CB	20	EASTERN SHORE	H	178014.9204	0.05978
CB	20	EASTERN SHORE	L	7164.5004	0.00096
CB	20	EASTERN SHORE	M	47601.0563	0.01291
CB	21	NORTHERN VIRGINIA	L	276633.8110	0.03722
CB	21	NORTHERN VIRGINIA	M	55.7962	0.00002
CB	22	VIRGINIA DARE	H	16915.5734	0.00568
CB	22	VIRGINIA DARE	L	116268.8782	0.01564
CB	30	HANOVER-CAROLINE	H	5410.0140	0.00182
CB	30	HANOVER-CAROLINE	L	417049.7631	0.05611
CB	30	HANOVER-CAROLINE	M	225771.4728	0.06123
CB	32	JOHN MARSHALL	H	165023.8265	0.05542
CB	32	JOHN MARSHALL	L	46740.6165	0.00629
CB	32	JOHN MARSHALL	M	205578.4131	0.05576
CB	34	PEAKS OF OTTER	H	0.0000	0.00000
CB	34	PEAKS OF OTTER	L	54375.7248	0.00732
CB	34	PEAKS OF OTTER	M	14099.4255	0.00382
CB	35	PRINCE WILLIAM	L	193153.5388	0.02599
CB	35	PRINCE WILLIAM	M	29794.7326	0.00808
CB	36	LOUDOUN	H	206980.7259	0.06951
CB	36	LOUDOUN	L	60839.2734	0.00819
CB	36	LOUDOUN	M	65870.5035	0.01787
CB	38	MONACAN	H	0.0000	0.00000
CB	38	MONACAN	L	307028.0969	0.04131
CB	38	MONACAN	M	45765.2283	0.01241
CB	39	PETER FRANCISCO	L	549482.5617	0.07393
CB	39	PETER FRANCISCO	M	16238.9186	0.00440
CB	40	HENRICOPOLIS	H	11912.8894	0.00400
CB	40	HENRICOPOLIS	L	114707.3996	0.01543
CB	40	HENRICOPOLIS	M	29029.8903	0.00787
CB	41	HEADWATERS	H	285341.7330	0.09582
CB	41	HEADWATERS	L	236725.2464	0.03185
CB	41	HEADWATERS	M	121583.1424	0.03298

CB	42	APPOMATTOX RIVER	L	49354.7042	0.00664
CB	42	APPOMATTOX RIVER	M	11145.6185	0.00302
CB	43	THREE RIVERS	H	128127.6216	0.04303
CB	43	THREE RIVERS	L	44782.8484	0.00603
CB	43	THREE RIVERS	M	401674.5915	0.10894
CB	45	MOUNTAIN CASTLES	H	188.4111	0.00006
CB	45	MOUNTAIN CASTLES	L	385152.6692	0.05182
CB	45	MOUNTAIN CASTLES	M	102548.9211	0.02781
OCB	3	SOUTHSIDE	L	417809.8486	0.08192
OCB	3	SOUTHSIDE	M	164424.2702	0.03551
OCB	5	PIEDMONT	L	105843.7762	0.02075
OCB	5	PIEDMONT	M	178.2941	0.00004
OCB	6	BLUE RIDGE	H	114613.8879	0.05819
OCB	6	BLUE RIDGE	L	425965.0579	0.08352
OCB	6	BLUE RIDGE	M	332174.7359	0.07174
OCB	10	ROBERT E. LEE	H	0.0000	0.00000
OCB	10	ROBERT E. LEE	L	101964.0963	0.01999
OCB	10	ROBERT E. LEE	M	241158.5671	0.05208
OCB	11	NEW RIVER	H	103930.8643	0.05276
OCB	11	NEW RIVER	L	137224.2126	0.02690
OCB	11	NEW RIVER	M	355300.0011	0.07673
OCB	12	JAMES RIVER	H	18842.7510	0.00957
OCB	12	JAMES RIVER	L	0.0000	0.00000
OCB	12	JAMES RIVER	M	73858.7983	0.01595
OCB	14	SKYLINE	H	110555.3247	0.05613
OCB	14	SKYLINE	L	447616.5078	0.08776
OCB	14	SKYLINE	M	355073.7224	0.07669
OCB	15	PEANUT	H	329741.5402	0.16741
OCB	15	PEANUT	L	13705.2132	0.00269
OCB	15	PEANUT	M	18901.0332	0.00408
OCB	19	CHOWAN BASIN	H	449817.4990	0.22837
OCB	19	CHOWAN BASIN	L	43076.5264	0.00845
OCB	19	CHOWAN BASIN	M	398591.0097	0.08608
OCB	20	EASTERN SHORE	H	210543.2219	0.10689
OCB	20	EASTERN SHORE	L	70572.0559	0.01384
OCB	20	EASTERN SHORE	M	85809.8163	0.01853
OCB	22	VIRGINIA DARE	H	196898.7004	0.09996
OCB	22	VIRGINIA DARE	L	12146.1820	0.00238
OCB	22	VIRGINIA DARE	M	79040.5833	0.01707
OCB	23	HOLSTON RIVER	H	7733.1741	0.00393
OCB	23	HOLSTON RIVER	L	142009.4129	0.02784
OCB	23	HOLSTON RIVER	M	213568.3175	0.04612
OCB	24	DANIEL BOONE	H	104444.6501	0.05303

OCB	24	DANIEL BOONE	L	53540.4427	0.01050
OCB	24	DANIEL BOONE	M	122101.8966	0.02637
OCB	25	CLINCH VALLEY	H	42545.0610	0.02160
OCB	25	CLINCH VALLEY	L	133171.2429	0.02611
OCB	25	CLINCH VALLEY	M	129417.4886	0.02795
OCB	26	SCOTT COUNTY	H	102363.5556	0.05197
OCB	26	SCOTT COUNTY	L	97112.8811	0.01904
OCB	26	SCOTT COUNTY	M	145304.0932	0.03138
OCB	27	LONESOME PINE	H	0.0000	0.00000
OCB	27	LONESOME PINE	L	448242.2118	0.08788
OCB	27	LONESOME PINE	M	24495.2767	0.00529
OCB	28	EVERGREEN	H	11274.6863	0.00572
OCB	28	EVERGREEN	L	121563.1922	0.02383
OCB	28	EVERGREEN	M	156643.4015	0.03383
OCB	29	TAZEWELL	H	72409.6471	0.03676
OCB	29	TAZEWELL	L	154749.1521	0.03034
OCB	29	TAZEWELL	M	105583.5725	0.02280
OCB	31	PITTSYLVANIA	L	150172.4718	0.02944
OCB	31	PITTSYLVANIA	M	475888.3761	0.10278
OCB	33	HALIFAX	L	217772.4359	0.04270
OCB	33	HALIFAX	M	313304.7959	0.06766
OCB	34	PEAKS OF OTTER	H	17888.1298	0.00908
OCB	34	PEAKS OF OTTER	L	298861.6479	0.05860
OCB	34	PEAKS OF OTTER	M	111441.7940	0.02407
OCB	37	BIG WALKER	H	16921.0856	0.00859
OCB	37	BIG WALKER	L	227016.3343	0.04451
OCB	37	BIG WALKER	M	282955.2803	0.06111
OCB	42	APPOMATTOX RIVER	H	13035.3681	0.00662
OCB	42	APPOMATTOX RIVER	L	127971.8837	0.02509
OCB	42	APPOMATTOX RIVER	M	137896.5576	0.02978
OCB	44	PATRICK	H	46049.2868	0.02338
OCB	44	PATRICK	L	183952.3413	0.03607
OCB	44	PATRICK	M	81296.4794	0.01756
OCB	45	MOUNTAIN CASTLES	H	0.0000	0.00000
OCB	45	MOUNTAIN CASTLES	L	24935.7052	0.00489
OCB	45	MOUNTAIN CASTLES	M	47577.8538	0.01028
OCB	46	LAKE COUNTRY	H	98.9832	0.00005
OCB	46	LAKE COUNTRY	L	621024.4954	0.12176
OCB	46	LAKE COUNTRY	M	178254.9341	0.03850
OCB	47	BIG SANDY	L	322436.0212	0.06322

Virginia's Agricultural BMP Cost-Share Funding Priorities


Total Agricultural Unit Ranking 2014

Cost-Share Funding Priorities - 2014


- High
- Medium
- Low

- Soil & Water Conservation Districts
- Chesapeake Bay Drainage Limit
- Basin Boundaries
- Hydrography
- Hydrologic Units (NWBD 6th Order)

NOTES:
Hydrologic units are ranked for the BMP cost-share program using a collective measure of the unit area agricultural pollution loads of nitrogen, phosphorous and sediment as determined in the 2014 biennial NPS assessment. The ranked order of the individual pollutant loads were summed to produce a total ag load order. This total was then ranked, approximately, as follows: the top 20 percent are ranked "High", the next 30 percent are ranked "Medium", and the remaining 50 percent are ranked "Low."



DATA SOURCES:
WATERSHED NPS LOADS: VPI-BSE, VADCR & USEPA
BASIN BOUNDARIES: VADCR
HYDROLOGIC UNIT BOUNDARIES: VADCR
S&W CONSERVATION DISTRICT BOUNDARIES: VADCR
HYDROGRAPHY: USGS



6 MAY 2014

Attachment E [VACS Cost-Share Allocations (excluding RMP and OCB SL-6 earmarks)]

SWCD	CB WQIF	CB Special GF Deposit	CB Recordation	CB Total	OCB WQIF	OCB Special GF Deposit	OCB Recordation	OCB Total	Grand Total
APPOMATTOX RIVER	\$24,317	\$0	\$9,086	\$33,403	\$73,522	\$0	\$47,207	\$120,729	\$154,132
BIG SANDY	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$53,852	\$0	\$34,577	\$88,429	\$88,429
BIG WALKER	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$134,297	\$0	\$86,228	\$220,525	\$220,525
BLUE RIDGE	\$4,875	\$0	\$1,821	\$6,696	\$286,733	\$0	\$184,103	\$470,836	\$477,532
CHOWAN BASIN	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$603,535	\$0	\$387,514	\$991,049	\$991,049
CLINCH VALLEY	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$103,956	\$0	\$66,748	\$170,704	\$170,704
COLONIAL	\$371,794	\$0	\$138,917	\$510,711	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$510,711
CULPEPER	\$1,061,926	\$0	\$396,778	\$1,458,704	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,458,704
DANIEL BOONE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$155,564	\$0	\$99,883	\$255,447	\$255,447
EASTERN SHORE	\$369,450	\$0	\$138,041	\$507,491	\$263,107	\$0	\$168,934	\$432,041	\$939,532
EVERGREEN	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,721	\$0	\$48,619	\$124,340	\$124,340
HALIFAX	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$122,833	\$0	\$78,868	\$201,701	\$201,701
HANOVER-CAROLINE	\$331,853	\$0	\$123,993	\$455,846	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$455,846
HEADWATERS	\$698,227	\$0	\$260,886	\$959,113	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$959,113
HENRICOPOLIS	\$81,046	\$0	\$30,282	\$111,328	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$111,328
HOLSTON RIVER	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$91,017	\$0	\$58,439	\$149,456	\$149,456
JAMES RIVER	\$194,748	\$0	\$72,766	\$267,514	\$40,755	\$0	\$26,169	\$66,924	\$334,438
JOHN MARSHALL	\$497,154	\$0	\$185,757	\$682,911	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$682,911
LAKE COUNTRY	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$153,021	\$0	\$98,250	\$251,271	\$251,271
LONESOME PINE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$81,624	\$0	\$52,408	\$134,032	\$134,032
LORD FAIRFAX	\$729,743	\$0	\$272,661	\$1,002,404	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,002,404
LOUDOUN	\$454,255	\$0	\$169,728	\$623,983	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$623,983
MONACAN	\$130,405	\$0	\$48,724	\$179,129	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$179,129
MOUNTAIN	\$322,237	\$0	\$120,401	\$442,638	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$442,638
MOUNTAIN CASTLES	\$203,890	\$0	\$76,182	\$280,072	\$17,295	\$0	\$11,104	\$28,399	\$308,471
NATURAL BRIDGE	\$335,836	\$0	\$125,482	\$461,318	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$461,318
NEW RIVER	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$233,340	\$0	\$149,821	\$383,161	\$383,161
NORTHERN NECK	\$895,379	\$0	\$334,549	\$1,229,928	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,229,928
NORTHERN VIRGINIA	\$81,042	\$0	\$30,280	\$111,322	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$111,322
PATRICK	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$102,947	\$0	\$66,099	\$169,046	\$169,046
PEAKS OF OTTER	\$28,401	\$0	\$10,612	\$39,013	\$100,009	\$0	\$64,214	\$164,223	\$203,236
PEANUT	\$527,488	\$0	\$197,090	\$724,578	\$364,022	\$0	\$233,729	\$597,751	\$1,322,329

Attachment E (continued)

SWCD	CB WQIF	CB Special GF Deposit	CB Recordation	CB Total	OCB WQIF	OCB Special GF Deposit	OCB Recordation	OCB Total	Grand Total
PETER FRANCISCO	\$175,251	\$0	\$65,481	\$240,732	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$240,732
PIEDMONT	\$216,514	\$0	\$80,898	\$297,412	\$17,727	\$0	\$11,382	\$29,109	\$326,521
PITTSYLVANIA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$156,410	\$0	\$100,427	\$256,837	\$256,837
PRINCE WILLIAM	\$82,927	\$0	\$30,985	\$113,912	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$113,912
ROBERT E. LEE	\$249,477	\$0	\$93,215	\$342,692	\$83,581	\$0	\$53,666	\$137,247	\$479,939
SCOTT COUNTY	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$166,994	\$0	\$107,222	\$274,216	\$274,216
SHENANDOAH VALLEY	\$853,491	\$0	\$318,898	\$1,172,389	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,172,389
SKYLINE	\$6,566	\$0	\$2,453	\$9,019	\$292,280	\$0	\$187,665	\$479,945	\$488,964
SOUTHSIDE	\$52	\$0	\$19	\$71	\$115,157	\$0	\$73,939	\$189,096	\$189,167
TAZEWELL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$133,272	\$0	\$85,571	\$218,843	\$218,843
THOMAS JEFFERSON	\$684,301	\$0	\$255,682	\$939,983	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$939,983
THREE RIVERS	\$602,773	\$0	\$225,221	\$827,994	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$827,994
TIDEWATER	\$365,767	\$0	\$136,665	\$502,432	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$502,432
TRI-COUNTY/CITY	\$233,910	\$0	\$87,398	\$321,308	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$321,308
VIRGINIA DARE	\$64,943	\$0	\$24,266	\$89,209	\$236,728	\$0	\$151,997	\$388,725	\$477,934
Grand Total	\$10,880,038	\$0	\$4,065,217	\$14,945,255	\$4,259,299	\$0	\$2,734,783	\$6,994,082	\$21,939,337