



**Minnesota Pollution
Control Agency**

520 Lafayette Road North
St. Paul, MN 55155-4194

SWAG Interim Report

Surface Water Assessment Grant (SWAG)
Appendix B

Doc Type: Grant Application

Instructions on Page 4

Grantee Information

Grantee name: _____ Contact name: _____
Contact phone number: _____ Grant award: \$ _____
Contact e-mail: _____
Project title: _____
Grant budget period: Start date (mm/dd/yyyy): _____ End date (mm/dd/yyyy): _____
Project time period covered by this report: Start date (mm/dd/yyyy): _____ End date (mm/dd/yyyy): _____
This is Interim/Progress report number: _____ Submittal date(mm/dd/yyyy): _____

Section I - Work Plan

- 1. Have you worked with Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) Environmental Quality Information System (EQuIS) staff to establish all sites listed in your grant work plan?**
☐ Yes ☐ No Date submitted (mm/dd/yyyy): _____
- 2. Was monitoring data for these established sites for the past field season submitted to EQuIS by the November 1 due date?**
☐ Yes ☐ No Last submittal date (mm/dd/yyyy): _____
- 3. Describe in detail the monitoring that has been conducted during the past field season. Please be specific by completing Table 1. The table should reflect all sites in your grant work plan, their site IDs, the number of samples to be collected annually according to the work plan and the number of samples actually collected (include QA/QC sampling) during the past field season. If you were not able to meet your sampling obligations this past year, describe in the comments section what sampling was missed, why, and how you will make up the missed sampling events. Refer to the instructions at the end of this report for an example of the completed table.**

Table 1. Monitoring summary

Waterbody ¹	Site ID#	Planned annual sampling		Actual for past season		Comments
		Parameter	No.	Parameter	No.	

¹ Identify target watershed site by using asterisk (*).

- 4. Please describe progress from the past year in successfully carrying out aspects of the grant work plan other than actual field water monitoring. Attach copies of any documents or products that were produced (i.e., brochures, press releases, etc.).**
- 5. Describe in detail any problems, delays, or difficulties that have occurred in fulfilling the grant work plan. How did you resolve these problems? Were there any change orders and/or amendments to the grant contract and/or work plan? If yes, list.**

6. Provide an annual quality assurance assessment that includes the following elements.

- A. Field meter calibration records.
- B. A list of narrative descriptions that highlight specific data points for which adverse field conditions, field meter malfunctions, errors, excess holding time (quantify), lab result qualifiers, or other factors may have affected the results, and would be beneficial to a data user. *For example*, a description might be included of the cross-section location of sampling chosen on a day when a stream is out of banks, and the main flow is inaccessible due to floating debris.
- C. Complete Table 2 presenting quality control sample results with columns showing comparison to lab method detection limit for sampler blanks, and the relative percent difference (RPD) for field duplicates (see the *SWAG Quality Assurance Project Plan*). Please use the "maximum expected relative percent difference" values presented on page 24 in Appendix D of the *Volunteer Surface Water Monitoring Guide* (<http://www.pca.state.mn.us/yhiz8f0>) to assess RPD on field duplicates. Field duplicates with values in excess of the expected RPD may be an indication of high variability within the stream, which is useful for data interpretation. Use the comment field to note RPD or sampler blank results outside of expectations.

Table 2. Quality control sample results and analysis

Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Site ID#	Analyte	Sampler blanks		Field duplicates			Comments
			Result	Detection limit	Sample result	Duplicate result	RPD	

Section II - Participants in Project

- 7. Have there been any changes in project staff or contractors or has participation by companies or units of government changed? How many volunteers participated in monitoring during the past field season? Complete Table 3 by listing the contact information for your volunteers. Once your grant ends, the MPCA Citizen Lake/Stream Monitoring Program coordinators plan to contact these volunteers to see if they are interested in continuing to collect transparency data at their assigned sites.**

Table 3. Volunteer contact information

Tennessen warning: Pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 13.43, some of the information that you are being asked to provide in the above table is classified as private data on individuals as described in Minn. R. 1205.0200, subp. 9, Minn. R. 1205.0400 and Minn. Stat. § 13.02, subd. 12 (home contact information). You are not legally required to provide this private data, but if you do the MPCA plans to use this information to invite volunteers to join their Citizen Lake/Stream Monitoring Programs (CMPs) after your grant project has ended. All private volunteer information is kept in a secure location and is never released to anyone outside of our SWAG or CMPs.

Organization name: _____

Grantee contact: _____ Telephone number: _____

Waterbody	Site ID#	Contact name	Address	Telephone number	E-mail address

8. Please describe training that you and/or an outside trainer provided to your project participants prior to the start of the past field season. Include details on what the training covered and who administered this training.

Section III - Budget

9. Fill in Table 4 (Project expenditures). List any changes to your original budget (change orders or amendments) that were made.

Table 4. Project expenditures

Project budget	MPCA grant funds available	Total MPCA funds expended	Total remaining balance	Percent of budget expended
Objective 1: (Title)				
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Objective 2: (Title)				
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Objective 3: (Title)				
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Objective 4: (Title)				
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Objective 5: (Title)				
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Objective 6: (Title)				
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Task:			\$ 0.00	%
Column Total	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	%

(Delete instructions prior to submitting)

Instructions

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency evaluates grants based on their contribution to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) mission. To ensure a routine, fair and consistent evaluation of grants, the MPCA requires grantees to submit periodic narrative and financial reports. In preparing your interim report(s), please refer back to Exhibit A (the work plan and budget) in your grant contract.

The grant report shall include detailed results in the form of data and information that best demonstrates progress toward achieving one or more of the objectives as identified in your work plan. The MPCA will use the information from this grant contract and others to document progress toward meeting these objectives to external parties, such as taxpayers and the legislature. The MPCA staff will work with the Grantee on what the best ways are to accomplish this information requirement.

Project grantees are required to complete and submit Interim reports as outlined in the grant contract and work plan during the grant contract period. **Failure to submit a detailed Interim report may result in the loss of current grant funds, the withholding of additional grant disbursements or being removed from consideration for future grant funding.**

A grantee may fill-in-the-blanks in the form provided, or they **may tailor the form to more accurately fit their project (work plan)**. Since projects are very diverse, the latter method may work best. This form is available electronically.

The report shall be sent to the attention of your MPCA Project Manager electronically.

Examples:

Table 1. Monitoring summary

Waterbody ¹	Site ID#	Planned annual sampling		Actual for past season		Comments
		Parameter	No.	Parameter	No.	
Lake A	71-***	Chl-A	4	Chl-A	3	Missed one sampling event – will pick it up next June.
		TP	4	TP	3	
		Secchi	4	Secchi	3	
Stream A	S****)	TP, TSS, DO, pH, conductivity	22	TP, TSS, DO, pH, conductivity	15	Stream ran dry for several months and prevented us from obtaining planned samples

¹ Identify target watershed site by using asterisk (*).

Table 2. Quality control sample results and analysis

Date	Site ID#	Analyte	Sampler blanks		Field duplicates			Comments
			Result	Detection limit	Sample result	Duplicate result	RPD	
8/29/11	S006-152	E. coli	<1	<1	140	160	6.7%	QC samples meet expectations
7/31/11	S006-151	E. coli	<1	<1	120	170	34%	Duplicate exceeds 30% method variability expectation. No contamination detected.
8/17/11	S005-143	TSS	1	1	5	3	50%	Duplicate exceeds 30% method variability expectation. No contamination detected.
8/17/11	S005-143	TSVS	1	1	1	1	0	QC samples meet expectations
8/17/11	S005-143	E. coli	1	1	651	921	34%	Duplicate exceeds 30% method variability expectation. No contamination detected.
8/17/11	S005-143	Ammonia (N)	0.04	<0.04	0.123	0.183	39%	Duplicate exceeds 10% method variability expectation. No contamination detected.
8/17/11	S005-143	NO2+NO3	0.03	<0.03	0.08	0.08	0%	QC samples meet expectations
8/17/11	S005-143	TKN	0.3	<0.3	1.42	1.44	1.4%	QC samples meet expectations
8/17/11	S005-143	TP	0.005	<0.005	0.573	0.57	0%	QC samples meet expectations