The Watershed Based Planning Approach

Thomas E Davenport

- 312-886-0209
- Davenport.thomas@epa.gov
- Tribal Training Session: National Water Quality Monitoring Council Conference
- Sheraton Downtown Hotel in Denver, CO
- Monday April 26th
- 8:00 am to 11:30 am

Watershed Management Moving beyond the Same Old Cheese





POLITICAL BOUNDARY

AIR MANAGEMENT

WATER MANAGEMENT





.....

.....

Participation trends in Conservation





Something Needs to Change



From the Dilbert-2007 Calendar





Using EPA's Handbook for Developing Watershed Plans to Restore and Protect Our Waters

Introduction

 Our hope it that this handbook will supplement existing guides



- Provides assistance in developing the necessary details of effective plans
- Serves as a starting point for an updateable document on planning across programs and levels of governance.

Watershed Management Process



PARTNERSHIP

- Watershed Management Guide, 2003

Establishes baseline of existing conditions. Identifies specific problems. **Develops solutions to problems.** Identifies potential implementers and costs. **Provides framework for evaluation.**



Additional benefits of effective watershed plans

A well drafted plan recognizes the need to address multiple problems in a watershed, such as:

Restoration & Physical Improvements
Residential Nutrients
Failing HSTS Units
Stormwater Management & Urban NPS

Section 319: Nine Elements

- a. Identify causes & sources of pollution
- b. Estimate load reductions expected
- c. Describe mgmt measures & targeted critical areas
- d. Estimate technical and financial assistance needed
- e. Develop education component
- f. Develop schedule
- g. Describe interim, measurable milestones
- h. Identify indicators to measure progress
- i. Develop a monitoring component

Source: US EPA 2004 319 Supplemental Guidelines



The nine elements work: why

- Quantifying pollutant sources to guide plan development
- Understanding what NPS management practices will achieve along with the point source controls
- Looking ahead to implementing and revising the watershed plan

(Watershed plans need to address more than the 9 elements – e.g. Protection, Drinking Water, Habitats, Fisheries, State Priorities permitted sources, solid waste, trading, etc.)

Watershed Management Plans Address Specific Restoration and Protection Actions. These Plans Document How, Who and When

The problem(s)



The goal

Reduce phosphorus loading to meet standard

How,who,when



Farmers & agencies cost share BMP's target 80% coverage by 2001



Local & state cost-share upgrade of treatment plant construction assistance grant \$20 M by 2001



Treat the Right Problems with the Right Solutions in the Right Places

How do we get there?

Approaches to NPS Pollution



Water Quality Degradation

Disproportionality



Disproportionality

hydrologically-disconnected (e.g., upland location) minimal application of inputs greater residue cover (e.g., ridge or no tillage) greater organic matter fine-to-medium textured soils





hydrologically-disconnected (e.g., upland location) over-application of inputs minimal residue cover fine-to-medium textured soils greater organic matter

hydrologically-connected medium-to-coarse textured soils low organic matter over-application + broadcasting minimal residue cover delayed incorporation of manure

hydrologically-connected greater residue cover (e.g., ridge or no tillage) minimal application quickly-expedited incorporation of manure medium-to-coarse textured soils low organic matter

The Salt Creek Watershed



Critical and Priority Areas

Critical Areas (Red) •Need treatment to improve existing poor water quality

Priority Areas (Yellow)Need protection to protect relatively good water quality

Based upon:

- historic water quality data,
- •current water quality data,
- •confirmed sources,
- projected future
- development,
- •and causes of impairment.



High Quality Stream Strategy



Nutrient Impaired Stream Strategies







A Hierarchy of Implementation



Source: EPA Office of Water, Protecting Natural Wetlands: A Guide to Stormwater Best Management Practices

Implement Actions

It sounds SO simple!

Public participation in conservation is becoming "institutionalized".

"Neither do environmentalists speak for soil and water resources. Degradation of resources is not as much a problem, but rather an opportunity to raise more funds and build up membership."

> Pete Nowak The subversive conservationist Journal of Soil & Water Conservation July/August 2008

Developing info/ed activities

- Define overall goal and objectives
- Identify and characterize target audience
- Create message(s) for target audience(s)
- Package the messages for distribution
- Distribute messages to the audiences
- Evaluate the information/education effort













matte Grants, among the trees in benkyround, was out of its banks Tuesday months, barving this home stong Garden D

Supervisors declare flood emergency

cial warns of more ns on the way fine fine fine the way the period

Derverse Miller am hand and han, lags hand han han han been and hand been and han b

the wald, and public works cores on the downer lob the memingation need downed by the memingation need downed by the memtaken need by the term of the second of the term of the second of the term of driving memory of the term of the driving memory of the driving memory of the term of the term of the driving memory of the term of the term of the driving memory of the term of the term of the term of the driving memory of the term of the term of the term of the driving memory of the term of the term of the term of the driving memory of the term of the term of the term of the driving memory of the term of the

29

Prioritizing management efforts

Integrate assessment results across objectives

Example factors to consider:

- Highest threats to achieving objectives
- Regulatory requirements
- Where are existing management regulations, programs, policies, practices falling short
- Stakeholder preferences





Debunking the myth about targeting



USDA funds are targeted just not for water quality or other environmental benefits

Targeted programming is critical to improving BMP effectiveness.

How do I know what other programs I should coordinate my watershed planning efforts with?



Integrated Watershed Planning





Ac - counting we will go! One a BMP! Two a BMP! Tree a BMP!

Dollars Spent Practices Contracted Loads (theoretically) Reduced Millions and billions, oh my



Have we lost track of what is important???

Indicators & targets: short/long term

🗞 Worksheet 12-2

Developing Criteria to Measure Progress in Meeting Water Quality Goals

[Note: Complete one worksheet for each management objective identified.]

Management Objective: Reduce nutrient inputs into Cane Creek by 20 percent

Indicators to Measure Progress	Target Value or Goal	Interim Targets		
		Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
P load	44 t/yr	52 t/yr	49 t/yr	44 t/yr
# of nuisance algae blooms	0	2	1	0
transparency	5.5 m	4.1 m	4.9 m	5.5 m
frequency of taste and odor problems in water supply	0	1	1	0
hypolimnetic DO	5.0 mg/L	2.5 mg/L	4.0 mg/L	5.0 mg/L

Measuring improvements: linking 106/319

- Document the parameter(s) you're trying to impact (sediment, nutrients, etc.)
- Identify measurable criteria associated with the parameter(s)
- Develop the most cost-effective monitoring program possible
- Be selective! Don't monitor everything! <u>Monitor to answer questions</u>



What can watershed plans provide?

- Clear Purpose & a Roadmap needed to coordinate complex scientific, social, and economic activities
- Accountability What indicators are we going to count and why are they important to watershed resources?

 Program Integration thru Partnerships -TMDLs, 319, NPDES, Source Water Protection, wetlands, Farm Bill Programs, local planning, private investment

Lake Fraser Watershed Management Plan 319 Work Plan #1 Parameter Period 2003-2013 2003-2008 Geographic scope 24 000 acres 180,000 acres 52 000 acres 7 000 acres Critical areas Goal statement Improve watershed conditions to support sustainable Reduce sediment loadings from priority ficheries subwatershed X Increase the Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) from 30 to 75 Treat 5.000 acres of cropland with crop Example objectives and key elements Identify causes and sources of sediment residue management (CRM) practices Identify load reduction expected Install six terraces to treat 1,200 acres Identify management practices needed Establish five buffer strips for a total of 8.000 Identify critical areas feet Implementation CRM: 2,000 acres of row crop/year into CRM Develop training materials on CRM in year 1 Terraces: 4 fields/year, 40 fields total Hold two workshops each in years 2 and 3 Buffers: restore 1 to 1.5 miles of riparian area/vear. 2 terraces/vear 8 miles total One buffer strip in first year and two each in Field buffers: 100 fields total vears 2 and 3 Costs \$4.02 million over 10 years \$250.000 over 3 years \$800.000 for information and education (I/E) \$50,000 to prepare training materials and \$600,000 for monitoring and reporting give 5 workshops on CRM \$1,980,000 for buffers (18,000 acres at \$110/acre) \$160,000 for management practice cost \$140,000 for 40 terraces sharing \$500 000 for CRM \$40,000 for monitoring and reporting Schedule Begin slowly and accelerate (build on successes) See above Annual progress reports Establish interim milestones Cropland: 2008 – reduce soil erosion by 80.000 tons/vear Streambanks: 2008 – stabilize 10.000 feet of eroding streambanks 2010 – stabilize 30,000 feet of eroding streambanks Push I/E early and complete by year 6 Annual reports that track progress Coordinate with partners Monitoring Environmental - water quality, IBI, acres treated, tons Attendance at CRM training workshops of soil erosion reduced, feet of streambank stabilized Acres of cropland using CRM Administrative - contracts approved, funds expended, Feet of stream buffers established and funds obligated Feet of field buffers established Social - landowners contacted Number of terraces Changes in public understanding resulting from I/E Environmental: reduction in sediment loads Administrative: contracts approved and funds expended 39 Social: landowners contacted

Table 13-1. Comparison of Example Parameters in a Hypothetical Watershed Plan and 319 Work Plan

Extracting Program Workplans from the Watershed Plan And finally

Practice Adaptive Management <





Finally...Make Adjustments

Monitor water quality and BMPs Compare results to goals Are you making progress? Are you meeting your goals? If you aren't meeting implementation milestones If you aren't making progress toward reducing pollutant loads....



Then...do it all over again!

Things to consider

Size

- Degree of uncertainty
- Plan to solve problems not for funds
- Plan to make better decisions



Questions?

davenport.thomas@epa.gov 312-886-0209



www.epa.gov/nps/watershed_handbook/