

Priority Watershed Selection Process

Minnesota

Source: Draft Minnesota Nutrient Reduction Strategy (WQ-S1-80), Review Draft 10-7-2013

Prioritization Scale: HUC8

Priority Setting: Minnesota prioritized all watersheds in the state as high, medium or protection priorities. The high priorities are represented on the national Hypoxia Task Force States Watershed Priorities map. Watersheds were considered high priority if they were in the top 25 percent of nutrient yielding HUC8 watersheds for either nitrogen or phosphorus, or, of the stream reaches with monitoring data, if 50 percent or more of the reaches are estimated as exceeding proposed river eutrophication standards (RES).

State Strategy Site: <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/water/water-types-and-programs/surface-water/nutrient-reduction/nutrient-reduction-strategy.html>

Wisconsin

Source: Wisconsin's Nutrient Reduction Strategy, November 2013

Prioritization Scale: HUC10

Priority Setting: Top group HUC10 watersheds were identified separately for nitrogen, phosphorus and drinking water priorities. Watersheds in the nitrogen and phosphorus top groups were selected if the watershed is either in the top 20 percent for both SPARROW incremental yield modeling and stream monitoring growing season concentrations, or in the top 10 percent of either SPARROW incremental yield modeling or stream monitoring growing season concentrations and the top 30 percent for the other. Many of the top group watersheds are in both the nitrogen and phosphorus top groups. Watersheds within the nitrogen drinking water/groundwater top group were those in the top 10 percent of HUC10 watersheds statewide based on the number and percent of public wells with nitrate concentrations of 5 mg/L or greater.

State Strategy Site: <http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/SurfaceWater/nutrientstrategy.html>

Iowa

Source: Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship, Division of Soil Conservation

Prioritization Scale: HUC8

Priority Setting: The priority watersheds were selected by the Iowa Water Resources Coordinating Council. The prioritization process is not readily identified.

State Strategy Site: <http://www.nutrientstrategy.iastate.edu/> and <http://www.iowaagriculture.gov/WRCC/pdf/WRCCPriorityWatersheds13.pdf>

Illinois

Source: Illinois Statewide Nutrient Reduction Strategy website and Illinois Nutrient Loss Reduction Strategy November 2014 Draft

Prioritization Scale: HUC8, HUC10, and HUC12

Priority Setting: The priority HUC8 watersheds were selected based on nutrient loss by year, with the highest priority being those that have the greatest capacity to reduce high nutrient losses annually. Nitrogen and phosphorus agricultural watersheds were prioritized separately, and high priority point source dominated phosphorus watersheds were also identified. Watersheds were scored based on nutrient contributions (highest received the most points), proportion of designated uses met (highest and lowest percent met received lower scores, watersheds with 40-60 percent of designated uses met received the highest scores), and the number of watershed plans in the HUC (watersheds with the most plans received the highest score). In addition, Keep It for the Crops (KIC2025) watersheds were identified as priorities. Selection of these was based on the watershed containing a public water supply source and having approved TMDLs for nitrate and phosphorus (if there is a lake in the watershed).

State Strategy Site: <http://www.epa.state.il.us/water/nutrient/index.html>

Indiana

Source: Indiana Nutrient Reduction Strategy – A framework to reduce nutrients entering Indiana’s waters

Prioritization Scale: HUC8 and HUC12

Priority Setting: HUC8 watersheds were selected as priorities because they are in the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) and thus have the most active local initiatives, sufficient conservation resources, and state and federal field staff for technical assistance and outreach. These are also some of the most impaired watersheds, but because of the resources available, they were determined to have the greatest potential for water quality improvements. Two HUC12 watersheds were selected as special focus areas because there is sufficient water quality data available to serve as baselines and changes can be measured in the future. Both watersheds have USGS water quality monitoring gages.

State Strategy Site: <http://www.in.gov/isda/2991.htm>

Ohio

Source: Ohio Nutrient Reduction Strategy, June 28, 2013

Prioritization Scale: HUC8

Priority Setting: The HUC8 watersheds were selected because of their significant nutrient loading contributions from both agricultural and urban sources and load reductions in these watersheds would contribute to achieving overall Gulf hypoxia goals. In addition, one watershed was selected because of local nutrient impacts and a declaration as a distressed watershed under state regulations.

State Strategy Site: <http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wqs/NutrientReduction.aspx>

Tennessee

Source: Agricultural Nonpoint Source Nutrient Load Reduction Plan in Tennessee’s Mississippi River Basin Watersheds, Preliminary Draft, December 2013

Prioritization Scale: HUC8

Priority Setting: No clear priorities set.

State Strategy Site: none http://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/environment/attachments/tennessee-draft-nutrient-reduction-framework_01-21-2015.pdf

Mississippi

Source: Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Basin Management Branch

Prioritization Scale: HUC8, HUC10, and HUC12

Priority Setting: Unknown process

State Strategy Site:

http://www.deq.state.ms.us/MDEQ.nsf/page/WMB_Basin_Management_Approach?OpenDocument

Louisiana

Source: 2014 Annual Report: Louisiana Nutrient Management Strategy Implementation, Final May 18, 2015

Prioritization Scale: HUC8, HUC12, and sub-segment

Priority Setting: Priority watersheds in Louisiana [are] through USDA initiatives including Gulf of Mexico Initiative (GoMI), Mississippi River Basin Initiative (MRBI), and the National Water Quality Initiative (NWQI), and through the LDEQ NPS Program.

State Strategy Site: <http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/DIVISIONS/WaterPermits/NutrientManagementStrategy.aspx>

Arkansas

Source: State of Arkansas Nutrient Reduction Strategy

Prioritization Scale: HUC8

Priority Setting: Based on results of qualitative risk-based assessment by Nonpoint Source Pollution Management Plan Stakeholder Group. Watersheds were assigned a value of 0-10 for each of the categories based on the type of impairment and relative importance: water body impairment, designated use impacts, urban population, impervious surface, unpaved roads, priority of bordering state, T&E species, cropland, forestry, biotic impacts, economic activity, livestock and pasture, potential human exposure. SPARROW results and priorities of conservation programs (MRBI, NWQI, and state) were also considered in identifying priority watersheds

State Strategy Site: <http://arkansaswaterplan.org/state%20nutrient%20reduction%20strategy.html>

Missouri

Source: Missouri's Nutrient Loss Reduction Strategy

Prioritization Scale: HUC 8

Priority Setting: For each watershed, perform an assessment of what is currently known about each watershed and what concerns are shared by those who live, work and recreate in the watershed, understand what resources exist to help protect and restore watershed environments, and create and implement a water resources vision at the local watershed level – where specific water resource needs are best addressed. The OMW assessment of each watershed will support targeting in three ways. The data compiled and shared with those in each watershed will support local decision-making on those topics most in need of attention, including nutrient loading. This will support focusing within the watershed on those areas or point sources most important to improving water quality, addressing stream impairments and aligning the resources with the areas of greatest need. By supporting local decision making, OMW provides incentives for both involvement and collaboration. This will support much more strategic use of departmental and other resources available within the watershed.

State Strategy Site: <http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/mnrsc/index.htm>

Kentucky

Source: Kentucky Nutrient Management Strategy, March 2014

Prioritization Scale: HUC 8

Priority Setting: To achieve the goal of Assess and Prioritize Watersheds, KDOW has developed specific tactics and actions. See Appendix A for a list of all tactics and actions for the Nutrient Reduction Strategy and the anticipated schedule of implementation. Tactic Identify Priority watersheds (HUC12 scale) Specific Actions Establish a Nutrient Management Steering Committee Use Recovery Potential Screening Tool to determine watershed recovery rankings Determine Nutrient Priority Watersheds

State Strategy Site: <http://water.ky.gov/Pages/NutrientStrategy.aspx>