

Species, Stories and Stakeholders

September 17, 2014

**Arkansas Natural Resources Commission
Tony Ramick, Supervisor
NPS Management Program**

Updates and Information

- **Funding**

- \$2,988,000 was approved by EPA to fund administrative functions of the NPS Management Program from October 2014 – September 2018

- **Workplans**

- A request for workplans has been announced by ANRC. Workplan submittals are due by COB December 05, 2014.
- FY 2015 – 2017 dollars will be specifically dedicated to projects. Projects workplans should continue to focus on NPS prioritized watersheds with accepted 9 element Watershed Management Plans **or** that **specifically targets** locations and BMPs needed to delist an impaired or address a (TMDL) waterbody*
 - *Focus remains in the NPS Priority watersheds
 - *Specific and targeted BMP to address the cause of impairment
 - *Specific measures of success that directly relates or demonstrates WQ improvement
 - *Monitoring

Updates and Information

- **Changes occurring**

- Allocation amounts for FY 2015 and beyond can not be predicted and are not typically known before mid January
- Starting for FY 2015 funding for ANRC and EPA approved workplans will not begin until October 01, 2015. To be considered for FY 2015 funding workplans must be submitted by COB December 05, 2014.

- **Matrix Update**

- Inclusion of Threatened and Endangered species into the matrix

- **Success**

- ADEQ delistings relative to NPS
- Success Stories

- **Milestone reporting**

- Milestones selected are more indicative of program accomplishments

Historic Funding for the NPS Program in Arkansas

- FY 03 \$4.561M (-) 56K
- FY 13 \$2.921M (-) 161K
- FY 14 \$2.988M + 67K

In 2002 the NPS program received \$4.617M. In 2014 the NPS program received \$2.988M. In 12 years the NPS program has been **reduced by 35%** (\$1.629M). Greater and documented results are required today with less dollars.

NPS Program focus for the Future?

Urban NPS*

- Leading source of impairments to surveyed estuaries (Presidents directive on Chesapeake Bay)
- Third largest source of WQ impairments to surveyed lakes

Why?

- Land conversion – yesterdays family farm of 100 acres is becoming 300 lot subdivisions of today
- Impervious surfaces
 - Concrete, asphalt and roofs do not allow water to percolate into the ground
 - Increased runoff (increased volume + increased velocity = greater pollutant loads)

*Based on a National Water Quality Inventory by EPA

Adapting to changes of the NPS Management Program

- Money – Too much or not enough?
 - The NPS program could use more \$'s but only if there are partners (entities) willing to do the work (projects) or do the work necessary (eligibility) with the restrictions of where \$'s can be used based on EPA guidance (criteria)
 - Currently on Federal \$'s are put into the NPS program. There is no “line item” or Arkansas legislative funding allocated
 - Project area or stream segment monitoring, results and WQx cost versus “on the ground” implementation
- Field Capacity – there are not entities to carry out projects
 - Not financially secure or ever develop a long term revenue stream
 - No full time coordinator or dedicated personnel
 - No activities to keep partners involved
 - Little or no recognition or expressed appreciation
- Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) – primacy agency for water quality
 - ADEQ develops the Integrated Water Quality Report (305b) and the subsequent 303(d) list of impaired waters
 - Roving monitoring network – waters actively assessed on a rotating basis
 - Typically an 8 digit HUC has 2-3 monitoring stations
 - Not enough monitoring to assess effectiveness of “small” projects

Limitations of the NPS Management Program

- Documented Success
 - Difficult and takes time (long term monitoring and assessment)
- Reactive versus Proactive management
 - Historically EPA has mandated a reactive management approach to WQ (i.e. address only waters that are impaired)
 - Federal fiscal year 2014 EPA agreed with states that some \$'s be dedicated to maintaining waterbodies
- Time
 - Practices (BMPs) placed along the streambank have the most immediate effect
 - BMPs placed within the riparian zone have the next quickest effect
 - BMPs placed out of the riparian zone but within $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile typically will not show an effect for years (dependent on the practice, condition, slope, etc.)
- No real way to assess the effects of controlling, reducing or abating NPS expediently
 - Watersheds are not static
 - Improvements may be negligible or negated in the geographic scope of the watershed

Strength of the NPS Management Program

Partners

- Federal and State agencies, academic institutions, conservation districts, organizations and watershed groups

How is Partnership strength demonstrated

- Informing stakeholders and citizens who your are and what you do
- Giving credit where credit is due
- Reporting activities through an “annual report”
- Distributing the “annual report” to partners

The NPS Program has initiated a “Snap shot” reporting form to help capture activities occurring in the State that agencies, academic institutions, conservation districts, organizations and watershed groups are doing.

Arkansas Water Plan Update

- Draft Executive Summary is out for review
- Public meetings are being conducted
 - September 03 – Stuttgart 26 people attended
 - September 04 – Jonesboro 17 people attended
 - September 05 – Russellville 3 people attended
 - September 15 – Smackover
 - September 16 – Texarkana
 - September 17 – Little Rock 2 p.m. @ Central AR Main Branch Library, 100 Rock St. Darragh Center Auditorium
 - September 19 – Fayetteville 10 a.m. @ U of A Pauline Whitaker Animal Science Center, 1335 West Knapp Rm 109
- About the Update
 - An adaptive management approach – updated every ~5 years
 - This update is focused more on quantity than quality
 - Water Quality information is limited
 - Recommends a need for the input of state \$'s for WQ programs

Arkansas Water Plan Update

- Lessons learned
 - WQ is a “stand alone” sector (was combined with the Fish and Wildlife and Recreation sectors)
 - Quantity generally has limited use without Quality
 - Water Quality, quantity and infrastructure are the basis for community growth
 - There is no substitute for verifiable data and sound science
- Get involved
 - Participation is paramount
 - It is a good chance others have the same concerns or issues
 - Directed collaborative efforts dictates change
 - Let others hear your voice – ANRC, members of the Legislature, County Judges, mayors, elected officials and **YOUR NEIGHBORS**

www.arkansaswaterplan.arkansas.gov

Questions?

Tony Ramick, Supervisor
NPS Management Program
Arkansas Natural Resources Commission
101 East Capitol, Suite 350
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
(501) 682-3914
Tony.ramick@arkansas.gov