



Missouri Department of Natural Resources

Water Quality Coordinating Committee Water Protection Program

Minutes

Oct. 21, 2008



Missouri
Department of
Natural Resources

WATER QUALITY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

U.S. Geological Survey
Columbia Environmental Research Center
4200 New Haven Road
Columbia, Missouri

Oct. 21, 2008
10 a.m.

MEETING AGENDA

Recreational Use Attainability Analyses,
John Hoke, Water Protection Program, Department of Natural Resources

Preparing a Watershed Management Plans – And the survey says:
Bob Broz, UMC Extension, Water Quality Program

Other

Agency Activities

Meetings and Conferences

MISSOURI WATER QUALITY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Oct. 21, 2008

USGS Columbia Environmental Research Center
4200 New Haven Road
Columbia, Missouri

MINUTES

Attendees:

Sarah Fast	MoDNR, Water Protection Program	Cindy DiStefano	MO Dept. of Conservation
Darlene Schaben	MoDNR, Water Protection Program	Bryan Hopkins	MoDNR, Water Resources Center
Mark VanPatten	Missouri Department of Conservation	Tucker Fredrickson	MoDNR, Water Protection Program
Amy Jungclaus	Missouri Department of Conservation	Bob Broz	University of Missouri - Extension
Andrew Branson	Missouri Department of Conservation	Candy Schilling	Environmental Resources Coalition
Greg Anderson	MoDNR, Water Protection Program	John Hoke	MoDNR, Water Protection Program
Terri Brink	EPA Region 7	Bob Campbell	Stantec Consulting
Priscilla Stotts	MoDNR, Water Protection Program	Mandy Sappington	MoDNR, Water Protection Program
Trish Rielly	MoDNR, Water Protection Program		

Introductions were made.

Recreational Use Attainability Analyses, John Hoke, Water Protection Program, Department of Natural Resources
PowerPoint Presentation

John said there were seven public meetings around the state where he explained the Recreational Use Attainability Analyses, or UAA, process. Meetings were held at each of the five department Regional Offices, Jefferson City, and Ozark County. In 2005, the Clean Water Commission designated all classified waters of the state with whole body contact recreation. As part of the directive, staff conducted use attainability analyses to determine whether or not that designation was appropriate for some of the waters. This was for the Class C waters, which are waters that maintain permanent pools during dry periods. John said they use the federal Clean Water Act, Section 101(a) for their direction. Whole body contact recreation means being able to fully submerge yourself in the water. While conducting the UAAs, they also looked for activities that would be incidental contact, called secondary contact, which includes wading, boating or canoeing, fishing, or voluntary water quality monitoring.

UAA is defined as a structured, scientific assessment of the factors affecting the attainment of the use, which may include physical, chemical, biological, or economic factors. Using this framework, John said they opted to look at physical factors. A stakeholder process was used to develop the protocol, which was approved by the commission. John showed examples of streams where whole body contact recreation use should be removed. Field data only makes up part of the picture. Their visual sight on some of the streams was limited to where they could access the stream with landowner permissions. They then devised a process to ask local residents how they use the streams. If residents say they use the stream, this information supersedes the field data.

Effective May 21, 2008, public comments were being solicited. The 60-day comment period was extended 30 days to Aug. 31, 2008. The majority of the comments were from an on-line survey, which more effectively captured the comments they were looking for. A map viewer was also available to more accurately help the public in finding the location being described. They hope in the future to have an interactive map viewer to assist in getting correct information on the location, where GIS would populate the location fields. An important part of the survey form was including the person's name, address, and phone number or email address. This allowed John's group to follow-up with each person to verify location and the information submitted. They then followed up with a letter to that person. They received 455 public comments.

They learned that they need to target local newspapers instead of just sending out the information hoping the local newspapers would print it and to target landowners of the affected stream. They found that people are really interested in providing information.

As a result of the public comments, they have changed the designated uses of some streams and made those changes in the rule. The draft rule now has a 30-day comment period. This work represents about one-third of the waters where they have done a recreational UAA. Contractors are in the field yet completing surveys for the other two-thirds. The survey form will remain on the Web site for anyone to submit comments. This information will be used for the next triennial review of the water quality standards.

For questions, any of the department's regional offices can be contacted or the Water Protection Program. The completed UAAs can be found at the following Web site. Click on the dropdown to find the county of interest. <http://www.dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/wqstandards/uaa/index.html>

John said the public meetings were interesting and valuable in that they can make the rules reflect how the public uses the streams.

Missouri's protocol is based on Kansas' method but made Missouri-specific. Iowa is considering changing theirs to be similar to Missouri's.

Preparing Watershed Management Plans – And the survey says:, Bob Broz, UMC-Extension, Water Quality Program

PowerPoint Presentation; Handouts: copy of PowerPoint Presentation; Heartland Regional Water Coordination Initiative's "Targeting of Watershed Management Practices for Water Quality Protection"

Bob participates on a group called the Heartland Region project that includes Region 7's four states and is funded by U.S. Department of Agriculture. The group is trying to identify the basic requirements for a Watershed Management Plan. They have been looking at how involved a community gets in watershed planning. They all agreed that a plan should include EPA's nine elements, general watershed information, high quality maps of the watershed, to be holistic and identify point source and nonpoint source pollution, and must be able to quantify pollutant reduction loading.

They felt the general information needed for a watershed plan should include maps of the watershed, GIS data layers of basic watershed information, a watershed assessment or inventory, history and description of the area, identification of contaminants and how they are prioritized, and how to determine success in the watershed.

With a Watershed Management Plan, local people are working on this voluntary effort so it's important for them to realize why it's important and why they need to have a plan. Bob said the first two watershed management plans that were written are sitting on a shelf because no one knows what to do. They were excellent plans written by agency staff but have never been implemented because local citizens were not involved in the planning. Bob went over the nine elements and talked about the ideas the Heartland group agreed that may be the best way to get the minimum amount of data in the plan. These ideas are draft until approved by EPA.

Bob said University Extension received a 319 grant to do training on watershed planning. They have been working in TMDL watersheds trying to get people to look at all the different aspects and develop these into plans of implementation. They found that no other state in EPA Region 7 is doing any training. These training classes were offered in five Missouri locations – Jackson, Stover, Vienna, Newtown, and Appleton City. Four more trainings will be held over the next two years plus one statewide workshop that will probably focus on watershed planning tools. The following topics are covered in the training: Workshop intro and general watershed information; How to establish a watershed group; DNR review on grants; Introduction to watershed planning; Nine element discussion; Web based tools for watershed management plan development; and BMP tour of the local area.

Bob mentioned some of the reasons for organizing a watershed management group include wanting to be proactive, for human and health safety issues, community needs, and others. The stakeholders need to be identified and encouraged to participate. A Citizens Steering Committee is formed from the local stakeholders. This committee will have decision-making authority. A separate Agency Technical Committee is also needed to serve as a technical advisor. Bob said any type of group process needs the developmental stages of forming, norming, storming and performing. Ground rules must be established and apply to everyone.

Bob said it is important to have good maps for the watershed management plan to help explain what is going on and why. He talked about what should be included in the introduction part of the plan about the watershed and where to look for some of the Web-based resources. Using the training evaluations and comments from the first trainings, they decided to revise the training plan somewhat. Bob said the plan should be useable by local people who will be implementing it; identify local support for accomplishing load reduction measures; promote capacity building and decision making; establish ownership and leadership for implementation and long-term acceptance; and, be seen as a road map of how to get from where they are to where they need to be.

Some of the first trainings had low attendance so Bob thought they would try advertising them using a slightly different name. They also plan to work more closely with local councils of government in hopes of getting better attendance. Greg mentioned that the Nonpoint Source Annual Report is now available on the Water Protection Program's Nonpoint Source Web page, which may be another good reference site for the watershed groups. It includes a section on each of the 66 HUC 8s.

Bob handed out copies of a booklet from the Heartland Regional Water Coordination Initiative's "Targeting of Watershed Management Practices for Water Quality Protection." Because money is getting tighter, they need to figure out what things they really need to be looking at and targeting the funding. The booklet discusses different concepts of what is meant by targeting, how to determine where they need to be targeting things, and what are the social or cultural indicators to be aware of. Contact Bob if you want a copy.

Agency Activities

Sarah said there will not be a November WQCC meeting due to a staff conference being held on Nov. 18-19. The Dec. 16 meeting may include a hazardous waste presentation, the climate change research presentation, and possibly the CARES project.

Bob Broz mentioned a Low Impact Development training tomorrow (Oct. 22, 8 a.m.) at Tan-Tar-A, Lake of the Ozarks, sponsored by AmerenUE.

Anyone can sign up for a “Healthy Yards for Healthy Streams” program, Nov. 19 and 20 in Columbia. There is a \$45 registration fee. This was designed based on a 319 minigrant, the James River Basin and Hinkson projects as a pilot.

Feb. 9-11, 2009, is the National Water Quality Conference in St. Louis. Bob recommended attending this conference if you don’t attend any other one. More information can be found at www.usa.waterquality.com.

Priscilla Stotts said she really appreciated hearing the information shared today. She is working with Stream Teams in Clark County who are talking about developing a watershed protection group. Bob suggested they attend their Watershed Management Plan training.

Meeting adjourned.