

---

*Nonpoint Source*

---

 **EPA** *News-Notes*

---

---

**A Commentary. . .**

---

*The States Share Approaches to Nonpoint Source Management*

It is our observation now that every State NPS Management Program has its own unique twist or flavor—something that is innovative, distinctive, and worth bragging about. We have managed to bring you a few of these special happenings in this issue of *News-Notes* in the interest of technology transfer, information exchange, and water quality.

We think that Washington State's Puget Sound funding proposal for watershed-wide NPS management deserves special attention. There's some new thinking here.

And we commend the U.S. Forest Service, Trout Unlimited, and the involved interested citizens who hammered out agreements on the management of riparian lands in forest harvest areas for the sake of habitat protection and water quality. These could very well be landmark agreements.

If you have something that deserves sharing, let us hear from you. We'll be glad to pass it along.

---

**Headquarters Notes**

---

*Nonpoint Source Program Status Summary**As of June 21, 1990***Assessment Reports**

EPA Regions have approved 55 State and Territory NPS Assessments; only the Virgin Islands and Pacific Trust Territories are not approved.

**Management Programs**

Regions have approved 54 Management Programs. Of these, 42 have been fully approved, and 12 States have approved portions. Programs from Alaska, the Virgin Islands, and the Pacific Trust Territories are not approved.

**Section 319 Incentive Awards and Implementation Grants**

- *Incentive Awards:* In March, a national awards panel representing EPA Headquarters and Regions selected four outstanding States (ID, MN, NC, VA) and eight honorable mention States (AZ, KY, MI, MT, RI, SD, WA, WI) to receive "bonus" awards of \$250K and \$105K respectively for long-term commitment to quality NPS programs.
- *Implementation Grants:* Performance-based Section 319 grant awards have been determined for 52 States and Territories; grants have not yet been awarded to DC and AL. (States without approved Management Programs cannot receive Section 319 grants.)

---

## National Guidance Issued on Wetlands and NPS Control Programs

Attaining water quality goals shared by the NPS control and wetlands protection programs is the stated objective of a new national guidance document dated June 18, 1990. The guidance was issued jointly by Martha G. Prothro, Director of EPA's Office of Water Regulations and Standards (OWRS) and David G. Davis, Director of the Agency's Office of Wetlands Protection (OWP).

Wetlands programs can assist State NPS programs by identifying wetlands that are influenced by NPS pollution and those whose continued effective functioning or restoration can help to achieve NPS control objectives.

Similarly, NPS assessment and implementation activities can be used by wetland programs to manage the protection and restoration of wetlands, which are themselves "waters of the United States" deserving full protection from NPS pollution under the Clean Water Act.

The guidance looks to enhance integration of the two programs. Wetlands provide easily recognizable and direct wildlife support functions. They also provide less obvious benefits to adjacent or downstream water bodies, including flood attenuation, erosion control, and water quality improvements. The control of NPS pollution is essential to healthy and properly functioning wetlands.

The document points out that

*[a]n important step in the coordination of these two programs involves the personal communication between the professionals within these two programs, both at the Federal and the State levels of government. This document is designed to encourage this communication.*

The guidance deals with the protection and restoration of wetland functions and values, NPS program activities under Section 319 of the Clean Water Act, wetland program activities, and coordination between the two programs.

*[For more information and copies of the guidance contact: Dov Weitman, Chief, Nonpoint Source Control Branch (WH-553), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington DC 20460. Phone: (FTS/202) 382-7085; or John W. Meagher, Director, Wetlands Strategies and State Programs Division (A-104F), U.S. EPA, same street address. Phone: (FTS/202) 382-5043.]*

---

## Final NPS Grants Allocation Formula and Guidance Up for Full Discussion Prior to FY 91 Grant Awards

Office of Water Regulations and Standards (OWRS) Director Martha G. Prothro has announced that the Agency will develop a final allocation formula and grants guidance for the issuance of future NPS implementation grants under Section 319 of the Clean Water Act. The final allocation formula and grants apply to the States and Territories, subject to full public review prior to initiation of the FY 91 grant process.

In a June 21, 1990, letter to Regional Water Division Directors and Headquarters Office Directors, Prothro commented that the issuance of the FY 90 grants was a "noteworthy achievement...given the time constraints," and that following those awards the Agency intended to "...develop final grant guidance through a process which provided opportunity for full public participation and comment."

The letter indicates that OWRS will now develop and publish a notice in the Federal Register in August that uses the interim FY 1990 guidance documents (December 1 and 15, 1989) as the departure point for soliciting public comment. The guidance documents will be supplemented by a set of issues and questions soliciting specific input on key issues of concern as well as potential new directions. A Notice of Availability of the Final Guidance is planned for publication later this fall.

*[For more information contact: Stu Tuller, Chief, Nonpoint Source Control Section (WH 553), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street S.W., Washington DC, 20460. Phone: (FTS/202) 382-7085.]*

---

# **Notes on NPS Pollution Control Funding**

## *NPS Pollution Control Fee System Proposed for Puget Sound*

### **Development of the Fee Proposal**

The Puget Sound Water Quality Authority included in its 1989 Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan a directive that the State Department of Ecology "...assess the adequacy of existing funding mechanisms for shellfish protection programs, identifying new sources, and develop and implement a strategy for securing funds."

Early in the conduct of the funding implementation studies it became evident that the protection of all beneficial water uses from NPS pollution was required. The Department reported at that time that "...the main sources of NPS pollution in the Puget Sound area are failing individual septic systems and runoff from agriculture, forest and urban lands. These sources add bacteria, toxins, sediments and nutrients to the lakes, rivers and estuaries of Puget Sound." In addition to shellfish, "...NPS pollution also impacts other beneficial uses of water,...such as fish and wildlife habitat, drinking water and recreation. For example, fisheries managers cite pollution from sediments and nutrients as causing significant reductions of salmonid fish populations."

*A Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Fee Proposal* has been developed and is now being reviewed by a broad range of interest groups, local governments, and State agencies in the 12-county region. Reviews are expected to be completed during the summer of 1990 with a final proposal to be developed and presented to the 1991 session of the legislature.

### **Concepts and Fee Elements**

Underlying the proposed financing concept is the fact that local units of government need to be provided with the financial resources necessary for them to control NPS pollution within their jurisdictions.

The proposed fee system combines three working principles that are coming to be recognized as essential to any successful NPS management program:

- The costs of NPS controls must largely and recognizably be borne by those who cause (generate) NPS pollution;
- Pollution prevention and keeping NPS-borne pollutants from entering surface and ground waters are essential NPS control strategies; and
- Large-scale changes in personal habits and housekeeping methods are also essential elements of NPS control. (Some would call this behavior modification or the application of "disincentives.")

Basic to the Department's proposal is a fee structure based on a charge to those land uses that cause or have the potential to cause NPS pollution.

The Department's summary report on the proposal also recommends using financial disincentives on landowners with land uses causing NPS pollution.

*This method has the potential to change individual management of polluting land uses, which has been widely recognized as a central problem of nonpoint source pollution control. The fee and disincentive approach combined become the mechanism to achieve direct NPS pollution control.*

A basic fee would be established, which would amount to

*[a]n annual assessment of at least \$12 per parcel on lands draining into the Puget Sound. Designated "open space" land would not be assessed. Lands in communities with existing stormwater fees would be exempt, and local jurisdictions could set higher fees if necessary to control NPS pollution.*

Puget Sound  
(Continued)

The proposal contains two suggested “disincentive fees,” including

*[a]n annual \$75 avoidable surcharge assessed to landowners with onsite septic tanks or livestock. The surcharge could be avoided when septic systems are inspected and in good working order or when best management practices to control animal wastes and runoff from farms are installed and working.*

*[The second disincentive fee is an] annual \$6 avoidable surcharge assessed to landowners in urbanized areas. The surcharge would be avoided when local comprehensive stormwater controls are in place.*

The area draining into Puget Sound contains approximately 1.2 million parcels of land in its 12 counties. About 700,000 parcels are served by municipal sewers and would be subject to the \$6 surcharge, avoidable when local stormwater controls are developed and in place.

About 500,000 are unsewered parcels with, typically, onsite sewage systems and animal keeping, agriculture, forestry or other rural uses. On these parcels, only those with onsite systems and animal keeping would be subject to the \$75 surcharge, avoidable with inspected and working sewage systems and BMPs in place to control animal wastes.

#### **Local Revenues and Annual Costs**

Revenues from this mixture of land uses in the region are projected to yield about \$10 to \$12 million per year, excluding revenues from the onsite/livestock avoidable surcharge. Of these dollars, over 90 percent would go to local governments for their NPS pollution control and fee administration costs. The remainder would go to State agencies for oversight, NPS pollution control administration, and technical assistance.

Local municipalities and counties would use their share of the revenues to provide services to help property owners meet the surcharge avoidance requirements:

1. Technical assistance and evaluation services would be provided for onsite septic systems.
2. Programs would be established to assist land owners in developing and implementing BMPs and farm management /conservation plans. Conservation Districts would need additional staff in order to make their contribution to this aspect of county pollution control programs. Local governments would work out cooperative arrangements with the Districts to insure that services are provided without duplication of costs. Maximum use would be made of USDA soil/water conservation programs.
3. Appropriate plans for compliance with State stormwater management rules would be developed and adopted.

Implementation of other watershed NPS control plan elements, such as erosion control on construction sites and other urban conversions of previous open or forest lands, would add inspection costs. There will be local administrative costs too in connection with fee billings and collections.

The primary purpose of the Puget Sound fee structure proposal is to generate stable revenue sources for local government NPS pollution control activities to be used as determined locally. The proposal does not provide for the financing of large capital outlays because State Revolving Loan Funds (substantially funded with EPA capital grants) can provide such financing. Then the local fee structure can be adjusted to create a fund to meet annual debt service requirements. Similarly, the Department’s report on the fee proposal suggests that “...a local fund could be established to provide low interest loans to individuals needing to fix failing septic systems or install farm management/water quality management plans.”

*Puget Sound* Thus, the proposal provides a dependable and flexible basis for meeting annual local NPS  
*(Continued)* control costs as conceived and managed locally.

**Concluding Thoughts...**

Bill Zachmann of the Department of Ecology's Shorelands and Coastal Zone Management Program is closely associated with the development of the fee proposal. He comments: "The Puget Sound Water Quality Authority has prepared, and kept current, the Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan. Hearings on the updated draft 1991 plan will be conducted during June and July. The NPS fee proposal is key to the implementation of several of the Plan's NPS Pollution and Shellfish Protection elements by the local governments in the region. As a result of consultations with local government, State agencies and the public, the proposal may be modified, but the Department of Ecology is working towards presenting a sound proposal to the Legislature in January."

Zachmann concludes, "Funding and financial planning is one of the key elements in successful NPS management. Nonpoint management is a new governmental responsibility that will require some new management responsibilities and ideas to meet those responsibilities."

*[For more information contact: Bill Zachmann, State of Washington, Department of Ecology, Shorelands and Coastal Zone Management Program, Mail Stop PV-11, Olympia, WA 98504-8711. Phone: (206) 459-6515.]*

---

## **Notes From The States**

### *California Intends to Use \$13.42 Million of its POTW Construction Grant Funds for NPS Management*

On April 19, 1990, California's State Water Resources Control Board, in adopting its "Intended Use Plan" governing the use of its Construction Grant funds under Title II of the Clean Water Act, availed itself of the governor's discretionary provision under section 201(g)(1)(B) of the Act in opting to use its maximum permissible 20 percent of FY 90 construction grant money for NPS control management.

This action makes \$13.42 million available. So far the State has approved the following commitments for the use of these monies:

\$2,250,000	Implementation of the State's Silviculture NPS Program on Federal, State, and private forest lands.
\$2,210,000	Completion of Nonpoint Source Control Implementation Program revisions of California's nine Basin Plans (each administered by a State Regional Water Quality Control Board).
\$ 510,000	Development of Implementation Programs for those bays and estuaries primarily affected by nonpoint sources of pollution.
<hr/>	
\$4,970,000	Committed funds

Although commitments have not been made, the State is studying the following possible uses for the balance of the discretionary funds:

\$2-3 million	NPS Management Program implementation projects.
\$6-5 million	State and Regional NPS staff support over the next four years of the State's NPS Management Control Program.

*California* Final arrangements for the use of the discretionary funds are subject to negotiation between  
*(Continued)* the State and EPA's Region IX.

"We commend California on their initiative in taking advantage of this option," commented Harry Seraydarian, Director of Region IX's Water Division. "This is the largest use of Title II funds for nonpoint control since the Act was passed. Control of nonpoint sources of water pollution requires preventative implementation actions where the NPS pollution originates. The State is on its way to do just that. I look forward to solid progress."

*[For more information contact: Tom Howard, California State Water Control Board, P.O. Box 100, Sacramento, CA 95801. Phone: (916) 324-7970.]*

---

## *South Dakota Uses Construction Grant Money to Fund Statewide NPS Education Program*

The South Dakota NPS Management Program arranged to finance its Statewide NPS Information and Education program (NPS I&E) with \$203,000 of the State's FY 90 U.S. EPA sewage treatment construction grant funds. Construction grant funds can be used for NPS purposes at a governor's discretion under the provisions of Section 201(g)(1)(B) of the Clean Water Act. The SD Department of Agriculture supplemented these CWA funds with an additional \$100,000.

The I&E agenda for the first year includes developing an NPS informational brochure, publishing a newsletter, developing news releases and public service announcements, and participating in a monthly radio program. Other projects involve the development of an agricultural waste handbook, information to city officials, community projects, and a water quality conference.

South Dakota has a sixty-four member NPS Task Force with broad representation. The Task Force plays an important policy advisory role in the development and implementation of the State's NPS Management Program.

On the government side, the Task Force has seventeen representatives from Federal agencies, eleven from State offices, five from universities, and ten representatives from conservation districts and local government organizations. Seven Statewide associations, two environmental organizations, and twelve individual citizens (farmers, business, and professional people) round out the Task Force.

During the development of the State's NPS Management Program, the NPS Task Force recognized the need to inform and educate the people of South Dakota about nonpoint sources of water pollution. It then undertook the initial development of the NPS I&E Plan addressing the issues of funding, coordination, and the establishment of a steering committee to work on the NPS I&E Plan.

The Division of Conservation of the South Dakota Department of Agriculture proposed that it undertake the initial development and coordination of the NPS I&E Plan, including providing a position and the use of existing staff. The NPS Task Force accepted the Division's proposal.

A NPS I&E Steering Committee is composed of representatives of the SD Department of Agriculture, SD Department of Water and Natural Resources, SD Water Congress, the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, Cooperative Extension, SD Association of Conservation Districts, and two local Water Development Districts, the James River and Eastern Dakota.

With the approval of the Task Force, the NPS I&E Steering Committee developed a four-year NPS I&E program as well as the one-year annual plan, currently in operation.

South Dakota  
(Continued)

The *Year 1 Annual Plan* was developed without Cooperative Extension Service funding earmarked for water quality programs. However, the Extension Service agreed to develop additional projects concerning water quality in conjunction with the NPS I&E program to avoid duplication.

SD Department of Agriculture funds covered the salary and benefits of the coordinator, travel, supplies, contractual services, and the salary and benefits of the Division when working on NPS I&E projects.

"Our Information and Education Program is just beginning," said Amy Converse, NPS I&E Coordinator. "We have many State, Federal and local agencies working closely together on nonpoint pollution management in South Dakota. We need to let the people know what's going on and why it's important to them. Clean water is everyone's business."

[For more information contact: Amy Converse, NPS I&E Coordinator, SD Department of Agriculture, Anderson Building, 445 E. Capitol, Pierre, SD, 57501. Phone: (605) 773-3258.]

---

## *Idaho Water Quality Conference Attracts 475 Participants*

*Building on Idaho's Agricultural Water Quality Program* was the theme of the State of Idaho's first comprehensive agricultural water quality conference held in Boise early this spring. The conference, which drew 475 attendees, was sponsored by the Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts (IASCD) and U.S. EPA Region X. "Cooperation among agencies" quickly emerged as the popular means for building on Idaho's water quality program. Legislators, regulators, planners, managers, producers, researchers—all stressed the importance of communicating and working together.

Opening speakers praised Idaho's agricultural water quality program. Delbert Winterfield, IASCD President, reported that Idaho is recognized as a leader in the Pacific region. Idaho Governor Cecil D. Andrus, speaking to conference participants by video, acknowledged that "the quality of Idaho's waters is high, and in many ways is the envy of the entire country. Yet there is more to do and more demands for improvement."

The objectives of the conference were as follows:

- Provide and update current concerns, opportunities, and programs regarding agricultural nonpoint source (NPS) pollution;
- Explain the roles and responsibilities of Federal, State, and local agencies involved in agricultural NPS management; and
- Gain needed public input in the direction to be taken in the revision of Idaho's State Agricultural Pollution Abatement Plan.

Monday, the first day of the conference, was packed with speakers, panels, and presentations. Tuesday, the "best day" according to common sentiment, provided ample opportunity for mental stimulation. Nine different concurrent sessions, comprising fifty-nine presentations, were held. Topics ranged from riparian habitat management to surface water monitoring to public involvement techniques.

Spurred no doubt by the increasing debate over the 1990 Farm Bill, National Association of Conservation Districts (NACD) President Bob Weatherbee took a strong position at Wednesday's banquet. NACD is advocating a cooperative, incentive-based program for solving the nation's resource problems.

Weatherbee told participants, "We need to go forth from this meeting and tell the public and those who represent us about what we are already doing to address water quality problems,

*Idaho  
(Continued)*

about the successes of our program in the past, and of our abilities to meet the needs of the future. We need the cooperation and the support of the American public if we are to adopt realistic, workable solutions to our water quality problems.”

Susan Martin, Manager—Surface Water Quality, Idaho Division of Environmental Quality (DEQ), explained the State’s Water Quality Objectives for nonpoint source pollution. She acknowledged the “good job” being done by the State and Idaho’s national renown but cautioned, “We still have our share of problems based on Idaho’s Section 319 NPS Assessment Report and we must deal with the problems. Congress and the public expect results.”

Dealing with the problems, according to Martin, “means adhering to the feedback loop, getting the whole picture, and working together.”

The feedback loop, Idaho’s basic framework for managing NPS pollution, consists of four discrete and sequential steps: land management practices, on-site implementation, monitoring, and instream criteria.

Congress wants abundant fishing, good riparian areas, decreased sediment in our streams, and decreased chemicals in our waters, “but they don’t want to put farmers out of business,” advocated Martin. “It is essential that we cooperate, we communicate, and we work together in a complementary fashion,” she said.

Ron Kreizenbeck, EPA Water Division Acting Director, Seattle (Region X), praised Idaho’s leadership in voluntary programs for promoting and controlling agricultural NPS pollution with food producers. “Idaho is responsibly addressing problems associated with agriculture and is making measurable progress in getting food producers to adopt best management practices to protect and improve water quality.”

“The interest and cooperation in Idaho’s agriculture program, with its State cost-share emphasis, is providing a standard for other States to follow. More people need to be aware of the coordination and cooperation among Idaho agencies that are making this program work. Programs to address environmental issues, like Idaho’s water quality program, will help keep agricultural programs voluntary,” Kreizenbeck commented.

He observed that accurate scientific data based on research and monitoring is needed to determine the effects of agricultural runoff and chemicals on ground and surface water and concluded by urging soil and water conservation districts to support additional monitoring and research efforts.

*[For more information contact: Amos Garrison, Executive Director, Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts, 118 West Franklin, Meridian, ID 83642. Phone: (208) 888-1890.]*

---

## *New Mexico Tackles Consistency of Federal NPS Management*

Section 319(b)(2)(F) of the Clean Water Act provides that a State may review individual applications and project plans for Federal financial assistance programs and Federal development projects to assess their effects on the State’s water quality and their consistency with the State’s NPS Management Program. Currently, the State of New Mexico’s Nonpoint Source Management Program is working cooperatively with Federal agencies within the State to ensure Federal consistency.

Numerous Federal agency operations have the potential to affect waters in New Mexico. Thirty-four percent of the land in New Mexico is owned and managed by Federal agencies, primarily the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) in the Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in the Department of the Interior. Approximately 90 percent of the State’s high quality cold water fishing streams flow through mountainous watersheds managed by the Forest Service. The Rio Grande and Red River, designated as Federal Wild



*New Mexico  
(Continued)*

and Scenic Rivers in north-central New Mexico, and the famous San Juan River in northwestern New Mexico, flow through lands managed by BLM. Due to the high value the State places on such waters, it has conducted Federal consistency reviews of USFS and BLM activities with particular care.

The consistency review process used in New Mexico generally proceeds as follows:

- As a part of its NPS Management Program, the State reviews all proposed civil projects of the Federal Highway Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, as well as projects of USFS and BLM.
- When a NPS impact or concern is identified through State review or monitoring, a report from the Federal agency, or a citizen complaint, the State Environmental Improvement Division (EID) of the Health and Environment Department—the lead agency for NPS water quality management—verifies the use impairment or water quality standards violation.
- A formal notification letter is sent to the Federal agency.
- EID staff visit the site with staff of the Federal agency and discuss appropriate best management practices (BMPs) to prevent or correct the water quality problem. In the case of the USFS and the BLM, interdisciplinary teams select appropriate site-specific BMPs to treat a given NPS problem.
- EID and the Federal agency agree to a schedule for implementation of selected BMPs.
- EID monitors compliance (the use of BMPs and the implementation schedule) and evaluates the effectiveness of BMPs in achieving water quality goals.
- EID informs the Federal agency that the BMPs are working to achieve water quality goals, or that modification of practices is needed.

“We are developing good working relationships with most Federal agencies and are working with them to ensure that the work of these agencies is consistent with our State’s water quality standards, programs, and goals,” said Jim Piatt, manager of NPS programs for EID. “Our consistency review efforts with these agencies are a cooperative effort that is particularly important given the grazing, logging, mining, and recreational impacts that can result from Federal land management activities.”

Susan Alexander, EPA Region VI Nonpoint Source Coordinator, feels that the New Mexico Federal/State cooperative arrangements are a good way to deal with the need for Federal consistency with State water quality policies.

In one example, the Forest Service and EID have been working cooperatively to assess and eliminate the water quality impacts of a massive erosion problem on an irrigation system in northern New Mexico. The “Ojo Sarco Acequia,” which runs through part of the Carson National Forest, has been eroding severely for over 70 years. The Acequia is delivering sediment to the Rio Embudo. “The Forest Service has begun to address this problem now and we commend them for their efforts in this area,” said Piatt.

At BLM, the State’s list of NPS-impacted waters has been provided to all District Managers, who are reviewing their land management practices for consistency with State water quality goals. EID water quality specialists will soon be working with the BLM hydrologist and other BLM resource professionals around the State to improve water quality and control NPS pollution on BLM-managed lands.

*[For more information contact: David Coss or Jim Piatt, New Mexico Environmental Improvement Division, 1190 St. Francis Drive, Santa Fe, NM 87503. Phone: (505) 827-2829.]*

---

## *Izaak Walton League Mobilizes and Trains Volunteers to Monitor and Restore Virginia Streams*

The Izaak Walton League of America's *Save our Streams* (SOS) program is a nationwide volunteer stream monitoring and restoration program. The SOS program in Virginia has been integrated into Virginia's NPS Management Program and is supported by funding from Section 319 of the Clean Water Act.

The SOS program includes analysis of pollution problems in selected watersheds, biological monitoring of water quality, and stream restoration projects including litter cleanups, tree planting, installation of best management practices, and other conservation activities.

The Virginia SOS program began as a 100 percent privately funded effort in 1988 in eleven counties in Northern Virginia. The 319 funding will help the program expand Statewide. The SOS biomonitoring technique aids State agencies in gathering more data on previously unmonitored streams threatened by nonpoint sources of pollution. Another equally important purpose of the monitoring program is to educate Virginia citizens on the need to protect their rivers from NPS pollution and demonstrate how the uniquely sensitive ecosystems depend on the wise use of river and land resources.

Participants begin their involvement in the Virginia SOS program through day-long training workshops scheduled where the State has requested additional monitoring to address targeted NPS problems or where there is a high level of public interest. The workshops are open to the public and are advertised in Virginia magazines, newspapers and by State and private agencies.

Workshops teach citizens how to recognize runoff pollution and how to measure water quality using biological monitoring and habitat assessment. Participants also learn about State regulations such as the Pollution Discharge Elimination System. Further, the workshops introduce participants to best management practices (BMPs); they are given brochures on BMPs for agriculture, livestock operations, forestry, and other land uses. A slide show is used to demonstrate stream pollution problems, monitoring techniques, and restoration practices. An on-site, hands-on demonstration and training session in the biological stream monitoring technique is provided. Participants then return to the workshop location and register to monitor a specific stream station(s).

Biological monitoring data generated by stream monitors is mailed to the League's national office in Arlington, Virginia where it is reviewed and stored on a database called "Bugs." Data reports on sampling sites will be routinely transmitted to State agency personnel for use in targeting and implementing NPS control programs.

In accordance with EPA's Quality Assurance requirements, the Virginia Izaak Walton League is currently revising their monitoring protocol to include data quality objectives and specific quality assurance measures.

Under the current State/319 grant from Virginia, the League's SOS will produce a variety of informational citizen guides to help volunteers recognize and prevent NPS pollution. One brochure will explain the purpose of Virginia's NPS Pollution Control Program and how to participate. A guidebook on how to identify and report construction site sediment violations will be produced as well as a teacher's manual for grades one to twelve with lesson plans and field studies on water quality, watershed mapping, and land uses. Stream restoration and land use planning will be major features of the manual.

Also scheduled for production are a new slide show on installation of BMPs and stream restoration activities and a citizens NPS pollution land-use survey.

West Virginia and Tennessee have initiated networks using the Virginia SOS experience as an

Virginia  
(Continued)

easily replicable model. Other States have also expressed an interest in getting started.

*[For more information about SOS networks and the Virginia program contact: Karen Firehock, SOS National Coordinator, Izaak Walton League of America, 1401 Wilson Boulevard, Level B, Arlington, VA 22209. Phone: (703) 528-1818; or Stu Wilson, NPS Program Coordinator, Virginia Division of Soil and Water Conservation, 203 Governor Street, Suite 206, Richmond, Virginia 23219-2094. Phone (804) 786-2064]*

---

## *Virginia Law Requires Conservation Plans for Farms in Chesapeake Bay Watershed*

Virginia is providing \$375,000 in State funds during the current fiscal year to fourteen Soil and Water Conservation Districts located in Tidewater Virginia. The Districts will use the money to hire additional technical staff to assist in carrying out new regulatory mandates for the protection of water quality of Chesapeake Bay enacted by the General Assembly in 1989.

Under regulations developed under the new Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, farmers within designated preservation areas will be required to develop soil and water quality conservation plans on their farms by 1995. These plans will address proper nutrient management and integrated pest management as well as traditional soil erosion concerns.

The Act also requires that farmers within designated protection areas retain or establish a 100-foot buffer strip along permanent watercourses. The size of this strip may be reduced to a minimum of 25 feet as a part of an approved and implemented conservation plan which provides water quality protection equivalent to the 100-foot buffer.

Under the guidance of the State's Division of Soil and Water Conservation, local Districts will hire additional personnel to assist land owners in meeting the regulation's requirements. These technical personnel will also work closely with the localities that have enforcement authority.

A portion of these State funds expended to implement the Act is being utilized as a State match for Federal funds being provided to implement Virginia's NPS Management Program under Section 319 of the Clean Water Act.

*[For more information contact: John Dondero, Division of Soil and Water Conservation, Commonwealth of Virginia, 203 Governor Street, Suite 206, Richmond, Virginia 23219-2094. Phone: (804) 786-3199.]*

---

## *Maine's Casco Bay Project Uses a Watershed Approach to NPS Control*

Nancy Sullivan, Region I's NPS Coordinator, wrote to us recently. We would like to pass her thoughtful observations along to our readers:

A focused watershed approach to solving NPS pollution appears to be a very effective method. Watershed control can take many forms, including prevention, remediation, and public awareness.

Prevention is most commonly achieved through land use planning, growth management and implementation of best management practices (BMPs). Remediation can be accomplished through demonstration projects which remove the pollutant at the source or close to the receiving water, and through enforcement/compliance with existing regulations. Public awareness is heightened by advertising, workshops, technical assistance, school curriculum, and other outreach activities.

Maine  
(Continued)

A good example of a multi-disciplinary approach to watershed control is the Casco Bay project currently underway in Maine. Casco Bay is a high priority waterbody nominated for inclusion in the National Estuary Program. The project will:

1. Provide direct technical assistance to communities implementing land use ordinances requiring BMPs;
2. Increase compliance monitoring and enforcement;
3. Educate the public on the benefits of BMP utilization; and
4. Evaluate stormwater BMPs.

The project intends to spread the word on NPS pollution to regulators, municipal leaders, and individual landowners in the Casco Bay area. This awareness, combined with BMP implementation and local ordinances, should prevent future degradation and lead to long term water quality improvements in the Bay.

[For more information contact: Nancy Sullivan, NPS Coordinator, Water Management Division, U.S. EPA—Region I, John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Boston, MA 02203. Phone: (617) 565-3546.]

### ***Important Reminder!***

It is not too late to mail your NPS public information materials to us for inclusion in the NPS Information Materials Study. In our March issue of *News-Notes* we described our project and provided a tear-out sheet to assist you in the submission of materials. We greatly appreciate the response we have gotten from around the country. However, we are certain there are many excellent materials that haven't been included, and which deserve recognition. Please send your materials as soon as you can to us at the address below.

### *Send Us Your Favorite Slides*

The NPS Control Branch is requesting from our readers copies of high quality slides (color preferred) on the subject of nonpoint source pollution. We would like to receive slides that depict NPS water quality problems as well as solutions to these problems (best management practices). We are looking for slides related to forestry, mining, agriculture, hydro-modification, urban, and other nonpoint sources. We will use the best slides to develop a general slide show on NPS pollution that will be available for loan from the NPS Control Branch at EPA. These slides, combined with those we have already collected, should provide a framework for a high quality show. We will give credit to all donors whose slides are included in the show. Please send single copies of slides and a short description of each to:

Lynne Kolze  
NPS News-Notes  
Assessment and Watershed Protection Division  
U.S. EPA  
401 M Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20460

**Thank You.**

---

## **U.S. Forest Service Notes**

### *Forest Service and Trout Unlimited Agree to Water Quality Protection in Montana's Gallatin National Forest; Riparian Area Management Agreement Reached in Bitterroot National Forest*

#### **The Gallatin National Forest Plan**

On January 10, 1990, the U.S. Forest Service signed a settlement agreement with the Madison/Gallatin Chapter of Trout Unlimited on its appeal of the Gallatin National Forest Plan. The National Forest, located in Montana at the Wyoming border, provides the headwaters and watersheds for the Madison, Gallatin, and Yellowstone Rivers, three of the most highly regarded trout streams in Montana and the nation. Filed 26 months earlier, the appeal was aimed at protecting the forest's irreplaceable spawning streams from damage associated with timber harvesting activities.

Gallatin National Forest Supervisor Bob Gibson said that the negotiated agreement "may be a landmark for us. We're probably setting a precedent in forest planning management."

Forest Service Regulation 36 CFR Part 217 (January 23, 1989), under which the settlement was reached, "offers any citizen or organization a process for obtaining review of decisions related to land and resource management plans, projects and activities."

#### **Forest Plan Deficiencies**

While Trout Unlimited's primary concern with the original Forest Plan had been its lack of safeguards against physical stream degradation, and especially the excessive deposition of sediment it would allow that would render spawning grounds useless, the appeal alleged four key deficiencies in the Forest Plan:

1. *Protection of Water Quality:* The Plan had no watershed analysis, failed to address sediment in matter and amount, adversely affected water quality and fish habitat, and violated Clean Water Act and Montana antidegradation standards through timber harvesting.
2. *Fisheries Habitat Protection:* The Plan violated a National Forest Management Act mandate by failing to inventory streams, set "standards" for adverse impacts, protect riparian areas, and address sediment impact; it allowed logging in Yellowstone cutthroat drainage; and included improper structural improvement planning.
3. *Monitoring:* The Plan lacked baseline information, included insufficient items to be monitored and insufficient frequency of reporting, had no monitoring budget, and was inadequate to protect the coldwater fishery.
4. *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA):* The Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) failed to discuss impacts of timber harvesting, failed to provide watershed(s) analysis, failed to use best economic data, and failed to address fisheries' economic values.

#### **The Settlement**

*Action Line*, Trout Unlimited's national quarterly newspaper, reported on the tenor of the negotiations in its spring 1990 issue:

*Working out the agreement was a model of cooperation. The Madison/Gallatin Chapter never argued against the volume of the harvest called for by the plan, and the Forest Service didn't contest the need for stream protection. The traditional "intense negotiations" were replaced by creative discussions in a relaxed, nonadversarial atmosphere.*

U.S. Forest Service  
(Continued)

*"This settlement simply corrected some oversights in the plan, without handcuffing legitimate and properly-executed timbering," said attorney Larry Jent, who aided TU on a pro bono basis.*

*Neither party wished to head for the courtroom, and both were quite open about their desire to resolve the issues amicably. Doug McClelland, TU's first Vice President, has long been involved in Madison/Gallatin Chapter conservation efforts. Said he, "it was most encouraging to find that the Forest Service was as interested in our goals as we were."*

The settlement, in summary, spells out a specific agreement on Forest Service actions in five major areas of concern:

1. It provides for a project halt or modification if sediment occurs over levels specified in the Forest Plan.
2. It provides for *implementation, effectiveness, and validation* monitoring for water quality, fish habitat, and soils. The settlement identifies projects, monitoring schedules, and evaluations, and provides for an annual monitoring report. Monitoring evaluations will utilize professionals from various agencies and organizations.
3. It provides for Stream Classification System guidelines and develops implementation standards for substrate composition, water temperature, pool habitat, streambank composition, shading and stream cover, bank stability, debris, and stream flow.
4. It provides for riparian area management to meet riparian-dependent resource objectives for fisheries, wildlife, and watershed. The settlement eliminates timber harvest activities and "vegetative manipulation" within 100 feet of a stream or in associated riparian/wetland areas.
5. It provides that the Forest Plan will meet NEPA requirements for watershed site-specific and cumulative effects analysis for proposed actions as they affect fishery, watershed, and water quality resources.

For its part, Trout Unlimited agreed to withdraw its appeal of the Gallatin National Forest Plan and EIS while reserving its right to initiate appeals of other future Forest Service actions.

#### **A Bitterroot National Forest Timber Sale**

In a separate action, Forest Supervisor Bertha C. Gillam signed an agreement on March 19, 1990, with a group of appellants, the "Friends of the Bitter Root," settling an appeal on the proposed Slate Point timber sale within the Bitterroot National Forest. The Bitterroot National Forest lies in western Montana at the Idaho State line.

The following are the six points of contention and their respective resolutions:

1. *Elimination of a fish passage barrier on a particular road.* The Forest Service agreed to its removal.
2. *The harvest of timber in three identified roadless areas and road construction in another roadless area.* The Forest Service agreed to defer the harvests and road construction in these roadless areas.
3. *The management of forest lands within riparian areas.* The settlement agreement defined riparian areas as

*areas with distinct resource values and characteristics that are comprised of an aquatic ecosystem and adjacent uplands areas that have direct relationships with the aquatic system. This includes floodplains, wetlands, and all areas within a horizontal distance of approximately*

100 feet from normal high water line of a stream channel, or from the shoreline of a standing body of water.

It was noted that a riparian ecosystem is

*a transition between the aquatic ecosystem and the adjacent upland terrestrial ecosystem. It is identified by soil characteristics and by distinctive vegetative communities that require free or unbounded water.*

The Forest Service then agreed that:

*Slate Point riparian areas will be managed as an ecosystem regardless of the presence or absence of fish or a defined stream channel. Any vegetative treatment within the riparian areas will benefit water, fisheries, or wildlife resources. If an activity benefits only one resource, water quality for beneficial water uses, such as fisheries or irrigation, will be maintained. Water, fisheries, and wildlife objectives rather than timber management objectives will determine vegetation treatment activities.*

The agreement also specified that "on-the-ground assessment and management prescriptions" will be developed by an interdisciplinary team, and that changes in Forest Plan riparian area delineation will be based on an on-the-ground evaluation. In both of these situations calling for on-the-ground interdisciplinary decisions, the State's fish, wildlife, and parks agency and its water quality agency, as well as EPA and the Montana Riparian Association, "will also be requested to participate."

4. *Snag management, or the "retention of snags in timber harvest units" to provide "biological diversity within our forest by maintaining habitat for a wide diversity of vertebrate and invertebrate wildlife species."* The agreement dealt with general guidelines and specific guidelines for each of the seventeen subunits of the timber sale.
5. *Road restrictions.* These were set down in the agreement.
6. *The management of silvicultural systems.* After being sure that riparian portions of specific sales units are treated in accordance with the previously outlined riparian management direction, the agreement detailed management treatment for each of the seventeen sales units.

In its issue of April 30, 1990, a local Montana newspaper, the Stevensville *Star*, quoted a clarifying letter from Forest Service Supervisor Gillam to timber industry representatives concerning the settlement. She noted that the agreement would apply only to the timber sales in question. She also said, however, that

*[t]he Forest Plan sets the objectives of: maintaining or enhancing fish habitat; maintaining water quality and quantity; maintaining riparian flora, fauna, and water quality; and maintaining viable populations of wildlife. The standards in the Plan require an interdisciplinary team analysis of projects in riparian areas. Those objectives and standards are what we will be weighing individual projects against in future sales.*

### **Nonpoint Source and Water Quality Issues**

When asked to comment on the Gallatin and Bitterroot decisions, Dr. Loren Bahls, Montana's Water Quality Management Program Supervisor, said the following:

*In Montana, the Forest Service has been delegated the responsibility of managing water quality on National Forest lands through the State's NPS Management Plan and a Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Health and Environmental Sciences and the Forest Service's Northern Region. Although timber sale audits have shown the Forest Service to be an industry leader in applying BMPs, the agency sometimes needs help in meeting water quality standards and the water quality goals of Forest Plans. The State has provided this assistance in the*

U.S. Forest Service  
(Continued)

Yaak drainage of the Kootenai National Forest and elsewhere, but State resources can stretch only so far. Grassroots conservation groups like Friends of the Bitter Root and Trout Unlimited provide valuable assistance to water quality agencies in resolving resource development/water quality issues.

[For more information from the Forest Service on 36 CFR 217, the Forest Service appeals process, or on a particular National Forest contact the District Ranger, Forest Supervisor, or Regional Forester serving the States with National Forests you are interested in. For more information on the Nonpoint Source Water Quality Program contact the appropriate EPA NPS Regional Coordinator or NPS NEWS-NOTES. Use the form provided below. We or the NPS Regional Coordinators can put you in touch with State Nonpoint Source Managers. For more information on the Montana Water Quality Program contact: Dr. Loren Bahls, Montana Water Quality Management Program, Department of Health and Environmental Services, Helena, MT 59620. Phone: (406) 444-2406. For more information on Trout Unlimited local chapter programs contact: Pam McClelland, Resource Director, Trout Unlimited, 501 Church Street, Vienna, VA 22180. Phone: (703) 281-1100.]

### **Nonpoint Source Information Exchange Coupon**

*(Clip or Photocopy and Mail or FAX this coupon to us)*

Our Mailing Address: **NPS News-Notes** (WH-553), Assessment and Watershed Protection Division,  
U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20460

Our FAX Number: **NPS News-Notes**, (202) 382-7024

- Use this Coupon to: *(check one or more)*
- Share your success story, OR
  - Ask for information, OR
  - Make a suggestion

### **Write your story, ask your question, or make your suggestion here:**

*Attach additional pages if necessary.*

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

Please add my name to the mailing list to receive News-Notes.

**Your Name** \_\_\_\_\_

**Organization** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address** \_\_\_\_\_

**City/State/Zip** \_\_\_\_\_

**Phone** \_\_\_\_\_ **FAX #** \_\_\_\_\_



---

## **Datebook**

---

This DATEBOOK has been assembled with the cooperation of: *Our Readers; Conservation Impact*, the newsletter of the Conservation Technology Information Center, 1220 Potter Drive, Room 170, West Lafayette, IN 47906-1334; and *NWQEP NOTES*, the newsletter of the National Water Quality Evaluation Project, North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service, North Carolina State University, 615 Oberlin Rd., Suite 100, Raleigh, NC 27605-1126. Their cooperation is appreciated. If you have a date you want placed in the DATEBOOK contact the editors of *NPS News-Notes*.

### **Meetings and Events**

#### July

17 - 19

*West Water Quality Coordinating Conference and Workshop*, Reno, NV. One of four USDA-sponsored regional workshops to assist State Water Quality Action Plan committees. For registration details contact your State Cooperative Extension Service or State Soil Conservationist in your region.

22 - 24

*Urban Non-Point Source Pollution and Stormwater Management Symposium*, Agricultural Science Center North—University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY. For registration, program, and housing information contact Geaunita Caylor at (606) 257-8013. For technical information contact Bill Barfield at (606) 257-8013 or Larry Feazel at (606) 257-5141. Address for all information: Kentucky Water Resources Institute, 219 Anderson Hall, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0046. Registration for the Symposium is \$150 before July 6 and \$175 after July 6.

24 - 25

*Workshop on Methods for Determining Potential Aquifer Sensitivity to Pesticide Contamination*, Estes Park, CO. EPA's Office of Ground-Water Protection is preparing a Technical Assistance Document (TAD) on current methods to assess the sensitivity of hydrogeologic environments to contamination from applications of agricultural pesticides. This workshop is to provide a broad spectrum of input to the development of the TAD. A Call for Potential Attendees has been issued. Contact (by June 18, 1990): Jane G. Marshall, Office of Ground-Water Protection (WH-550G), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460. Phone: (FTS/202) 382-7077.

29-Aug. 1

*Water Futures, 45th Annual Meeting of the Soil and Water Conservation Society*, Salt Lake City, UT. Contact: SWCS, 7515 Northeast Ankeny, IA 50021-9764. Phone: (515) 289-2331.

#### August

12 - 15

*ASIWPCA Annual Conference*, Hyatt Newporter Hotel, Newport Beach, CA. Contact hotel for reservations. Phone: (800) 341-1474 or (714) 644-1552. Contact ASIWPCA for registration materials and program information. Phone: (202) 624-7782.

14 - 16

*North Central Water Quality Coordinating Conference and Workshop*, St. Paul, MN. One of four USDA sponsored regional workshops to assist State Water Quality Action Plan committees. Contact your State Cooperative Extension Service or State Soil Conservationist in your region for registration details.

15 - 16

*Summer Field Tour of Reclamation Activities in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem*, Grand Teton and Yellowstone National Parks. Two-day tour of reclamation activities in the greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, including a road reclamation project and research plots dealing with the feasibility of maintaining genetic integrity within the park. Also, reclamation following heap leaching for gold. Contact: Jeanne Chambers or Ray Brown, Forest Service Research, 860 N 1200 E, Logan, UT 84321. Phone: (801) 752-1311.

15 - 18

*National Sustainable Agriculture, Natural Resources Conference*, Lincoln, NE. Contact: Dixon Hubbard, USDA, Extension Service, Washington, DC. Phone: (202) 447-4341; or Jim Bushnell, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE. Phone: (402) 472-2966.

Datebook (Continued)  
September

- 5 - 7 *Fourth Annual Montana Riparian Association Workshop*, Big Mountain Ski and Summer Resort, Whitefish, MT. The workshop will focus on the management of riparian forested ecosystems in Montana. Small group field trips are planned with reports and whole group discussion on each trip. Contact: Montana Riparian Association, School of Forestry, University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812. Phone: (406) 243-2050.
- 5 - 9 *International Conference on the Conservation and Management of Lakes*, Hangzhou, People's Republic of China. Contact: Zhang Yutian, Secretariat of Preparation Committee, Foreign Affairs Office, Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences, Beiyuan, Anwai, Beijing, P.R.C. Phone: 421-1025.
- 16 - 20 *National Association of Abandoned Mine Lands Programs—12th Annual Conference*, Breckenridge, CO. Cooperation, coordination, and communication between States, Tribes, and OSM. Technical sessions will include artificial wetlands for AMD treatment and natural wetlands evaluation and accounting. Contact: Colorado AML Program, Mined Land Reclamation Division, 1313 Sherman #215, Denver, CO 80203. Phone (303) 866-3567.
- 17 - 22 *Water Laws and Management*, the American Water Resources Association Annual Meeting, Tampa, FL. Contact: Ken Reid at (301) 439-8600.
- 20 - 21 *Utah Water Quality Conference*, Yarrow Hotel, Park City, UT. Sponsored by the Utah Department of Health and the Utah Department of Agriculture. Plenary sessions will feature State and national leaders; over 30 work and discussion roundtables will be concerned with many practical aspects of NPS management in Utah. For additional program and reservations information contact: Roy D. Gunnell, Utah Department of Health, 288 North 1460 West, Salt Lake City, UT 84116. Phone: (801) 538-6146; or Ken Wyatt, Utah Department of Agriculture, 350 North Redwood Road, Salt Lake City, Utah 84116. Phone: (801) 538-7179.
- 23 - 27 *The National Association of State Land Reclamationists Annual Conference*, Gatlinburg, TN. Addresses current reclamation issues and developments from around the country. The conference will also include a field trip to local mines. This conference will be held in conjunction with the Annual Interstate Mining Compact Commission Meeting. Contact: Greg Conrad, NASLR, 459B Carisle Dr., Herndon, VA 22070. Phone: (703) 709-8654.
- 30 - Oct. 5 *Northern Rocky Mountain Water Congress*, The Copper King Inn and The War Bonnet Inn, Butte, MT. Featuring the Rocky Mountain Ground-Water Conference (19th Annual), American Water Resources Association (Montana) Conference (7th Annual), Montana Symposium on Agri-Chemicals and Ground-Water, Montana Water Resources Center Research Symposium, Workshop on Monitoring Well Design and Installation, and the 1990 Mineral and Hazardous Waste Process Symposium. Contact: Northern Rocky Mountain Water Congress, c/o Brenda C. Sholes, Hydrology Division, Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology, Montana Tech, Butte, MT 59701. Phone: (406) 496-4152.

October

---

- 1 - 5 *Association of Engineering Geologists—33rd Annual Meeting*, Pittsburgh, PA. The conference will focus on mine subsidence, slope stability, dams, karst, erosion, and ground water with emphasis on new technology and rehabilitation of existing facilities. Contact: Stan R. Michalski, GAI Consultants, Inc., 570 Beatty Road, Monroeville, PA 15146. Phone: (412) 856-6400.
- 16 - 19 *International Symposium on Ecological Indicators*, sponsored by EPA, Clarion Castle Hotel, Miami Beach, FL. Contact: Ecological Indicators Symposium, Kilkelly Environmental Associates, P.O. Box 31265, Raleigh, NC 27622.

*Datebook (Continued)*

October

- 17 - 18 *FOCUS Conference on Eastern Regional Ground-Water Issues*, Springfield, MA. Contact: Eastern Conference/National Water Well Association, PO Box 182039, Dept. #017, Columbus, OH 43218. Phone: (614) 761-1711.
- 22 - 24 *Florida Acidic Deposition Conference*, Tampa Hilton Hotel at Metrocenter. Sponsored by Florida Department of Environmental Regulation. A forum to address the current understanding of acid deposition in Florida. Session topics will include atmospheric deposition monitoring and effects on forestry, limnology, and fisheries. Contact: Curtis E. Watkins, Florida Department of Environmental Regulation, 2600 Blair Stone Road, Tallahassee FL 32399-2400. Phone: (904) 488-0782.

November

- 4 - 9 *The Science of Water Resources: 1990 and Beyond*, the American Water Resources Association Annual Conference, Denver, CO. Topics include: hydrologic trends, legal issues, water resources development, and emerging issues (NPS pollution, urban impacts on water quality, water resources education, radon, hazardous wastes, biomonitoring). Contact: Jim Loftus, Colorado State University, Rm. 100, Engineering South, Ft. Collins, CO, 80523. Phone: (303) 491-7923; or Bob Montgomery, Woodward-Clyde Consultants, 4582 Ulster Parkway, Suite 1000, Denver, CO, 80237. Phone: (303) 694-2770.
- 4 - 9 *Symposium on Urban Hydrology*, to be held simultaneously and in conjunction with *Water Resources: 1990 and Beyond* (see above). Sponsored by the American Water Resources Association. Contact: Marshall E. Jennings, U.S.G.S., 8011 Cameron Road, Austin, TX 78753. Phone: (512) 832-5791.
- 6 - 10 *10th Annual International Symposium on Lake, Reservoir and Watershed Management*, sponsored by the North American Lake Management Society, Sheraton Tara Hotel, Springfield, MA. Contact: NALMS, P.O. Box 217, Merrifield, VA 22116. Phone: (202) 466-8550.
- 9 - 12 *National Urban Conservation Symposium*, Hyatt Regency Hotel, Kansas City, MO. Sponsored by the National Association of Conservation Districts. Symposium will focus on the kinds of programs that conservation districts can assist and implement to manage urban conservation problems. Topics will include water conservation, quantity, and quality; urban forestry; waste recycling and reduction; erosion and sediment control; stormwater management; floodplain management; and so on. Contact: Lynn Sprague, NACD Coastal and Urban Committee, P.O. Box 260, Dover, DE 19903. Phone: (302) 734-7337.
- 10 - 12 *Water Quality Standards for the 21st Century*, Hyatt Regency Hotel, Crystal City, 22202 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202. Sponsored by Criteria and Standards Division, OWRS, U.S. EPA. Conference objective is to identify the scientific, technical, and policy guidance EPA should develop to assist States in strengthening the role of water quality standards in the management of the nation's aquatic resources. Contact: Mark Southerland, Dynamac Corporation, 11140 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852. Phone: (301) 468-2500. Call the hotel for reservations: (703) 418-1234.
- 12 - 13 *Biological Criteria, Research, and Regulation Symposium*, follow-on to the Standards meeting above. Same hotel. Sponsored by Criteria and Standards Division (CSD), OWRS, U.S. EPA. Topics will include the CSD biological program, biological criteria in regulations, defining habitat variables, designing biosurveys, etc. Contact: Suzanne Marcy, CSD, U.S. EPA. Phone: (202) 382-2144.
- 12 - 14 *Conference on Application of Geographic Information Systems, Simulation Models and Knowledge-Based Systems For Land Use Management*, Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA. Contact: Dr. J. P. Mason, Coordinator, 212 Seitz Hall, VPI & State University, Blacksburg VA 24061.

**NPS NEWS-NOTES**  
**Nonpoint Source Information Exchange**  
**Assessment and Watershed Protection Division**  
**Office of Water (WH-553)**  
**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency**  
**401 M Street, S.W.**  
**Washington, D.C. 20460**

---

First Class Mail  
Postage and Fees Paid  
EPA  
Permit No. G-35

Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use  
\$300



Printed on recycled paper

---

Datebook (Continued)

**1991**

February

20 - 23

*International Erosion Control Association, 22nd Annual Conference, Orlando, FL. Effective control methods and how they relate to improved environmental quality. Contact: Ben Northcutt, Executive Director, International Erosion Control Association, P.O. Box 4904, 1485 S. Lincoln, Steamboat Springs, CO 80477. Phone: (303) 879-3010.*

March

18 - 21

*Fifth Interagency Sedimentation Conference, sponsored by the Federal Interagency Subcommittee on Sedimentation, Las Vegas, NV. The conference will focus on "Practical Sediment Management: Issues and Answers." This Federally-sponsored conference is open to State and local government agencies and private sector/academic organizations. Contact: Bob Thronson, Assessment and Watershed Protection Division, (WH-553), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460. Phone (FTS/202) 382-7103.*

July

8 - 12

*Coastal and Ocean Management, The Seventh Symposium, Hyatt Hotel, Long Beach, CA. Sponsored by the Coastal Zone Foundation, the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Port of Long Beach, and the American Society of Civil Engineers. Themes will include coastal and marine policy, institutional relations; global environment; public participation, information, and access; environmental and information; development and resource management; and international issues. Contact: Coastal Zone 91, Orville Magoon or Gail Oakley, P.O. Box 279, 21000 Butts Canyon Road, Middletown, CA 95461. Phone (707) 987-0114.*



*Nonpoint Source*

---

# *Information Exchange*

---

*Special Insert for Nonpoint Source News-Notes, July 1990, #6*

---

## **New NPS Information Exchange Network for the 90s**

The design of a NPS Information Exchange Electronic Bulletin Board System (BBS) is underway, according to Dov Weitman, Chief of EPA's Nonpoint Source Control Branch.

"This bulletin board system is being created for the purpose of fostering communication and technology transfer in the nonpoint source management community throughout the country," said Weitman in his announcement. "It will provide an information exchange hub, readily accessible at the working level, to EPA staff, State and local officials, researchers, and the public. The system will be available twenty-four hours a day," he continued.

To access the NPS-BBS, users will need a computer, modem, phone line, and a communications program such as CrossTalk or ProComm.

The design study, to be completed during August 1990, will address two general areas:

1. The topics and formats of information to be made available on the BBS. The possible topics of information will be discussed later in this article. Formats include the following:
  - **Bulletins** that are read while the user is calling into the BBS;
  - **Text and program files** that can be transferred (uploaded) from users to the BBS, and then downloaded from the BBS to another user's computer for use at a later time;
  - **Messages** that can be sent to private individuals or addressed to the general public;
  - **Databases** that can be searched by keywords; and
  - **Conferences** for special topics of interest.
2. The software and hardware necessary to accommodate the system's design needs, as defined above.

The design studies will be followed by testing and installation, with the BBS becoming operational during the fall of 1990.

### **The Range of BBS Features**

**Messages** can be exchanged between individual BBS users or messages may be addressed to all users, in which case important information can become generally available and shared.

**Bulletins** can deal with meetings, training availability, program deadlines, publication availability, or new guidance issuance, for example. These may be read on-line or downloaded for future reference and use. The DATEBOOK feature of NPS NEWS-NOTES could be updated between issues of the newsletter and made available via the bulletin feature. In general, bulletins are to be updated frequently.

**Files** include computer programs, databases, or other files available for downloading to the user's computer for future use. Bibliographies on selected NPS management issues, case studies, Guidance and policy documents, State NPS rules and local ordinances, and summaries of NPS-related programs are a few examples of the kinds of data files that might be assembled for the NPS-BBS.

**“Conferences”** is a word used to describe mini-BBSs that are located within the broader NPS-BBS. The conference feature provides forums and information exchange opportunities on selected NPS management issues, i.e., on narrower and more specialized areas of information. Conferences can provide messages, bulletins, and data files in each selected interest area. Examples of specialized interest areas where conferences might be organized could include, for example, the management of riparian areas, urban stormwater management, the management of mining wastes or feed lots for cattle, or the use of geographical information systems in nonpoint monitoring and assessments. These are but four illustrative examples where a BBS conference might provide important benefits to individuals in need of such specialized information exchange.

**Priority Topics for the NPS Information Exchange BBS**

The *BBS features* outlined above can be used for any or all types of NPS information. Of importance, then, is the selection of the priority NPS subject areas to be placed on the operative NPS-BBS. The design studies now underway will concentrate on the identification of such priorities. In-depth discussions and interviews with NPS managers will be held, both individually and on a group basis. EPA regional and headquarters personnel will be asked to contribute.

Readers of *NPS News-Notes* can make their opinions heard too. Write to us—use the page supplied with this special insert. Let us hear from you. What are the NPS subject areas that you would like to have access to—24 hours a day—or at least when you want it?

Here are some suggestions that you might want to think about as you select your priority information areas for use on the NPS-BBS (this list is not exhaustive, nor is it intended to influence your thinking about your choices for NPS-BBS priorities):

---

***NPS Issues For Potential NPS-BBS Priority Treatment***

***Resource Management Issues***

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Groundwater and NPS Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection</li> <li>• Monitoring</li> <li>• Quality Standards</li> <li>• Wellhead protection</li> </ul> <p>Wetlands and NPS Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection</li> <li>• Regulation</li> </ul> <p>Bays &amp; Estuaries/NPS Management</p> | <p>Surface Water/NPS Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater</li> <li>• Highway &amp; airport runoff</li> <li>• Soil erosion</li> <li>• Toxic runoff</li> </ul> <p>Watershed Management</p> <p>Fisheries and Wildlife Management</p> <p>Riparian Area Management</p> <p>Acid Rain</p> |
|---|--|

***Pollution Sources and Best Management Practices***

Fill in and list your own priorities for BMPs and categories of pollution. On which do you want to get the latest available technical information and have need to consult with your peers on their problems and successes?

## ***State and Local NPS Management Issues***

EPA Regulations and Guidance

The dimensions of voluntary BMP programs in agricultural NPS management

Regulatory measures for the management of:

- agriculture
- silviculture
- etc.

Monitoring and NPS management

- Biomonitoring
- BMP effectiveness
- The application of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for water-quality-limited receiving waters
- The use of Geographic Information Systems in NPS water quality monitoring

Federal consistency with State NPS management

Antidegradation in NPS Management

The appropriate use of State Revolving Funds for NPS management

Other financial options and funding issues

Summaries of NPS-related programs administered by other Federal agencies

Model State legislation and local ordinances for NPS management

Conservation Districts—rural and urban

Information Systems and Data Management

## ***NPS Management and the Urban Environment Issues***

Homeowners

- Hazardous wastes
- Other NPS management

Urban stream restoration

Stormwater

- Studies
- Permits
- Utility charge systems

## ***NPS Education and Public Involvement***

## ***Help Wanted/Jobs Wanted***

**I want to help design the Nonpoint Source Information Exchange!**

*(Clip or Photocopy and Mail or FAX this coupon to us)*

Our Mailing Address: **NPS News-Notes** (WH-553), Assessment and Watershed Protection Division,  
U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20460

Our FAX Number: **NPS News-Notes**, (202) 382-7024

*My information needs and priorities include these issues. Please include these items in your overall design for the NPS Electronic Bulletin Board System:*

Lined area for writing information needs and priorities.

**Your Name** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Organization** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Address** \_\_\_\_\_  
**City/State/Zip** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Phone** \_\_\_\_\_ **FAX #** \_\_\_\_\_