



Nutrients Working Group Progress Tracker Survey Summary Results ACWA Annual Meeting

Nutrients Working Group Updates on
Nutrients Progress Tracker and Point Source Perspectives Session
August 15, 2016

The Nutrients Working Group (“NWG”) is a collaboration between ACWA and EPA established in 2014. One of the first tasks of the group was to help identify a set of measures that demonstrated progress toward nutrient reduction in the nation’s waters. States expressed concern that the only national metric for demonstrating progress on addressing nutrient pollution was the establishment of nitrogen and phosphorus criteria for lakes, estuaries, and flowing waters. States believed there was a potential for more robust national metrics to demonstrate state actions taken to reduce nutrient loads in conjunction with the development of nutrient criteria. The desire to demonstrate progress on nutrient reduction became more pertinent with EPA’s release of Nancy Stoner’s 2011 memorandum (the “Stoner Memo”) titled *“Working in Partnership with States to Address Phosphorus and Nitrogen Pollution through Use of a Framework for State Nutrient Reductions”*. The Stoner Memo described a framework States could utilize to focus near term efforts on nutrient reduction while ultimately developing nutrient criteria.

One of the key questions posed to the NWG was how to demonstrate progress on nutrient reduction envisioned by the Stoner Memo. The NWG concluded that a short, easy-to-complete form of agreed upon measures that States would complete on a routine basis would be the appropriate path forward. To that end, the NWG developed an initial survey to begin to ascertain what small, core set of outputs and outcomes States agreed would best demonstrate nutrient reduction progress. The initial survey detailing numerous possible metrics was sent to State members in 2015 with the goal of finding common threads from which to base a second, more specific survey.

Based on analysis of the responses from the first survey, the NWG spent significant time in early 2016 preparing the second survey to focus on the common threads resulting in a more specific and concise survey. The second survey was sent out in May and received an outstanding response from the States – 57 responses from 41 States and the District of Columbia. Job well done!

On the following pages, you will find a summary of the results. They are listed in priority order based on a simple weighting system – a weight of 1 for low priority, 2 for medium priority, and 3 for high priority responses. The weighting system was then normalized to account for the fact not every respondent answered every question.

While the responses to each survey question are provided, the top 15 responses are highlighted and are the focus of the Update Session. Based on initial input received during this session, the task from this point forward will be to gain consensus on the core group of items to track in a regularly scheduled survey, then begin administering the survey.


Question	Source S=State/E=EPA	Data		Priority			Count	Weighted Priority
		Available?	Capturable?	Low	Med	High		
Are baseline and continued (long-term) nutrient monitoring available for assessing trends (statewide, regionally, and in key waterbodies)?	S			4	12	26	42	2.52
Number and percent of public water systems violating nitrate MCL (likely not possible for private systems/wells), and population served by those systems.	E	30	6	8	5	22	35	2.40
Are nutrient and biological monitoring available for all applicable water types in your state (e.g. rivers, lakes, estuaries, etc.)?	S			4	19	19	42	2.36
Does your state have a nutrient reduction strategy?	S			5	19	20	44	2.34
Acres of BMPs installed per 319 Grants Reporting and Tracking System, and estimated lbs of TP and/or TN/TIN load reduced in the last calendar year.	E			5	16	17	38	2.32
Demonstrated changes in nutrient loads/water quality in state waterbodies (For example: lower levels of TN/TIN and TP in waters, decrease in harmful algal blooms, increase in health of aquatic life, stabilization of dissolved oxygen, etc.)	S	22	16	8	15	19	42	2.26
Percent of "Nutrient Majors" with limits for TP and/or TN/TIN.	S/E	31	9	10	11	19	40	2.23
Percent of lake/impoundment acres impaired due to nutrient-related causes (e.g. hypoxia, algal blooms, fish kills, etc.).	E	31	11	10	15	15	40	2.13
How many major wastewater treatment facilities (municipal and industrial) are in your state?	E	41	7	10	15	15	40	2.13
Percent of stream/river miles impaired due to nutrient-related causes (e.g. hypoxia, algal blooms, fish kills, etc.).	E	31	12	11	14	16	41	2.12

Question	Source S=State/E=EPA	Data		Priority			Count	Weighted Priority
		Available?	Capturable?	Low	Med	High		
Percent of stream/river miles assessed for nutrients in state.	E	27	13	11	13	15	39	2.10
Percent of major facility flow known or expected to be nutrient sources (i.e. Nutrient Majors) with monitoring for TP and/or TN/TIN.	S/E	33	10	11	14	15	40	2.10
Number and percent of public water systems actively operating to meet the nitrate MCL (e.g., via treatment or blending).	E	26	7	11	11	14	36	2.08
Does your state have a formal relationship (e.g., data sharing agreement, MOU, etc.) with your state NRCS office? If yes, how would you rate your partnership? (DISCLAIMER: Do not actually answer the question asked. Rather, provide us feedback as to whether this is a good question for tracking progress.)	S			13	12	16	41	2.07
Are there fertilizer restrictions or additional nutrient management planning programs in place in your state (either state-wide or county/municipal)?	S			12	17	15	44	2.07
Percent of lake/impoundment acres assessed for nutrients in state.	E	31	11	12	13	14	39	2.05
Percent of "Nutrient Majors" with WQBELs for TP and/or TN/TIN.	S	28	11	15	8	16	39	2.03
Linear extent (mi) of streams/ivers with nutrient-related TMDLs.	E	36	11	11	17	12	40	2.03
Estimation of money spent by your state (including combinations of state, local, and federal funds used) in implementing BMPs for nutrient load reduction within the past calendar year.	S	15	14	10	17	10	37	2.00
Are there local nutrient reduction strategies in your state (e.g. municipal, county, etc.)?	S			10	23	9	42	1.98

Question	Data Source S=State/E=EPA	Data		Priority			Count	Weighted Priority
		Available?	Capturable?	Low	Med	High		
Areal extent (ac) of lakes/impoundments with nutrient-related TMDLs.	E	30	13	16	11	11	38	1.87
Percent of lake/impoundment acres for which NNC for TP and/or TN/TIN have been adopted.	S	36	10	14	17	8	39	1.85
Estimated lbs of TP and/or TN/TIN load reduced from acres of BMPs installed, both public and private.	S	11	7	17	11	10	38	1.82
Percent of lake/impoundment acres for which nutrient-related criteria have been adopted (such as narrative criteria, bio-indicators, chlorophyll-a, secchi disk depth, etc.).	E	33	9	13	18	6	37	1.81
Total lbs of TP/TN-TIN per million gallons of discharge from all wastewater treatment facilities in previous calendar year.	S/E	15	12	19	10	11	40	1.80
Areal extent (ac) of lakes/impoundments impaired due to nutrient-related causes (e.g. hypoxia, algal blooms, fish kills, etc.).	E	26	13	18	11	10	39	1.79
Amount of money spent on wastewater treatment facility construction/upgrades to reduce nutrients in the previous calendar year.	S			18	11	10	39	1.79
How many waters in your state were delisted in the last calendar year under 303(d) due to a finding of no impairment for nutrients, i.e. moving from Category 5 to Category 1?	S	37	8	15	17	7	39	1.79
Does your state have a state-wide system for assisting facilities with optimization for nutrient reduction?	S			21	9	12	42	1.79
To establish a baseline, what is the number of wastewater treatment facilities built/upgraded to reduce nutrients prior to the previous calendar year?	S	18	11	18	9	10	37	1.78
Percent of lake/impoundment acres for which NNC for TP and/or TN/TIN have been adopted.	S	31	10	21	12	9	42	1.71

Question	Data Source S=State/E=EPA	Data		Priority			Count	Weighted Priority
		Available?	Capturable?	Low	Med	High		
Acres of BMPs installed, both public and private.	S	7	8	23	7	10	40	1.68
Number of wastewater treatment facilities built/upgraded to reduce nutrients in the previous calendar year.	S	21	10	21	9	8	38	1.66
Average lbs of TP/TN-TIN per million gallons of discharge from all wastewater treatment facilities in previous calendar year.	S	14	13	22	12	6	40	1.60
To establish a baseline, how many waters in your state were delisted prior to the last calendar year under 303(d) due to a finding of no impairment for nutrients, i.e. moving from Category 5 to Category 1?	S	36	8	19	13	4	36	1.58

 Top 15 by Weight

 Assumes Data Available