

Introduction

BACKGROUND:

The ACWA/ASDWA/EPA Nutrients Working Group ("NWG") began work in 2014 to 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 titled "Working in Partnership with States to Address Phosphorus and Nitrogen Pollution through Use of a Framework for State Nutrient Reductions" (the "Stoner Memo"). The Stoner Memo described a framework States could utilize to focus near term efforts on nutrient reduction while they continued to develop nutrient criteria. The 2016 Joel Beauvais memorandum, titled "Renewed Call to Action to Reduce Nutrient Pollution and Support for Incremental Actions to Protect Water Quality and Public Health" (the "Beauvais Memo"), highlighted the continued importance of these efforts.

One of the key questions posed to the NWG was how to demonstrate progress on nutrient reduction envisioned by the Stoner Memo and the Beauvais Memo. The NWG concluded that a short, easy-to-complete form of agreed upon measures that States would complete on a routine (annual/biennial) 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 positive response from the States – 57 responses from 41 States and the District of Columbia. The NWG took the results and listed the metrics 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. Using feedback on the top ranked metrics from the 2016 ACWA Annual Meeting and from other groups such as ASDWA, the NWG worked on a core group of items to track in a regularly scheduled tracker. It was determined that the core group would include outputs and outcomes from various program areas including permitting, 303d/TMDL, assessment, and drinking water. In February 2017, the NWG finalized a beta version of the tracker and released it to Iowa, Oregon, Wisconsin, Kansas, and North Carolina for testing. Using the results from the beta test and feedback at the March 2017 ACWA Mid-Year Meeting and the August 2017 ACWA Annual Meeting, the NWG crafted Version 1.0.

ACWA asks your support in completing the tracker to demonstrate progress in reducing nutrient pollution to our waters nationwide.

THE NUTRIENT REDUCTION PROGRESS TRACKER 1.0 - 2017:

The Nutrient Reduction Progress Tracker is made up of six sections:

- I. Statewide Strategy/Monitoring/Assessment
- II. Nonpoint Source
- III. Point Source
- IV. Drinking Water
- V. Additional Comments
- VI. Survey Feedback

Please answer as best you can. You will likely need to consult others in your state to complete the tracker. For open-ended questions/comments, please respond in one or two short paragraphs. We will determine if follow-up is necessary based on the answers provided.

Some questions will have answers provided by EPA. Those questions are provided and will be flagged for your information.

If you have any questions, please contact Mark Patrick McGuire at mpmcguire@acwa-us.org or 202-756-0604. Thank you for taking the time to complete the Nutrient Reduction Progress Tracker!

* 1. Please provide your state.

* 2. Please provide a name and email for a single person of contact from your state.

Part I: Statewide Strategy/Monitoring/Assessment

3. Is ambient nutrient monitoring available in your state to assess reductions and trends (e.g., baseline, long term, flow)? Select all that apply in your state.

- Statewide Waters
- Watershed
- Key Waterbodies
- Exported from State

Additional information or comments:

4. Is your state assessing trends in nutrient loading using baseline and continued monitoring in the following range of waterbodies?

	Flowing Water: Yes/No	If Yes, Choose One: Less Nutrients/More Nutrients/Constant/Unclear	Non-Flowing Water (e.g., lakes, reservoirs, ponds, etc.): Yes/No	If Yes, Choose One: Less Nutrients/More Nutrients/Constant/Unclear
Individual Waterbodies	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Small Watersheds	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Large Watersheds	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Export from State	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Additional information or comments:

5. Has your state observed and recorded demonstrated changes in water quality in state waterbodies for the following parameters? Please choose from the choices below.

	Yes/No/Not Evaluated	If Yes, Choose One: Better Water Quality/Worse Water Quality/Constant/Unclear
N and/or P	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Algal Blooms	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
D.O. Fluctuation	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
pH Fluctuation	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Aquatic Life Health	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Macrobiotic Indices	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Algal Indicators (e.g., Chlorophyll-A)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Additional information or comments:

6. Are paired nutrient and biological monitoring available for the following water types in your state?

	Yes/No/Not Applicable
Lake/Reservoir	<input type="text"/>
Wadable Streams	<input type="text"/>
Large Rivers	<input type="text"/>
Estuaries	<input type="text"/>
Marine Waters	<input type="text"/>
Wetlands	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>

Additional information or comments:

7. Does your state have a nutrient reduction strategy? If "Yes", please include a link/reference to your state's strategy.

Yes

No

If you chose "Yes" above, please include a link/reference to your state's strategy here.

8. If your state has a nutrient reduction strategy, does the strategy identify quantitative goals?

Yes

No

Not Applicable

Additional Comments:

9. What is the percent of assessed lake/impoundment acres impaired due to nutrient-related causes (e.g., hypoxia, algal blooms, fish kills, etc.) in your state? **[EPA will provide this information, please review]**

10. What is the percent of assessed stream/river miles impaired due to nutrient-related causes (e.g., hypoxia, algal blooms, fish kills, etc.) in your state? **[EPA will provide this information, please review]**

11. If applicable, what is the percent of assessed estuary acres impaired due to nutrient-related causes (e.g., hypoxia, algal blooms, fish kills, etc.) in your state? **[EPA will provide this information, please review]**

Part II: Nonpoint Source

12. Please provide the number of 319/Nonpoint Source projects, number and type of BMPs, and first year load reduction estimates per 319 Grant Reporting and Tracking System (GRTS)? **[EPA will provide this information, please review]**

13. Please provide the estimated pounds of TP and/or TN/TIN load reduced from 319 projects in your state in the last calendar year. **[EPA will provide this information, please review]**

Pounds TN

Pounds TP

14. Does your state (i.e., departments of clean water, environment, natural resources, agriculture, etc.) have a working relationship with your state NRCS office (e.g., data sharing agreement, MOU, etc.)?

Yes

No

Please Briefly Describe:

15. If you answered "Yes" on Question 14, has the relationship helped with locating BMPs and quantifying associated nutrient reductions?

Yes

No

Not Applicable

Additional Comments:

16. If you answered "No" on Question 14, do you plan to reach out to NRCS?

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

Additional Comments:

17. Does your state have nutrient management planning programs relative to fertilizer and manure (either state or local) beyond federal minimum CAFO permit requirements? If "Yes", please include a link/reference to the program(s).

- Yes
- No

If you chose "Yes" above, please include a link/reference to the program(s) here.

Part III: Point Source

18. Please provide the number and percent of major sewage treatment plants with numeric discharge limits for N and/or P compounds. **[EPA will provide this information, please review]**

19. Please provide the number and percent of major sewage treatment plants with N and/or P monitoring requirements for monitoring only purposes or for compliance with an effluent limit. **[EPA will provide this information, please review]**

20. How many major wastewater treatment facilities known or expected to be nutrient sources (municipal and industrial) are in your state?

Part IV: Drinking Water

21. Please provide the number and percent of public water systems in your state and the population they serve that violated the nitrate MCL in 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015. **[EPA will provide this information, please review]**

22. Please provide your state's best estimate of the number and percent of public water systems actively operating to meet the nitrate MCL (e.g., via treatment or blending).

Part V: Other

23. Please briefly describe any other efforts your state is employing to make progress on reducing nutrient pollution in state waters (e.g., TMDLs, optimization for nutrient reduction, urban non-point source pollution management, state tracking of BMPs, innovative approaches, etc.)

24. If necessary, please use this space to clarify or add context to any of your tracker responses.

Part VI: Tracker Feedback

25. How much time did you (and your office) spend completing the tracker?

26. Thank you for completing the Nutrient Reduction Progress Tracker. If you would like, please provide feedback on the tracker below.