

October 18th Meeting: Discussion Notes

Additional Comments on September 18th notes:

- No comments

Introductory Items Comments:

- What is the difference between the stakeholder and collaborator sections?
 - State agencies aren't stakeholders, but there are multiple agencies collaborating on the strategy, and having both sections allows this distinction to be made.

Final Action: Keep Section as Proposed

Science Assessment Comments:

- WATER QUALITY EVALUATION
 - Useful to know both point and non-point source runoff in all watersheds
 - This is covered in item 5 in the Table of Contents
- COST ANALYSIS
 - Need analysis for: Wastewater, agricultural, and urban
 - Urban BMP cost analysis?
 - Maybe information can be put together in subcommittees, b/c loading data not available
 - Lots of info about % reduction from various practices—probably cost for that
 - Does practice Science Assessment need cost in it?

***Final Action: Add Urban NPS section to Table of Contents;
Cost Analysis information should be assembled in Subcommittees***

Stoner Memo 1: Watershed Priorities:

- DO THE ITEMS ON THE PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS (TOC) ADDRESS THE STONER MEMO REQUIREMENTS?
 - Q: Strategy has a long life, will probably outlive EPA memo: perhaps at state-level, state leadership, so reframe as "Illinois" strategy
 - A: Each state needs to make own strategy, but this pairing is a place to start
 - Q: If strategy is organized around the Stoner Memo, why is Science Assessment separate?
 - A: Science Assessment lays out data; it can be plugged into the Illinois Nutrient Management Strategy multiple ways—this decision is up to writing teams
 - Final TOC won't say "Stoner Memo"
 - Why is the Current Key Nutrient program list here?
 - A: It is moveable. Possible locations:
 - Introduction or
 - Separate section between SM 2 and 3
- WHAT ITEMS ARE MISSING OR NEED TO BE CHANGED?
 - Presenting and ID'ing priority watersheds
 - Table and map

Final Action: Make Key Nutrient Reduction Programs separate section;

Watershed load reduction goals should be presented in table and map format in the final plan.

Stoner Memo 2: Set Watershed Load Reduction Goals:

- DO THE ITEMS ON THE PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS (TOC) ADDRESS THE STONER MEMO REQUIREMENTS?
 - **Is B adequately addressed?**
 - What loading baselines were used?
 - MN—2000
 - Illinois baseline: 1980 to 1996
- WHAT ITEMS ARE MISSING OR NEED TO BE CHANGED?

Final Action: Keep Section as Proposed

Stoner Memo 3: Ensure Effectiveness of Point Source Permits:

- DO THE ITEMS ON THE PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS (TOC) ADDRESS THE STONER MEMO REQUIREMENTS?
- WHAT ITEMS ARE MISSING OR NEED TO BE CHANGED?
- SHOULD THIS SECTION BE ORGANIZED BY NUTRIENT-TYPE OR SOURCE-TYPE?
 - Depends on ability to sort out
 - Source—starting point
 - Defines who funds nutrient reductions
 - Practices for each source-type
 - Subcommittee discussions
 - Nutrients

Final Action: Plan organized by source type, and then by nutrient subheadings as needed

Stoner Memo 4: Agricultural Areas

- DO THE ITEMS ON THE PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS (TOC) ADDRESS THE STONER MEMO REQUIREMENTS?
- WHAT ITEMS ARE MISSING OR NEED TO BE CHANGED?
- TARGETING: DO WE TARGET PARTICULAR PRACTICES IN SPECIFIC WATERSHEDS OR USE A BROAD APPROACH EVERYWHERE?
 - Drainage water management and riparian strategies are good additions
 - Science Assessments are set up by watersheds
 - Where should practices be in watersheds?
 - Process for how to determine which practices can be located in what watersheds to be most effective?
 - Develop a process for watershed-scale plans that target (replace wording bullet 3 on SM 4)
 - Number of NRCS watershed plans—based on land use, recommend that practices be based on land use, and watershed specific
 - Upland management practices don't need separate section. Same as crop production strategies.

Final Action: Add Drainage water management and Riparian management strategies; Remove Upland management; Replaced Optimization Strategies with selecting watershed-specific practices.

Stoner Memo 5: Stormwater and Septic Systems

- DO THE ITEMS ON THE PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS (TOC) ADDRESS THE STONER MEMO REQUIREMENTS?
- WHAT ITEMS ARE MISSING OR NEED TO BE CHANGED?
 - Move septic to Point Source?
 - Discuss all urban sources together, regardless of MS4
- DO STORMWATER STRATEGIES INCLUDE LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE?
 - Why not make sub-categories under storm water strategy?
- SHOULD PHOSPHORUS LIMITS IN PRODUCTS (E.G. DETERGENT AND LAWN FERTILIZERS) BE INCLUDED?
 - IL has some rules already, is the strategy a chance to expand?
 - Does sediment control always = stream bank stabilization?
 - Assimilative Capacity—improving that—where should we discuss this?
 - Wildlife habitat
- INCLUDED IN OTHER SECTIONS, OWN SECTION, NOT INCLUDED?

Final Action: Move Septic to Point Source (does this depend on permitting process for septic fields?); Add subcategories under Stormwater Strategies; Subcommittees will discuss phosphorus limits for detergents and lawn fertilizers; Stormwater and Septic Systems will be covered under own section in Nutrient Reduction Plan.

Stoner Memo 6: Accountability and Verification Measures

- DO THE ITEMS ON THE PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS (TOC) ADDRESS THE STONER MEMO REQUIREMENTS?
- WHAT ITEMS ARE MISSING OR NEED TO BE CHANGED?
 - What is important to stakeholder groups on an annual basis?
 - Annual reporting of steps being taken is important—implementation activities
 - Funding levels, and did it work
 - Monitoring—where and at what level?
 - Measuring undesirable practices
 - undesirable and desirable end up being same things—just measure practices
- SHOULD TARGETING AND IMPLEMENTATION BE ADDRESSED? HOW?
- SHOULD ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES BE INCLUDED?
 - Phased milestones go with Adaptive Management
 - Why not?
 - 5 to 7 year cycle of reporting outcomes?
 - Differences between outcomes and practices
 - Outcome every 5 to 7 years
 - Practices annually and biannually

Final Action: Adaptive management strategies should be included.

Stoner Memo 7: Public Reporting

- DO THE ITEMS ON THE PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS (TOC) ADDRESS THE STONER MEMO REQUIREMENTS?
 - Effectiveness, especially budgets and cost—accuracy measurements
 - Implementation is annual, while load reductions is biannual

- Meets up with IEPA goals
- Every 5 years at Task Force level—no new resources for assessments, so how to measure?
- Need to clarify difference between output and outcome in reporting
- Schedule for assessment?
 - Variability in statewide loads is great--every two years might be even too much
 - IEPA collecting data every two years anyway
 - Transect survey with Conservation Districts—but still arguments over how accurate and what are the statewide trends = be careful what we promise, but it might not be possible to deliver
 - How/what to measure will shape what gets reported
 - Point source could be measured, and reported—DMRs—could be easily added and reported
 - River discharge—IL River gauged well, but the other large rivers are not—reasonable estimate if better monitoring with the 6 big rivers, good numbers for whole state
 - If good monitoring at IL River is USGS nutrients
- Biologically—Gulf, or locally, what other states doing
 - How to measure and express this
- WHAT ITEMS ARE MISSING OR NEED TO BE CHANGED?
- WHAT DETAILS ON *IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES* SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN PUBLIC REPORTING?
- HOW SHOULD LOAD REDUCTIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS BE REPORTED?

Final Action: Annual or biannual reporting of practices implemented and steps taken; Outcomes should be reported on a 5 to 7 year cycle.

Stoner Memo 8: Nutrient Water Quality Criteria

- DO THE ITEMS ON THE PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS (TOC) ADDRESS THE STONER MEMO REQUIREMENTS?
- WHAT ITEMS ARE MISSING OR NEED TO BE CHANGED?

Final Action: Keep Section as Proposed

Miscellaneous Comments/Parking Lot

- Think about most pristine waters—strategies in making sure they don't become nutrient impaired (OH included)
 - Go in Targeting Watersheds

Final Action: Under the Targeting Watersheds section, develop and add a strategy to ensure that pristine waters do not become nutrient impaired