



# **NPS Management Update**

**September 27, 2017**

**Arkansas Natural Resources Commission  
Allen Brown, Program Coordinator  
NPS Management Program**



# Updates and Information

## ➤ Funding

- \$3,062,000 was approved by EPA to fund 11 NPS related projects in Arkansas starting on October 1, 2017
  - ❖ Costshare
  - ❖ Streambank Restoration
  - ❖ Monitoring
  - ❖ Green Infrastructure
  - ❖ Education

## ➤ Workplans

- No request for workplans will be announced by ANRC in December 2017
- The FY18 grant will be used for administrative cost over a 3 to 4 year period



# Updates and Information

## ➤ **Funding – unknown in the future**

- We expect allocation amount(s) to be systematically reduced. It also appears allocation amounts will not be determined quickly.
- Also we do not know what the focus will be if EPA downsizes

## ➤ **Annual Report**

- Annual report to EPA was submitted on January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2017 and received a favorable review of the accomplishments made, the success accomplished, coordination with other partners and projects being implemented.

## ➤ **Success**

- Since January 1<sup>st</sup> of 2017 ANRC has had a total of 3 Watershed Management Plans that have been accepted by EPA and currently 1 is in development



# Historic Funding for the NPS Program in Arkansas

- FY 15            \$2,957M            (-)            31K
- FY 16            \$3,057M            +            100K
- FY 17            \$3,062M            +            5K
- FY 18            \$????            (?)            \*

\* Currently we are anticipating and planning for less \$\$ for FY18.

Depending on the FY18 \$\$ we would fund admin to keep the program going.



# NPS Program focus for the Future?

## Changes

- More focus on BMP implementation
  - Smaller 12 Digit HUCs
  - Delistings
- Costshare projects are declining based on match
  - More Costshare partners
- Slight upswing in LID projects
- Milestones

## Hurdles

- MS4 permits
- City ordinances
- Knowledge based Planners, Developers and Contractors
  - ❑ Education opportunity



# Essential changes needed of the NPS Management Program

## ➤ Money

- The NPS program could use more \$'s but only if there are partners (entities) willing to do the work (projects) or do the work necessary (eligibility) with the restrictions of where \$'s can be used based on EPA guidance (criteria)
- Currently only federal \$'s are put into the NPS program. There is no "line item" or Arkansas legislative funding allocated
- Project area or stream segment monitoring, results and WQx cost versus "on the ground" implementation

## ➤ Field Capacity – there are not entities to carry out projects

- Not financially secure or ever develop a long term revenue stream
- No full time coordinator or dedicated personnel
- No activities to keep partners involved
- Little or no recognition or expressed appreciation


## ➤ Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) –

- ADEQ develops the Integrated Water Quality Report (305b) and the subsequent 303(d) list of impaired waters
  - Roving monitoring network – waters actively assessed on a rotating basis
  - Typically an 8 digit HUC has 2-3 monitoring stations
  - Not enough monitoring to assess effectiveness of "small" projects



# Limitations of the NPS Management Program

- Documented Success
  - Difficult and takes time (long term monitoring and assessment)
  - Indicative of waters removed
- Reactive versus Proactive management
  - Historically EPA has mandated a reactive management approach to WQ (i.e. address only waters that are impaired)
  - Federal fiscal year 2014 EPA agreed with states that some \$'s be dedicated to maintaining waterbodies
- Time
  - Practices (BMPs) placed along the streambank have the most immediate effect
  - BMPs placed within the riparian zone have the next quickest effect
  - BMPs placed out of the riparian zone but within  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a mile typically will not show an effect for years (dependent on the practice, condition, slope, etc.)
- No real way to assess the effects of controlling, reducing or abating NPS expediently
  - Watersheds are not static
  - Improvements may be negligible or negated in the geographic scope of the watershed



# Strength of the NPS Management Program

## Partners

- Federal and State agencies, academic institutions, conservation districts, organizations and watershed groups

## How is Partnership strength demonstrated

- Informing stakeholders and citizens who your are and what you do
- Giving credit where credit is due
- Reporting activities through “snap shot reporting”
- Distributing the “annual report” to partners

The NPS Program has initiated a “Snap shot” reporting form to help capture activities occurring in the State that agencies, academic institutions, conservation districts, organizations and watershed groups are doing.

- 2015 ANRC received **21** Snap Shot forms
- 2016 ANRC received **13** Snap Shot forms





# NPS Management Plan Update 2017-2020

- ANRC is currently in the process of updating the plan to submit to EPA
- New plan will not include regulatory or permitted practices
  - ❑ Mining
  - ❑ Septic tanks
  - ❑ CAFO's
  - ❑ Land application
  - ❑ Roads/Construction

# UP Next

Brian Fontenot, Ph.D.  
EPA Region VI

Tony Ramick,  
Supervisor  
ANRC NPS Section

Allen Brown, Program Coordinator  
NPS Management Program  
Arkansas Natural Resources Commission  
101 East Capitol, Suite 350  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201  
(501) 682-3902  
[Allen.Brown@arkansas.gov](mailto:Allen.Brown@arkansas.gov)