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Treat the Right Problems with the Right Solutions in the Right Places

How do we get there?
Identifying Critical Areas in Your Watershed

**Definition of a Critical Area:** Where watershed efforts need to be targeted to have the greatest impact on water quality.

Getting it right

- Critical areas
- Delivery System (who, what)
Solving Water Problems

- Use biophysical measures to identify vulnerable locations within problem area.
- Assess salient behaviors in these locations to determine where disproportionality may be occurring.
- Gain understanding why inappropriate behaviors are occurring in these locations.
- Design intervention effort based on this understanding.

Objective

To remediate a significant amount of water quality degradation from nonpoint sources using existing policy, knowledge, and methods through the incorporation of the “human dimension” in a rigorous and scientifically valid fashion.
So what are some options for identifying critical areas?

Critical Area Types

• Restoration:

• Protection:
Critical Areas Identification

“Within a WMP and following the EPA guidelines, critical areas should be identified as one or a combination of the following descriptions:

1. 12 digit HUCs or smaller geographic areas where a particular pollutant needs to be addressed to meet the water quality goals of the WMP.
2. Specific region within a 12 digit HUC or smaller geographic area where a particular source(s) is contributing a pollutant of concern and needs to be addressed to meet the water quality goals of the WMP.
3. Specific source(s), anywhere in the project area, that are contributing a pollutant of concern.”

Critical Areas Identification Options

1. Defined by geographic area (usually HUCs or subwatersheds)  
   Example: Mudbug Watershed

2. Combination  
   Example: Livestock access to streams in Mudbug Watershed

3. Defined by Source  
   Example: Locations where livestock have access to streams
Critical Areas Identification Options

1. Defined by geographic area (usually HUC or subwatershed)

Makes sense if you
- Have monitoring data that differentiates locations
  - high spatial resolution
  - shows one watershed with higher yields (concentration or load/area)
- Have a very homogenous land use

Example of high spatial resolution monitoring data

- Define geographic areas if you have monitoring data that can differentiate locations
1. Defined by geographic area (usually HUCs or subwatersheds)

Example:
Five priority levels of HUCs defined in a large watershed

Critical and Priority Areas

Critical Areas (Red)
• Need treatment to improve existing poor water quality

Priority Areas (Yellow)
• Need protection to protect relatively good water quality

Based upon:
• historic water quality data,
• current water quality data,
• confirmed sources,
• projected future development,
• and causes of impairment.
Salt Creek Headwaters

- Highest average *E. coli* concentration
- Highest average TSS concentration and loading rate
- High nutrient loading rates
- Low DO
- Poor habitat rating

Beauty Creek

- Lowest average *E. coli* concentration
- Lowest average TSS concentration and areal loading rate
- Relatively low nutrient concentrations
- Highest habitat rating
Critical Areas Identification Options

Makes sense if

- you know that there are particular behaviors that people are willing to change
- "the time is right" for grants to fund a particular solution to a source
- your monitoring data is sparse or concentrations in all areas are similar

3. Defined by source of pollution to address

Examples:
- Cropped fields without cover crops
- Lawns that receive P fertilizer

3. Defined by source of pollution to address

- Highly erodible areas contributing to the high levels of suspended sediment and nitrate found throughout the watershed.
- Riparian areas in need of buffers and filter strips to provide wildlife habitat and water quality improvements.
Where are the critical areas?

- Unbuffered Streambank
- Conventionally Tilled Cropland

Biophysical Approaches to NPS Pollution
1. Heterogeneity between agricultural systems is recognized along biophysical dimensions. Variation is examined on the dimensions of climate, hydrology, soils, biology, and prevailing agronomic techniques. The human element is assumed to be a constant relative to profit maximizing behavior. Aquatic system impacts are determined by the interaction between the biophysical characteristics and system-wide production techniques.
2. A social science perspective where the emphasis is on markets, institutions, economic behavior, culture, and technology adoption processes all of which are examined largely independent of the biophysical setting. Variation in attitudes, beliefs, institutional structures, and market processes are viewed as the primary determinant of agriculture’s impact on aquatic systems while largely ignoring specific biophysical settings.

Approaches to NPS Pollution

Social Systems

Biophysical Systems

This is Unacceptable!

Water Quality Degradation
How to Address This Dilemma

1. Base planning efforts on the fact that land user behaviors vary significantly, even when engaging in the same type of land use.
2. Use biophysical models and science to determine what land user behaviors need to be assessed.
3. Focus on disproportionality in your initial efforts.

Disproportionality

Any assessment in a water quality or quantity program needs to try and account for disproportionality as it should become the focus of any intervention effort that is intended to solve problems.
Why Assess Behaviors?

Behavior relative to the environment varies significantly – from saint to sinner.
* If we want to **advance science**, then we need to assess the full spectrum.
* If we want to **manage programs**, then we need to assess receptive audiences within the program area.
* If we want to **solve water problems**, then we begin with those making disproportionate contributions.

Inappropriate Behaviors

What is the explanation for inappropriate behavior in vulnerable or susceptible biophysical settings?

1. Technological “leakage”
2. Tradition/Community norms
3. Market Rationality
4. Ignorance
5. Scale Incongruence
6. Others?
Disproportionality

Egregious behaviors in a well-buffered setting may have an insignificant impact on degradation processes. “Normal” behaviors in a vulnerable setting may have a significant impact on degradation processes.

Disproportionality emerges out of scale-specific interactions between human and biophysical attributes.
Scales of Management

**Scale**
- Sub-Field
- Field
- Farm

**Decisions**
- Operational Day-to-Day Implementation
- Tactical Seasonal Use/Non-Use
- Strategic Multi-Year Planning

Not Considered

Disproportionality

- Hydrologically-connected
  - medium-to-coarse textured soils
  - low organic matter
  - over-application + broadcasting

- Hydrologically-disconnected
  - (e.g., upland location)
  - minimal residue cover
  - fine-to-medium textured soils

- Greater Impact
  - greater residue cover (e.g., ridge or no tillage)
  - minimal application
  - greater organic matter
  - delayed incorporation of manure

- Lesser Impact
  - minimal application
  - greater residue cover
  - greater organic matter

- Appropriate
  - quick-expedited incorporation of manure

- Inappropriate
  - over-application of inputs
  - minimal residue cover
  - fine-to-medium textured soils
  - greater organic matter
Example of Diverse Biophysical Resources

The vulnerability of field #10 can nullify or negate the “conservation gains” from the other 9 fields.

Assume “behavior” measure is constant

Temporal Scales of Management

Variation in climate and hydrologic patterns induce changes in the spatial and temporal attributes of manure distribution decisions.
Same Behavior, Different Time

Does modeling help define critical areas?

- Inappropriate
- Appropriate
Models are useful, but perhaps not for critical area definition

Useful for
- Load estimation
- Load reduction estimation
- If we are confident in load reduction, can use models to see where load reduction is greatest

Delivery System administrative goals driving environmental protection

- Critical areas not being addressed – not going out to the critical area
- Partial treatment of problems – scope and BMPS
- Not all problems being addressed
- Landowner capacity not developed
### Table 21. Landowner survey: Willingness to install best management practices (N = 606).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES</th>
<th>PERCENT RESPONDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cropland</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat improvement</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrient management</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation easements</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland installation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced-tillage program</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grassland</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat improvement</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest management</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native grass planting</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrient management</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation easements</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning grassland</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodland</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat improvement</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber stand improvement</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree planting</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest management</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation easements</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber harvest</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streamside</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant a buffer with trees and/or shrubs</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route a field tile drainage to a treatment wetland</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23. Landowner survey: Interest in letting volunteer groups install practices (N = 606).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEREST</th>
<th>PERCENT RESPONDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let a volunteer group install a grassland/prairie</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let a volunteer group install a wetland</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let a volunteer group install a riparian buffer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let land be used for research demonstrations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Karyn McDermid, University of Illinois, 2005

Table 26. Landowner survey: Self-reported obstacles to implementing conservation practices (N = 317).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSTACLE</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of money/costs</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining productivity</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of government funding/incentives</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with cost-share</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government regulations/interference</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of technical assistance</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of equipment</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee landowner won’t approve</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative neighbor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broton</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of labor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red tape with government assistance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife damage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant won’t do</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Karyn McDermid, University of Illinois, 2005
Identifying Implementation Sites in Critical and Priority Areas

*Challenges*

⭐ Logistically difficult – ownership, physical requirements

⭐ Potentially expensive – cheaper to prevent

What Should be the Focus of NPS Control Efforts?

- Focus on Solving Problems
- Focus on Managing Programs
What characteristics cause watershed efforts to have the greatest impact on water quality?

- A source of pollution is causing a real problem
- We can identify the location it comes from
- A possible solution exists
- Land owner is willing to make a change

Conclusion

We have the capacity and knowledge to address the “human dimension” of water problems in a robust and valid fashion.