

# **EXPECTATIONS: ELEMENT D**

Rush & Wendt

Bandera, TX

June 5

# Element D

- Estimate of the amounts of technical and financial assistance needed, associated costs, and the sources and authorities that will be relied upon to implement all elements of the WPP.
- Handbook Section 12.7 covers Estimating Financial and Technical Assistance Needed

# Financial / Technical Assistance

- Take into account the following needs:
  - Administration and management services such as salaries, fees, supplies, in kind services
  - Information and education costs
  - Installation and operation and management
  - Monitoring, data analysis, data management

# Identify All Funding Sources

## Federal

- USDA EQIP, CREP
- USGS monitoring; USACE riparian funds
- EPA CWA 319h, 604b, 106, CWSRF
- [www.epa.gov/owow/funding/databases.html](http://www.epa.gov/owow/funding/databases.html)

## State

- TWDB CWSRF
- TCEQ/TSSWCB for EPA funds

## Local Sources

## Private Sources

# Identify All Relevant Technical Assistance Authorities

- An effective WPP is contingent upon all relevant authorities being identified and for them agreeing to carry out their respective portions of the WPP
- Example technical authorities include
  - State : TFS, SWCDs, TSSWCB, TCEQ, TPWS, Texas Agrilife, TCEQ's SBEA
  - Federal: NRCS, USFWS,

# Leverage Existing Sources

- Often existing financial and technical resources are already working in the area
  - Work with those entities to find a common goal of their mission and your mission in the WPP

# SAMPLE COST / Technical Assistance Matrix

## Worksheet 12-1 Sample Implementation Plan Matrix

Watershed Goals								
Goal 1: Restore water quality to meet designated uses for fishing								
Objective 1: Reduce sedimentation by 20 percent								
Tasks for G1/O1	Respon. Party	Total Costs	Funding Mechanism	Indicators	Milestones			
					Short < 1 yr	Med < 3 yr	Long < 7 yr	Remaining
<b>Task 1</b> Seek donation of conservation easements from property owners along Baron Creek	Local land trust	\$0		# acres donated	2	7	10	10
<b>I/E Activities Task 1</b> Hold informational workshop with property owners Develop brochures on how to donate easements	Local land trust	\$3,000	Section 319 funding	# workshops held # participants # requests for assistance	3 40 2	3 45 4		0
<b>Task 2</b> Purchase greenway alongside Baron Creek	County park district	\$2,000/mile	County general funds	# miles purchased	2	4	7	5
<b>I/E Activities Task 2</b> None								
<b>Task 3</b> Develop ordinance requiring a 150-ft easement for new construction in floodplain of Baron Creek	Local municipalities	\$0		# ordinances adopted	1	2	4	0
<b>I/E Activities Task 3</b> Run articles in local newspapers on benefits of ordinances	Watershed Committee	\$0		# articles	2	5	8	0
<b>Task 4</b> Install 300 ft of riparian buffer along Baron Creek	County dept. of natural resources	\$2,500	EQIP, CREP	# ft of buffers	100			
<b>Monitoring Activities for Task 1/2/3</b>								
Monitor sediment load before and after implementation	State DEP	\$5,000/yr	Section 319 funding, state funds	Annual TSS load (kg/yr)	2,500	2,250	2,000	
Evaluate substrate habitat	State DEP & Watershed Committee	\$3,000/yr	Section 319 funding, local volunteers	% embeddedness % sand	12 10	6 5	3 2	

# Example: Millers Creek, MI

Table 8.2 Millers Creek Recommended Monitoring Plan and Costs

Item	Stations	Monitoring Frequency	Five Year Cost	Annual Cost	10 yr cost
Benthic Monitoring	8	3 sites/yr		\$3,600	\$36,000
Habitat Monitoring	8	4 sites in yrs 4,5,9,10	\$7,500		\$15,000
Rating Curve Adjustments	6	3 sites/3 yrs starting in 2005		\$11,344	\$34,000
Geomorphic Measurements	5	2 sites/4 yrs starting in 2008		\$8,700	\$17,400
Transducer Flow Data	2	2 sites in yrs 1,4,5,9,10		\$10,000	\$50,000
Water Quality	5	Once every 5 yrs	\$20,000		\$40,000
Website	NA	NA		\$3,500	\$35,000
Annual Total				Total 10 year Cost	\$227,400



# Example: U. San Antonio River

Table 2-1: Nine Key Elements of Proposed Management Measures

(a)	(c)	(b)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)
Causes and Sources of Bacterial Impairment	Management Measures and Targeted Critical Areas	Estimated Potential Load Reduction (org/yr)	Technical and Financial Assistance Needed for Each Measure	Education Component for Each Measure (and Other Education)	Schedule of Implementation for Each Measure	Interim, Measurable Milestones for Each Measure	Indicators to Measure Progress	Monitoring Component	Responsible Entity
<b>STORM WATER RUNOFF POINT SOURCES, Existing Load = 5.55E+15 org/yr, Required Load Reduction = 1.67E+15 org/yr (30%)</b>									
Avian land deposition (urban runoff) <sup>1</sup>	bird feeding ban at River Walk and City Parks in riparian areas	1.8E+14 (2%)	\$100,000	signs and exhibits, public awareness programs	2007-2009	Fewer birds observed along riparian areas	reduction in runoff-related bacteria concentrations basin-wide	routine basin monitoring	COSA
	bird exclusion/deterrent practices and devices at River Walk and selected riparian areas		\$100,000	education of COSA Parks staff by Texas Parks and Wildlife	2007-2009	Fewer birds roosting along riparian areas	reduction in runoff-related bacteria concentrations basin-wide	routine basin monitoring	COSA
Pet land deposition (urban runoff)	increase awareness and enforcement of pet control ordinance	2.6E+14 (3%)	already funded, additional funds could be used to expand public awareness campaign and enforcement	public awareness program at Community Link Centers: (Valley View, South Park, McCreless, and Las Palmas)	2007-2009	pet owner participation, number of citations and complaints	reduction in runoff-related bacteria concentrations basin-wide	routine basin monitoring	COSA
	expand Pooper Scooper programs		expand existing program to all City Parks: \$100,000	signs and exhibits, community education, mitt dispensers and disposal	2007-2009	pet owner participation, number of citations and complaints; increase in number of mitts used per year	reduction in runoff-related bacteria concentrations basin-wide	routine basin monitoring	COSA

# Ft. Cobb WPP, Oklahoma

## Sample of a Good Element D

**Table 7. Funding Necessary to Implement TMDL Recommended Practices to Restore Beneficial Use Support to Fort Cobb Reservoir.**

Load Reduction		TMDL Recommended BMP	Project/Funding Source	Federal	State/Local	Total
TMDL target	Anticipated from this project					
17%	7%	No-till in 50% of wheat and other row crop	FY 2005 319 Fort Cobb TMDL Implementation	\$672,380	\$586,754	\$1,259,134 <sup>4</sup>
	10%		CSP, EQIP, ???			\$930,000
25%		Convert 20% of worst cultivated land to pasture	FY 2001 319 Fort Cobb Project			
			EQIP, CSP,???			\$2,050,000 <sup>5</sup>
30%	1%	Riparian Areas in 60% of watershed	FY 2001 319 Fort Cobb Project	\$38,802	\$25,867	\$64,669
	15%		2005 CREP	\$4,726,790	\$945,358	\$5,672,148
	14%		EQIP, CRP, CSP,???	\$4,235,204	\$1,058,801	\$5,294,005
31.5%	31.5%	Nutrient Management Plans for 90% of producers	FY 2001 and 2005 319 Programs, EQIP, CRP, CSP,???			\$375,000 <sup>6</sup>
???	???	Grade Stabilization Structures	FY 2001 319 Fort Cobb Project	\$92,804	\$61,870	\$154,674
	???		EQIP,???			
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$15,799,630</b>

# Ft. Cobb WPP

**Table 6. Funding Needs for Technical Support for Implementation of BMPs.**

Project/Funding Source	Task	Federal	State Cost Share Funds	Total
FY 2001 319 Fort Cobb Project- five year period	On-Site Coordinator	\$225,000		\$225,000
	Plan Writer	\$80,000		\$80,000
	District Support	\$75,000		
FY 2005 319 Fort Cobb TMDL Implementation Project- salaries and support for 2 years beyond 2001 project	On-Site Coordinator	\$121,000		\$121,000
	District Support	\$15,000		\$15,000
Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP)- funding for 2-3 years of technical support	Plan Writer		\$94,000 - \$312,000	\$94,000 - \$312,000
NRCS District Conservationists (3)		\$52,000 - \$85,000 <sup>3</sup>		\$52,000 - \$85,000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$609,800 - \$642,800</b>	<b>\$94,000 - \$312,000</b>	<b>\$703,000 - \$954,800</b>