

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Idaho Nitrate Initiative



Ed Hagan

Western States Source Water and
Ground Water Protection Forum
May 5, 2009



Overview

- Provide Background information
- Discuss four components
- Describe three different approaches used to develop Ground Water Quality Improvement Plans




The Origin

Idaho Ground Water
Quality Plan -1992

Idaho Ground Water
Quality Rule - 1996

DEQ Policy for Addressing
Degraded Ground
Water Quality Areas -
2000



IDEQ Policy for Addressing Degraded Ground Water Quality Areas:

To improve areas with degraded ground water quality by providing education, encouraging the use of **voluntary** measures, modifying current practices, and implementing best management practices.



DEQ Goal

Plans developed for top 10 areas by 2010

Four Components of Nitrate Initiative

- 1) Identify & Rank Areas of significant degradation
- 2) Develop plans or strategies
- 3) Implement plans or strategies
- 4) Monitor & evaluate effectiveness



Collaboration

- Requires collaboration of state agencies during all 4 steps of process.
- Different agencies are involved depending on stage of process.
 - Local governments generally minimal involvement during Components 1 & 4
 - Local governments and public involved during Components 2 & 3



1) Identify & Rank Areas

- 1) Compile Data
- 2) Delineate Areas
- 3) Rank Areas




Ground Water Monitoring Technical Committee


- Formed in 1996 to help gov't. agencies coordinate sampling efforts & share info
- Participants include ground water quality professionals from local, state, and federal agencies, universities, health districts & non profits.
- Help DEQ to:
 - Develop methodology to designate and delineate degraded areas
 - Develop criteria to rank degraded areas



- 25% of tested wells have nitrate levels \geq 5 mg/L
- Ranked from 1 to 32 based on severity of degradation, population, & trend
- Over 1600 wells with nitrate $>$ 5 mg/l
- Over 500 wells $>$ 10 mg/L
- 2.2 million acres of land overlie aquifers within Nitrate Priority Areas
- Almost 300,000 people live within Nitrate Priority Areas (20% of pop)



TWIN FALLS COUNTY NITRATE PRIORITY AREA FOR GROUND WATER



**Twin Falls County
Nitrate Priority Area**

Legend

Nitrate Concentrations Milligrams per Liter (mg/L)

- Non-Detect - 1.99
- 2.00 - 4.99
- 5.00 - 9.99
- ≥ 10.00

- - - Draft Nitrate Priority Areas
- ☆ Cities
- County Boundaries

Nitrate Priority Area - 25% of samples are greater than or equal to 1/2 drinking water standards or 5.00 mg/L

EPA Drinking Water Standards for Nitrate is 10.00 mg/L



April, 2008



Four Components


- 1) Identify & Rank Areas of significant degradation
- 2) Develop plans or strategies
- 3) Implement plans or strategies
- 4) Monitor & evaluate effectiveness



Ground Water Quality Improvement Plans

With local input develop GWQIP

- DEQ facilitated
- Include state and federal agencies, local stakeholders - govt, business, civic groups
- Identify sources
- Identify relevant strategies - BMP's, land use planning, education
- Identify agency roles



The cover of the "Cassia County Groundwater Quality Management Plan" report, dated June 2004. It features four images: a baby, a golf course, a map of Idaho with Cassia County highlighted, and a wellhead in a field. The text on the cover reads: "Cassia County Groundwater Quality Management Plan June 2004". Below the map, it states: "This plan meets the requirement set forth in Policy PM08-04 to address the Burley/Marsh Creek area of concern."

Pause to Consider

**Who are the end users of the
ground water management plan and
do they need the same product?**

**COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
PLANNING/ZONING & CITY OFFICIALS**

**REGULATORY
AGENCIES**

**GENERAL
PUBLIC**



Advisory Committees

■ Committee Formation

- 1) Advertise - anyone can be involved
Not all stakeholders represented, dedication lacking.
- 2) Advertise & invite - best results in areas with worst degradation
Stakeholders had incentive because individuals are impacted
- 3) Invite selected stakeholders - limit size
Exclude general public, entrenched positions, very dedicated - difficult




Committee Process

■ Education

- Explain the problem
 - Health threats
 - Identify sources
 - Identify BMPs

■ Develop a plan

- Strategies
- Roles of govt & public
- Timeline/schedule
- Funding options



Advisory Committee

PROs

- Local stakeholders
- Decision makers
- Local ownership
- Regular meetings
 - Yearly
 - Quarterly
 - Monthly



CONs

- Extensive Education
- Authority?
- Time consuming
- Need dedicated volunteers



Result of Committee Approach

- Plan with strategies is created
- Implementation is responsibility of state agencies
- Plans are similar
- Local leadership uncertain
- Long term viability of committee uncertain




Open House

- Abbreviated public involvement
 - Use known strategies
 - Two or three advisory committee meetings to identify strategies
 - Prepare Plan
 - Open house to inform public & receive input



SW Idaho

- 15 of 32 NPAs
 - 7 Counties
- 11 still to do
- Sought more efficient approach



Direct to local government

- No need to reinvent the wheel - select strategies that are proven
- Target decision makers
- Requires local governments to assume leadership role
- Less agency staff time
- Focus on implementation

CON

- Less public involvement



Status of GWQIPs

- Eight plans have been completed
 - Seven w/ local advisory committee
 - One open house approach
- Five are in process
 - Three local advisory committee
 - One open house approach
 - One direct to county government approach
 - covers multiple areas within a county



Four Components

- 1) Identify & Rank Areas of significant degradation
- 2) Develop plans or strategies
- 3) **Implement plans or strategies**
- 4) Monitor & evaluate effectiveness



Funding Sources



Federal funds

- 319 Grants
- Drinking Water Source Protection Grants

State Funds -

- Special projects -
 - Education efforts
 - Agricultural BMPs
- Research activities



Funding Sources

Local Funds - Aquifer Protection District

- Limited by Law to one aquifer in Idaho
 - Fee \$8/year per tax lot
 - aquifer water quality testing and ground water quality improvement projects




Implementation Efforts

- Education events
 - Open houses with free nitrate testing of water
- Information distribution
 - Brochures in PWS bills
 - Placemats
 - Local speakers (PWS operator) at civic organizations (+)
- Agricultural BMPs
 - Reduced fertilizer application
 - Irrigation Water Management - drip lines



Placemat



The Portneuf River Watershed

This is the Portneuf River Watershed - our watershed. It covers more than 1200 square miles and contributes water from rain and snow melt to local rivers and streams.

Our watershed extends to the head waters of the Portneuf River above Chesterfield Reservoir in the northern Gem Valley, south to Malad Pass, and ends near the City of Chubbuck where it meets the Snake River Plain. The watershed is a haven for a variety of wildlife and supports many types of land uses. These include farming, ranching, recreation, transportation, industry, mining, and every-day country and city living. Each of these land uses has an impact on how water flows through our watershed and whether it's safe to drink.

Some of the water in any watershed is stored below the land surface. This is called ground water, and it is stored in sediments like sand and gravel and in rocks that hold water in cracks. Sediments and rock that hold lots of water are called aquifers. The aquifer beneath Pocatello, Chubbuck, and Inkom is the only source of drinking water for city and rural residents and supplies all the water for agriculture and industry in the lower Portneuf River Valley.

Water is a precious resource. Conserving and protecting our watershed is necessary to preserve our Portneuf way of life.


Note the three major stream drainages that are shown. They are the Portneuf River, Marsh Creek, and Mink Creek.

Resources for this project provided by:
 Greater Portneuf Water Resource Partnership



Implementing Agencies

- Local soil & water conservation districts
 - Encourage agricultural BMPs
- Local governments
 - Utilize land use planning
- State Agencies
 - Education efforts



Implementation Difficulties

- No single entity to coordinate efforts
- Ground water quality is not the priority
 - Ground water availability
 - Surface water quality
 - Air quality
- Unreliable funding or no funding



Four Components

- 1) Identify & Rank Areas of significant degradation
- 2) Develop plans or strategies
- 3) Implement plans or strategies
- 4) Monitor & evaluate effectiveness



Monitoring & Evaluation

- Primarily state role
 - IDWR - statewide
 - IDEQ - local projects
 - ISDA - dairy monitoring
- Special projects -
if funding available



April 15, 2009



Summary

- Idaho identified aquifers with elevated nitrate levels
- Ground Water Quality Improvement Plans are being developed with public participation
- Plan development approaches vary
- Implementation efforts are moving forward




Successes

- Increased interest in ground water quality
- Numerous projects being implemented
- Fewer areas with increasing trends
 - 2002 - 9 areas
 - 2008 - 4 areas

Nitrate Interactive Mapping

<http://global.deq.idaho.gov/npa/>



More Information

- http://www.deq.idaho.gov/water/prog_issues/ground_water/nitrate.cfm
- Ed.Hagan@deq.idaho.gov
- DEQ.IDAHO.GOV

