

## Parameters for selecting Waterbody for WPP Development (12/15/2005)

This is what we used to select Plum Creek for initial WPP Development.

- Impairment
  - Utilize draft 2004 303(d) and 305(b) list and Secondary concerns list
  - Assess points per assigned category (e.g. 4a, 4b, 4c, etc...)
  - Split 4a and 5a between those with TMDLs underway and those without
  - High points for 5a w/o, 4a w/o IP, secondary concern, threat/trend
  - Medium points for 5b, 5c, 1, 2, 3, 5a w/, 4a w/
  - Review data for trends
  - Protection from potential impairments
  - EPA priorities and concerns
  - If multiple segments and listings within watershed, use category with highest point value
  - Change title from “Impairment” (negative) to “Waterbody 305(b) Status” (more positive)
- Planning Status
  - Planned TMDL or WPP
- LULC
  - 2001 NLCD is now available
  - Use only cropland or all three agriculture (cropland, rangeland, forestland)
  - Compare agriculture to developed versus just % agriculture
  - Use agriculture statistics from NASS survey
  - Number of permitted dischargers (high # = low WPP potential)
- Implementation Status
  - To evaluate the potential for implementation of BMPs in watershed
  - Use TSSWCB Water Quality Management Plan acreage compared to agriculture acreage from LULC above
  - Limitation because HUC-12 is now available, but not in all coastal zones
- Size
  - Watershed size for realistic management
  - High WPP potential for watersheds within target range
  - 100 to 1,000 mi<sup>2</sup>
  - Also 1 million acres (about 1,600 mi<sup>2</sup>) suggested as maximum
- Ag NPS Potential
  - Limitation because some coastal zones are not delineated in HUC-12
  - Evaluated and ranked watershed potential from 1997 USDA NRCS nation-wide study
  - Study examined parameters such as climate, soil characteristics, pesticides and nitrogen loadings from ag sources
- Threat or LULC Change
  - 2001 NLCD is now available
  - Next option use US Census Bureau population data
  - 1990-2000 change in county with most area in watershed
  - Use projections as well as historic change

- Use density versus population change
  - Eliminate irregularities by using block-level data instead of county (COGs should be able to help with this)
- Member Priority
  - WCSC Member entity
  - Select top two watersheds within jurisdiction for WPP
- Coastal Zone
  - Simply Yes or No
  - Any part of the watershed in delineated Coastal Zone
- Stakeholder Buy-in
  - Of these ten “simple” parameters, this one turned into most complex
  - Combination of points in four different sub-categories: citizen interest, local government, WCSC member support, and local SWCD interest
  - First three (citizen, local government, and WCSC) will be self-ranked by WCSC member entity
  - SWCD will be assessed by TSSWCB Field Representatives
  - To tie to Texas Watershed Steward, should also include evaluation of TCE County Faculty in each watershed