

# Session 1

## States' Approaches

### *Engagement, Prioritization, Protection*

MassDEP  
CWA Vision Workshop  
November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016

# Current Approaches: Engagement

Approach	States
<b>Groups/councils</b>	KS, AK, AR, CO, MN, MT, NY, UT, ND, IL
<b>Meetings</b>	AZ, AR, CA, CT, FL, GA, IL, IN, IA, MD, MO, MT, NV, NM, NC, OH, RI, SC, TX, WY, <b>MA</b>
Public meetings before water quality surveys	NM
Public meetings for 303(d) list development	AR, AZ, NV, FL, GA, RI, TX, MD, IA
Public meetings for TMDL development	AZ, FL, MD, NV, NM, NC, RI, TX, WY, <b>MA</b>
TMDL “kickoff” meetings before development begins	IN, <b>MA (MEP)</b>
Public meetings for WQS review	AR, NV, NM, TX, <b>MA</b>
Stakeholder conference	AR, MT
<b>Field Staff</b>	VA, IA, UT, ND
<b>Listserv/email</b>	CT, DE, MO, UT, <b>MA (IR data solicitation)</b>
<b>Publications</b>	IA, KY, MI, MN, MT, NJ, NB, NC, NM, <b>MA</b>
Newsletters	IA, MT, NM
Watershed health reports	KY
TMDL factsheets	MI
Clean Water Fund Performance Report	MN
<b>Website</b>	CA, CT, DE, GA, MA, MO, MT, NV, NC, VA, WY, FL, <b>MA</b>
Web-based interactive GIS map	NV, <b>MA</b>
Website with monitoring/assessment methods; how to report and upload monitoring data; status of projects	MO, MT, MN, VA, <b>MA</b>

# Current Approaches: Prioritization

Approach		States
<b>Recovery potential</b> (ability to meet standards)		KY, MD, NH, NM , HI, WY, NC, VA, <b>MA (new)</b>
<b>Multi-agency team</b> prioritizing waters of concern		AK, MT, TX, LA, CO, AZ
<b>Public Process</b> (indicator of social impact, economic value, political relevance)		AK, CT (public review of 303(d) list), <b>MA Integrated Report</b>
<b>Availability of Implementation Support</b> (money, time, influence, authority)		KY, IA, IL, SC, CO, MN, NV, IA, UT, <b>MA</b>
<b>EPA Nutrient Framework Memo</b> (meeting phosphorus or nitrogen criteria)		KS, ND, <b>MA</b>
<b>What to Prioritize</b>		
	Pollutants	KS, ID, CO, LA, ME, OK, <b>MA (nutrients and bacteria)</b>
	Impacts/Uses	MO, CT, MI, <b>MA (prioritize coastal)</b>
	Sources	CO, MD, MN
	Geographic	<b>MA (prioritize coastal)</b>
<b>Prioritization with consideration of 319 program</b>		CO, IA, KS, KY, MT

# Current Approaches: Protection

Approach	States
Established method for determining priorities	CO, NE, UT, VA
Input from agencies and the public	NY, OR, CO, DE, NM, NC
Multi-agency team	AK, LA
Degree or nature of threat to water quality, habitat (stressed)	NY, MD, UT
Value of watershed (critical habitat, PWS, ORW, ACEC, fisheries)	KS, KY, NC, MT, SC, , NC, SD, <b>MA</b>
Availability of Implementation Support (money, time, influence)	KT, MD, CT, KS, <b>MA (Taunton)</b>
Technology and Information	<b>MA (BioMap2, Recovery Potential Screening Tool)</b>
**Most states have regulations with provisions for anti-degradation	

# Current Approaches: Protection

Approach	States
Monitoring and analysis	CT, KY, MD, VT, ME, <b>MA (probabilistic 305(b)), Fish and Game</b>
Regulations & Standards: Waterbody Classification, Anti-degradation	NC, MO, SD, PA, <b>MA</b>
Planning	TX
Outreach	CO, OR
**Most states have regulations with provisions for anti-degradation	