



## **HEALTHY WATERS COALITION URGES ACTION ON NUTRIENT RUN-OFF**

Since passage of the Clean Water Act (CWA) in 1972, America's clean water resources have seen dramatic improvement in overall water quality, however over the past two decades these gains have been threatened by nutrient contamination that the CWA was not originally designed to address. Over this next decade, the critical challenge facing efforts to restore and maintain clean and safe water is whether excessive amounts of nitrogen and phosphorus (nutrients) in our waters can be reduced.

According to State water quality reports, 80,000 miles of rivers and streams, 2.5 million acres of lakes, reservoirs and ponds, 78% of the assessed continental U.S. coastal areas and more than 30% of estuaries are impaired due to excessive levels of nitrogen and phosphorus. In all, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency attributes excess nutrients as the direct or indirect cause of impairments in over 50% of impaired river and stream miles; over 50% of impaired lake acres; and nearly 60% of impaired bay and estuarine square miles. For the majority of these waters, nutrient run-off from agricultural lands is the dominant source of the nutrient impairments according to studies by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). In fact, recent USGS data indicate that despite efforts to reduce nitrate levels in the Mississippi River Basin, concentrations at eight major USGS study sites did not consistently decline from 1980-2008.

America's clean water resources and agricultural practices are inextricably linked. In fact, over the next five years agricultural policies and practices will have the single greatest impact on our lakes, rivers and estuaries. Congress has an opportunity in this next Farm Bill to establish policies to more effectively reduce agricultural nutrient run-off and improve water quality throughout the United States.

Conservation practices designed to reduce agricultural nutrient run-off support multiple agricultural, water quality and ecological goals, many of which are already established policy goals for agricultural investments under the Farm Bill. For example, many practices that control for nitrogen and phosphorus loss also control for erosion and sediment loss thereby avoiding unnecessary loss of fertile farmland and supporting the Highly Erodible Lands policy Congress established in the 1985 Farm Bill. In addition, many effective nutrient-control practices, such as wetlands and other riparian restoration activities, also have significant habitat and wildlife conservation benefits, thereby supporting goals of the Wetlands policy established by the 1985 Farm Bill and the Wetlands Reserve Program and Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program. Thus, many effective strategies for controlling nutrients not only improve water quality, but also can contribute to important benefits related to food security, biodiversity, and habitat and wildlife

preservation. The following recommendations are designed to better leverage our agricultural resources to achieve real reductions of nutrient run-off.

1. **Conservation programs:** The Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP), Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP), and Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI) provide technical and financial assistance for a variety of conservation activities on agricultural lands. While water quality improvement is a goal of these programs, program investments can more effectively achieve reductions of nutrient run-off through the following policy reforms:
  - For EQIP, prioritize nutrient control as the primary program goal in watersheds impaired by nutrients and tie these investments to performance standards.
  - For CSP, direct participants in nutrient impaired watersheds be assigned nutrient reduction as a required resource concern.
  - For CRP (and the CRP enhancement program), ensure that sufficient acres are available for new conservation buffer enrollments and require buffer enrollments ensure nitrogen run-off is reduced.
  - For WRP, restore full funding so restoration work continues and the important water quality benefits of wetlands are expanded.
  - For CCPI, increase the percentage of funding available for targeted projects and require projects address performance-based nutrient reduction in impaired watersheds.

By incorporating these policies, Congress would ensure that conservation dollars more effectively reduce nutrient run-off in impaired watersheds. Should Congress consolidate these programs, these concepts and approaches should be incorporated into a consolidated framework.

2. **Commodity and Crop Insurance Programs:** Conservation compliance requirements should apply to all commodity and crop and revenue insurance programs. In addition, federal payments and premium subsidies should be linked in some manner to the goal of avoiding adverse water quality impacts from agricultural operations. Options to consider include expanding conservation compliance requirements to include nutrient reduction activities, particularly in watersheds impaired by nutrients, or providing increased assistance to producers in such watersheds to adopt an adaptive management approach to maximizing nutrient use efficiency and/or other effective and documentable practices and approaches to reduce nutrient losses. In addition, Congress should examine commodity and crop and revenue insurance programs to identify where these programs may create disincentives for effective nutrient management and remove those disincentives.

3. **Monitoring and Evaluation:** Successful nutrient control programs demonstrate that effective implementation of nutrient management practices by agricultural operations is critically dependent upon monitoring systems which generate timely, precise and accurate data about the environmental pathways of agriculturally applied nutrients. Congress should provide monitoring and evaluation tools and incentives to help farmers gather and evaluate real-time data on the most efficient nutrient management practices for site-specific soil and crop conditions. Congress should also strengthen mechanisms for improved collaboration among on-going state and federal water quality monitoring programs to gather water quality data to determine the effectiveness of on-farm site-specific nutrient management practices and to identify opportunities for more effective practices.

These recommendations are supported by a diverse cross-section of municipal water and wastewater organizations, state clean water officials, conservation and sustainable agricultural organizations who call on Congress to strengthen the links between water quality and agricultural practices, including:

**NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:**

AMERICAN FISHERIES SOCIETY	ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND POLICY CENTER
AMERICAN PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION	ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP
AMERICAN RIVERS	FRIENDS OF WETLANDS
AMERICAN WATER WORKS ASSOCIATION	GREENPEACE USA
ASSOCIATION OF CLEAN WATER ADMINISTRATORS	IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA
ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN WATER AGENCIES	JOHNS HOPKINS CENTER FOR A LIVABLE FUTURE
ASSOCIATION OF STATE DRINKING WATER ADMINISTRATORS	NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CLEAN WATER AGENCIES
CHESAPEAKE BAY FOUNDATION	NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WATER COMPANIES
CLEAN WATER ACTION	NATIONAL SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE COALITION
CLEAN WATER NETWORK	NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND	NATURE ABOUNDS
	WATER ENVIRONMENT FEDERATION

**STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS:**

ALASKA'S BIG VILLAGE NETWORK, AK	INDIANA WATER ENVIRONMENT ASSOCIATION, IN
BEAVER WATER DISTRICT, AR	SAVE THE DUNES, IN
CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF SANITATION AGENCIES, CA	KANSAS WATER ENVIRONMENT ASSOCIATION, KS
CALIFORNIA WATER ENVIRONMENT ASSOCIATION, CA	KENTUCKY WATERWAYS ALLIANCE, KY
DELTA DIABLO SANITATION DISTRICT, CA	GULF RESTORATION NETWORK, LA
EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT, CA	NEW ENGLAND INTERSTATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION, MA
ENDANGERED HABITATS LEAGUE, CA	MUSKEGON RIVER WATERSHED ASSEMBLY, MI
LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER, CA	TIP OF THE MITT WATERSHED COUNCIL, MI
CITY OF PUEBLO, CO	MINNESOTA ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE AND ECONOMIC REVIEW BOARD, MN
COLORADO WATERSHED ASSEMBLY, CO	MINNESOTA CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCACY, MN
CONNECTICUT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL, CT	WESTERN LAKE SUPERIOR SANITARY DISTRICT, MN
SOUTH CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY, CT	CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, MO
WILMINGTON DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, DE	INDEPENDENCE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL DEPARTMENT, MO
COLUMBUS WATER WORKS, GA	LITTLE BLUE VALLEY SEWER DISTRICT, MO
GEORGIA RIVER NETWORK, GA	METROPOLITAN ST. LOUIS SEWER DISTRICT, MO
DES MOINES WATER WORKS, IA	MISSOURI COALITION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, MO
IOWA ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL, IA	CITY OF RALEIGH, NC
PACIFIC NORTHWEST CLEAN WATER ASSOCIATION, ID	NORTH CAROLINA WATER QUALITY ASSOCIATION, NC
ALLIANCE FOR THE GREAT LAKES, IL	NEBRASKA SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE SOCIETY, NE
CENTRAL STATES WATER ENVIRONMENT ASSOCIATION, IL	LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT, NV
ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF WASTEWATER AGENCIES, IL	
PRAIRIE RIVERS NETWORK, IL	

NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, NY

NEW YORK WATER ENVIRONMENT  
ASSOCIATION, NY

ONONDAGA COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY, NY

ASSOCIATION OF OHIO METROPOLITAN  
WASTEWATER AGENCIES, OH

NORTHEAST OHIO REGIONAL  
SEWER DISTRICT, OH

TULSA METROPOLITAN UTILITY  
AUTHORITY/CITY OF TULSA, OK

CITY OF CORVALLIS, OR

CITIZENS FOR PENNSYLVANIA'S  
FUTURE (PENNFUTURE), PA

PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, PA

PROVIDENCE WATER, RI

BEAUFORT-JASPER WATER & SEWER  
AUTHORITY, SC

SPARTANBURG WATER, SC

TENNESSEE CLEAN WATER NETWORK, TN  
SNYDERVILLE BASIN WATER RECLAMATION  
DISTRICT, UT

ALEXANDRIA SANITATION AUTHORITY, VA  
HOPEWELL REGIONAL WASTEWATER  
TREATMENT FACILITY, VA

CASCADE WATER ALLIANCE, WA

FRIENDS OF GRAYS HARBOR, WA

NORTHWEST WATERSHED INSTITUTE, WA

GREEN BAY METROPOLITAN SEWERAGE  
DISTRICT, WI

MADISON METROPOLITAN SEWERAGE  
DISTRICT, WI

MIDWEST ENVIRONMENTAL  
ADVOCATES, INC., WI

MILWAUKEE METROPOLITAN SEWERAGE  
DISTRICT, WI

WESTERN VIRGINIA WATER AUTHORITY, WV