

# KANSAS-LOWER REPUBLICAN BASIN TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD

## Waterbody: Delaware River Watershed above Perry Lake Water Quality Impairment: Fecal Coliform Bacteria

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

**Subbasin:** Delaware

**Counties:** Atchison, Brown, Jackson, Jefferson,  
and Nemaha

**HUC 8:** 10270103

**HUC 11s:** 010, 030, 040, 050,060

**Drainage Area:** 679.5 miles<sup>2</sup>

**Main Stem Segments:** 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21 and 22 starting at the inlet to Perry Lake and traveling upstream to headwaters in Nemaha County near Berwick.

**Tributary Segments:** Muddy Creek (25)  
Little Grasshopper Creek (16)  
Negro Creek (43)  
Straight Creek (28)  
Mosquito Creek (42)  
Elk Creek (29 and 30)  
    Unnamed Creek (31)  
    Banner Creek (45)  
    Bills Creek (47)  
Catamount Creek (49)  
    Nebo Creek (48)

**Designated Uses:** Expected Aquatic Life Support, Primary Contact Recreation and all other designated uses on Main Stem.  
Expected Aquatic Life Support, Primary Contact Recreation and Food Procurement on Cedar Creek, Elk Creek (both segments) and Muddy Creek,  
Expected Aquatic Life Support, Secondary Contact Recreation and Food Procurement on Banner Creek and Straight Creek.  
Expected Aquatic Life Support and Secondary Contact Recreation on Bills Creek, Catamount Creek, Little Grasshopper Creek, Mosquito Creek, Nebo Creek, Negro Creek, and Unnamed Creek.

**1998 303d Listing:** Table 1–Predominant Point and Non-point Source Impacts

**Impaired Use:** Primary Contact Recreation on Main Stem, Muddy Creek; Secondary Contact Recreation on all Main Stem and Tributary Segments.

**Water Quality Standard:** Fecal Coliform Bacteria: 2000 colonies per 100 ml for Secondary (KAR 28-16-28e(c)(7)(C)); 900 colonies per 100 ml for Primary (KAR 28-16-28e(c)(7)(B))  
Classified streams may be excluded from applying these criteria when streamflow exceeds flow that is surpassed 10% of the time ((KAR 28- 16-28c(c)(2))

## **2. CURRENT WATER QUALITY CONDITION AND DESIRED ENDPOINT**

**Level of Support for Designated Use under 1998 303d:** Not Supporting Secondary Contact Recreation.

**Monitoring Sites:** Station 103 near Muscotah, Station 554 (primary) near Half Mound

**Period of Record Used:** 1987 (near Muscotah), 1990--1998 (near Half Mound)

**Flow Record:** USGS Station Near Muscotah (06890100), Recorded daily data 1969 - 1997

**Long Term Flow Conditions:** 10% Duration High Flow Exclusion = 300 cfs; 7Q10 = 1 cfs

**Current Conditions:** Since loading capacity varies as a function of the flow present in the stream, this TMDL represents a continuum of desired loads over all flow conditions, rather than fixed at a single value. Flow duration data were examined from the Muscotah Gaging Station for each of the three defined seasons: Spring (Apr-Jun), Summer-Fall (Jul-Oct) and Winter (Nov-Mar). High flows and runoff equate to lower flow durations, baseflow and point source influences generally occur in the 85-99% range. Load curves were established for both Primary Contact Recreation and Secondary Contact Recreation criterion by multiplying the flow values along the curve by the applicable water quality criterion and converting the units to derive a load duration curve of colonies of bacteria per day. These load curves represent the TMDL since any point along the curve represents water quality at the standard at that flow. Historic excursions from WQS are seen as plotted points above the load curves. Water quality standards are met for those points plotting below the applicable load duration curves.

Excursions were seen in all three seasons. Forty two percent of Spring (S) samples and 40% of Summer-Fall (SF) samples were over the primary criterion. Eight percent of Winter (W) samples were over the secondary criterion. Overall 29% of the samples were over the criteria. This would represent a baseline condition of partial support of the impaired designated use.

**PERCENT OF SAMPLES OVER WATER QUALITY STANDARDS BY FLOW AND SEASON**

STREAM NAME	I M P A I R M E N T	S E A S O N	MAGNITUDE	0 T O 10%	10 T O 30%	30 T O 60%	60 T O 90%	90 T O 100%	F R E Q U E N C Y	Current Condition of Water Quality at Site 554 Over 1990-1998
DELAWARE RIVER ABOVE PERRY LAKE	F C B	S	900-2000	0	0	0	8	0	5/12 =42 %	10/34=29% Exceedence
			> 2000	0	0	0	8	0		
			> 2 X 2000	0	8	8	8			
	S F	S	900-2000	0	0	0	10	0	4/10 =40 %	
			> 2000	0	0	0	20	0		
			> 2 X 2000	0	10	0	0	0		
	W	W	> 2000	0	8	0	0	0	1/12 =8 %	
			> 2 X 2000	0	0	0	0	0		

**Desired Endpoint Condition of Water Quality at Site 554 over 2004 - 2008:**

Overall, the endpoint of this TMDL will be to reduce the percent of samples over the applicable criteria from 29% to less than 10% for samples taken at flows below the high flow exclusion over the monitoring period of 2004-2008. This TMDL endpoint meets water quality standards as measured and determined by Kansas Water Quality Assessment protocols. These assessment protocols are similar to those used to cite the stream segments in this watershed as impaired on the Kansas 1998 Section 303d list.

Seasonal variation in endpoints is account for by TMDL curves established for each season and will be evaluated based on monitoring data from 2004-2008. Monitoring data plotting below the applicable seasonal TMDL curves will indicate attainment of the water quality standards. As with the overall endpoint, the manner of evaluation of the seasonal endpoints is consistent with the assessment protocols used to establish the case for impairment in these streams.

1. Less than 10 % of samples taken in Spring exceed primary criterion at flows under 300 cfs with no samples exceeding the criterion at flows under 75 cfs.
2. Less than 10% of samples taken in Summer or Fall exceed the primary criterion at flows under 300 cfs with no samples exceeding the criterion at flows under 40 cfs.
3. Less than 10% of samples taken in Winter exceed secondary criterion at flows under 300 cfs.

These endpoints will be reached as a result of expected, though unspecified, reductions in loading from the various sources in the watershed resulting from implementation of corrective actions and Best Management Practices, as directed by this TMDL. Achievement of the endpoints indicate loads are within the loading capacity of the stream, water quality standards are attained and full support of the designated uses of the stream has been restored.

### 3. SOURCE INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT

**NPDES:** There are eleven NPDES permitted wastewater dischargers within the watershed.

MUNICIPALITY	STREAM REACH	SEGMENT	DESIGN FLOW
Goff	Mosquito Cr.	42	0.03 mgd
Huron	L. Grasshopper Cr.	16	0.02 mgd
Holton	Elk Cr.	29	0.55 mgd
Muscotah	Delaware R.	17	0.248 mgd
Netawaka	Mosquito	42	0.015 mgd
Powhattan	Delaware R.	23	0.012 mgd
KDOT Brown Co. Rest Area	Cedar Cr.	37	0.0015 mgd
Sabetha (South Plant)	Delaware R.	23	0.5 mgd
Wetmore	Mosquito Cr.	42	0.0424 mgd
Whiting	Negro Cr.	43	0.023 mgd

Population projections for half the municipalities through to the year 2020 indicate small increases in population. Projection for the other half indicate small decreases in population. Projections for associated future water use and resulting wastewater appear to be under design flows for all systems, although Holton may begin to approach their design flow limits by 2020. At design flows, the contributions from these systems make up 22 % of the flow which was exceeded during the Summer-Fall season 90% of the time. One excursion during the Summer-Fall season occurred at relatively low flow when point sources might have influenced the water quality, otherwise, excursions were related to runoff conditions, thus, given the magnitude of the design flows of each of these systems, these point source impacts appear to be minimal to the watershed.

**Livestock Waste Management Systems:** Forty nine operations are registered, certified or permitted within the watershed. Most of these facilities are located in the western half of the watershed. These operations are mostly swine (55% of animal units), beef (27% of animal units), or dairy (16% of animal units). Animal units for the watershed total 10,093. Most facilities have systems (these facilities account for 61% of the animal units in the watershed) that are designed for the 25 year, 24 hour rainfall/runoff event, which would be indicative of flow durations well under 10 percent of the time. The actual number of animal units on site is variable, but typically less than permitted numbers.

**Land Use:** Most of the watershed is grassland (50% of the area) or cropland (43% of the area). Grazing density of livestock is moderate to heavy for the watershed (43-52 animal units/sq. mi.). Cropland above the primary water quality monitoring site (Station 554) is located mainly in HUC11 010, 030, 040 ,060 (significantly less in 050).

**On-Site Waste Systems:** The population density in the watershed is low. Rural population projections for Brown and Nemaha Counties through 2020 show declining populations while projections for Atchison and Jackson Counties show increasing populations. Failing on-site waste systems can contribute bacteria loadings. In FY 1998, 28 complaints or inspections on on-site systems were investigated in Atchison County, 19 in Brown and 226 for Jackson County. In the first three quarters of Fiscal Year 1999, 37 visits have been made on on-site systems in Atchison County, 7 in Brown County and 122 in Jackson County. The sporadic excursion from the water quality standards seems to indicate a lack of persistent loadings from such systems on any grand scale. However, the projected rural growth in Atchison and Jackson counties may lead to proliferation in on-site systems within the watershed.

**Contributing Runoff:** The watershed has an average soil permeability of 0.4 inches/hour according to NRCS STATSGO data base. Runoff would be produced from storms one to six hours in duration, having a recurrence interval of five, ten or twenty-five years. Runoff is chiefly generated as infiltration excess with rainfall intensities greater than soil permeabilities. Generally, 95 percent of the watershed would generate runoff under dryer conditions or smaller storms. Moderate or wet conditions or larger storms would see runoff contributed from 96 or 97 percent of the watershed respectively.

**Background Levels:** Some fecal bacteria counts may be associated with environmental background levels, including contributions from wildlife, but it is likely that the density of animals such as deer is fairly dispersed across the watershed resulting in minimal loading to the streams below the levels necessary to violate the water quality standards.

#### **4. ALLOCATION OF POLLUTION REDUCTION RESPONSIBILITY**

The nature of bacteria loading is too dynamic to assign fixed allocations for wasteloads and non-point loads. Instead, allocation decisions will be made which reflect the expected reduction of bacteria loading under defined flow conditions. These flow conditions will be defined by the presumed ability of point or non-point sources to be the dominant influence on stream water quality. Therefore, the allocation of wasteloads and loads will be made by demarcating the seasonal TMDL curves at a particular flow duration level. Flows lower than that designated flow will represent conditions which are the responsibility of point sources to maintain water quality standards, those flows greater than the designated flow are the responsibility of non-point sources up to the high flow exclusion value.

**Point Sources:** The municipal point sources are responsible for maintaining their systems in proper working condition and appropriate detention volume to handle anticipated wasteloads of

their respective populations. Ongoing inspections and monitoring of the systems will be made to ensure that minimal contributions have been made by these sources.

The Wasteload Allocation is defined at the flow condition where the sum of the design flows represent more than 10% of the flow, thereby exerting influence on the water quality of the stream. The critical conditions on the Delaware River at this location would be under 22 cfs where design flows constitute 10% or more of the flow. Such flows were exceeded 74% of the time during the Summer-Fall. Future NPDES and state permits will be conditioned such that discharges from permitted facilities will not cause violations of the applicable bacteria criteria at this low flow.

**Non-Point Sources:** Based on the assessment of sources, the distribution of excursions from water quality standards and the relationship of those excursions to runoff conditions, non-point sources are seen as the primary cause of water quality violations. Background levels attributed to wildlife are not significant as a cause of the problem. The twenty-six of the 49 livestock facilities (accounting for 61% of the animal units in facilities in the watershed) rely on lagoon systems for wastewater detention and long holding times to minimize the release of fecal bacteria to receiving streams. The previous assessment suggests that faulty on-site waste systems may contribute to the occasional bacteria problem. Small operations involving livestock may also contribute bacteria loadings to the streams. Given the runoff characteristics of the watershed, overland runoff can readily carry waste material from developed areas into streams. Activities to reduce fecal pollution should be directed toward the smaller, unpermitted livestock operations and rural homesteads and farmsteads in the watershed. The goal for reduction in fecal pollution contributions would be to have functioning waste management systems in place for two thirds of these operations by 2004.

Activities to reduce fecal pollution should be directed toward the smaller, unpermitted livestock operations and rural homesteads and farmsteads in the watershed. The Load Allocation assigns responsibility for maintaining water quality below the TMDL curve over flow conditions bracketed by the 7Q10 low flow of 1 cfs and the high flow exclusion of 300 cfs. These flows are exceeded 18-88% of the time during the Spring, 7-74% of the time over the Summer and Fall and 10-53% of the time during the Winter. Best Management Practices will be directed toward those activities such that there will be minimal violation of the applicable bacteria criteria at higher flows.

**Defined Margin of Safety:** Because there will not be a traditional load allocation made for fecal bacteria, the margin of safety will be framed around the desired endpoints of the applicable water quality standards. Therefore, evaluation of achieving the endpoints should use values set 100 counts less than the applicable criteria (800 colonies for primary contact recreation; 1,900 colonies for secondary contact recreation) to mark full support of the recreation designated use of the streams in this watershed. By this definition, the margin of safety is 100 colonies per 100 ml and would be represented by a parallel line lying below each seasonal TMDL curve by a distance corresponding to loads associated with 100 colonies per 100 ml.

**State Water Plan Implementation Priority:** This TMDL will be a High Priority for implementation, because this watershed has high grazing densities and persistent bacteria

excursions over the criteria and because water quality improvement in the watershed will benefit Perry Lake.

**Unified Watershed Assessment Priority Ranking:** This watershed lies within the Delaware Subbasin (HUC 8: 10270103) with a priority ranking of 3 (Highest Priority for restoration work).

**Priority HUC 11s and Stream Segments:** Because of the greater density of livestock and probable rural on-site waste systems, the western subwatersheds (HUC = 010, 040, 050) should be the priority focus of implementation.

## **5. IMPLEMENTATION**

### **Desired Implementation Activities**

1. Renew necessary state and federal permits and monitor permitted facilities for permit compliance
2. Install necessary proper manure and livestock waste storage
3. Install necessary grass buffer strips along streams.
4. Install necessary pasture management practices, including proper stock density on grasslands
5. Remove feeding sites in proximity to streams
6. Reduce livestock use of riparian areas
7. Insure proper on-site waste system operations in proximity to main streams.

### **Implementation Programs Guidance**

#### **NPDES and State Permits - KDHE**

- Municipal permits for facilities in the watershed will be renewed after 2000 within existing operations of the lagoon systems.
- b. Livestock permitted facilities will be inspected for integrity of applied pollution prevention technologies.
- c. Registered livestock facilities with less than 300 animal units will apply pollution prevention technologies.
- d. Manure management plans will be implemented.

#### **Non-Point Source Pollution Technical Assistance - KDHE**

- a. Support Section 319 demonstration projects for pollution reduction from livestock operations in watershed.
- b. Provide technical assistance on practices geared to small livestock operations which minimize impact to stream resources.
- c. Guide federal programs such as the Environmental Quality Improvement Program, which are dedicated to priority subbasins through the Unified Watershed Assessment, to priority subwatersheds and stream segments within those subbasins identified by this TMDL.

**Water Resource Cost Share & Non-Point Source Pollution Control Programs - SCC**

- a. Provide alternative water supplies to small livestock operations
- b. Develop improved grazing management plans
- c. Reduce grazing density on pasturelands
- d. Install livestock waste management systems for manure storage
- e. Implement manure management plans
- f. Install replacement on-site waste systems
- g. Coordinate with USDA/NRCS Environmental Quality Improvement Program in providing educational, technical and financial assistance to agricultural producers.

**Riparian Protection Program - SCC**

- a. Design feeding areas away from streams
- b. Develop riparian restoration projects

**Buffer Initiative Program - SCC**

- a. Install grass buffer strips near streams.
- b. Leverage Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program to hold riparian land out of production.

**Extension Outreach and Technical Assistance - Kansas State University**

- a. Educate livestock producers on riparian and waste management techniques.
- b. Provide technical assistance on livestock waste management design.
- c. Continue Section 319 demonstration projects on livestock management.

**Agricultural Outreach - KDA**

- a. Provide information on livestock management to commodity advocacy groups.
- b. Support Kansas State outreach efforts.

**Local Environmental Protection Program - KDHE**

- a. Inspect on-site waste systems within one mile of main tributary streams.

**Timeframe for Implementation:** Pollution reduction practices should be installed within the priority subwatersheds over the years 2000-2004, with minor follow up implementation, including other subwatersheds over 2004-2008.

**Targeted Participants:** Primary participants for implementation will be small scale livestock producers operating without need of permits within the priority subwatersheds. Implemented activities should be targeted at those areas with greatest potential to impact the stream. Nominally, this would be activities located within one mile of the streams including:

1. Facilities without water quality controls
2. Unpermitted permanent feeding/holding areas
3. Sites where drainage runs through or adjacent livestock areas
4. Sites where livestock have full access to stream and stream is primary water supply
5. Grazed acreage, overstocked acreage and acreage with poor range condition



6. Poor riparian sites
7. Near stream feeding sites
8. Failing on-site waste systems

Some inventory of local needs should be conducted in 2000 to identify such activities. Such an inventory would be done by local program managers with appropriate assistance by commodity representatives and state program staff in order to direct state assistance programs to the principal activities influencing the quality of the streams in the watershed during the implementation period of this TMDL.

The EPA will need to work with the Kickapoo Tribal Nation to implement any necessary practices to reduce bacteria loads from tribal lands.

**Milestone for 2004:** The year 2004 marks the midpoint of the ten-year implementation window for the watershed. At that point in time, milestones should be reached which will have at least two-thirds of the landowners responsible for the facilities and sites cited in the local assessment participating in the implementation programs provided by the state. Additionally, sampled data from Station 554 should indicate evidence of reduced bacteria levels at moderate to low flow conditions relative to the conditions seen over 1990-1998.

**Delivery Agents:** The primary delivery agents for program participation will be the conservation districts for programs of the State Conservation Commission and the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Producer outreach and awareness will be delivered by Kansas State Extension and agricultural interest groups such as Kansas Farm Bureau, Kansas Livestock Association, the Kansas Pork Producers Council and the Kansas Dairy Association. On-site waste system inspections will be performed by Local Environmental Protection Program personnel for Atchison and Jackson counties.

The Environmental Office of the Kickapoo Nation will look for opportunities of program participation on tribal lands.

### **Reasonable Assurances**

**Authorities:** The following authorities may be used to direct activities in the watershed to reduce pollution.

1. K.S.A. 65-164 and 165 empowers the Secretary of KDHE to regulate the discharge of sewage into the waters of the state.
2. K.S.A. 65-171d empowers the Secretary of KDHE to prevent water pollution and to protect the beneficial uses of the waters of the state through required treatment of sewage and established water quality standards and to require permits by persons having a potential to discharge pollutants into the waters of the state.
3. K.A.R. 28-16-69 to -71 implements water quality protection by KDHE through the establishment and administration of critical water quality management areas on a watershed basis.

4. K.S.A. 2-1915 empowers the State Conservation Commission to develop programs to assist the protection, conservation and management of soil and water resources in the state, including riparian areas.
5. K.S.A. 75-5657 empowers the State Conservation Commission to provide financial assistance for local project work plans developed to control non-point source pollution.
6. K.S.A. 82a-901, et seq. empowers the Kansas Water Office to develop a state water plan directing the protection and maintenance of surface water quality for the waters of the state.
7. K.S.A. 82a-951 creates the State Water Plan Fund to finance the implementation of the *Kansas Water Plan*.
8. The *Kansas Water Plan* and the Kansas-Lower Republican Basin Plan provide the guidance to state agencies to coordinate programs intent on protecting water quality and to target those programs to geographic areas of the state for high priority in implementation.

**Funding:** The State Water Plan Fund, annually generates \$16-18 million and is the primary funding mechanism for implementing water quality protection and pollution reduction activities in the state through the *Kansas Water Plan*. The state water planning process, overseen by the Kansas Water Office, coordinates and directs programs and funding toward watersheds and water resources of highest priority. Typically, the state allocates at least 50% of the fund to programs supporting water quality protection. This watershed and its TMDL is a **High Priority** consideration.

In State Fiscal Year 1999, the state provided to Jackson and Atchison counties, \$264,912 of State Water Plan Funds for non-point source pollution reduction. The Commission will decide State Fiscal Year 2000 allocations in May 1999 and is expected to direct similar amounts of funding to the two counties for the next fiscal year

**Effectiveness:** Non-point source controls for livestock waste have been shown to be effective in reducing pollution in locales such as the Herrington Lake watershed.. The key to effectiveness is participation within a finite subwatershed to direct resources toward the activities influencing water quality. The milestones established under this TMDL are intended to gauge the level of participation in those programs implementing this TMDL.

Should participation significantly lag below expectations over the next five years or monitoring indicates lack of progress in improving water quality conditions from those seen over 1990-1998, the state may employ more stringent conditions on agricultural producers in the watershed in order to meet the desired endpoints expressed in this TMDL. The state has the authority to impose conditions on activities with a significant potential to pollute the waters of the state under K.S.A. 65-171. If overall water quality conditions in the watershed deteriorate, a Critical Water Quality Management Area may be proposed for the watershed, in response.

## 6. MONITORING

KDHE will continue to collect bimonthly samples at Station 554, including fecal coliform samples over each of the three defined seasons during the initial implementation period. During the evaluation period (2004-2008), more intensive sampling will need to be conducted under specified seasonal flow conditions in order to determine the achievement of the desired endpoints of this TMDL. In Spring, at least 20 samples should be taken at flow conditions below 300 cfs, with half taken below 75 cfs. In Summer and Fall, 20 samples need to be taken below flows of 300 cfs, a majority of which will be collected at flows less than 40 cfs. In Winter 10 samples need to be taken at flows below 300 cfs. Use of the real time flow data available at the Muscotah stream gaging station can direct sampling efforts.

Monitoring of bacteria levels in effluent will be a condition of NPDES and state permits for facilities using lagoons as the method of wastewater treatment. This monitoring will continually assess the functionality of the lagoon systems in reducing bacteria levels in the effluent released to the streams.

USGS should complete analysis of SSURGO soil data and 30-m resolution DEM topographic data to evaluate the relative runoff contributing areas within the watershed and provide greater resolution on where implementation activities would be most effective. This analysis should be complete in 2000.

Local program management needs to identify its targeted participants of state assistance programs for implementing this TMDL. This information should be collected in 2000 in order to support appropriate implementation projects.

## 7. FEEDBACK

**Public Meetings:** Public meetings to discuss TMDLs in the KLR Basin were held March 10, 1999 in Topeka, April 27 in Lawrence and April 29 in Manhattan. An active Internet Web site was established at <http://www.kdhe.state.ks.us/tmdl/> to convey information to the public on the general establishment of TMDLs and specific TMDLs for the Kansas-Lower Republican Basin.

**Public Hearing:** A Public Hearing on the TMDLs of the Kansas-Lower Republican Basin was held in Topeka on June 3, 1999.

**Basin Advisory Committee:** The Kansas-Lower Republican Basin Advisory Committee met to discuss the TMDLs in the basin on December 3, 1998; January 14, 1999; February 18, 1999; March 10, 1999; May 20, 1999 and June 3, 1999.

**Discussion with Interest Groups:** Meetings to discuss TMDLs with interest groups include:  
Agriculture: November 10, 1998; December 18, 1998; February 10, 1999; April 10, 1999, May 4, 1999, June 8, 1999 and June 18, 1999.  
Municipal: November 12, 1998, January 25, 1999; March 1, 1999; May 10, 1999 and June 16, 1999.

Environmental: November 3, 1998; December 16, 1998; February 13, 1999; March 15, 1999, April 7, 1999 and May 3, 1999.  
Conservation Districts: March 16-18, 24-25, 1999

**Milestone Evaluation:** In 2004, evaluation will be made as to the degree of implementation which has occurred within the watershed and current condition of the Delaware River. Subsequent decisions will be made regarding implementation approach, follow up of additional implementation and implementation in the non-priority subwatershed.

**Consideration for 303d Delisting:** The streams in this watershed will be evaluated for delisting under Section 303d, based on the monitoring data over the period 2004-2008. Therefore, the decision for delisting will come about in the preparation of the 2008 303d list. Should modifications be made to the applicable water quality criteria during the ten year implementation period, consideration for delisting, desired endpoints of this TMDL and implementation activities may be adjusted accordingly.

**Incorporation into Continuing Planning Process, Water Quality Management Plan and the Kansas Water Planning Process:** Under the current version of the Continuing Planning Process, the next anticipated revision will come in 2002 which will emphasize revision of the Water Quality Management Plan. At that time, incorporation of this TMDL will be made into both documents. Recommendations of this TMDL will be considered in *Kansas Water Plan* implementation decisions under the State Water Planning Process for Fiscal Years 2000-2004.

Approved January 26, 2000.