

LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD

Water Body: Harvey County Camp Hawk Lake
Water Quality Impairment: Siltation

1. INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

Subbasin: Little Arkansas

County: Harvey

HUC 8: 11030012

HUC 11 (HUC 14): 040 (060)

Drainage Area: Approximately 6.02 square miles.

Conservation Pool: Area = 12.6 acres, Maximum Depth = 2 meters

Designated Uses: Primary and Secondary Contact Recreation; Expected Aquatic Life Support; Food Procurement

1998 303d Listing: Table 4 - Water Quality Limited Lakes

Impaired Use: Aquatic Life Support

Water Quality Standard: Suspended solids - Narrative: Suspended solids added to surface waters by artificial sources shall not interfere with the behavior, reproduction, physical habitat or other factor related to the survival and propagation of aquatic or semi-aquatic or terrestrial wildlife. (KAR 28-16-28e(c)(2)(D)).

2. CURRENT WATER QUALITY CONDITION AND DESIRED ENDPOINT

Monitoring Sites: Station 063401 in Harvey County Camp Hawk Lake.

Period of Record Used: One survey during 1994, plus a visual observation in 1989.

Current Condition: Harvey County Camp Hawk Lake has high, inorganic turbidity and high levels of siltation. The average transparency (Secchi Disc depth) is 21.5 cm, and the average turbidity is 60.5 formazin turbidity units.

Interim Endpoint of Water Quality (Implied Load Capacity) at Harvey County Camp Hawk Lake over 2005 - 2009:

1. Secchi disc depth measurements are to be greater than 30cm.

3. SOURCE INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT

Land Use: Land use coverage analysis indicates that 94.8% of the watershed is cropland. Erosion from cropland is the most likely source of siltation.

Contributing Runoff: The watershed's average soil permeability is 2.8 inches/hour according to NRCS STATSGO data base. About 82% of the watershed produces runoff even under relative low (1.5"/hr) potential runoff conditions. Under very low (<1"/hr) potential conditions, this potential contributing area is greatly reduced (74%). Runoff is chiefly generated as infiltration excess with rainfall intensities greater than soil permeabilities. As the watersheds' soil profiles become saturated, excess overland flow is produced. Generally, storms producing less than 0.5"/hr of rain will generate runoff from only 4% of this watershed, chiefly along the stream channels.

Background: Given the small size of the lake, sediment resuspension may have more to do with carp and other bottom feeding fish than with wind mixing.

4. ALLOCATION OF POLLUTANT REDUCTION RESPONSIBILITY

More detailed assessment of sources and confirmation of the siltation impairment must be completed before detailed allocations can be made. The general inventory of sources within the drainage does provide some guidance as to areas of load reduction.

Point Sources: A current Wasteload Allocation of zero is established by this TMDL because of the lack of point sources in the watershed. Should future point sources be proposed in the watershed and discharge into the impaired segments, the current wasteload allocation will be revised by adjusting current load allocations to account for the presence and impact of these new point source dischargers.

Nonpoint Sources: Siltation loading comes predominantly from nonpoint source pollution. Given the runoff characteristics of the watershed, overland runoff can easily carry sediment into the streams. The Load Allocation within the lake is turbidity levels not to exceed 32.7 formazin turbidity units, a 40% reduction from current condition.

Defined Margin of Safety: The margin of safety provides some hedge against the uncertainty of the Secchi disc depth endpoint. Therefore, the margin of safety will be 3.6 formazin turbidity units (10%) taken from the load capacity to ensure that adequate load reduction occurs to meet the endpoint.

State Water Plan Implementation Priority: Because the Harvey County Camp Hawk Lake is under local jurisdiction, this TMDL will be a Low Priority for implementation

Unified Watershed Assessment Priority Ranking: This watershed lies within the Little Arkansas subbasin (HUC 8: 11030012) with a priority ranking of 14 (High Priority for restoration).

Priority HUC 11s: The lake is within HUC 11 (040).

5. IMPLEMENTATION

Desired Implementation Activities

There is a good potential for reducing pollutant loads to this lake through the use of best management practices. There is also a need to assess the fishery to ascertain its role in the chronic turbidity problems. Dredging of this small water body may also have a positive impact on water quality and use support. Some of the recommended agricultural practices are as follows:

1. Maintain conservation tillage and contour farming to minimize cropland erosion.
2. Install grass buffer strips along streams.
3. Reduce activities within riparian areas.

Implementation Programs Guidance

Until additional assessment of probable sources of siltation is made, no direction can be made to those implementation programs.

Time Frame for Implementation: Pollution reduction practices should be installed within the lake drainage during the years from 2009 to 2013.

Targeted Participants: Primary participants for implementation will be agricultural producers within the drainage of the lake. A detailed assessment of sources will be conducted by KDHE over 2003-2005.

Milestone for 2005: The year 2005 marks the midpoint of the ten-year implementation window for the watershed. At that point in time, sampled data from Harvey County Camp Hawk Lake will be reexamined to confirm the impaired status of the lake. Should the case of impairment remain, source assessment, allocation and implementation activities will ensue.

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.

Reasonable Assurances:

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

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. K.S.A. 75-5657 empowers the State Conservation Commission to provide financial assistance for local project work plans developed to control nonpoint source pollution.

4. 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.

5. K.S.A. 82a-951 creates the State Water Plan Fund to finance the implementation of the Kansas Water Plan.

6. The Kansas Water Plan and the Lower Arkansas 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 pollutant 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 are a Low Priority consideration and should not receive funding until after 2005.

Effectiveness: Sediment control has been proven effective through conservation tillage, contour farming and use of grass waterways and buffer strips. The key to success will be widespread utilization of conservation farming within the watersheds cited in this TMDL.

6. MONITORING

Additional data and source loading would be of value prior to 2006. Further sampling and evaluation should occur once before 2006.

7. FEEDBACK

Public Meetings: Public meetings to discuss TMDLs in the Lower Arkansas Basin were held March 9 in Wichita, April 26 in Wichita and Hutchinson, and April 27 in Arkansas City and Medicine Lodge. 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 Lower Arkansas Basin.

Public Hearing: A Public Hearing on the TMDLs of the Lower Arkansas Basin was held in Wichita on June 1, 2000.

Basin Advisory Committee: The Lower Arkansas Basin Advisory Committee met to discuss the TMDLs in the basin on September 27, November 8, 1999; January 13, 2000; March 9, 2000.

Discussion with Interest Groups: Meetings to discuss TMDLs with interest groups include:

Agriculture: January 12, February 2 and 29, 2000

Environmental: March 9, 2000

Conservation Districts: November 22, 1999

Industry: December 15, 1999, January 13, February 9 and 22, 2000

Local Environmental Protection Groups: September 30, November 2, December 16, 1999

Milestone Evaluation: In 2005, evaluation will be made as to the degree of impairment which has occurred within the drainage and current condition of Harvey County Camp Hawk Lake. Subsequent decisions will be made regarding implementation approach and follow up of additional implementation.

Consideration for 303d Delisting: Harvey County Camp Hawk Lake will be evaluated for delisting under Section 303d, based on the monitoring data over the period 2005-2009. Therefore, the decision for delisting will come about in the preparation of the 2010 303d list. Should modifications be made to the applicable nutrient criterion 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 after Fiscal Year 2004.

Approved November 13, 2000.