

SAC RIVER HEALTHY WATERSHED PLAN



Sac River Healthy Watershed Plan

Executive Summary *Page 2*

Chapter 1: Background & Introduction *Page 3*

Chapter 2: Collaborative Watershed Process
Page 8

**Appendix A: Advisory Committee's
Problems & Solutions**
Page 13

Appendix B: Community Meeting Survey
Page 15

Appendix C: Survey Response Graphs *Page 16*

Appendix D: Complete Survey Results *Page 18*

DATE OF REPORT
OCTOBER 2016

REPORT CREATED FOR



MISSOURI
DEPARTMENT OF
NATURAL RESOURCES

REPORT CREATED BY



Executive Summary

On May 1, 2015, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources awarded the Our Missouri Waters Collaborative project for the Sac River watershed to the Watershed Committee of the Ozarks. The goal of this project was to gather local input and identify water resource priorities through community meetings. Community meetings were held to reach citizens living and working in the Sac River watershed, asking them to voluntarily serve on an advisory committee to identify and develop resources to achieve those priorities. Citizens, community leaders and elected officials in the watershed were invited to participate in this process to share how they use water and what is needed to continue protecting and enhancing the Sac River watershed. The summary and recommendations of the process are outlined in this document, the Sac River Healthy Watershed Plan. This plan will be a living, working document to help maximize resources and focus watershed priorities over the next five years. To learn more about the Our Missouri Waters statewide initiative, visit <http://dnr.mo.gov/omw/>.

CHAPTER 1

Background & Introduction

WATERSHED CHARACTERISTICS

The Sac River watershed covers 1,981 square miles and includes Stockton, Fellows and McDaniel Lakes. The watershed contains 2,633 miles of streams, 74,892 acres of lakes and 303 known springs. According to the 2010 census, the largest cities in the watershed include: Springfield, with a population of 166,810 people; Republic, with a population of 16,005; Willard, with a population of 5,454; and Stockton, with a population of 1,859. Few changes in land use have occurred from 2001 to 2011. This change comprised less than a one percent difference overall, while there was a slight increase of 0.1 percent of impervious surface area. As this watershed is largely rural, nonpoint source pollution contributors are relevant to the overall health of the watershed. Some counties in the watershed did experience population growth from 2006 to 2010, as Greene and Polk counties grew by fifteen percent.

GEOLOGY & GROUNDWATER

Two aquifers lie under the Sac River Watershed. The Ozark aquifer is a high-yielding, deep, confined aquifer of generally very good quality. It provides for municipal, agricultural and industrial water. The Springfield plateau aquifer is a shallow, unconfined aquifer located from near the surface down to 200–300 feet and is recharged by precipitation. The shallow aquifer was generally of fairly good quality and was a major drinking water supply resource until the mid-1950s. Karst geologic conditions in the Springfield area can result in contamination to the shallow aquifer, combined with improper investigation and construction techniques. Contamination of this aquifer has prompted stricter regulations for wells, which are now required to be drilled to the deep aquifer and cased through the shallow aquifer. Most of the domestic water is now pumped from the deep Ozark aquifer, but the Springfield plateau aquifer still provides agricultural and industrial water.

Groundwater quantity is important to consider as groundwater levels in the predominant aquifer of the area, the Ozark aquifer, are

OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVE #1: Build local understanding of water resources and programs available

OBJECTIVE #2: Local citizen engagement with community meetings to find local watershed priorities for the next five years


OBJECTIVE #3: Assemble a local Watershed Advisory Committee to rank priorities and develop the next steps

OBJECTIVE #4: Create the Sac River Healthy Watershed Plan

declining in some areas of high use. Water conservation efforts by groundwater and surface water users can be implemented to help mitigate impacts of increasing water needs in the area. Missouri shares water resources with many other states, some of which regulate water use and have already established their demand for water. It is important for Missouri to document its need for water and to protect the right to that water. Registering major water use, annually, establishes a user's need for water and helps the state understand the water needs of Missouri citizens. Carbonate bedrock and associated karst topography (including abundant losing streams and sink areas) in the southern half of the basin make pollution-prevention measures a priority. Within the basin, stream types transition from typical clear, gravel bottom streams of the Ozark highlands to silt- and sand-bottomed prairie-type streams more typical of the Osage Plains. Relatively low potential for surface to groundwater contamination exists in the northern reaches of the basin due to the restrictive permeability of bedrock.

WATER QUALITY

In the southern portion of the watershed, there are challenges regarding bacteria levels in bodies of water, which can cause serious public health and recreational safety issues. Nonpoint sources of contamination, such as animal waste and contaminants carried by stormwater runoff, can have a serious cumulative impact on surface waters in a largely rural watershed. However, agricultural best management practices can significantly



reduce nonpoint source impacts. Pollution prevention is also critical due to connectivity of surface water and groundwater. Point and nonpoint sources of pollution to bodies of water, or in and around karst features such as sinkholes, can lead to regional contamination of groundwater wells and springs.

In the northern portion of the watershed, low dissolved oxygen levels in waterbodies often cause negative impacts to aquatic life and create challenges for the watershed. These low dissolved oxygen levels are often a result of excess organic materials, which consume oxygen, and may be discharged from wastewater treatment system types less effective in removing organics. Other sources of excess organics in bodies of water may include animal waste, nutrient loads (fertilizer) and sedimentation from streambank and erosion.

Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act requires each state identify waters that do not meet water quality standards and for which adequate water pollution controls are not in place. These identified waters are considered impaired. Water quality standards protect beneficial uses of water such as making whole-body contact (e.g. swimming), maintaining fish and other aquatic life, and providing drinking water for people, livestock and wildlife.

In 1998, the Little Sac River was placed on the 303(d) list for bacterial contamination, for which a TMDL (total maximum daily load) for fecal coliform was approved in 2006. The following lake and streams within the watershed are listed on the state's 2012 list of impaired waterways and are presented on map in figure 1. Turnback Creek (*E. coli*), tributary to Goose Creek (*E. coli*), Horse Creek (aquatic macroinvertebrate assessment), Cedar Creek (aquatic macroinvertebrate assessment), Panther Creek (dissolved oxygen), Brush Creek (dissolved oxygen) and Fellows Lake (atmospheric deposition of mercury).

Impairments can be caused by known sources like point or nonpoint source pollution, or may be unknown; however, identifying activities near impaired bodies of water can provide key information in determining the sources of contamination, as well as developing solutions for impaired waters.

Examples of point sources of pollution include municipal

FIGURE 1: Map of water quality impairments in the Sac River watershed from 2012 303(d) list




FIGURE 2: Map of land use in the Sac River watershed

wastewater treatment plants, land disturbance sites, large confined animal operations and treated industrial wastewater discharges. Common challenges for wastewater treatment include the limited contaminant removal capacity of certain types of treatment. When facilities experience difficulty in providing the proper level of treatment and contaminant removal, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) often works with them to improve the treatment process and quality of the discharge. In the case that point source emitters are unwilling to improve the quality of their discharge, the department has regulatory authority to ensure that inappropriate discharges are discontinued in a timely manner.



In early spring, anglers float Turnback Creek in search of white bass and walleye.


The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program was created in 1972 by the Clean Water Act and helps to address water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants to waterways. NPDES-permitted facilities, shown in figure 7, have to comply with permit requirements and are inspected regularly by MDNR.

Nonpoint source pollution sources refer to contaminants that do not come from specific conveyances and may come from multiple sources, such as failing septic systems or contaminants carried in stormwater runoff from rural, urban and agriculture lands. Everyone that lives or works in the watershed contributes to nonpoint source pollution. Anything that is on the ground can get in our waterways, which is why being proactive to protect our watershed is cost-effective and essential. Other causes of impairments to bodies of water include natural causes like precipitation, climate and drought, which can alter stream flow and channel characteristics, leading to changes in water quality.

LAND USE

A large portion of the Sac River Watershed is located in the

FIGURE 3: Chart showing the annual average precipitation in Missouri from 1895 to 2015, overlaid with a five-year mean.



Ozark Border Major Land Resource Area (MLRA). This area is part of the northeast and central farming forest region. The Ozark Border MLRA is comprised of approximately 35 percent forest, 25 percent pasture (mainly of introduced grasses and legumes) and 40 percent cropland. Feed grains and hay are the main crops. Summer droughts and steep slopes limit the use of the land for crop production. Shallow wells, small creeks or springs are often used for livestock needs. Deep wells supply water for drinking and high-volume uses.

This area supports oak-hickory forests. The grassland supports a combination of introduced and native tall-prairie grasses consisting mainly of Indian grass, little bluestem, big bluestem and switch grass. Introduced grasses include fescue, annual crab grasses and Kentucky bluegrass. The pastures are mostly in fescue grass over-seeded with red clover.

The watershed consists mostly of grassland, 67 percent, and forests, 30 percent. The grassland designation includes hay,




FIGURE 4: Estimated annual major water use in 2013 (data from Missouri Department of Natural Resources)

pasture and land enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). Hay and CRP land, which are sometimes considered cropland, behave more like grassland in terms of runoff, erosion and nutrient loads, and have been left in this class. Urban areas comprise 2.4 percent of the watershed. A high contamination potential exists due to the high urban population density and the amount of impervious surfaces. Estimates indicate that the most urbanized portion of this watershed has about 25 percent imperviousness.

As this watershed is largely rural, nonpoint source contributors are relevant to the overall health of the watershed. The City of Springfield and the surrounding urban areas also have a significant influence on stream conditions in the watershed due to their proximity to the headwaters of the Sac River.

CLIMATE & WATER AVAILABILITY

Missouri precipitation data from 1895 to 2013 shows annual




FIGURE 5: Map of NPDES (national pollutant discharge elimination system) permits in the Sac River watershed




FIGURE 6: Graph of the type of NPDES permits issued in the Sac River watershed

average statewide precipitation in figure 3. A five-year trend line reveals several wet periods have dominated since the early 1980s, and this wet pattern has been accompanied by an increase of heavy precipitation events. Severe drought occurred during 2012, but this drought was brief compared to major multiyear droughts that occurred in the 1930s and 1950s. Tree ring analysis, which provides data prior to written records, also shows multiyear severe droughts in Missouri's history. Both data sets indicate multiyear severe droughts are likely to occur in the future.

Thirty major water users are registered in the basin. A major water user is defined as the capacity to withdraw more than 70 gallons per minute or 100,000 gallons per day. The reported

estimated annual water use as of 2013 is 8.1 billion gallons, of which 83 percent is diverted surface water and 17 percent is groundwater. The majority of water diverted is used for municipal drinking water (92.2 percent). Water reporting is encouraged but not required, so there could be major water users in the watershed that are not reporting data.

There are 110 public drinking water systems serving approximately 235,701 people. Water systems that are required to report to the department show that approximately 35 million gallons of water are consumed per day. There are 82.5 million gallons of available drinking water capacity per day for public water use.

CHAPTER 2

Collaborative Watershed Process

The Sac River Watershed encompasses portions of Cedar, Dade, Lawrence, Greene, Polk, St. Clair, Vernon, Barton, Christian and Hickory counties, and includes the towns of Springfield, Republic, Bolivar, Willard, Ash Grove, Greenfield, Stockton and Walnut Grove. In an effort to engage members from all these areas within the watershed, informational community meetings were hosted in three different geographic locations throughout the watershed. Those community meetings were held on Nov. 17 in Stockton, Dec. 15 in Greenfield and Jan. 12 in Willard, with a total of 142 meeting participants. Of those participants, 66 completed and submitted surveys during the meetings with most couples submitting one survey together. All the information provided through the survey was shared by email with all the meeting attendees that submitted contact information. The survey asked participants if they are interested in voluntarily serving on the Sac River Watershed Advisory Committee (WAC). The only requirement to serve as a WAC member is to be a resident or property owner in the Sac River Watershed. Thirty-four survey respondents expressed interest in serving on the WAC. Those that expressed interest were contacted, asked if they owned property the Sac River Watershed, and if they would like to serve on the committee. Twenty-four of those respondents committed to serving on the WAC. The WAC also received a summary of the community survey results. The complete survey results can be found in Appendix D on page 18.

To reach people that live and work in the watershed, informational flyers and press releases were submitted to local media to help publicize the community meetings. Local community leaders and regional groups in the watershed were notified of meetings by phone and email, including Missouri Farm Bureau, soil and water districts, city clerks, mayor's offices, local Stream Teams, Lakes of Missouri Volunteer Program, local newspapers and media stations, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Missouri Department of Conservation, county commissioners, state representatives, local green teams and Watershed Committee of the Ozarks' comprehensive contact list.

FIGURE 7: Sac River Watershed Advisory Committee Members

NAME	LOCATION IN WATERSHED
Michael Cheek	Dunnegan
Dale Cornelius	Dadeville
Dwight Crevelt	Walnut Grove
Billy Dryer	Greenfield
Robin Farmer	Greene County
Bob Glenn	Everton
Casey Groose	Walnut Grove
Tom Huff	Greene County
Connie Ian	Stockton
Frank Johnson	Greenfield
Theresa Johnson	Greenfield
Lynden Kenney	Stockton
Peggy Kenney	Stockton
Jeanie Mayer	Greenfield
Martha Molz	El Dorado Springs
Clark Montgomery	Cedar County
Eric helton	Springfield
Todd Wagner	Springfield
Beth Walker	
Holly Welch	Bolivar
Jeff Wilkins	Lockwood
Brian Worthington	
Bob Zwingle	Greenfield

The Cedar County Republican, Cross Country Times (the local Willard newspaper which includes the Ash Grove Commonwealth newspaper), KSMU, KY3 and the Southwest Missouri Council of Governments quarterly newsletter published information

about the community meetings. The first informational community meeting was held Tuesday, Nov. 17 in Stockton at the Cedar County Health Complex. There were forty people in attendance, which included a diverse group of local community leaders, citizens and governmental organizations. DeDe Vest was the meeting facilitator, and presenters included Jennifer Hoggatt with MDNR, Stacey Armstrong with Watershed Committee of the Ozarks, Tony Thorpe with Lakes of Missouri Volunteer Program, and Kara Tvedt and Ben Parnell with Missouri Department of Conservation. Nineteen surveys were collected at the first meeting. The next two community meetings included the same format and informational presentations to allow for communities in different locations in the watershed to receive the same information without having to drive too far. The second community meeting was held Dec. 15 at Greenfield High School with 40 in attendance, and the third was held Jan. 12 at the Willard Community Center with 61 in attendance.

SAC RIVER WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The WAC is formed of voluntary landowners that live or work in the Sac River watershed. The committee is a diverse group of individuals that represent different geographic areas in the watershed. The committee went through a facilitated process that allowed each person to share their thoughts and discuss the resource concerns for the watershed. From that process, the committee created a list of watershed priorities to be the focus for the next five years and listed possible solutions to those problems. A list of committee members and the locations they represent in the watershed is found in figure 7 on page 8.

The voluntary local WAC was assembled and held their first facilitated meeting in Greenfield on Feb. 23. Twenty-six landowners participated in the first committee meeting. The public survey results were presented to the committee and were also shared with every participant of the introductory community meetings. During the facilitated meeting, committee members broke out into three category groups of Agriculture, Water Quality and Recreation, then discussed and created a list of watershed concerns or problems (found in figure 9 on page 10). Watershed Committee of the Ozarks provided educational materials and field trips based on the topics and questions generated.

The first educational presentation was by U.S. Army Corps



A series of meetings were held in different communities throughout the Sac River Watershed.

FIGURE 8: Sac River Watershed Meetings

DATE	LOCATION	ATTENDANCE	FORMAT
Nov. 17, 2015	Stockton Health Department Community Room	41	Introductory Community Meeting
Dec. 15, 2015	Greenfield High School Library	40	Introductory Community Meeting
Jan. 12, 2016	Willard Community Building	61	Introductory Community Meeting
Feb. 23, 2016	Greenfield High School Library	26	WAC Facilitated Meeting
March 24, 2016	Stockton Dam	15	Educational Tour
April 19, 2016	Greenfield High School Library	18	Educational Presentations for WAC
May 3, 2016	Greenfield High School Library	13	WAC Facilitated Meeting
May 17, 2016	Willard Community Building	19	WAC Facilitated Meeting

FIGURE 9: Resource Concern List

At the Feb. 23, 2016, meeting, the Sac River Watershed Advisory Committee compiled a list of resource concerns.

- Drinking Water/Pollution/Monitoring**

 - Wastewater overflow from cities
 - How many municipal/wastewater and private systems are in the watershed?
 - What are municipal standards and how well are the systems meeting standards?
 - How do the municipal inputs affect the overall health and regulations of river and lakes?
 - What municipalities use water from Stockton? Surface water in Sac River Watershed?
 - How are groundwater levels? If declining, it's a problem
 - Use testing to determine source, more information needed
 - Urban runoff, stormwater, nonpoint pollution, impact?
 - More testing to identify sources of pollution
 - Is there a problem worthy of action?
 - How much monitoring is done, who does it and where?
- What impact does Springfield Landfill have on Sac River Watershed?
 - Why does Springfield allow outsiders to bring trash? How does that work?
 - Erosion problem, especially streambank
 - Trash problem
 - Problem educating citizens to prevent erosion, trash, other issues
 - Connecting people to available resources
 - Erosion and sediment from county (unpaved) roads
 - Confined animal feeding operations, if they pollute
 - Why are impaired streams impaired—by what, how is it measured, how can it be helped?
 - If livestock uses streams and property is fenced out, what watering alternatives are available from Stockton?
 - Potential problem: flood control, especially in urban areas and towns
 - Is there data on septic systems—where they are and their impact?
- How many abandoned wells are there and what can we do to cap them?
 - Sinkhole management and education; get the word out; where are they?
 - Where are abandoned mines? Is lead and zinc an issue? Are shafts a danger?
 - If you are sick, you go to the doctor to get tests. Are our waters sick, and how do you test it?
 - Separation of TMDLs (total maximum daily load) between urban-origin streams and agriculture-origin streams
 - Construction (especially homes) within flood plains.
 - Sinkholes and caves—the protection of those is a BIG issue within this watershed because of the potential impacts on drinking water supplies
- Agriculture/Wildlife**

 - Regulation—common sense
 - Remain voluntary
 - Promote existing programs
 - Landfill
 - City sewer facilities
 - Precision fertilizer
 - CAFO-regulation
 - Corps of Engineers
 - Poultry
 - Education Transparency
 - How do soil types play into water movement through the soil?
 - Nutrient pollutant translocation
 - Stockpiling animal wastes for fertilizer spreading on fields
 - DNA testing on water E. coli
- Potential pollution from recreational vehicles
 - Trash
 - Non-native wildlife
 - Infringement of trails
- Stream corridor/buffer destruction by land owners on all streams.
 - Gravel mining
 - Fish passage barriers (mill dams, low water crossings, culverts, etc.)
 - Cattle around sinkholes and streams causing high nutrients and bacteria in groundwater and surface water

FIGURE 10: Resource Concern Priorities

At the May 3, 2016, meeting, the Sac River Watershed Advisory Committee developed a ranked list of resource concerns.

RANK	RESOURCE CONCERN	POINTS	PEOPLE
1	Urban Runoff	18	8
2	Streambank Erosion	14	7
3	CAFOs	11	5
4	Municipal Waste	10	6
5	Animal Waste	7	4
6	Nutrients/Stormwater Runoff	5	2
7	Septic Tanks	5	2
8	Lack of Knowledge	3	1
9	Sinkholes	2	2
10	Genetic Testing (Bacteria)	2	1
11	Landfill	1	1

of Engineers Water Management Department from Kansas City in March, which gave a background about Stockton Dam, how flows are calculated and information on the new turbine. The committee also went on a tour of Stockton Dam to see the facilities. The second educational meeting was held on April 19 in Greenfield where presenters provided information about watershed monitoring, soils, municipal wastewater systems and landfills. The presenters included: Dick Henderson with Soil Consulting; Trish Rielly with MDNR's Monitoring and Assessment Unit; Brian Wirth, superintendent of Clean Water Services with the City of Springfield; and Barbara Lucks, sustainability officer with the City of Springfield.

The committee's second facilitated meeting was held May 3 at the Greenfield High School Library to discuss watershed priorities. Thirteen committee members were in attendance. Using the concerns list created during the February meeting as a guide, they wrote down their top three concerns on sticky notes, then placed the sticky notes on the wall and grouped them into categories. The group then received numbered stickers and were asked to

place the sticker with the highest number on their top priority, the following number on their second priority and so on until they had voted with all of their stickers. The numbers were then added up and the priorities were listed from highest total of points to the lowest. (The “Resource Concern Priorities” list created by the committee is found in figure 9 on page 10.) The committee discussed urban runoff, CAFOs, municipal waste, and nutrients/stormwater runoff, and also created a list of problems and solutions for each resource concern.

The committee’s third facilitated meeting was May 17 at the Willard Community Center with 19 members in attendance. The committee discussed the resource concerns not fully covered in the previous meetings, which included animal waste, nutrients/stormwater runoff, septic tanks and lack of knowledge. The committee voted to decide if they wanted to meet again to discuss the list further. The majority voted that another meeting was not necessary.

WATERSHED PRIORITIES

Figure 10 summarizes the priorities that the WAC identified and discussed. The resource concerns are ranked in order of greatest concern, with one being the top concern. Under each resource concern, the landowners came up with a list of ideas on how to fix these problems. Lack of education was a topic that came up frequently and was connected to many of the solutions. The group agreed that continued educational opportunities for both the committee and citizens in the watershed would help solve watershed problems and potentially identify new solutions. Local citizens also need access to information about the resources and cost-share programs available to help make watershed improvements.

An extensive list of problems and possible solutions identified by the committee can be found in Appendix A on page 13. The committee held additional discussion on the following solutions:

SOLUTION: Forming a Stream Team & Stream Team Water Quality Sample Collection

The WAC decided to work towards forming a Stream Team group. The first introductory stream team workshop training opportunity will be in spring 2017. After forming a stream team, potential projects the committee discussed included storm drain stenciling, trash pickup, seedling planting and year-round water



The Sac River Watershed Advisory Committee visits Stockton Dam.

quality monitoring. To learn more about Missouri Stream Team, a volunteer partnership coordinated through the Missouri Department of Conservation, visit: <http://www.mostreamteam.org>.

SOLUTION: Educational Materials & Workshops

The committee expressed a need for educational information for county offices to have available for residents within the watershed. The Watershed Committee of the Ozarks is working to update three educational factsheets on sinkholes, springs and streams to provide for the counties within the Sac River Watershed. Other educational materials currently available—including resources on maintaining on-site wastewater systems and protecting private wells—will also be shared with the county offices.

The Missouri Department of Conservation offers a free Stream Crossing workshop available for county commissioners and road crew staff. If a county within the watershed is interested

in these workshops, they can contact their local fisheries management staff with Missouri Department of Conservation to coordinate a program.

SOLUTION: Cost-Share Opportunities

The committee agreed that the local cost-share opportunities and programs currently available need to be easily accessible to the public. Many local landowners are not aware of the programs available. MDNR and Soil and Water Conservation Districts coordinate cost-share programs to help create nutrient management plans, soil tests, riparian corridor protection and improvements. You can contact these offices for more information:

- SWCD: <http://swcd.mo.gov/> (to find your district)
- NRCS- USDA: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/>
- FSA: <https://www.fsa.usda.gov/>
- MU Extension technical assistance:
<http://extension.missouri.edu/>
- MDC: <https://mdc.mo.gov/>

CONCLUSION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This document and the information gathered during this project will be submitted to MDNR and will be utilized at the state level. It can also act as a guide for local landowners to know which watershed improvements to focus on over the next five years. This plan is meant to be a living, working document. Each year, it can be added to or changed as needed. In about five years, the state plans to re-evaluate the plan to see if all the suggestions have been implemented in the watershed. If the Our Missouri Waters effort and the Sac River Healthy Watershed Plan is found useful, then the same process could be followed for the next five years.

The Watershed Committee of the Ozarks would like to thank all of the individuals who participated in the Our Missouri Waters-Sac River Watershed project. A special thank you goes out to the voluntary members of the WAC. Your time is valuable and we appreciate the time and effort that was given to this process to discuss and create a priority list for the watershed. Input from people that live and work in the watershed is critically important to protect and sustain the water resources for generations to come.

APPENDIX A

Advisory Committee's Problems & Solutions

URBAN RUNOFF (DEVELOPED AREAS)

PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS
Fertilizer on lawns	Soil tests, lawn service providers, no fertilizer sales in spring/education
Pesticides and chemicals	Licensed applications/education
Parking lots, roofs, driveways, roads (impervious surfaces)	Greenways, buffers, absorption fields
Pet waste	Skip
Illicit discharges (oil)	Education, fines, storm drain stenciling
Wildlife in parks and golf courses	Geese, no mowing, changing ordinances

STREAMBANK EROSION

PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Streamline the permitting process
Southwest Power Administration	Find a different way to moderate the flow
Power target needs to be adjusted	Get documentation from MDC, DNR
Flow needs to be moderated	Get visible documentation with witnesses and notarized
Removing riparian corridor upstream from the dam or washed out	Much of the streambank erosion is caused by winter freeze/thaw
Improper gravel mining	Proper gravel mining
	Stream buffers
	Education about available programs

CAFOs (CONFINED ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATIONS)

PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS
Overspreading of litter, arsenic	Soil test before spreading, spreading in floodplains, litter test to determine amount
Regulations on decomposing birds/disease?	Tighter regulations on litter spreading, state laws?
Heavy metals in litter	Nutrient management plans through Soil and Water Districts
HSUS facilities tied to CAFO regulations through litter	
Stockpiling litter	Better regulations on stockpiling animal wastes

MUNICIPAL WASTE

PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS
Old pipes and stormwater	Grants for upgrading old infrastructure
Cracks in manholes	
Overflows during storms, aging infrastructure	
Effluent not to the stream, use the nutrients	
Biosolids spreading	
Pharmaceutical pollutants left in sewage treatment discharges	New sewage treatment technologies

ANIMAL WASTE

PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS
Chronic wasting disease/dead deer, blue tongue	Grazing systems
Cattle in streams	Education on proper management and programs available
Animal feeding operations (not CAFOs)	Twelve-month testing on impaired streams, no water = no fish
Ducks, geese/wildlife	Document rainfall amounts
People at the lake	Do not decrease deer harvest
Boating and recreation	Dumping stations at lake might need to be increased
	Proper disposal of dead animals

NUTRIENTS/STORMWATER RUNOFF

PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS
Improper application of chemicals or fertilizer	Education
Improper storage of chemicals or fertilizer	Bank stabilization
Private landfills	Precision application
Eroding streambanks or no buffers	Cost-share practices are available
Leaves in street or storm drains	Use more cover crops with crop farming

SEPTIC TANKS

PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS
Installed too close to watershed/waterway	Education so people understand how they work and placement
Breakout system overloaded with rainwater	Education on maintenance
Placement on shallow soils or karst areas	Information
Improper maintenance	Info pamphlets at courthouse, city halls and extension offices
Old systems not installed correctly	Financial assistance for replacing and maintaining systems
How many? Where? When last pumped?	Kassinger Basin
Some don't even have septic tanks	Loan/grant program
Lateral lines not installed correctly	Keep track of contaminated wells and areas they come from
Shallow to bedrock	
Only the old ones	
Unpermitted installation or regulations	
Flushing hazardous or unwanted things	

LACK OF KNOWLEDGE

PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS
Lack of knowledge	Establish "official" watershed coalition for the Sac River

APPENDIX B

Community Meeting Survey

This is the text of the survey distributed at the community meetings held in the Sac River watershed. Graphs illustrating the summarized responses are found in Appendix C, starting on the next page. Complete responses are found in Appendix D, starting on page 18.

Background: The Watershed Committee of the Ozarks is partnering with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources on The Sac River Healthy Watershed Project. This project will gather local input on water resource priorities and form a local watershed advisory committee to identify and develop resources to achieve those priorities. As local citizen in the community your input on the following questions will help make this project a success.


1. What is your general perception of the Sac River and associated streams and lakes in your community? Please list local water bodies that are important to your community.
2. How do you and/or your community use the local streams, rivers and lakes?
3. What are the primary challenges with these water bodies?
4. What are the primary benefits of the water bodies here? For example: recreation, open space, economy, ecological benefits, etc.
5. What are the significant water uses in your community? How do these uses impact your community?
6. Do you feel there are any activities occurring upstream or downstream that impact your use of the river?
7. What would you like to see as a priority for the Sac River watershed in the next 5 years?
Priority #1:
Priority #2:
Priority #3:
8. Would you be willing to serve on a Watershed Advisory Committee for the Sac River watershed? If yes, please provide name and email.

APPENDIX C


Survey Response Graphs

These are the summarized responses to the survey distributed at the community meetings. Complete responses are found in Appendix D, starting on page 18.


1. What is your general perception of the Sac River and associated streams and lakes in your community?




2. How do you and/or your community use the local streams, rivers and lakes?




3. What are the primary challenges with these water bodies?




4. What are the primary benefits of the water bodies here?




5. What are the significant water uses in your community?



6. Do you feel there are any activities occurring upstream or downstream that impact your use of the river?



7. What would you like to see as a priority for the Sac River watershed in the next 5 years?



APPENDIX D

Complete Survey Responses

MEETING 1: NOV. 17, 2015, AT STOCKTON – 41 ATTENDEES, 19 SURVEY RESPONDENTS

General Perception	Waterbody	Use	Primary Challenges	Primary Benefits	Community Uses	Upstream/ Downstream Activities	Priority #1	Priority #2	Priority #3
Good overall	Stockton Lake, Sac River, Little Sac, Bear Creek, Cedar Creek, Horse Creek	Recreation, drinking water, livestock	Livestock access, pollution runoff	Recreation, economy, drinking water	Recreation, drinking water	No	Water quality monitoring	Invasive species monitoring	
Stockton Lake is key to our community that feeds into the lake must be monitored		Recreation, sailing (lake is top 10 sailing lake in four states)	Make sure there are no pollutants	Tourism, to keep lake clean to promote new business	Fishing, which brings tournaments to community which brings people to purchase local products	Not sure; however, it is important for me to know and how we can connect	Chemicals need to be	Regular animal waste	Work with city of Stockton on their wastewater
Sac is muddier prairie soil watershed vs. (lower clarity) James/Ozark chert/gravel watershed (higher clarity)		Fishing, swimming, canoeing, boating	Keeping water clean enough for swimming WBC	Rivers that only occur	Drinking water	Crop prices have driven more producers to clean up creek banks to plant more corn (high sediment and nutrients)	Soil health practices to mitigate lack of	Stream bank stabilization project, riparian buffer	Education outreach through get by people out of enjoy local waters
A wonderful set of resources. Stockton Lake is the main water resource we use		Fishing, boat (kayak and fishing) and monitor water quality on Stockton Lake	Minimizing pollution (chemical, physical), providing adequate usage opportunities for a variety of interests	Recreation and ecological	Recreational and water for farms and livestock impacts are economic and emotional	Concerned about any activities that pollute or contaminate the waters	Clean water (allow recreation as well as for aquatic organism health)	Water conservation	Riparian corridor maintenance
Seemed to be fairly clean bodies of water	Stockton Lake, Sac River	Recreational, cultural	The risk of having to provide water to other sources in Springfield; Stockton Lake has lots of traffic/recreational	Recreation, economic	Recreational, they provide a great deal of revenue we wouldn't have otherwise	Unknown	Keep our water/lake clean and clear	Community/landowner impact	Impact positive to our economy
All are important		Fishing, farming needs, other recreational uses	Too much government control	The natural needs, farming and recreation	Farming	Springfield landfill	Agriculture	Recreation	
	Stockton Lake, Cedar Creek	Recreation	That they be there	Economy	Recreation and economy	No			
Water quality is still very good. Some signs of degradation can be observed from time to time.	All tributaries to Stockton Lake need to be protected	Fishing, trapping, water recreation	Future population growth and its associated pressure on W.A.	Recreation, open space, livestock and wildlife watering	Drinking water mostly from wells, water table impacts	Nonpoint sources, unidentified sources of unidentified pollutants	Water quality study	Identify actual sources of pollutants causing	Impairments, long standing advisory committee formed and maintained
We are fortunate to have the resources we have		Water resource for city; lake provides food (irrigation), recreation (fishing)	Management	All of the above	Irrigation, drinking water	No	Manage for sustainability	Volunteer planning for the future	Cooperation
	Cedar Creek, Sac River	Drain region, fishing, floating			Irrigation	Inconsistent water release of Stockton Dam			

General Perception	Waterbody	Use	Primary Challenges	Primary Benefits	Community Uses	Upstream/ Downstream Activities	Priority #1	Priority #2	Priority #3
Positive, good water source	Fellows Lake	Source for drinking water and livestock water and recreation	Monitor water source and maintain landowner property rights	Water source for people with animals, recreation and tourism	Drinking water source for people with animals, recreation (boating/fishing)	Residential runoff in municipalities	No mandates, all voluntary programs		
Heavily impacted. High nutrient load	Turnback Creek	Recreation	Poor land-use practices	Recreation, open space, ecological benefits	Livestock watering. Poorly	Poor farming practices leading to erosion, nutrient loading, stinky streams	Farmer education	Expansion of grant programs	
That they are clean	Stockton Lake, Sac River, Bear Creek, Spring Creek	Water recreation, economic driver, cattle watering	Having clean and safe water, bank erosion	Recreation, economy, ecological benefits	Recreation and cattle watering	NA	Lake Stockton reserved for storage for Stockton and Cedar County	Access to Sac River water for Stockton and farmers	Having a clean, safe watershed
	Sac River, Stockton Lake	Fishing, trapping and hunting	River access			Water generation			
Major contributor to lake	Stockton Lake	Recreation, some electricity generation although from my understanding Stockton does not obtain electric power from the lake, flood control	Keep them clean, sustaining the health and wellness of water	All of the above, ecological impact on wildlife	Boating, fishing, swimming, very important to local businesses and homeowners	Do not know any specific examples but highly likely example: pollution into streams, downstream use of large quantities of water	More education of general public	Promotion of activities to preserve or enhance water quality	Promotion of activities to conserve water resources
Being destroyed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers		Recreation and farms	Erosion from the US Army Corps of Engineers power releases	Fauna		Power generation	Shut down power generation on the Sac River	Protect archaeological sites	
Okay, concerned algae growth on lake	Stockton Lake	Recreation and power generation, fishing for consumption	Algae growth, NPS fertilizer runoff	Power generation, recreation, wildlife support	Same as 4, drinking water	Fertilizer runoff, in my opinion, causing algae bloom	Reduce nonpoint source fertilizer runoff	Increase recreation opportunity on river below dam, bike trails	Wildlife protection
Never hear anything about condition of Sac River. Suspect it and Stockton are polluted from excess fertilizer, herbicide and insecticide	My farm pond	Fishing, boating, drinking water	Nonpoint source pollution	Beauty, recycles water, sport boating/fishing, fish food source	Drinking, residential, fishing, boating, clean water improves community	Yes	Monitor water condition all along the drainage area	Reduce agricultural and power plant pollutants	
I have been around the country and the cleanliness is much higher than the majority of waterways in the country		Recreational canoeing, kayaking, livestock	Keep farm animals from destroying water quality and habitat through broken fences	Green environments, native habitat, recreation and feeding livestock	It brings people, resources and revenue to our region	Continued monitoring of industrial runoff does help tremendously	Maintaining the safeguards to keep our waters clean	Keeping our record of not ever having to close the beach because of E. coli and contaminants	

APPENDIX D: COMPLETE SURVEY RESPONSES

MEETING 2: DEC. 15, 2015, AT GREENFIELD – 40 ATTENDEES, 23 SURVEY RESPONDENTS

General Perception	Waterbody	Use	Primary Challenges	Primary Benefits	Community Uses	Upstream/ Downstream Activities	Priority #1	Priority #2	Priority #3
Generally good water quality, sediment and nutrients	Stockton Lake	Fishing, livestock, recreation	Agriculture	Various, all the above	Drinking water	Not that I am aware of	Nutrients	Sediments in streams	Groundwater recharge
A biologically significant watershed, strongly affected by Stockton Dam	Stockton Lake	Conservation of endangered species especially freshwater mussels	The operation of Stockton Dam, nitrogen pollution, flow fluctuations, erosion	All the above, archaeological resources, biodiversity education	For biology department at MSU, study oppourtunities for students and faculty	Continuing abuse of the river downstream of Stockton Dam by peaking flows from hydropower generation	Consultation by USFWS with USACE (endangered species)		
Sac River is polluted	Sac River	We don't live here	Cattle, poultry, abuse of sinkholes, sludge disposition			Cattle, poultry, abuse of sinkholes, sludge disposition	Control of pollution sources		
Generally clean but has pollution from tourism and agricultural use	Sons Creek	Fishing, run to Sons Creek almost daily recreation	Probably water quality, pollution from fertilizer and tourists	Recreation brings visitors that improves economy	Recreation, improve economy	Tourism and fertilizer pollution	Water quality, improve tourism		
Better condition than others like Table Rock and Lake of the Ozarks		Recreation	Trash	Recreation	Irrigation	Organic fertilizer	Clean up streams		
Waters are good	Stockton Lake	Recreation, power generation	Pollution	Recreation is good for local economy	Recreation, power supply		Keep streams and creeks clean		
Good but room for improvement		Recreation, study of aquatic organisms, drinking water	Riparian zones, surrounding land use	Ecological benefits, economy, recreation	Drinking water, recreation—you won't appreciate it if you are not out in it	Dam changing water patterns	Smaller releases from the dam, more regulated, natural flows	Repair riparian corridors, limit sedimentation	Comprehensive ecological assessments
Fairly clean	Stockton Lake	Lake recreation, drinking water	Soil erosion	Recreation fishing, boating, power source	Drinking water, recreation	Yes, sewage fertilization	Less erosion	No two-stroke boat motors on lake	Reclaim used oil
	Stockton Lake, Sac River	Stockton Lake every weekend during summer for recreation	Keeping them clean, farmer protected land from causing trouble	Love its not commercialized and not too crowded	Recreation, many people enjoy our water and come from other places	I believe most landowners do a good job in protecting our resources	Keeping it clean if places like Springfield need drinking water	Have places for families to go	
Our streams and rivers in southwest Missouri are great	Rivers and streams in southwest Missouri	Fish, swim, just enjoy them	Excess nutrient and siltation/sediment, better than 30 years ago	All the above	Domestic use/industry	No			
Worried about pollution from Springfield landfill and sewage treatment affecting Sac River quality	Sac River and Little Sac	Recreation, livestock watering	Keeping livestock out of local rivers. Making use of sludge from Springfield treatment plants are not dumped in Dade County and watershed	All above and clean drinking water	Cropland in western part of watershed used for beans and corn. Drinking water	Landfill leakage in Greene County, dumping of sludge near creeks, have heard of incidents upstream on Turnback Creek in last couple of years	Monitoring of streams, Sac/Little Sac and Turnback Creek	Closer monitoring of CAFOs	Continued communication with DNR, Watershed Committee and MDC
Bald eagle habitat, animals, deer and beaver	Turnback Creek, Sons Creek, Sac River, Little Sac	Water cattle, camping, fishing, boating, crops	Paying to use areas as local residents	Recreation, agricultural	Gigging and fishing-Turnback, Sac River and boating swimming, camping Stockton	Downstream water for Springfield	Maintain clean water	Public use	More information regarding sinkholes and how to map sinkhole areas

General Perception	Waterbody	Use	Primary Challenges	Primary Benefits	Community Uses	Upstream/ Downstream Activities	Priority #1	Priority #2	Priority #3
Impaired but has lots of room for improvement	Sac River	I use local waterbodies and streams for recreation, floating and fishing	Maintain biodiversity through proper management of water flowing through the watershed from lake to Sac	The Sac River largely provides ecological benefits with added bonus of recreation/economy	Municipal	I believe that improper management of water outflow from Stockton affects my use of the river and others by affecting aquatic organisms	More run of river dam management	Better riparian-zone management by landowners	Find ways to address nonpoint source inputs, septic, nutrient input, sedimentation
Ozark streams are vital component of the region's identity of outdoors recreation, hunting fishing. Most streams fit the image but some are losing this quality		Recreation hunting, fishing is very important	Nutrient-input management, flow regimen from Stockton	Recreation and economic benefits linked to integrity of ecological systems	Clean drinking water	Pollution, land use, sedimentation, overharvesting of river fauna	Ecologically sound river flows from Stockton	Riparian-zone integrity	Whole system nonpoint source pollution management (nutrients/sedimentation)
	Sac River, Stockton Lake	Recreation, drinking water	Nonpoint source pollution	Recreation, open space, ecological benefits (wildlife) drinking water	Same as 4, drinking water	Agricultural pollution use of herbicides, pesticides	Soil stabilization	Maintain water quality/biodiversity	Encourage reporting of required information and make sure businesses/individuals conform to existing legislation
Overall healthy but fragile	Stockton Lake, Turnback Creek	Primarily recreation, some agricultural uses tock and irrigation		Yes, all of these especially enjoy the wildlife and birding	Municipal and agricultural	I would like to be made aware of negative activities	Protection of water quality	Wetland maintenance	Continued public involvement in protection and monitoring
	Stockton Lake, Sac Tributaries	Hunt, fish, swim	People	All the above	Irrigation, potable wells	No	Educate		
Mostly clean, some trouble with Turnback Creek	Turnback Creek	Drinking and other home use, recreational, animals	Maintain steady, do not increase pollutants	Home use, economic use, recreation	Recreational	Yes	Control of pollution from CAFO operations	Maintain water quality	
Mostly in good shape but does have a lot of turbidity due to riparian removal		Fishing, floating, hiking, swimming, drinking	Nonpoint source pollution, human development, groundwater protection	All above plus home use	Recreation provides revenue	Removal of riparian corridor, nonpoint pollution, CAFOs	CAFOS	Water quality	Education for general population on how their activities affect watershed and water quality
Some are clean and some are not, building restrictions on lake are good		Lake recreation	Erosion	Recreation and open space	Drinking water and recreation		Preserving groundwater quality	Perserving quality of Stockton Lake	Working with landowners and private groups
Very clean compared to Kansas	Turnback and Stockton Lake	Mainly agriculture, recreation at lake and drinking water	Public opinion, public use, potential nonpoint source pollution and wastewater in future	Agriculture	Agriculture, drinking water	Public wastewater facilities, dumping lagoons	Stream bank erosion control	Wastewater monitoring from cities	Help for the landowners in the watershed district (financial and legal)
We have an abundance of clean water but it can be improved quality-wise	Sac River, Little Sac and Stockton Lake	Water use for agriculture, recreation	Potential overuse, too many people, agriculture, septic systems	Recreation (lake) economy	Agriculture, recreation	I am not sure	Stockton Lake protection	Maintain current water quality and improve areas of concern	Balance use of land for all users
	Sons Creek	Water cattle, hunt and fish		Wildlife and cattle	Drinking water	Mostly runoff from farms and factors	Keeping it clean	Runoff	Sinkholes

APPENDIX D: COMPLETE SURVEY RESPONSES

MEETING 3: JAN. 12, 2016, AT WILLARD – 61 ATTENDEES, 24 SURVEY RESPONDENTS

General Perception	Waterbody	Use	Primary Challenges	Primary Benefits	Community Uses	Upstream/ Downstream Activities	Priority #1	Priority #2	Priority #3
		Recreation, drinking water	Keeping them clean and changing old mindsets about water management	All of the above	Drinking, livestock, recreation	Improper management of wastewater systems in area towns of poor systems which are outdated or in need of repair. Improper waste management on farms, in particular poultry farms	Improving and maintaining an improved water quality	Stop contamination	Advanced planning to meet water needs (another lake)
That Greene County has more oppourtunity with the James River than Sac River			Low taxbase and uneducated community leaders	Agriculture, recreation	Drinking water, septic impact is old lines that contaminate groundwater	Illegal dumping, mostly past some present	Safe drinking water for all especially chronically ill and infants	Notifying the above mentioned as soon as water test reveals bacteria	
						Urban sprawl	Erosion		
	Little Sac	Livestock water	People throwing out trash	All of the above	Livestock, recreation	Only people throwing out trash	Keeping waters open for livestock owners		
Some land erosion but overall seems healthy	Sac and Turkey Creek	Livestock water, recreation	Are any	Recreation	We are farmers, so community is different than what it seems like these questions are geared	City pollution	Not use my taxes wisely	Do not use my taxes as pre-empt for power	Clean up the pollutants from cities and towns like cigarettes
My community loves and cares for Stockton Lake and the Sac River. Most of the people in my area utilize them	Sac River and Stockton Lake	Fishing, boating, farming, hunting	Flooding, drought	Recreation, ecological benefits	Fishing, farming	No			
Streams are trashy	Sac and Little Sac	Cattle water, fishing	Clean them up	Open space	Stock water, garden water	No	Keep the chicken and turkeys houses away from them		
Generally good water quality especially Turkey Creek, not so much Little Sac	Little Sac and Turkey Creek	Recreation	Bank erosion, flood waters	Recreation, perserving for next generation	Personal and livestock	Yes	Upstream pollution solutions, landfill, wastewater plan		
It is directly connected to our water sources	Fellows and McDaniel Lake	Drinking water	Quality is good but a challenge to maintain; small watersheds, quantity can be an issue	Drinking water, quality of life, economic prerequisite, recreation	See #4	Yes, always	Sustain/protect for drinking water		
Livestock water									
	Fishing, boating	Keeping them clean	Recreation, green space		Debris floating down	Education of the public to keep it clean	Better building codes to help with runoff		
	Turkey Creek	Livestock water	Erosion	Economy	Livestock water and drinking water				

General Perception	Waterbody	Use	Primary Challenges	Primary Benefits	Community Uses	Upstream/ Downstream Activities	Priority #1	Priority #2	Priority #3
Accessible contributor to the quality of life	Sac, Fellows, McDaniel, Stockton Lake	Canoeing, fishing, hiking, boating	Pollution	Recreation	Private, community pool		Pollution cleanup	Education	conservation
	Sac River and Little Sac	Cattle, fishing, boating canoeing	Being clean	Recreation	Fishing, recreation for future generations	Chicken farms	Less poultry farms		
	Stockton Lake and branches	Wildlife stability, horses and cattle	Excessive flooding at least 4 times annually	Open space, ecological benefits	Provide stability of well-water levels, provides recreation and lake living	Erosion	Provide guidelines for big business which impose penalties	Ease access to funding for use of water feeders vs. use of waterways by livestock for drinking water	
	Sac, Stockton Lake, Clear Creek	Fishing, swimming, boating	Pollution	Recreational	Drinking from groundwater	Farming, raising cattle, stormwater runoff from towns and city	Better stormwater management in cities		
Good	Asher Creek	Enjoyment, growing trees along streambank, talking walks		Livestock and wildlife water source	Residential none as city willard sanitary goes to Springfield and also have pasture as buffer	No			
The condition of Sac River is fair to poor. There is too much direct contact to the waterway from cattle	Sac River	As a water resource	Agriculture, stormwater and septic tank effluent runoff	Recreation, economic, drinking water, floodwater management	Potable water, groundwater resources, agriculture useage	Yes	Enhance protection of Stockton Lake	Financial support, incentive programs for sustainable ag	promotion of best management practices for land use and development
More education	Cedar County, Cedar Creek	Livestock, recreation, life itself	Keep it clean, useable and controled	All of the above and more	Answered in above	All	Available	Clean	harvested education/ demonstration
Overall in good health	Sac River and tributaries	Irrigation, swimming, fishing, water for livestock	River bank erosion, flood control	Benefit is defined by the individual landowner	Farm is not located near community	Erosion of individual rights by governmental agencies	River/stream bank erosion	Flood control	maintain rights of the individual landowner
Large urban areas getting polluted		Recreation, fishing, good source of revenue from trouism/ recreation	Water supply for Springfield affects us all	Good drinking water, recreation	Residential and business use, agriculture, recreation, dams make our electricity	None in my area	Springfield landfill runoff particularly disposal of those new mercury lightbulbs	Regular input from landowners/business	municipal sewer systems that are not handling capacity
Drinking water supply and health related to waterborn pollutants and contaminants	Sac River	Recreation	Erosion, excess runoff, nonpoint pollutants due to karst topography	Industry and jobs, recreation, economy, health of forests related to economy and erosion control and drinking water	Drinking water, industry, overall health and quality of life for citizens. Everyone drinks water	I previously lived downstream from development of the James River Freeway. There was exessive flooding into Lake Springfield causing	Monitor residential watering systems, runoff agricultural, chemical	Look for creative drainage solutions such as rain gardens and permeable parking surfaces	
General perception is good	Flint Hill Branch	Wade in creek on my property at South Dry Sac along trail	Increased bacteria loading probably from septic/livestock	Recreation, ecological benefits, drinking water	Recreation, drinking water, agricultural		Better protection of sinkhole and streams from livestock	Incentive program to improve septic systems	
As stewards of the natural resources, all waters are important to protect and preserve	Sac River, Clear Creek, Asher Creek, Stockton Lake	Recreation, economic development, to help recharge aquifers	Keeping them clean, ensuring their existence in the future as water use increases with population	Fishing, swimming, boating, agricultural, wildlife, power generation	Potable water, mining, agriculture, survival, economic development	Wastewater discharge	Increased monitoring and money for programs to repair and maintain wastewater systems	Increased fines for illegal dumping of trash, tires, TVs, couches	increased education, public awareness, stiffer design criteria for sewage disposal systems