

NRCS National Water Quality Initiative (NWQI)
Watershed Assessment:

**Wiser Lake Creek-Nooksack River
Watershed**

Prepared By:
Whatcom Conservation District
Lynden, WA

December 2020



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	2
Tables and Figures	4
Overview	6
1. Background and Purpose	7
1.1. Background	7
1.2. Location of Watershed Assessment Area.....	8
Sub-basins of Wiser Watershed.....	9
Special Districts	9
1.3. Water Quality Resource Concerns	11
Washington State Surface Water Quality Criteria.....	11
303d Assessed Waters	11
Lower Nooksack River Basin Bacteria TMDL	12
1.4. Opportunities and Goals for Water Quality	12
1.5. NRCS's Partnership in Reaching Goals.....	13
2. Watershed Characterization	14
2.1. Watershed Location.....	14
2.2. Local Climate Overview	14
2.3. Physical Characterization of Watershed Area.....	15
Hydrologic Features	15
FEMA Flood Zones	17
Soils	17
Digital Elevation Model	17
2.4. Land Cover and Use.....	20
Land Use Characterization	20
Septic System Locations and Compliance Classification.....	23
Livestock Surveys.....	23
2.5. Socioeconomic and Demographic Characterization of Watershed.....	25
3. Hydrologic and water quality characterization	27
3.1. Available Water Quality Data and Resources.....	27
3.2. Watershed Hydrology	27
Gauging Stations.....	27
Stream Flow Analysis.....	28
Relative contribution of the Wiser Watershed to the Lower Nooksack River	28
Seasonality of Water Quantity.....	28

Precipitation-Runoff Budget.....	29
Groundwater Recharge Potential.....	29
3.3. Irrigation in the Wiser Watershed	30
3.4. Current Water Quality Conditions	30
Pathogen Monitoring (Whatcom Clean Water Program)	30
Nitrogen and Phosphorus	35
Sediment	35
4. Resource Analysis Assessment.....	36
4.1. Overview of Watershed Assessment Model	36
Objective.....	36
Spatial Modeling Approach.....	37
4.2. Critical Source Areas Identified	38
4.3. Treatments and Opportunities	42
Conservation Management Practices.....	42
Assessment of Management Scenarios.....	42
5. Summary and Recommendations	44
5.1. Watershed Assessment Summary	44
5.2. Practice Implementation Recommendations	44
5.3. Effectiveness Monitoring	44
Effectiveness Monitoring of Watershed Plan.....	44
Conservation Practice Implementation Monitoring	45
Conservation Practice Monitoring.....	45
Conservation Planning.....	46
Water Quality Monitoring	46
Tracking Data Metrics and Trends over Time.....	47
5.4. NEPA Concerns	47
6. Outreach.....	49
6.1. Outreach Plan Goals and Objectives.....	49
6.2. Background Analysis for Audience Selection	49
Primary Livestock Types in Watershed.....	49
Primary Land Use Types in Watershed.....	49
6.3. Target Audience Prioritization	50
6.4. Outreach Strategy by Audience Type	52
6.5. NRCS Outreach Barriers and Recommendations	55
6.6. Evaluation of NRCS Program Impact and Adaptive Management.....	56
6.7. Partners in Outreach	57

Agricultural Audience Focus.....	57
Non-Agricultural or General Audience Focus.....	58
7. References.....	60
8. Local Contacts	62
9. Appendix.....	63

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. Sub-basins of Wiser Watershed by area.	9
Table 2. Surface water quality criteria for Washington State for the pollutants (or parameters) of concern in this assessment.	11
Table 3. Total Maximum daily load allocations for fecal coliform bacteria for 6 tributaries and within the Wiser Watershed area and the Mainstem Nooksack River at Brennan (Slater Road). 12	
Table 4. Land Use by Category for the Wiser Watershed. Land uses are categorized into four primary categories (agricultural crops, farmsteads, developed, and natural). Each primary category is subdivided into secondary categories that further describe the land use. All land uses sum to a total watershed area of 44,705 acres (70 sq. miles).....	21
Table 5. Livestock properties in Wiser Watershed by animal type and sub-basin. Properties per square mile is calculated to reflect density of properties per animal type in each sub-basin.	24
Table 6. Surface water quality sampling in the Wiser Watershed.	27
Table 7. Spatial data layer model inputs were grouped into two categories: terrain factors and land use factors.	37
Table 8. Most effective NRCS conservation management practice(s) identified for surface water quality protection by agricultural crop.....	43
Table 9. Most effective NRCS conservation management practice(s) identified for surface water quality protection by farmstead type.....	43
Figure 1. Location of the Wiser Watershed within the Nooksack River Watershed basin; Whatcom County, WA, USA.....	8
Figure 2. Sub-basins of Wiser Watershed showing major waterways and waterways with TMDL targets.....	10
Figure 3. Special Districts Associated with Wiser Watershed. DD=Diking district; DID=Drainage improvement district; CDID=Consolidated drainage improvement district.....	10
Figure 4. Annual climate summary (1981-2010) for Wiser Watershed. Precipitation and ambient temperature are from the Clearbrook, WA weather station located less than 2 miles northeast of the Wiser Watershed. Data accessed from the Western Regional Climate Center: https://wrcc.dri.edu/ (2020).....	14
Figure 5. Annual precipitation variation in Wiser Watershed. Data source: USDA and Texas A&M University.	15

Figure 6. Hydrologic features of Wiser Watershed with major waterways labeled including those with TMDL bacteria targets.....	16
Figure 7. FEMA Flooding potential map for Wiser Watershed (Data Source: FEMA).....	16
Figure 8. Soils of Wiser Watershed by NRCS Hydrologic Group. (Data source: NRCS).....	18
Figure 9. Soils of Wiser Watershed by NRCS Drainage Classification. (Data source: NRCS)...	18
Figure 10. Digital elevation model of Wiser Watershed.	19
Figure 11. Slope derived from digital elevation model of Wiser Lake Watershed.	19
Figure 12. Land Use of Wiser Watershed: Agricultural Land Uses.	20
Figure 13. Developed land uses of Wiser Watershed. On-site septic systems are shown as black dots.....	22
Figure 14. Natural land uses of Wiser Watershed. Mapped wetlands include the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) and constructed wetlands.	22
Figure 15. Livestock Presence in the Wiser Watershed by animal type from windshield survey conducted by the Whatcom Clean Water Program between 2015 and 2019 and WCD during June 2020.....	25
Figure 16. Lower Nooksack Water Budget (Bandaragoda, 2012).....	29
Figure 17. Map of Nooksack Routine monitoring stations. Eight sites represent sub-basin tributaries and 4 of the 5 mainstem sites fall within the Wiser Watershed.....	32
Figure 18. Geometric mean and estimated 90 th percentile for fecal coliform (October 2017-September 2020) for 20 Nooksack Routine monitoring stations. The bar must be blue on both graphs for each sample site to be meeting the freshwater health standard.	34
Figure 19. Workflow graphic for spatial modeling approach using ArcMap10.....	36
Figure 20. Potential critical source area contribution rating for terrain factors in the Wiser Watershed.	39
Figure 21. Potential critical source area ratings based on terrain and land use factors in the Wiser Watershed using the combined pollutant ranking score.	39
Figure 22. Potential critical source area ratings for Phosphorus based on terrain and land use factors in the Wiser Watershed.	40
Figure 23. Potential critical source area ratings for Nitrogen based on terrain and land use factors in the Wiser Watershed.	40
Figure 24. Potential critical source area ratings for Sediment based on terrain and land use factors in the Wiser Watershed.	41
Figure 25. Potential critical source area ratings for Pathogens based on terrain and land use factors in the Wiser Watershed.	41
Figure 26. Audience prioritization by likeliness to participate (familiarity with NRCS) and impact on water quality (Critical Source Area Rating).	52

OVERVIEW

The following document contains a watershed assessment completed for the Wiser Lake Creek – Nooksack River Watershed (HUC 171100040503) located in Whatcom County, Washington and nested within the larger Nooksack River Watershed (HUC 17110004). This watershed assessment was conducted as part of the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) National Water Quality Initiative (NWQI) and is an exercise in characterizing and identifying the land uses, or “critical source areas”, that have the greatest potential for nutrient (nitrogen and phosphorous), sediment, and/or pathogen impacts to water quality. This assessment process also includes an outreach strategy that identifies barriers, opportunities, and conservation management practices that can be implemented to reduce those identified impacts.

The watershed assessment and outreach components follow the NRCS 9 Steps of Planning:

1. Identifying the pollutants of concern in the watershed
2. Determining the water quality objectives of the watershed
3. Inventory resources by collecting watershed data
4. Analyze the data via modeling to identify critical source areas
5. Formulate alternatives by suggesting various conservation practices
6. Evaluate/model the impact of different conservation practices on water quality pollutants
7. Work with partners on decision on plans of action for the watershed
8. Implement the Outreach and Implementation plan in the watershed
9. Evaluate the effectiveness of the plan and adapt as necessary to achieve water quality goals

This assessment addresses steps 1-5. It is suggested that steps 6-8 should be evaluated next and carried out via the Outreach and Implementation Plan, with step 9 being a long-term objective of the project to be conducted by local partners indelibly.

For more detail on the general process for development of a watershed assessment plan, see the NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook (NPPH), Subpart F: Areawide Conservation Planning (NPPH Part 600.50 B. (2)).

For more information about this report, please contact authors:

- Nichole Embertson, Ph.D., Science and Planning Coordinator
- Meagan Harris, M.S., Water Quality Data Coordinator
- Aneka Sweeney, M.Ed., Education and Outreach Coordinator

Other contributing authors:

- Scarlett Graham, M.S., Research Specialist
- Kyle Cassady, Resource Technician
- Andrew Phay, GIS Specialist

Whatcom Conservation District
6975 Hannegan Rd, Lynden, WA 98229
P: (360) 526-2381

Written in collaboration with Washington State NRCS.
USDA - Natural Resources Conservation Service
316 W. Boone Ave., Suite 450, Spokane, WA 99201-2348
P: (509) 323-2900

1. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

1.1. Background

This watershed assessment plan was developed in collaboration with Washington NRCS to identify critical source areas for strategic implementation of land conservation practices for water quality. Past and current conservation practice and plan implementation has been based on landowner engagement, opportunity, and/or regulatory response. A critical, watershed level evaluation has not been performed to create a targeted and strategic outreach effort to focus on high risk land uses for water quality. This watershed assessment provided a means to identify all land uses on a HUC-12 watershed level, potential pollution from nitrogen, phosphorous, sediment, and pathogens to surface waters, and the relative effectiveness of different conservation practices to effect water quality improvement. The results of the watershed assessment will be used to implement a focused and engaged watershed outreach plan to connect land users to available programs, practices, and materials, and/or guide the adoption or revision of current programs to better reach end users.

The Nooksack Watershed in Whatcom County, Washington (Figure 1) is home to a strong agricultural economy, residential communities, rural landowners, commercial business, productive forest and natural habitats, and valuable natural resources. However, with so many diverse and demanding land uses, the watershed has also seen an impact in environmental resources such as water quality. The primary artery through this diverse land use is the Nooksack River which originates from mountain glaciers and natural headwater lands and meanders through the County on its 75 mile journey to Portage and Bellingham Bay in the Puget Sound (Figure 1). At its deposition point in Portage Bay is a recreational, commercial, and tribal shellfish industry that is dependent on clean waters for production. Unfortunately, the Nooksack River had a TMDL instated in 2000 for fecal coliform (pathogens), and has roughly 53 303(d) listed segments in the Nooksack watershed for pathogens, ammonia, low dissolved oxygen, and/or temperature, many of which have seasonal high pollutant levels. The persistent high levels of pollutants, particularly fecal coliform, is reflected in the on-going seasonal closures of the shellfish beds in Portage Bay. These closures impact not only the economics of the downstream aquafarmers, but also the tribal harvest that occurs year round for subsistence and ceremonial purposes. The loss in harvest and change in timing of collection, has greatly impacted the social structure and community dynamics of these populations.

The Nooksack Watershed TMDL (Joy, 2000; Hood, 2002) sets water quality targets for 18 waterways in the Nooksack Watershed that contribute to bacteria loading in the Nooksack River. Several of those waterways are within the Wiser Lake Creek Watershed (hereafter “Wiser Watershed”) that is the focus of this assessment including Bertrand Creek, Duffner Ditch (a tributary of Bertrand Creek), Kamm Creek, Mormon Ditch (a tributary of Kamm Creek), Scott Ditch, Wiser Lake Outlet (part of Cougar Creek), and Keefe Lake Outlet (part of Schneider Creek). Water quality targets included in the TMDL in the Wiser Watershed sub-basins of the Nooksack River Watershed are outlined in the Detailed Implementation Plan (Hood, 2002).




Figure 1. Location of the Wiser Watershed within the Nooksack River Watershed basin; Whatcom County, WA, USA.

1.2. Location of Watershed Assessment Area

The Wiser Watershed is located within the greater Nooksack River Basin (HUC 17110004) in Whatcom County Washington (Figure 1). It also falls within the Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 01. A comprehensive description of the Nooksack watershed and WRIA 1 is included in the Puget Sound Partnership's *2014/2015 Action Agenda for Puget Sound, Section 4* (Puget Sound Partnership, 2014).

The Wiser Watershed is 91.5 square miles (58,560 acres) in total, with 24% of this area (22 square miles) falling within British Columbia, Canada borders (Figure 1). For the purposes of this assessment, only the Wiser Watershed (70 square miles) within US borders will be considered. The watershed encompasses multiple sub-basins and has mixed land use, a high level of stakeholder engagement, and a history of water quality concerns, monitoring, and source correction work. Portions of the cities of Lynden, Ferndale, Nooksack, and Everson fall within the watershed boundaries.

Table 1. Sub-basins of Wiser Watershed by area.

Sub-basin	Area (square miles)	Area (acres)	Area (as % of total)
Bertrand Creek ¹	20	13,108	29%
Wiser Lake/Cougar Creek	13	8,636	19%
Scott Ditch	11	7,150	16%
Schneider	11	7,035	16%
Kamm Creek	11	6,861	16%
Nooksack R. (Deming to Everson)	3	1,914	4%
TOTAL	70	44,705	100%

¹The Bertrand Creek area (square miles) presented in this table is only the area within US borders that is assessed in this report. Roughly 22 additional square miles (14,000 acres) are within Canada. The total watershed area also reflects only the area within the US borders.

Sub-basins of Wiser Watershed

The Wiser Watershed is comprised of six sub-basins summarized in Table 1 and shown in Figure 2. Target bacteria allocations have been set for four of the six sub-basins in the Nooksack River TMDL (Joy, 2000) and Detailed Implementation Plan (Hood, 2002). These sub-basins are also used by the WCWP and other local partners to describe the watershed in more detail, evaluate water quality, and prioritize work.

Additionally, defining sub-basins can be useful for specific, targeted outreach within a sub-basin, where residents and producers often work more closely together, and relate to the idea of being “watershed neighbors”. The Bertrand Creek sub-basin is unique from the other sub-basins within Wiser Watershed because it originates in Canada (Figure 1). It is one of two sub-basins in the greater Nooksack River Watershed that originate in Canada (the second sub-basin is Fishtrap Creek, which is not included in this assessment). For this assessment, only the area of the Bertrand Creek watershed within the United States has been considered when calculating areas and for identifying critical source areas (Table 1).

Special Districts

There are also multiple special agricultural districts that in the watershed, including three Watershed Improvement Districts (WIDs); the Bertrand WID, South Lynden WID, and Laurel WID (Figure 3). Watershed Improvement Districts, founded under WA State law (RCW 87.03), are groups of farmers organized by watersheds to represent the needs of the agriculture community.

Overlapping with the WIDs, there are also six Diking Districts (DD) and Drainage Improvement Districts (DID or CDID) (Figure 3). These diking and drainage districts were established under WA State Law (85.22 RCW) to protect communities from flooding and to provide irrigation.



Figure 2. Sub-basins of Wiser Watershed showing major waterways and waterways with TMDL targets.




Figure 3. Special Districts Associated with Wiser Watershed. DD=Diking district; DID=Drainage improvement district; CDID=Consolidated drainage improvement district.

1.3. Water Quality Resource Concerns

Based on local resource concerns, the following pollutants were chosen for evaluation in this assessment: sediment, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorous), and pathogens. Project-driven surface water quality monitoring of sediment and nutrients has taken place in the Nooksack Basin and Wiser Watershed since 1997. Regular sampling of surface water quality pathogens (measured as fecal coliform and *Eschericia coli*) has been occurring since 1997. Land use would indicate that all four pollutants are potential threats to water quality within the watershed.

Washington State Surface Water Quality Criteria

Table 2 summarizes surface water quality criteria for Washington State for the pollutants of concern in this assessment. These criteria are established under WAC 173-201A-200 (fresh water designated uses and criteria). More information can be found at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/swqs/criteria.html>. The full text of Chapter 173-201A WAC is available at <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=173-201a&full=true>.

Table 2. Surface water quality criteria for Washington State for the pollutants (or parameters) of concern in this assessment.

Parameter	Measured as	Surface Water Criteria for Freshwater
Total Suspended Solids	Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)	No defined criteria for rivers and streams.
	Turbidity (NTU)	Turbidity criteria are defined as percent saturation (percent increase over background).
Nitrogen	mg/L	No defined criteria for rivers and streams.
Phosphorus	mg/L	No defined criteria for rivers and streams.
Pathogens	Fecal coliform (#/100 ml) *	Geometric mean: 100 #/100ml 90 th percentile: 200 #/100 ml
	<i>E. coli</i> (#/100 ml) ¹	Geometric mean: 100 #/100ml 90 th percentile: 320 #/100 ml

¹Washington State fecal coliform surface water criteria for recreation were replaced with *E. coli* criteria in 2019. The fecal coliform values in this table, while no longer the approved state criteria, are still being used by natural resource managers to track changes in pathogens over time, especially in areas with established fecal coliform criteria for marine waters under the National Shellfish Sanitation Program.

303d Assessed Waters

Fourteen stream segments within the Wiser Watershed are listed 303(d) assessed waters by the Department of Ecology (2020) for pH, dissolved oxygen, and/or temperature.

- pH: portions of Bertrand Creek, Keefe Lake Outlet/Schneider Ditch, Wiser Creek, Kamm Creek, and Scott ditch are listed as not meeting pH standards.
- Dissolved oxygen: portions of Bertrand Creek, Duffner Ditch, Keefe Lake Outlet/Schneider Ditch, and Kamm Creek are listed as not meeting dissolved oxygen standards.
- Temperature: portions of Bertrand Creek and Wiser Creek are listed in exceedance of temperature standards.

Lower Nooksack River Basin Bacteria TMDL

Following the 2000 Nooksack River basin bacteria total maximum daily load (TMDL) evaluation, Ecology published specific water quality targets for bacteria in the mainstem Nooksack River at Brennan (Ferndale, WA) and its lowland tributaries (Hood, 2002). The TMDL targets for the 6 tributaries and 2 sub-tributaries within the Wiser Watershed and the Nooksack River at Brennan are listed in Table 3 (modified from Joy, 2000). For reference and clarity, the corresponding Wiser Watershed sub-basin name from Table 1 and Figure 2. Sub-basins of Wiser Watershed showing major waterways and waterways with TMDL targets. are also provided in Table 3.

Table 3. Total Maximum daily load allocations for fecal coliform bacteria for 6 tributaries and within the Wiser Watershed area and the Mainstem Nooksack River at Brennan (Slater Road).

TMDL Tributary or Sub-Tributary name	Wiser Watershed sub-basin name	TMDL Target Geometric Mean (cfu/100 ml)	Load Allocation (average annual CFS*cfu/100 ml)
Kamm Creek	Kamm Creek	35	3,109
Mormon Ditch	Kamm Creek	35	994
Scott Ditch	Scott Ditch	49	7,017
Bertrand Creek	Bertrand Creek	49	40,162
Duffner Ditch	Bertrand Creek	49	3538
Wiser Lake Outlet	Wiser Lake/Cougar Creek	59	2,113
LLPL Ditch	Wiser Lake/Cougar Creek	19	421
Keefe Lake Outlet	Schneider Ditch	45	2,045
Nooksack at Brennan	Nooksack to Everson (North)	39	517,461

1.4. Opportunities and Goals for Water Quality

The Wiser Watershed is reflective of the greater Whatcom County in its diverse land uses with agriculture being the primary land use (68% by acreage of crop land and farmsteads) and the remainder split between developed residential and commercial area (15%) and natural spaces such as forest, riparian, wetlands, and waterbodies (17%). The agricultural sector is serviced by a variety of agencies and organizations including the Whatcom Conservation District (WCD) and NRCS who provide non-regulatory technical assistance in conservation planning and practice implementation. Whatcom County Public Works (WCPW) provides outreach to agricultural and non-agricultural land users. Other agencies such as the Washington Department of Agriculture (WSDA), Ecology, and Whatcom County Planning Development and Services (PDS) are the primary regulators for the dairy (WSDA) and non-dairy agriculture sectors (Ecology, PDS). Whatcom County PDS, Washington Department of Health, and Ecology also interact in non-agricultural land use in a regulatory context. A variety of other groups interact with landowners around water quality issues for education, outreach, awareness, services, and more.

Special districts offer partnership opportunities in the Wiser Watershed, especially with the Bertrand and South Lynden Watershed Improvement Districts (WIDs). A portion of the Laurel WID also overlaps with this watershed, though it is primarily linked to the Ten Mile Watershed. Several Diking Districts (DD) and Drainage Improvement Districts (DID; Consolidated DID or

CDID) also have boundaries within or overlapping the watershed. WID, DD, and DID boundaries are shown on Figure 3.

1.5. NRCS's Partnership in Reaching Goals

Local NRCS is committed to helping the watershed meet its water quality goals. NRCS actively works with Whatcom Conservation District through planning and implementation and has assisted farmers in the watershed via programs such as EQIP. This work follows the NRCS 9 Steps of Planning and other guidelines outlined in the NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook (NPPH) (NRCS, 2013).

There are currently two NRCS conservation planners in the Everson Field Office to assist with landowner engagement in the Wiser Watershed. However, it would be beneficial to have an additional field office engineer and/or planning specialist in the office to assist with and carry out recommendations based on this assessment and outreach plan.

2. WATERSHED CHARACTERIZATION

2.1. Watershed Location

See Section 1.2 for more information about the watershed.

2.2. Local Climate Overview

Located in northwest Washington, the Nooksack Basin and Wiser Watershed receive large amounts of precipitation annually. On average, the Wiser Watershed receives 47 inches of precipitation as rainfall annually. The majority of precipitation (82%) falls October-May; while the warmer months, June-September, receive less than 20% of the annual rainfall (Figure 4; Clearbrook, WA Station <https://wrcc.dri.edu>). There is also variation in annual rainfall amounts within the study area as shown in Figure 5 with modeled annual rainfall amounts ranging from 34 to 58 inches.




Figure 4. Annual climate summary (1981-2010) for Wiser Watershed. Precipitation and ambient temperature are from the Clearbrook, WA weather station located less than 2 miles northeast of the Wiser Watershed. Data accessed from the Western Regional Climate Center: <https://wrcc.dri.edu/> (2020).




Figure 5. Annual precipitation variation in Wiser Watershed. Data source: USDA and Texas A&M University.

2.3. Physical Characterization of Watershed Area

Hydrologic Features

Figure 6 shows the waterways (including constructed waterways and ditches) and wetlands of the Wiser Watershed. As described in Section 1.2, there are six sub-basins of the watershed (Figure 2. Sub-basins of Wiser Watershed showing major waterways and waterways with TMDL targets.); five of the six represent main tributaries to the Nooksack River and were assigned fecal coliform water quality targets in the Nooksack TMDL (Hood 2002). These main tributaries include Bertrand Creek, Kamm Creek, Scott Ditch, Schneider Ditch (called Keefe Lake Outlet in the Nooksack TMDL), and Wiser Lake Creek/Cougar Creek (called Wiser Lake Outlet in the Nooksack TMDL). Each of these five tributaries described above flows into the Nooksack River between Everson and Ferndale, WA. In addition to these main tributaries, there is a small ditch that was assigned a fecal coliform water quality in the Nooksack TMDL that is within the Wiser Water called LLPL Ditch (Table 3). The LLPL Ditch drains a 1.2 square mile area and flows directly into the Nooksack River between the Scott Ditch and Bertrand Creek outlets (Figure 6).

The sixth sub-basin of the Wiser Watershed is the Nooksack to Everson- North sub-basin and includes the land that flows directly into the mainstem Nooksack south of the city of Everson (Figure 2. Sub-basins of Wiser Watershed showing major waterways and waterways with TMDL targets.).

Additional information on the hydrology of the Wiser Watershed is found in Section 3.




Figure 6. Hydrologic features of Wiser Watershed with major waterways labeled including those with TMDL bacteria targets.




Figure 7. FEMA Flooding potential map for Wiser Watershed (Data Source: FEMA).

FEMA Flood Zones

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provides flood hazard and risk data and defines the boundaries of regulatory floodways. The portion of the Wiser Watershed along the Nooksack River falls within the Regulatory Floodway and the 1.0% Annual Flood Hazard (Figure 7). The Nooksack River Regulatory Floodway and the 1.0% Annual Flood Hazard (Zone AE) equates to a traditional 100-year flood risk zone.

Scott Ditch, Mormon Ditch and Wiser Lake Outlet tributaries fall entirely within the 1.0% Annual Flood Hazard areas of the Nooksack River (Figure 7). Portions of Kamm Creek, Schneider Ditch, and Duffner Ditch are also within the 1.0% Flood Hazard Area of the Nooksack River. In addition, the area surrounding Bertrand Creek and Wiser Lake Outlet area within a 1.0% Annual Flood Hazard area. More information about these flooding designations can be found online at: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>

Soils

For NRCS purposes, soils are most often defined by their Hydrologic Soil Group based on the soil's runoff potential, with Group A having the lowest runoff potential and Group D having the highest runoff potential (Figure 8). The Wiser Watershed is comprised primarily of Group C (48% by acreage), followed by Group A (21% by acreage) and then Group D and B (19% and 9% by acreage, respectively). Group A soils tend to follow the Nooksack River floodplain and are more common in the southernmost portions of the Wiser Watershed. Soils that were classified in dual groups (i.e. A/D, B/D, or C/D) were classified as Group D which applies to the undrained condition for this area summary.

For the purposes of spatial modeling, soils were defined by their drainage class with the well-drained soil classes having low runoff potential and the poorly drained soils having high runoff potential (Figure 9). Drainage class has been found to better predict runoff potential in this region than the Hydrologic Soil Group, given research by the WCD.

The Wiser watershed has varied soil drainage classes across its sub-basins and along its tributaries. The sub-basin of Bertrand Creek is composed of predominately well-drained to somewhat poorly drained soil types. The Schneider sub-basin is also composed of predominately well-drained to somewhat poorly drained soil types, except for the area that directly borders Schneider Ditch. Similarly, the area that directly borders Cougar Creek, Scott Ditch, and Kamm Creek is also composed of very poorly drained soils. The Nooksack River flood plain to the south of Lynden is composed of somewhat poorly drained to very poorly drained soils.

There are 36 unique soil types in the Wiser Watershed, with the most common (by acreage) being Lynden sandy loam (6,072 acres) and Hale silt loam (3,739 acres). Soil types are represented in Figure 8 and Figure 9 by grey lines between different soil types.

Digital Elevation Model

The Digital Elevation Model (DEM) shows the elevation profile of the Wiser Watershed, from 16 feet at its lowest point to 387 feet on the northernmost edge of the US portion of the watershed (Figure 10). The DEM was derived from the 2006 LiDAR imagery for the North Puget Sound accessed through the Washington LiDAR Portal hosted by the WA Department of Natural Resources (WA DNR): <https://lidarportal.dnr.wa.gov/>.

Slopes were derived from this DEM in a 100 by 100 foot grid. DEM values for the 100x100 foot grid square were averaged to obtain a percent slope for each grid square (Figure 11).




Figure 8. Soils of Wiser Watershed by NRCS Hydrologic Group. (Data source: NRCS)




Figure 9. Soils of Wiser Watershed by NRCS Drainage Classification. (Data source: NRCS).




Figure 10. Digital elevation model of Wiser Watershed.




Figure 11. Slope derived from digital elevation model of Wiser Lake Watershed.

2.4. Land Cover and Use

Land Use Characterization

Land use in the Wiser Watershed is predominantly crop land and livestock agriculture (67% by acreage). Crop land in the watershed includes pastured lands, hay and silage, corn, berry crops, potatoes, and a small number of orchards, tree nurseries, and vegetable crops. (Figure 12).

National-scale land cover datasets such as NOAA's Coastal Change Analysis Program (C-CAP) Land Cover Atlas and the USGS National Land Cover Database (NLCD) are available for the Wiser Watershed and provide a general overview of land use in the watershed. However, these national scale land cover data sets lack the specificity and resolution that we required for the watershed assessment modeling and associated outreach. Thus, recent land use characterizations from Whatcom County (2018) and Washington State Department of Agriculture (2019) were combined to create a single land cover/land use dataset for the watershed. The work to combine these datasets in ArcGIS and ground-truth any gaps or discrepancies was done by WCD in 2020. The land use classifications used in the modeling were modified from the NQWI Watershed Assessment for the Ten Mile Watershed (Embertson, 2018).

Table 4 summarizes the results of this land use assessment in the Wiser Watershed by four broad land use categories (agricultural crop, farmstead, developed, natural space) (Primary category) and more specific subcategories (Secondary category). Figures 12 through 14 show results of this land use assessment. Figure 13 shows the location of all on-site septic (OSS) systems in the watershed in addition to the Developed land uses.






Figure 12. Land Use of Wiser Watershed: Agricultural Land Uses.

Table 4. Land Use by Category for the Wiser Watershed. Land uses are categorized into four primary categories (agricultural crops, farmsteads, developed, and natural). Each primary category is subdivided into secondary categories that further describe the land use. All land uses sum to a total watershed area of 44,705 acres (70 sq. miles).

Primary Land Use Category	Secondary Land Use Category	Wiser Sub-Basin Land Use Area (Acres)						Total HUC-12 Wiser Area	
		Bertrand	Wiser Lake/ Cougar Creek	Scott	Kamm	Schneider	Nooksack R. Deming to Everson	Total (Acres)	% of Total Watershed Area
Agricultural Crop	Forage	3,626	1,247	1,938	1,647	958	283	9,698	21.7%
	Corn	1,101	974	1,531	975	295	58	4,935	11.0%
	Caneberry	1,538	1,079	664	529	251	200	4,261	9.5%
	Unmanaged	624	789	443	499	881	79	3,316	7.4%
	Pasture	570	551	319	389	297	20	2,147	4.8%
	Blueberry	803	324	274	213	354	4	1,972	4.4%
	Potatoes	517	94	72	65	312	22	1,084	2.4%
	Nursery	97.2	240	6	0	2	0	346	0.8%
	Small Grain	238	0	0	13	0	0	250	0.6%
	Fallow	57	11	4	24	90	7	193	0.4%
	Vegetable	0	80	4	11	2	26	122	0.3%
	Strawberry	36	37	0	0	14	0	88	0.2%
	Orchard	12.2	0	3	0	8	0	23	0.1%
	Other	0.4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.0%
	Total:	9,221	5,427	5,259	4,365	3,465	699	28,437	63.6%
Farmstead	Other Animal	216	166	98	86	213	18	797	1.8%
	Dairy	257	111	127	123	23	18	660	1.5%
	Crop	150	135	26	30	35	3	380	0.8%
	Total:	622	412	252	240	271	39	1,837	4.1%
Developed	Residential	638	950	456	721	1,166	170	4,102	9.2%
	Road	226	142	104	133	178	17	801	1.8%
	Commercial	271	89	32	139	105	38	675	1.5%
	Gravel	2	41	260	1	71	98	472	1.1%
	Res. Turf Grass	68	161	64	12	52	3	359	0.8%
	Unmanaged	72	49	44	75	48	23	311	0.7%
	Comm. Turf Grass	0	8	7	36	16	2	69	0.2%
	Total:	1,277	1,442	966	1,117	1,635	352	6,789	15.2%
Natural Space	Forest	1,143	803	180	688	1,211	227	4,252	9.5%
	Riparian	744	292	238	292	337	288	2,190	4.9%
	Water	101	245	229	159	116	308	1,158	2.6%
	Wetland	0	14	26	0.2	1	0	41	0.1%
	Total :	1,988	1,354	673	1,139	1,664	824	7,642	17.1%



Septic System Locations and Compliance Classification

Whatcom County Health Department (WCHD) maintains records of all on-site septic (OSS) systems in Whatcom County, including the inspection and maintenance status of each OSS. Inspections of residential OSS are required every 1 to 3 years, depending on the type and design of each system. WCHD tracks OSS compliance using five categories: new, in compliance, out of compliance, out of compliance/late for inspection, or failing. Compliance status is updated regularly. Locations of OSS in Wiser Watershed are shown in Figure 13.

Livestock Surveys

In addition to the land use characterization work, parcels with livestock in the Wiser Watershed (Figure 15, Table 5) were identified using *windshield* surveys of the watershed by WCWP partners. This livestock information was used in the spatial modeling and will be useful for designing and implementing livestock-specific outreach. The data used in this assessment is being used with permission from WCWP partners. WCWP partners had previously conducted livestock *windshield* surveys in the watershed between 2015 and 2020. WCD staff conducted additional *windshield* surveys during June 2020 to update the oldest records (2015-2018) and fill in gaps in information or spatial coverage.

The *windshield* surveys represent observations of livestock on the landscape at the time of the survey. They are not comprehensive nor all inclusive. While attention was given to complete coverage of the watershed, there are some limitations to this data. First, observations were made opportunistically as staff/partners were out conducting sampling and watershed surveys. The season, day, or even time of day that these surveys were conducted can affect whether livestock can be observed. Secondly, all windshield surveys are conducted from the public right of way which limits the observations that can be made in certain areas. Private roads or driveways were *not* used to make observations or properties that are difficult to see from the main roadways.

The livestock survey results indicate approximately 348 properties with livestock have been identified in the watershed (Table 5). Most prevalent are cattle (150; includes dairy heifers, observed grazing dairy cattle, and beef cattle) and horse (115) properties. 31 dairy operations (identified via presence of milk cows at the dairy farmstead) were identified in the watershed. The “cattle” category included grazing dairy cattle that may have been associated with a dairy operation. However, this grouping was made as the conservation practices from grazing dairy or beef cattle are similar. 52 properties were identified as having pigs, goats, llamas, or other small livestock species. While the numbers are not comprehensive, these estimates of the total number of livestock and the most common types of livestock owners that live within the watershed will help to guide the project outreach in the watershed.

Table 5. Livestock properties in Wiser Watershed by animal type and sub-basin. Properties per square mile is calculated to reflect density of properties per animal type in each sub-basin.

Sub-basin ¹	Bertrand	Wiser Lake/ Cougar Creek	Scott	Kamm	Schneider	Nooksack Deming to Everson	Wiser Lake HUC-12	
Animal Type	Number of Properties (Properties per square mile)						Number of Total Properties (#)	Percent of Total Properties (%)
Cattle²	51 (2.6)	29 (2.2)	27 (2.5)	30 (2.7)	13 (1.2)	0 (0.0)	150	43%
Dairy	11 (0.6)	5 (0.4)	6 (0.5)	6 (0.5)	2 (0.2)	1 (0.3)	31	9%
Horse	20 (1.0)	38 (2.9)	19 (1.7)	14 (1.3)	23 (2.1)	1 (0.3)	115	33%
Sheep	6 (0.3)	3 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	12	3%
Goat	4 (0.2)	3 (0.2)	3 (0.3)	4 (0.4)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.3)	16	5%
Pig	0 (0.0)	2 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	3	1%
Poultry	0 (0.0)	6 (0.5)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	4 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	11	3%
Llama	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	1	0%
Other	2 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.2)	3 (0.3)	2 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	9	3%
Total Number of Properties (Properties per square mile)	94 (4.7)	86 (6.6)	58 (5.3)	59 (5.5)	48 (4.4)	3 (1.0)	348	100%

1. Areas for each sub-basin are presented in Table 1 and shown in Figure 2.

2. Cattle includes dairy heifers, grazing dairy cattle, and beef cattle. Dairy includes milking facilities associated with dairies. These categories were defined as such based on the specific activities and management practices of these properties or facilities.




Figure 15. Livestock Presence in the Wiser Watershed by animal type from windshield survey conducted by the Whatcom Clean Water Program between 2015 and 2019 and WCD during June 2020.

2.5. Socioeconomic and Demographic Characterization of Watershed

The Wiser Watershed consists of large acreage agriculture, small acreage hobby farms, high density urban areas, commercial business districts, and rural residential. There are 62 distinct zoning designations and 10,090 individual parcels in the 44,705 acre watershed. Over 4,900 parcels are less than 1 acre in size; these are primarily zoned as general commercial and mixed density residential. Over 1,080 parcels are greater than 10 acres.

The watershed spans multiple school districts and includes a portion of the Cities of Ferndale, Lynden, and Everson, with cultural centers dispersed throughout the watershed.

While Census data is not available for the Wiser Watershed specifically, the Census of Agriculture for Whatcom County (USDA 2017), which can be extrapolated to the watershed, indicates that of the 1,721 farms and 2,982 producers who responded:

- 93% of farm producers indicate that they identify as White (includes Hispanic/Latino/Spanish which is 3% of “White” total) and 5% Asian. Less than 1% of the producers were American Indian/Alaska Native, Black, or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.
- 56% of farm producers are male with 56% within White, 72% in Hispanic, and 66% in Asian race categories.
- The percent of farmers indicating they are “New and Beginning” is 28% in white, 41% in Hispanic, and 38% in Asian race categories.
- The majority of all farm producers are between the ages of 35-64 (60%), with 32% over the age of 65. While this largely represents values for White producers, Asian

demographics show 75% of producers are 35-65 and only 9% over the age of 65, and Hispanic producers had 25% of producers under the age of 35.

- 52% of farms have less than \$2,500 in annual sales and 30% greater than \$10,000 in annual sales.
- The average farm size was 57 acres for White, 44 for Hispanic, 75 acres for Asian, and 172 for American Indian (largely skewed by one producer) producers, with the majority of producers having less than 50 acres (80, 83, 61, and 91%, respectively)
- The majority of farms identifying as Asian were producing berry crops (75%) representing 35% and 66% of the total acres in raspberry and blueberries, respectively.
- The majority of forage (99%) and corn (100%) crops were produced by White producers representing 29% of the total number of White identified farm operations. White farms also accounted for 75% of raspberry production acres farmed, and nearly 100% of total numbers of layer chickens, cattle, and horse animal units produced/raised.

The implications of these socioeconomic and demographic boundaries are discussed in further detail in Section 6 (Outreach).

3. HYDROLOGIC AND WATER QUALITY CHARACTERIZATION

3.1. Available Water Quality Data and Resources

Surface water quality monitoring efforts in the Wiser Watershed focus largely of pathogens, though specific projects have targeted sampling for nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment between 1997 and 2019. Surface water sampling for each of the four pollutants of concern in this assessment (nitrogen, phosphorous, sediment, pathogens) are summarized in Table 6. More information on the results of this water quality monitoring is provided in Section 3.3.

Table 6. Surface water quality sampling in the Wiser Watershed.

Pollutant	Measured as	Sampling Locations	Period of Record
Sediment	Turbidity (NTU)	2 monitoring stations for grab samples (Bertrand sub-basin)	1999-present
Nitrogen	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (mg/L)	3 monitoring stations sampled during TMDL Evaluation	1997-1998
	Nitrite+Nitrate (mg/L) Ammonia (mg/L)	2 sites in Kamm subbasin sampled by Western Washington University (WWU)	2015-2016
Phosphorus	Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	3 monitoring stations sampled during TMDL Evaluation	1997-1998
	Orthophosphate (mg/L)	2 sites in Kamm subbasin (WWU)	2015-2016
Pathogens	Fecal coliform (CFU/ 100 ml)	Over 30 monitoring stations sampled monthly. *10 sites have longer periods of record.	2010 – present *1997 – present

3.2. Watershed Hydrology

Gauging Stations

The US Geological Survey (USGS) and Washington State Department of Ecology (WA Ecology) maintain multiple stream flow gage stations within the Wiser Watershed including:

- *USGS 12211200*-Located on the Nooksack River at Everson, WA (USGS 12211200) which records discharge (cubic feet per second) and gage height (feet). Data from this station can be accessed online at https://waterdata.usgs.gov/wa/nwis/uv?site_no=12211200.
- *USGS 1221310*-Located on the Nooksack River at Ferndale, WA (USGS 1221310) which records discharge (cubic feet per second), gage height (feet), turbidity (FNU), and nitrate+ nitrite (mg/l). Data from this station can be accessed online at https://waterdata.usgs.gov/wa/nwis/uv/?site_no=12213100 (As of Nov 2020, nitrate+ nitrite data is temporarily unavailable.)
- *USGS 12212390*- Located on Bertrand Creek at H Street near the US/Canada international border, which records discharge (cubic feet per second), gage height (feet), and temperature (degrees C). Data from this station can be accessed online at https://waterdata.usgs.gov/wa/nwis/uv?site_no=12212050.

- *WA Ecology 01N060*- Located on Bertrand Creek at Rathbone Road near the mouth of Bertrand Creek where it discharges to the Nooksack River This station records discharge (cubic feet per second), stage height (feet), rainfall (inches), water temperature (degrees C), and air temperature (degrees C). From 2014-2017, this site also recorded turbidity, dissolved oxygen, pH, conductivity, and nitrate nitrogen. Current and historic from this station can be accessed online at <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/eap/flows/station.asp?sta=01N060>.

Stream Flow Analysis

The Whatcom County Stream Flow Analysis provides a comprehensive summary historic and current precipitation and stream flow records in WRIA 1, including two stations within the Wiser Watershed on Bertrand Creek (RH2 Engineering, Inc, 2016). This document is available online at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qEqE-4k-LDLnIcaQA2TDRyEAYD50QoCY/view>.

Over the period of record (1999-2015), Bertrand Creek- as measured at H Street (USGS 12212390) and near the mouth (Ecology 01N060)- has shown an overall increase in maximum and mean daily discharge. Minimum flows tend to occur in late august or early September and data show that minimum flows are occurring earlier each year for most Nooksack River Tributaries, including at Bertrand station USGS 12212390. Maximum flows, which occur between mid-December and mid-January are generally occurring later in the water year. However, Bertrand Creek near the mouth (Ecology 01N060) shows inverse patterns in timing, with minimum flows occurring slightly later in the year and maximum flows occurring slightly earlier; the report does not attempt to explain this anomalous pattern.

Relative contribution of the Wiser Watershed to the Lower Nooksack River

According to the 2000 Nooksack TMDL Report, which calculated a water balance for the 1997-1998 water year, Wiser Watershed comprised a cumulative 4.2% of the discharge to the Lower Nooksack River. For context, the Upper Nooksack River (measured at North Cedarville) contributed 89.4% of the water balance. Bertrand Creek is the largest contributing sub-basin at 2.8% of the total Nooksack River water balance; other sub-basins contribute $\leq 0.5\%$ of the total Nooksack River water balance (Joy, 2000).

This water balance was calculated using gauging stations on the mainstem Nooksack River and simulated hydrographs for the tributaries. The hydrographs for each tributary were developed from regression equations, comparing tributary flow to the gauging station on Bertrand Creek (Joy, 2000). Any questions of data requests regarding these regression equations and resulting hydrographs should be addressed to Ecology.

The Lower Nooksack Water Budget compiled by Whatcom County and the WRIA 1 Joint Board describes in further detail the water budget of the Lower Nooksack and its tributaries (Bandaragoda et al., 2012). This document provides information on rainfall to runoff ratios (the proportion of rainfall that is converted to streamflow) and seasonal timing of stream flow in the Lower Nooksack and its tributaries.

Seasonality of Water Quantity

Average annual discharge in the Nooksack River is dominated by snowmelt and rainfall in the upper watershed. By contrast, average annual discharge in the lowland tributaries is dominated by lowland rainfall between the months of October and April. Thus, flows in these tributary creeks fluctuate throughout the year, with highest flows throughout the winter months and immediately following storm events. Low flows in these lowland tributary creeks during the

summer months is typical, with some tributaries and ditches in the watershed drying up completely during this time. Additional information on seasonal patterns of water quality can be found in the Lower Nooksack Water Budget (Bandaragoda et al., 2012).

Instream Flow requirements for the Bertrand Creek and Wiser Lake Creek are outlined in WAC 173-501-030 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). Year-round limitations to further consumptive uses are established in WAC 173-501-040 for Bertrand Creek, Wiser Lake Creek, and Wiser Lake.

Precipitation-Runoff Budget

The Lower Nooksack Water Budget estimated rainfall-to-runoff ratios for the sub-basins of the Lower Nooksack River, including the sub-basins of Wiser Lake (Figure 16). No further modeling or estimation of precipitation-runoff budget was performed for this assessment.

Of the sub-basins of Wiser Lake, Scott and Wiser/Cougar have the lowest runoff to rainfall ratios in the Nooksack River watershed. Schneider, Bertrand, and Kamm have moderate runoff to rainfall relative to the other sub-basins.




Figure 16. Lower Nooksack Water Budget (Bandaragoda, 2012).

Groundwater Recharge Potential

In 2018-19, a spatial assessment of groundwater recharge potential was conducted by University of British Columbia (Ayetan, 2019). In a similar spatial modeling approach employed by this watershed assessment for runoff potential (as described in Section 4), the authors combined multiple spatial factors that impact groundwater recharge and combined them using a normalized weighting/ranking calculation to determine groundwater recharge potential across Whatcom County. Groundwater recharge potential was given a 5-scale ranking (Low, Moderately Low, Moderate, High, Very High), which was mapped spatially.

Groundwater recharge is an important consideration for both water quantity and water quality. Projects that utilize groundwater recharge to replenish water stores can be vital to the function of

the groundwater aquifer. However, groundwater recharge can also provide a pathway for land-based pollutants, such as nitrates, to enter the groundwater.

In the Wiser Creek Watershed, groundwater recharge is generally highest in the northern most portion of the watershed, including the Bertrand sub-basin. This is largely driven by lower slopes and less curvature (i.e. flatter land), higher average precipitation, and less developed land cover.

3.3. Irrigation in the Wiser Watershed

A study of agricultural irrigation water use was completed in 2016 for the Public Utility District No. 1 of Whatcom County (RH2 Engineering Inc, 2016). According to this study, 15,688 acres in the Wiser Watershed are irrigated annually (out of a total 22,747 agricultural acres in the watershed). Estimates of water use range from 22,498 acre-feet per year (afy) to 32,575 afy (RH2 Engineering Inc, 2016). These estimates were derived from 1) field-specific data from WSDA, and 2) water application efficiencies by irrigation type from Department of Ecology's Water Resources Guidance *GUID-1210 Water Resources Program Guidance for Determining Irrigation Efficiency and Consumptive Use*. The full report is available online at <http://wrialproject.whatcomcounty.org>.

Previous efforts to estimate agricultural water use in the Nooksack Basin are captured in the Lower Nooksack Water Budget Report (Bandaragoda et al., 2012), which can also be found at <http://wrialproject.whatcomcounty.org>.

Based on the 2016 report, about 40% of this irrigated acreage is in the Bertrand sub-basin; Kamm, Scott and Wiser sub-basins each contribute 15-19% of the irrigated acreage. Nooksack River Deming-Everson and Schneider sub-basins contribute <10% of the irrigated acreage.

This NWQI assessment does not evaluate irrigation uses in the Wiser Watershed and does not account for irrigation in the spatial modeling. While irrigation data on a field use scale is not available for this watershed, a general overview of irrigation practices was conducted to assess potential high impact land uses for mitigation. In general, irrigation is conducted for the majority of crops grown. For caneberry, blueberry, and strawberry crops, tape and drip irrigation systems are present in almost all acres (6,321 cumulative acres or approximately 14% of the Wiser watershed). When applicable, overhead sprinkler type irrigation systems are used for corn, grass, small grain, and potato crops (18,114 cumulative acres or approximately 40% of the Wiser Watershed). Orchard, nursery, and vegetable crops use different methods including drip and sprinkler type irrigation systems, but almost all are irrigated. Most irrigation water is from groundwater wells. More work is needed to properly inventory the number of acres irrigated. Challenges include crop rotation and seasonal variability which impact the need to irrigate, which will affect the timing, volume, and number of acres irrigated annually.

3.4. Current Water Quality Conditions

Pathogen Monitoring (Whatcom Clean Water Program)

Monitoring of fecal bacteria, as an indicator of pathogens in water, is coordinated by the WCWP. Six partner agencies sample fecal bacteria in the Wiser Watershed.

- Whatcom County Public Works
- Washington Department of Agriculture
- Washington Department of Ecology
- Nooksack Indian Tribe

- City of Ferndale
- British Columbia Ministry of the Environment

The fecal bacteria monitoring within the watershed can be broken into three subcategories.

1. *Long-term Ambient monitoring (2010 to present, Figure 17)*: 20 to 24 sites are sampled twice monthly during Nooksack Routine run. Seven of these sites are on waterways within the sub-basins of the Wiser Watershed; five are sites on the Mainstem Nooksack River within the Wiser Watershed. These monitoring used for comparing bacteria trends over time across the sub-basins of the Nooksack basin. Six tributary and four mainstem sites within the watershed have longer monitoring records dating back to 1997.
2. *Short-term Ambient monitoring (2019 to present)*: Additional sites sampled monthly in the Scott and Bertrand sub-basins. This multi-year dataset provides extra spatial coverage of these priority sub-basins and is used primarily for evaluating short-term data trends, seasonal analysis, and provide better spatial coverage of the watershed.
3. *Source ID and Storm Event (2014 to present)*: varies by season and need. Source identification and storm event samples are used for informing source correction efforts and understanding the impact of rain events on bacteria concentrations in the watershed.

The primary indicator of bacteria for the monitoring program described above is fecal coliform, though some agencies also monitor additional indicators of *Eschericia Coli (E.coli)* and *Enterococcus*. Monitoring results are compared to state WQ criteria for fecal bacteria the geometric mean and 90th percentile (described in more detail in Section 1.3 and Table 2) at each monitoring station on an annual and 3-year timeframe. Three-month seasonal statistics and dry-versus-wet season statistics are also calculated. Summaries of current bacteria monitoring can be found at: <http://www.whatcomcounty.us/2606/Focus-Area-Monitoring-Results>.

Ten of the long-term ambient sites have sample records dating back to the TMDL evaluation monitoring in 1997-1998. Additional monitoring stations were added in 2010 and again in 2014 as WCWP partners observed worsening water quality throughout the Nooksack Watershed. Most recently short-term ambient sites were added in Scott and Bertrand sub-basins in 2019.

Water quality within the Wiser Watershed has generally followed patterns of the larger Nooksack Watershed, with bacteria concentrations increasing around 2013-2015 and improving in the years since. Many of the monitoring stations have seen dramatic improvements in fecal bacteria in the past five years, though some of these same stations have also shown signs of increasing bacteria (worsening water quality) since late 2018.




Figure 17. Map of Nooksack Routine monitoring stations. Eight sites represent sub-basin tributaries and 4 of the 5 mainstem sites fall within the Wiser Watershed.

Seasonally, fecal bacteria concentrations and loading tends to be higher in the fall and winter seasons following large rain events and periods of saturated soils. Large spring rain events also create conditions for elevated bacteria throughout the watershed as surface water runoff enters the tributaries of the Wiser Watershed. Summertime low flow conditions can cause elevated bacteria concentrations in some of the sub-basins of the Wiser watershed, but these elevated counts generally do not persist as the tributaries enter the Nooksack River.

While the annual and seasonal fecal bacteria patterns described above are largely similar among sub-basins (Table 1) and key tributaries (Table 3) of the Wiser Watershed, unique conditions include:

Bertrand

- Bertrand Creek represents the largest contribution of flow of the Wiser tributaries; thus, the intermittent high bacteria concentrations observed in Bertrand Creek represent a significant loading to the Nooksack River. Bertrand Creek (B1) is currently meeting the state health benchmark for fecal coliform for the geometric mean but exceeding the benchmark for 90th percentile (Figure 18). This is largely due to seasonally elevated bacteria in the fall and winter when soils are saturated and rainfall events are common.
- Cave Creek and Bertrand Creek at the international boundary (BECC0.2 and BE-9.1) are monitored by both WCWP partners and the BC Ministry of the Environment. Following fall and winter storm events, it is not uncommon to see bacteria concentrations exceeding 1,000 CFU/100 ml at these monitoring sites.
- Duffner Ditch is a small waterway that flows west from the city of Lynden into Bertrand Creek just before its confluence with the Nooksack River. Bacteria in Duffner ditch is

consistently exceeds 200 CFU/100 ml and monitoring results show that it is frequently elevated in the fall and winter following storm events.

Scott

- Scott Ditch (S1) is not currently meeting either part of the state health benchmark for fecal coliform. However, two upstream stations (S2 and S3) do meet the geometric mean portion of this benchmark (Figure 18).
- Additional sites on upper Scott Ditch and Elder Creek show intermittent high bacteria counts, especially during summer low flow conditions and after fall and winter rain events.

Kamm

- Kamm Creek (K1) is currently meeting the state health benchmark for fecal coliform for the geometric mean but exceeding the benchmark for 90th percentile (Figure 18).
- Additional sites on upper Kamm Creek and Mormon Ditch show intermittent high bacteria counts, especially during summer low flow conditions and after fall and winter rain events.

Schneider

- Schneider Ditch (SD) and Whiskey Creek (Wh1) are both currently meeting the state health benchmark for fecal coliform for the geometric mean but exceed the benchmark for 90th percentile (Figure 18). Elevated bacteria concentrations in these waterways occur less frequently than the other larger tributaries.

Wiser Lake /Cougar Creek

- Cougar Creek (COU2) is the only tributary in the watershed currently meeting both parts of the state health benchmark for fecal coliform (Figure 18). Elevated bacteria concentrations in this tributary occur infrequently.
- LLPL ditch is a small waterway in the northern portion of Wiser/Cougar subbasin. Elevated bacteria concentrations are observed regularly in this ditch during the fall season, though bacteria concentrations have been low in the fall of 2020 as the authors compile this report.

Nooksack River (Deming to Everson)

- The mainstem Nooksack River at Everson (M5) has met both parts of the state health benchmark for fecal coliform since 2016 (Figure 18). However, intermittent high bacteria counts at this site have been seen in 2018-2020 through the summer and following early fall rain events.
- There are no tributary sampling sites in this sub-basin as most of the land flows directly into the mainstem Nooksack River.




Figure 18. Geometric mean and estimated 90th percentile for fecal coliform (October 2017- September 2020) for 20 Nooksack Routine monitoring stations. The bar must be blue on both graphs for each sample site to be meeting the freshwater health standard.

Nitrogen and Phosphorus

There is very limited monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorous in the watershed. Historic nitrogen and phosphorus data are available from the TMDL evaluation study from 1997 to 1998 at six tributary and four mainstem sites in the Wiser watershed (Joy, 2000). From 2015 to 2016, Western Washington University monitored two sites in the Kamm Creek sub-basin for nitrogen and phosphorus (Cohan, 2018).

The authors are not aware of current nitrogen or phosphorus grab sample monitoring being done in the Wiser watershed.

Sediment

The USGS and Nooksack Indian Tribe (NIT) have published datasets of the total suspended sediment (TSS) concentration and loads for the mainstem Nooksack River from 2009 to 2017 (Curran, 2018). This research does not include monitoring stations within the Wiser Watershed sub-basins but could be used to assess changes in TSS in the Nooksack River Basin over time.

Turbidity, a surrogate measurement of suspended sediment that is easier to monitor in the field, is collected at two sites in the Bertrand sub-basin on a monthly basis by NIT (along with temperature, dissolved oxygen, and specific conductance). For more information on this sampling, see the NIT website: <https://nooksacktribe.org/departments/cultural-resources/water-resources/water-quality-monitoring/>.

Turbidity measurements were also collected along with temperature, dissolved oxygen, nutrients, and specific conductivity during the TMDL evaluation study from 1997 to 1998 at six tributary and four mainstem sites in the Wiser watershed (Joy, 2000).

More regular measurement of either turbidity or TSS in the Wiser Watershed would provide a better understanding of suspended sediment in the surface waters of the watershed over time. It would be useful to track seasonal trends in sediment concentrations and peak sediment concentrations after “first flush” rain events in the fall. Additionally, in areas with conversion of land use (e.g. from one agricultural land use to another or from an agricultural land use to developed land use), surface water sediment concentrations would provide a more complete picture of the water quality impacts.

4. RESOURCE ANALYSIS ASSESSMENT

4.1. Overview of Watershed Assessment Model

Objective

The potential for pollutants to leave land surfaces and enter nearby surface waters depends on:

1. Terrain features (e.g. soil type, topography, proximity to surface waters)
2. Land use
3. Specific land management activities or practices

The objective of the watershed assessment model was to incorporate spatial data in order to estimate each of the parameters listed and overlay them spatially in order to identify specific critical source areas (hereafter CSA) within the watershed. A CSA is an area where pollutant “export” to surface waters is likely the result of a combination of terrain features and land use. The level of risk associated with a CSA can be modified with the addition of a known or modeled land management activity or practice to show where pollutant export can be reduced or eliminated. In many cases, these activities are already being employed by land managers to protect water quality and public health.

It is important to note that these CSA are potential, meaning that they do not necessarily represent the actual conditions of a site. Well considered land use management (e.g. consideration of soil type, topography, and proximity to surface waters) and the implementation of conservation best management practices or “BMPs” can reduce or eliminate the potential for runoff into surface waters, thereby reducing the potential for that field to be a CSA.




Figure 19. Workflow graphic for spatial modeling approach using ArcMap10.

Spatial Modeling Approach

The workflow process for the spatial modeling approach employed is illustrated in Figure 19. The first step in modeling the CSA was to identify factors of terrain and land use that contribute to runoff risk and the potential to export pollutants. These factors were identified, and the necessary spatial data layers were compiled or created to map each factor (e.g. precipitation, soils, and land use data sets). An initial list of more than 20 layers was simplified into a list of eight of the most influential layers (five terrain and three land use layers) used for the final modeling (Table 7). The spatial data layers (or shapefile) included in the model are further described in Appendix A. Additional information about these layers can be found in Section 2 (Watershed Characterization).

In order to combine these layers and compare areas with lower or higher pollutant export potentials, the data in each layer was ordered into 2-5 categories or bins, each of which was given a ranking score of 1-5 (Appendix A). For the land use categories, each land use was assigned five different ranking scores, one for each of the pollutants (phosphorus, nitrogen, sediment, and pathogens) and a combined pollutant ranking score (Appendix B). The combined score represents the combined pollutant export potential for all four pollutants when considered together. The categories and ranking scores were defined by WCD staff using relevant literature and expert knowledge.

The spatial layers (and their associated ranking scores) were combined in ArcMap10 using the Merge tool and Calculate field tool to create unique polygons each with a different overall ranking score. For each polygon, the ranking scores for the contributing input layers was summed to create a relative overall ranking score. A higher relative overall ranking score represents an area with a higher potential of pollutant export or CSA. Section 4.1 describes the different CSAs that were created based on the input layers.

The overall ranking scores were categorized as low, medium, medium-high or high pollutant export potential. The areas with a ranking of medium-high or high are the ones defined as a CSA. Maps were created to illustrate the locations of the CSAs within the watershed and help draw conclusions about the most influential terrain and land use factors contributing to CSAs within the Wiser Watershed (Section 4.1, Figures 20 through 25).

Table 7. Spatial data layer model inputs were grouped into two categories: terrain factors and land use factors.

Terrain Factors	Land Use Factors
Annual average precipitation	Land use classification
Proximity to waterways	Livestock presence (from livestock surveys)
Location relative to flood zone	Septic system locations and compliance status
Soil Drainage Class	
Slope (derived from DEM)	

4.2. Critical Source Areas Identified

The modeled critical source areas (CSA) in the Wiser Watershed are described through a series of six maps (Figure 20–25) including:

- (1) Critical source areas considering terrain factors only (Figure 20).
- (2) Critical source areas considering terrain factors and land use with pollutant risk combined for the four pollutants (nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment, and pathogens) (Figure 21).
- (3-6) Critical source areas considering terrain factors and land use with each pollutant (nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment, and pathogens) considered individually (Figures 22 through 25).

The layers included in the CSA calculations for each map are listed in Table 7; more information on each layer can be found in Appendix A. The CSA ratings displayed on the map (Low, Medium, Medium-High, High) are based on the CSA scores described in Section 4.1 (Spatial Modeling Approach). A Critical Source Area is defined as an area with a rating of high or medium-high.

It should be noted that the area within the city boundaries of Ferndale, Lynden and Everson is not included in Figures 21-25 due to the difficulty in accurately modeling contributing sources (i.e., stormwater, residences, greenways, etc.). Since urban area source contributions are not the focus of this assessment, this area was left unmodeled and CSA ratings not provided. This area *is* included in Figure 20 where only terrain factors (and not land uses) are considered in the model.

The CSA identified for terrain (Figure 20), combined (Figure 21), and individual pollutants (Figures 22-25) shows the effect of both the land features and land use on each assessment. For the terrain map, areas with steep slopes and poorly drained soils had a significant impact on elevating the rating. This can be seen in the combined map which highlights the impact that certain land uses can have on increasing the rating when also overlaid on higher risk terrain. These maps showcase the use of the model to select and tailor conservation practice implementation by location and land use. Further differentiation can be made by assessing the individual pollutant maps which provide insight into the combination of terrain, land use, and pollutant potential when a targeted practice implementation approach is desired. In addition to focused practice implementation by land use, the maps also show locations where targeted outreach on practice and/or land management can be done. By overlapping land assessment maps (Figures 12 through 15) with the CSAs, these locations can be prioritized in programs and planning.




Figure 20. Potential critical source area contribution rating for terrain factors in the Wiser Watershed.




Figure 21. Potential critical source area ratings based on terrain and land use factors in the Wiser Watershed using the combined pollutant ranking score.




Figure 22. Potential critical source area ratings for Phosphorus based on terrain and land use factors in the Wiser Watershed.




Figure 23. Potential critical source area ratings for Nitrogen based on terrain and land use factors in the Wiser Watershed.




Figure 24. Potential critical source area ratings for Sediment based on terrain and land use factors in the Wiser Watershed.




Figure 25. Potential critical source area ratings for Pathogens based on terrain and land use factors in the Wiser Watershed.

4.3. Treatments and Opportunities

Conservation Management Practices

NRCS provides conservation practice standards that outline the purpose, applicable conditions, and criteria for why, where, and how a conservation management practice is applied to achieve its intended purpose. Tables 8 and 9 show the top identified NRCS practices for water quality protection for the Cropland and Farmstead categories assessed, respectively. Practices were identified by WCD and local NRCS staff by reviewing the land use survey and the NRCS primary practices list to determine which practices were relevant to the local conditions and would have the largest impact on improving water quality. Further ground-truthing of the effectiveness of each practice, for each pollutant, is encouraged to identify impact to modeled pollutants.

It should be noted that selection of practices for a cropland or farmstead site is typically done as a suite to achieve the desired resource protection outcome. It is less common for a singular practice to achieve the desired conservation goals. Additionally, some practices, such as Riparian Forest Buffer (NRCS Practice Standard 391), work best when implemented by several landowners in a connected fashion over a waterway, not as discrete, disconnected pockets. Therefore, practices should be selected based on current cropland and farmstead conditions, landowner goals, and desired level of resource protection.

For more effective use, the information provided in Tables 8 and 9 should be coordinated with the CSA results presented in Figures 20 through 25 to identify the top land uses and areas in the watershed to apply the practices to. In this way, the planning approach will be targeted to the most effective and promising land uses.

Assessment of Management Scenarios

In addition to identifying CSA based on terrain and land use features, this model can be used to inform decision making around management practice implementation. The following two examples show how this could be done in the Wiser Watershed.

Identify potential locations for management practice installation. Terrain and land use features impact both the feasibility of practice installation and the effectiveness of the practices installed. For example, Structure for Water Control (NRCS Practice Standard 587) are an effective practice when installed to improve irrigation water management but should not be installed on well-drained soil types where the practice will not be necessary. The model could be used to evaluate or prioritize locations for these water control structures within the watershed.

Better understand how management practices will impact water quality across the watershed. Broad implementation of conservation management practices can minimize the risk of pollutant runoff, thereby reducing the amount of high and medium-high CSAs. By incorporating these practices into the pollutant ranking scores used within the model (see Section 4.1, Appendix B), reductions in CSA can be estimated.

Table 8. Most effective NRCS conservation management practice(s) identified for surface water quality protection by agricultural crop.

Conservation Management Practice	Irrigation Water Management	Structure for Water Control	Nutrient Management	Manure Application Setbacks	Prescribed Grazing	Conservation Cover / Cover Crop/Conservation Crop Rotation	Field Border	Filter Strip	Riparian Forest Buffer	Mowing / Brush Management	Underground Outlet (Ditch Cover) / Drainage Ditch Covering
NRCS Practice Standard Code	449	587	590		528	327/340/328	386	393	391	314	620/775
Crop-Blueberry	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x
Crop-Caneberry	x		x	x		x	x	x	x		x
Crop-Corn	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x
Crop-Forage	x	x	x	x					x		x
Crop-Pasture	x	x	x	x	x				x		x
Crop-Nursey	x		x	x		x			x		
Crop-Orchard	x		x	x		x			x		
Crop-Potatoes	x	x	x	x		x	x		x		x
Crop-Unmanaged			x	x					x	x	

Table 9. Most effective NRCS conservation management practice(s) identified for surface water quality protection by farmstead type.

Conservation Management Practice	Watering Facility	Feed Management (Seasonal Feeding)	Fence / Access Control	Field to Road Tracking	Heavy Use Area	Roof Runoff Structure & Outlet	Waste Transfer	Waste Storage Facility	Roofs and Covers	Access Road	Vegetative Treatment Area	Agrichemical Facility (Fertilizer mixing)
NRCS Practice Standard Code	614	592	382/472		561	558	634	313	367	560	635	309
Farmstead-Crop				x		x						x
Farmstead-Dairy	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	
Farmstead-Other Animal	x	x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	

5. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Watershed Assessment Summary

The watershed assessment was conducted on the Wiser Watershed to better understand the dynamics of the pollutants of concern (Nitrogen, Phosphorous, Sediment, Pathogens) including the source areas of these pollutants and the way in which management practices can be implemented in the watershed to reduce pollutant concentrations and loading.

A spatial modeling approach was used to identify potential CSA based on terrain characteristics, land use, and estimated impacts. These CSA are areas that can be targeted for management practice implementation through improved outreach, planning, and even NRCS cost-share prioritization. This strategy is covered further in Section 6 (Outreach), which identifies outreach strategies for communicating with landowners in the watershed.

5.2. Practice Implementation Recommendations

This assessment has identified current agricultural land uses (Table 4) and potential conservation practices (Tables 8 and 9) which are recommended for the Implementation Phase of the NRCS NWQI program. These practices are based on local land use, climate, effectiveness, and practicality. Additional modeling work needs to be conducted to identify the most effective practices for each land use based on current practices by the landowner. This information needs to be gathered on an individual basis through landowner engagement.

Estimation of costs for recommended practices should be based on current EQIP cost-share rates.

5.3. Effectiveness Monitoring

The following subsections outline the various areas that NRCS, along with key partners, can establish and track metrics of success for determining the effectiveness of NRCS programs, planning, and practice implementation at protecting surface water quality. By developing a strategic tracking plan in conjunction with this Watershed Assessment, efforts can be directed where they are needed to achieve a greater level of resource protection and/or document those existing efforts that are already successful.

Effectiveness Monitoring of Watershed Plan

Without a tracking and monitoring plan in place, it is difficult to assess the impact and success of the recommend watershed improvement plan. It is recommended that the Implementation Phase of the NRCS NWQI watershed plan define and track *measurable* metrics for progress in the following three categories:

1. *Implementation*: Location of where NRCS practices are currently being implemented and to what level. This would be conducted by NRCS and partners such as WCD.
2. *Effectiveness*: Water quality levels at or near implementation sites that are measurable as concentration reductions or load reductions. This would be conducted by local WCWP partners and others as applicable and shared with NRCS.
3. *Broader Impact*: Improvements in *downstream* water quality (Lower Mainstem Nooksack stations (M2 and M1), and WA DOH marine monitoring stations) to relate

actions in the Wiser watershed to improvements in the greater Nooksack Watershed and shellfish restoration objectives. This monitoring is conducted by local WCWP partners and evaluated routinely, including by WA DOH, which evaluates marine water quality patterns and growing area closures.

Conservation Practice Implementation Monitoring

The implementation of conservation practices to the landscape is imperative to reduce any impacts of terrain and land use interactions as demonstrated in Section 4.2. To assess both the coverage by land use type and resource impact, implementation of conservation practices across the watershed should be tracked by NRCS and planning partners such as WCD including:

- Number of landowners/operators contacted
- number of landowners/operators participating in programs including land use type and relevant demographic information
- Number of historically underserved producers contacted or enrolled
- Number and type of pollution sources identified
- Number of farm plans completed
- Number and location of practices planned and installed/implemented
- Number of acres treated by implemented practices
- Summary CSA rating of land that practices were installed on

This information could then be aggregated by land use type and CSA if applicable and compared to practices listed in Tables 8 and 9 for applicability. The outreach plan may inspire conservation stewardship outside the tracking parameters identified above, intrinsic motivation to change behavior, or management not associated with NRCS or WCD programs. These results are more difficult to quantify and would require follow up survey post-implementation for adequate assessment.

Conservation Practice Monitoring

While average effectiveness of conservation practices can be estimated using best available science, the monitoring of conservation practices on the ground is valuable to determine their effectiveness over different terrain features, local conditions, and management strategies. Successful conservation practice monitoring has been shown using Edge of Field (EoF) monitoring for assessing the impact of land management activities to adjacent surface waters. This system installs surface flow (and sub-surface flow, when appropriate) monitoring equipment at the edge of a field/area in a controlled experimental design (control-treatment scenario), and implements specific management practices/scenarios on the land surface and measures their potential impact/protection on water quality.

Continued EoF monitoring in Whatcom County is recommended in order to collect event mean concentration (EMC) data for various soils, land use types and practices. These EMC values could be used to strengthen the spatial modeling described in this assessment or to support other modeling by local and State. EoF data also gives indication of when specific soil types have surface runoff, data which can be used to strengthen the model and/or assist in tailored conservation practice implementation. These results can guide recommendation of various conservation practices for maximum protection of water quality.

For more information on the NRCS Edge of Field Monitoring program:

<https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/water/quality/tr/?cid=stelprdb1240285>

Conservation Planning

Conservation planning, also referred to as “farm planning”, is an important part of the overall success and monitoring of the watershed plan. The planning process allows interaction with individual landowners and assessment of their level of implementation of current and planned practices. It also allows a planner to conduct an assessment of their landscape, which can be used to validate the model parameters and improve the effectiveness of conservation practice implementation. Lastly, the final step of the planning process requires the process of adaptive management and plan evaluation. This can be used to track progress of individual landowners in implementation of land use activities and subsequent water quality impacts, both positive and negative. It can also assist in modification of practice adoption or implementation as new science-based information is obtained about practice effectiveness. It is recommended that the activities associated with adaptive management be added to the long-term planning process as a practice to ensure they are conducted.

Water Quality Monitoring

Water quality sampling provides an on-going, real-time way to look at water quality on a scalable level (i.e., by total watershed, sub-watershed, or field level) to assess actions taken within a discrete area. Current water quality monitoring efforts are conducted locally by the WCWP partners. The following recommendations are those activities that support the watershed assessment and monitoring for progress:

- *Current water monitoring* - WCWP partners conduct regular surface water fecal bacteria monitoring. This includes both the twice-monthly monitoring of ambient stations, routine sub-basin focus area sampling, and continued source identification and storm event monitoring as needed to track and address sources or bacteria pollution within the watershed.
- *Needed surface water monitoring* - Regular sampling of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment (as TSS or turbidity) in the Wiser Watershed is recommended, at minimum, on a quarterly schedule to establish a baseline and progression of watershed impacts. Consistency in which analytes are measured (e.g. nitrate and nitrate or nitrate+nitrite; total nitrogen or Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen) between agencies and projects would allow the tracking of trends over time for these nutrients. Targeted sampling in areas with CSAs is recommended to validate the model and effectiveness of implemented practices.
- *Field level runoff monitoring* - WCD conducts field level analysis of conservation practices through the NRCS Edge-of-Field program. Installation of additional sites are encouraged in areas identified as medium-high and high CSAs testing recommended water quality practices (Table 8 and 9).
- *Additional analysis* - Relate flow measurements on Bertrand Creek (USGS 12212390 and Ecology 01N060). with bacteria monitoring results in order to estimate seasonal or storm-driven flow at these stations and calculate loading based on measured pollutant concentrations.

Tracking Data Metrics and Trends over Time

To assess the short- and long-term impact of NRCS actions in the watershed, local NRCS offices are required to review and report on metrics for each NWQI watershed. It is recommended that NRCS review existing local water quality data on at least an annual basis in conjunction with their annual metrics of planning and practice implementation to track metrics of success. A process for identifying, tracking, and reporting on key metrics will be coordinated between the local NRCS staff and the WCD. This metric tracking and reporting process will consider all NWQI watersheds in Whatcom County such that similar metrics are being tracked and reported for each watershed.

The recommendation of this assessment is that annual reports be prepared locally and build on *existing* frameworks for tracking both conservation practice implementation and water quality. The level of detail and format of these reports should be agreed upon by local NRCS staff and their colleagues at the national level.

It should be noted that an existing framework of water quality monitoring stations already exists in the watershed for the purpose of monitoring fecal coliform bacteria (see Section 3.4). The existing layout of these stations may not be broad enough nor ideally located to get a comprehensive assessment of NRCS activity impact, but it can provide some metric of impact when assessed in conjunction with other data sources and non-NRCS activities within the watershed.

Metrics to be tracked and reported on *may* include:

- Three-year trends, annual and/or seasonal data of fecal bacteria water quality results for key watershed monitoring stations. Key stations will be identified such that they show water quality patterns in each of the subbasins of the Wiser Watershed and how these subbasins contribute bacteria relative to the concentrations or loading in the mainstem Nooksack River.
- Metrics of NRCS work in the watershed over the past year, including number of clients, acres treated, and practices planned and installed.
- A brief description of important watershed successes or challenges over the past year that provide context for other metrics being tracked. This could include, for example, changes in shellfish harvest closure status, new partnerships, regulatory activities, or significant precipitation or flooding events.

5.4. NEPA Concerns

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1964 requires all federal agencies to conduct an environmental review of all federal actions. This requirement also applies to area wide or watershed planning activities. As part of these plans, the responsible federal agency is required to evaluate the individual and cumulative effects of the actions being proposed. Any project that has significant environmental impacts must be evaluated with an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) unless the activities are eligible under a categorical exclusion or are covered by an existing EA or EIS.

NRCS utilizes a planning process that incorporates an evaluation of potential environmental impacts using an Environmental Evaluation checklist. NRCS also has categorical exemptions for several different activities that include many of our conservation practices. These categorical

exemptions include conservation practices that reduce soil erosion, involve the planting of vegetation and/or restore areas to natural ecological systems.

The Wiser Watershed Plan recommends implementation of conservation practices that have successfully been utilized in the region for years. These practices include several nutrient and erosion control field-based practices that are covered by categorical exclusions, and a range of structural practices that are used to address manure management issues on the farmstead. Figures 20-25 should be used to identify the top land uses and areas in the watershed that should be targeted for practice selection and implementation to increase effectiveness of plan implementation.

As part of the planning process, each planned practice will be evaluated individually and combination with other planned practices to ensure it meets the criteria of the categorical exclusions and any existing Environmental Assessments. Any significant negative practice impacts, either individually or cumulatively, will first try to be avoided, then minimized and/or mitigated to the extent possible or eliminated from the individual farm plan if necessary. There is not an expectation that the practices planned for implementation in the Wiser Watershed will necessitate an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement.

6. OUTREACH

6.1. Outreach Plan Goals and Objectives

This Watershed Outreach Plan for the Wiser Watershed is designed to increase participation in conservation programs and implementation of conservation practices by focusing outreach on the lands and landowners with the highest probability of adoption and biggest potential impact on water quality. To date, the majority of cooperators for Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) and National Water Quality Initiative (NWQI) programs have been dairy producers, so this plan also focuses on building messaging and materials to engage and enroll previously underrepresented agricultural types that can have a large impact on water quality.

The objective of this plan is to provide the framework to develop outreach materials to inform and educate target landowners of the technical assistance and tools available to them by considering their values, communication preferences, and trusted sources of information. Outreach goes beyond just informing the public and stakeholders about watershed conservation goals, but rather informs NRCS and partners about issues, barriers, and preferred practices for the watershed then focuses on the outreach audiences that can create the biggest benefit.

6.2. Background Analysis for Audience Selection

The intent of this plan is to focus outreach on the lands and landowners with the highest probability of conservation practice adoption and biggest potential impact on water quality. Those with the highest probability of adoption are those landowners with familiarity of NRCS, then those with the highest motivation. The identification of those with the biggest potential impact on water quality are those landowners with parcels intersecting lands with medium-high to high Critical Source Area (CSA) ratings (see Section 4 Resource Analysis Assessment).

Primary Livestock Types in Watershed

Dairy, Cattle and Horses are the primary livestock types (85% of total livestock, and 9%, 43%, and 33%, respectively) in the Wiser Watershed according to the livestock survey (Table 5). These specific audiences have distinctly different motivations to enroll in conservation programs and different trusted sources of information to reach them; therefore, each audience requires unique outreach tools. These are broken down in Section 6.4.

Primary Land Use Types in Watershed

Of the parcels have been identified with a CSA rating of med-high or high (Section 4 and Appendix C), there are a few land use types that stand out as priority audiences for targeted outreach. Crops represent 77% (7,378 acres) of all lands that are in the med-high to high CSA rating, and 17% of the total acreage in the watershed (Appendix C). Specifically, forage and corn represent 41% (3,908 acres) and 14% (1,350 acres), respectfully, of all med-high to high CSA acres in the watershed. These are the primary crop types to enroll in conservation programs as they will have the highest impact on watershed health. These two land use types are primarily associated with Dairy operations with a small percentage of forage acres also represented by Cattle and Horse; therefore, prioritizing these audiences will be an important focus. Pasture, which accounts for 2,149 acres of the watershed, is almost primarily associated with cattle and

horse operations. Of those acres, 919 acres (43%) is CSA, indicating that these audiences can have a large impact on water quality.

Additionally, Berry and Potato crop acres represent 4% (328 acres) and 2% (158 acres), respectfully, of all med-high to high CSA acres in the watershed. While these land use types are a relatively small number of acres, this defined set of landowners provides a great opportunity for outreach as the communication can be one-on-one for greatest impact. It should be noted that within the Berry category, blueberry crops and raspberry crops are grouped, but have different CSA acre values (167 (8%) and 161 (4%) acres, respectively). Raspberries have a lesser number of CSA acres because they tend to be grown on well drained soils away from adjacent waterbodies, while blueberry crops are grown on heavier soils, often with closer proximity to water.

Of the total acres in the watershed, 17% of the Natural land use area was listed as CSA. This includes riparian areas and vegetated stream corridors, which are often home for wildlife and can be a source of nutrient and pathogens entering waterways. While there is not a lot that can be done to mitigate these impacts, they are important to note.

For a complete table of the land use types with med-high to high CSA ratings as compared to the total watershed, see Appendix C.

6.3. Target Audience Prioritization

Focusing outreach on the lands and landowners with the highest probability of adoption and biggest potential impact on water quality will yield the greatest impact on resource management within the watershed. To assess this, we have first classified landowners as qualifying for NRCS programming, then categorized them by their CSA rating and likeliness to participate. The following definitions outline the different categories that were considered when classifying a property by CSA and likeliness to participate.

High impact property: For the purpose of the metrics collected in this analysis, landowners with a Critical Source Area (rating of med-high or high) on a significant portion of the parcel (>40%) are referred to as “high impact properties”.

- There are 1,449 unique landowners on high impact properties which represents 1,977 total parcels on 9,303 acres. This includes both agriculture and non-agriculture properties.

Agricultural parcels: Properties identified as “agricultural parcels” are assumed to qualify for NRCS programs. Agricultural parcels have been identified by the following criteria: zoned agricultural, and/or those with observed agricultural related activities, and/or those that participate in the Open Space Farm and Agriculture (OSAG) program. OSAG is a voluntary tax reduction program, where participants must prove income generated from agricultural related activities. Using property use codes as designated by Whatcom County Assessor’s office, this analysis showed that:

- Of the 10,079 total parcels in the watershed, 1,566 were determined as agricultural/likely qualifying for NRCS programs, representing 76% of total watershed acreage.
- Of these 1,566, there are 1,086 total parcels on high impact properties, representing 8,379 acres and 692 unique landowners.

Likeliness to participate: The highest probability of participation is associated with a landowner's familiarity and trust of NRCS. Cooperators who have previous experience in NRCS cost-share programs will have the highest rate of participation. This was determined through information gathered on NRCS program participation within the last 10 years in the watershed (personal communication with NRCS staff, September 2020).

- 34 producers in the watershed have worked with NRCS in the past 10 years.
- Of the 692 landowners on high impact properties, 17 of them have participated in NRCS cost-share programs.
- 675 landowners have not worked with NRCS and are on high impact parcels. These include both small and large agricultural landowners.

Based on the definitions above, landowners have been divided into four audience types representing their impact to the watershed and likeliness to participate in NRCS programs (Figure 26). The 1,566 agricultural parcels identified in the watershed are categorized as:

- **Audience 1:** High Impact, Likely to Participate. Received NRCS assistance in the last 10 years and are on a high impact property. **17** landowners.
- **Audience 2:** High Impact, Less Likely to Participate. Have not received NRCS assistance but are on a high impact property. **675** landowners.
- **Audience 3:** Low Impact, Likely to Participate. Received NRCS assistance in the last 10 years but are on a lower impact property. **17** landowners.
- **Audience 4:** Low Impact, Less Likely to Participate. Have not received NRCS assistance and are on a lower impact property. These would be the lowest priority for outreach. **860** landowners.

A list of landowners/operators identified in this plan by audience type and agricultural land use category can be made available to NRCS upon request.




Figure 26. Audience prioritization by likeliness to participate (familiarity with NRCS) and impact on water quality (Critical Source Area Rating).

6.4. Outreach Strategy by Audience Type

Understanding barriers to conservation, what motivates people to adopt conservation practices, who influences adoption of practices, and how information is best disseminated are some key elements that should be understood for success of meeting conservation goals. Knowing what landowners consider to be benefits to practice adoption and addressing their concerns around participation is critical to make conservation practices appealing to landowners.

Historically, Dairy audiences have been the primary participants in NRCS cost-share programs (particularly EQIP) and thus recipients of NRCS funding in the Wiser Watershed. This is primarily driven by the responsibility of the producer to comply with the state's Dairy Nutrient Management Act (RCW 90.64) and local manure ordinance, and secondarily by the need for dairy producers to be an economically viable and stay current in a competitive market.

Additionally, the familiarity and availability of local technical assistance through the Whatcom Conservation District (WCD) provides a trusted messenger for the Dairy audience.

Recommendations included here strive to reach a broader audience, inclusive of many land use types, that have been traditionally underrepresented in NRCS programming.

Recommendations include development of materials and messages that engage potentially eligible landowners on high risk properties by tailoring outreach messaging to motivate them to start the process and get connected with the WCD or NRCS. We broke out the primary agricultural groups (Horse, Cattle, Potato, Berry, Dairy) and provided pertinent information on motivational factors and barriers. In particular, we list the “Priority” and “Motivational” conservation practices which are those practices that address water quality (Priority) and those that entice or grab attention of the landowner (Motivational) (Appendix D).

- **Priority Practices:** Those conservation practices with highest return on investment for resource conservation.
- **Motivational Practices:** As a landowner considering bottom line, return on investment, chore efficiency, and overall farm management, these are the practices the help their business thrive with reduced risk.

Each of the following audiences is important for more broadly addressing the resource management needs and water quality concerns within the Wiser Watershed. Numerical codes listed after conservation practices are the NRCS Practice Standard number.

Horse or Equine Facilities

- 115 facilities in watershed.
- *Priority conservation practices:* Fence (382), Waste Storage Facility (313), Roofs and Covers (367), Nutrient Management (590)
- *Motivational conservation practices:* Watering Facility (614), Livestock Pipeline (516), Irrigation Water Management (449)
- *Barriers:* Familiarity with NRCS, intimidation by large construction projects, financial, time management
- *Motivators/incentives:* Farm aesthetics, animal health, chore efficiency, relief from regulators/complaints
- *Preferred communication method/format:* WCD farm planner, word of mouth, social media, boarding facility client feedback
- *Preferred communication partners/messengers:* Backcountry Horsemen, NW Horse Source magazine, peer

Cattle Operations

- 132 unique operators in watershed.
- *Priority conservation practices:* Nutrient Management (590), Prescribed Grazing (528), Heavy Use Area (561)
- *Motivational conservation practices:* Irrigation Equipment and Pipeline (430)
- *Barriers:* Familiarity with NRCS, not wanting to work with government, financial burden to cover upfront costs
- *Motivators/incentives:* Animal health, relief from regulators
- *Preferred communication method/format:* WCD farm planner, word of mouth, social media
- *Preferred communication partners/messengers:* Whatcom County Cattleman Association, Everson Auction Market, KGMI radio

Potato Growers

- Approximately 1,084 acres and 3 growers in watershed.
- *Priority conservation practices:* Conservation Cover (327), Nutrient Management (590)
- *Motivational conservation practices:* Waste Facility Closure (360), Irrigation Water Management (449), Underground Outlet/Drainage Ditch Covering (620/775)
- *Barriers:* Leasing or renting of fields, rotation with other crops, very few growers in watershed
- *Motivators/incentives:* Financial, cover ditches to farm on top of it, farm more acreage, fill in existing waste storage ponds
- *Preferred communication method/format:* word of mouth, social media
- *Preferred communication partners/messengers:* WID, WSU Extension, Whatcom Family Farmers, Washington State Potato Commission

Berry (Caneberry, Blueberry) Growers

- Approximately 6,322 acres and 40 growers in watershed.
- *Priority conservation practices:* Field Border (386), Agrichemical Handling Facility (309), Nutrient Management (590)
- *Motivational conservation practices:* Underground Outlet (620), Conservation Cover/Cover Crop (370/340), Hedgerow Planting (422), Irrigation Water Management (449)
- *Barriers:* Do not want to work with government, limited practices that are applicable, language/cultural
- *Motivators/incentives:* Financial, cover ditches to farm on top of it, gain more acreage, East Indian population for historically underserved
- *Preferred communication method/format:* Cultural centers, word of mouth
- *Preferred communication partners/messengers:* Washington Red Raspberry and Blueberry Commissions, WSU Extension, WID

Dairy Producers

- Approximately 15,329 acres (Forage, Corn, and Dairy Farmstead) and 31 facilities in watershed.
- *Priority conservation practices:* Nutrient Management (590), Cover Crop (340), Roof Runoff Structure/Outlet (558)
- *Motivational conservation practices:* Waste Storage Facility (313), Underground Outlet (620), Irrigation Pipeline (430)
- *Barriers:* Do not want to work with government, tradition
- *Motivators/incentives:* Trust, familiarity, relief from regulators
- *Preferred communication method/format:* word of mouth, mailers, personal communication
- *Preferred communication partners/messengers:* NRCS, WCD, Washington State Dept of Agriculture (WSDA), Farm Service Agency (FSA) newsletters, Whatcom Family Farmers, KGMI radio

6.5. NRCS Outreach Barriers and Recommendations

In Whatcom County, NRCS lacks a direct outreach and communication presence with local producers and landowners and has long relied on local WCD staff to bring cooperators into their programs. From interviews with local NRCS staff, it appears that funds are allocated for planning and programs, but there is little to no funding available for outreach and education. Reliance on other agency staff for landowner engagement has proven sufficient to date (demonstrated by NRCS cost-share dollars allocated in Whatcom County), yet WCD and NRCS staff have identified shortcomings and barriers to enrollment in NRCS programs for a number of crop and livestock producers.

General barriers to NRCS program participation include:

- Landowners do not hear about NRCS programs directly and do not engage in the process (no method of communication). This is particularly true for individuals who have not previously worked with NRCS nor have an existing relationship with WCD.
- Information and deadlines for programs are usually communicated by NRCS late (not enough time to engage and complete all paperwork and planning in time to meet deadlines) and/or deadlines are changed without much notice to the public.
- NRCS materials and notices regarding programs are not user friendly and can be very difficult to read and interpret, particularly for landowners. Additionally, materials are not translated for local non-English speaking audiences, who also tend to be historically underserved audiences.
- Many small farms in the watershed are not eligible for programs such as EQIP.

Another significant barrier is the requirement of a Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (CNMP) for enrollment of livestock operations into EQIP programs, which presents a large hurdle for producers and planners to work through including:

- Many of the farmers in the watershed are small operations (<20 acres), therefore CNMP is too robust for their use.
- There are a limited number of local certified CNMP planners or Technical Service Providers (TSP) to complete a CNMP.
- The time required to complete a CNMP is considerable, which can be frustrating to producers particularly if they do NOT end up receiving EQIP funds.

Recommendations for NRCS specific outreach improvements:

- 0.5 FTE (full time equivalent) devoted to outreach and information dissemination.
- Translation of material into priority languages to support historically underserved audiences.
- Revamping current NRCS program materials to be more photo-centric, user friendly, and locally relevant for all target audience.
- Create landowner stories of NRCS projects in local papers/newsletters that represent examples for all target audiences.
- Provide news releases in local media on program open enrollment periods and deadlines with simple, clear instructions on eligibility and application procedures.
- Given the priority audiences outlined in Section 6.3, develop mailing lists for Audience Types 1 and 2. Using locally relevant, audience specific messaging (as outlined in Section 6.4) developed a mailing strategy at critical times throughout the year.

- Enroll and engage partners in both agricultural and non-agricultural sectors (Section 6.7) in general water quality awareness outreach. NRCS outreach staff should collaborate with all partners and develop trusting relationships so that information sharing is simple and fluid. Specifically, we recommend engaging with Whatcom County Pollution Identification and Correction (PIC) Outreach Committee and Field Staff.

6.6. Evaluation of NRCS Program Impact and Adaptive Management

To assess the impact of NRCS programs on improvements in water quality in the watershed, NRCS should assess water quality metrics in a meaningful way. WCD and local water quality partners will work with NRCS to generate an annual metrics reporting framework including identification of water quality metrics, progress reports on water quality changes over time, landowners contacted, project planned, conservation practices implemented, and others as needed (see Section 5.3 for more detail on these recommended metrics). These annual reports will also be distributed to local stakeholders for continued program support.

Water quality impairments in the Wiser Watershed and Nooksack Basin have come about over many decades and may take time to fully resolve. Therefore, simply using water quality improvements as a measure of outreach plan effectiveness is likely inadequate in the short-term. Confirmation that new producers are being engaged and enrolling in programs will be the best evaluative tool to assess outreach plan effectiveness. Over the long-term, established monitoring in the Wiser Watershed and Nooksack Basin will allow NRCS and local partners to track water quality changes over time (Section 5.3).

To track the results of this outreach strategy, a survey should be administered within one year of outreach implementation to determine if the following social outcomes have been met:

For the target agricultural audiences:

- Increased awareness of technical assistance programs available
- Increase awareness of NRCS and Whatcom CD
- Increase adoption of practices to improve water quality

For the general or non-agricultural audience:

- Increased awareness of water quality issues
- Changes in attitudes toward water quality improvements
- Increased support for water quality improvement projects

Local partners including the WCD could provide guidance and recommendations to NRCS on how to complete this survey. For examples of survey methodology and potential metrics to evaluate, refer to the *NRCS NWQI Outreach Plan for Tenmile Watershed* (Whatcom Conservation District, 2018)

6.7. Partners in Outreach

Development and implementation of the outreach plan for the Wiser watershed will involve partners to ensure the plan is supported throughout the watershed. Below is a list of local partners who have been identified as trusted messengers of information and should be engaged in the communication and outreach effort to ensure broader sharing and success in water quality goals.

Agricultural Audience Focus

[Natural Resource Conservation Service](#)

The Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) conservationists provide technical expertise, conservation planning, and distribute financial assistance for farmers, ranchers and forest landowners wanting to make conservation improvements to their land. The Everson Service Center provides services for all of Whatcom County including the Wiser Watershed.

[Whatcom Conservation District](#)

The Whatcom Conservation District (WCD) mission is to assist land managers with their conservation choices, through a variety of services including farm planning, habitat programs, outreach, and education. Since 1946, WCD has worked to promote responsible stewardship, sustainable land management, and support for natural resource based economies.

[Washington State Department of Agriculture](#)

Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) Dairy Nutrient Management Program work directly on Dairy Nutrient Management Act (RCW 90.64) compliance. Dairy Nutrient Management Program regulatory staff inspect dairy facilities and provide technical assistance to dairy producers. Staff monitor water quality and follow a referral process to communicate to partner agencies about possible manure-related discharges and complaints regarding dairy and non-dairy agriculture properties.

[Watershed Improvement Districts](#)

The Watershed Improvement Districts (WID) are special purpose district managed by farmers and landowners who live and work within the district. The South Lynden WID, Bertrand WID and Laurel WID each overlap significant portions of the Wiser Watershed. The North Lynden WID overlaps a small portion of the Wiser Watershed.

[Washington State Department of Ecology](#)

Washington State Department of Ecology, Water Quality Program works directly on non-dairy agriculture, Water Pollution Control Act (RCW 90.48) compliance. Regulatory staff monitor water quality, identify sources of preventable fecal bacteria pollution from non-dairy agricultural properties, and offer residents technical help to fix pollution sources. Staff may use enforcement authority when a landowner is unwilling to act to fix an identified and preventable fecal bacteria pollution source.

[Washington State University](#)

For nearly a century, WSU Whatcom County Extension has worked with local agriculture producers to bring research-based information to improve the productivity, efficiency, economic well-being, and safety of products produced in this diverse agricultural community. WSU Extension is a local trusted resource, particularly to berry and potato growers in Whatcom County.

Whatcom Family Farmers

Whatcom Family Farmers is a non-profit organization with a mission of preserving the legacy and future of family farming in Whatcom County by unifying the farming community and building public support. They reach out with positive messages on farmer stewardship, food safety, animal welfare, and the positive relationships farmers have with their employees. This organization is a leader and trusted voice in the farm community.

Washington Red Raspberry Commission

The Washington Red Raspberry Commission (WRRC) was formed in 1976 to support and promote the raspberry industry. They establish promotion plans and conduct programs for advertising, sales, promotion, and/or other programs for maintaining present markets and/or creating new or larger markets for raspberries.

Washington Blueberry Commission

The Washington Blueberry Commission was formed under a marketing order from the Director of Agriculture in 1969, following Washington Agricultural Enabling Act of 1955. The commission serves as a touchstone for grower advocacy, research and best practices, and marketing for the hardworking growers and their 18,000+ planted acres across Washington State.

Washington State Potato Commission:

The mission of the Washington State Potato Commission is to support an economically and environmentally sustainable Washington State potato industry by providing strong leadership and innovation and building partnerships to meet the demands of global consumers.

KGMI - News Talk Radio 790:

KGMI News/Talk 790 covers issues related to Whatcom County, including a weekly farming show. Trusted and most listened to radio station by Whatcom County farmers.

Other Agricultural Industry Based Organizations:

Washington State Dairy Federation, Whatcom County Cattlemen's Association, Whatcom Chapter Backcountry Horsemen of Washington, Whatcom County Dressage and Eventing Association, Everson Auction Market.

Non-Agricultural or General Audience Focus

Whatcom County Public Works

Whatcom County Public Works' Pollution Identification and Correction (PIC) Program uses water quality monitoring data to identify areas with high levels of bacteria in surface waters and work with local landowners to reduce these water quality problems. The PIC program provides community outreach and education, technical and financial assistance for landowners, and coordination with County departments and other agencies to identify and address potential bacteria sources.

Whatcom County Health Department

Whatcom County Health Department (WCHD) manages community health and environmental health, including oversight of on-site sewage (OSS) evaluations and code enforcement. Partner in Whatcom County PIC program. Staff provide homeowner education, technical help, and notification regarding proper septic system operation and maintenance. Staff also enforce codes and investigate septic-related complaints

Whatcom County Planning & Development Services

Whatcom County Planning & Development Services (PDS) oversees environmental permitting in Whatcom County, including activities that impact shorelines, wetlands, and other critical areas. PDS works regularly with Whatcom County Public Works and other partners through the PIC program. Critical Areas Ordinance (WCC: Title 16.16) compliance - PDS regulates land use in unincorporated Whatcom County, including ensuring that farms comply with the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO). PDS approves farm plan applications submitted for compliance with the CAO through Whatcom County's Conservation Program on Agriculture Lands (WCC 16.16. Article 8).

7. REFERENCES

- Ayetan, O. 2019 GIS Assessment of Groundwater Recharge Potential in Whatcom County, Washington State: Implications for Land Use. Thesis: University of British Columbia. Accessed 03 July 2020 at <http://lfs-mlws.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2019/09/Ayetan-2019-GIS-Assessment-of-Groundwater-Recharge-Potential-in-Whatcom-County.pdf>
- Bandaragoda C, Greenberg J, Dumas M, Gill P. 2012. Lower Nooksack Water Budget. Whatcom County, WA: WRIA 1 Joint Board. Accessed 30 September 2020 at <http://wria1project.whatcomcounty.org/>.
- Cohan, B. 2018. Hydrologic and Nutrient Fluxes in a Small Watershed with Changing Agricultural Practices. WWU Graduate School Collection. 684. Accessed 28 September 2020 at <https://cedar.wvu.edu/wwuet/684>.
- Curran, CA, Anderson, SW, Foreman, JR, Beaulieu J. 2018. Suspended sediment concentration and loads in the Nooksack River Basin, northwest Washington: U.S. Geological Survey data release. Accessed 03 July 2020 at <https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/5a32c98be4b08e6a89d883c6>
- Dept. of Ecology. 2020. Washington State Water Quality Assessment 303(d)/305(b) List. <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/ApprovedWQA/ApprovedPages/ApprovedSearch.aspx>
- Hood S. 2002. Nooksack River Watershed Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load- Detailed Implementation Plan. WA Department of Ecology Water Quality Program. Accessed 28 September 2020. <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0110060.pdf>
- Joy J. 2000. Lower Nooksack River Basin Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load Evaluation. WA Department of Ecology- Environmental Assessment Program, Watershed Ecology Section. Accessed 28 September 2020. <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0003006.pdf>
- [NRCS] Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013. National Planning Procedures Handbook (NPPH), Amendment 5. Title 180 – National Planning Procedures Handbook. US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Accessed 30 September 2020 at <https://directives.sc.egov.usda.gov/OpenNonWebContent.aspx?content=33234.wba>.
- Puget Sound Partnership. 2014. *The 2014/2015 Action Agenda for Puget Sound, Section 4: Local Recovery Actions, Whatcom County/Nooksack Watershed*. Puget Sound Partnership. Accessed 28 September 2020 at http://www.psp.wa.gov/downloads/2014_action_agenda/Final%202014%20action%20agenda%20update/2014-2015_Action_Agenda_for_Puget_Sound.pdf
- RH2 Engineering, Inc. 2016. *Public Utility District No. 1 of Whatcom County: Quantification of Agricultural Irrigation Water Use and Water Rights*. RH2 Engineering, Inc. Accessed 13 September 2020 at <http://wria1project.whatcomcounty.org>
- Schilling KE, Wolter CF, McLellan E. 2015. Agro-hydrologic Landscapes in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River Basins. *Environmental Management* 55:646-656. DOI 10.1007/s00267-014-0420-x

[USDA] United States Department of Agriculture. Census of Agriculture for Whatcom County, WA. 2017. USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service. Volume 1, Chapter 2. Available at: <https://www.nass.usda.gov/>.

Whatcom Conservation District. 2018. *NRCS NWQI Outreach Plan for Tenmile Watershed*. Whatcom Conservation District. Accessed 25 November 2020 at <https://whatcomcd.org/research-projects>.

Whatcom County Agriculture-Watershed Pilot Project. 2016. *Agriculture-Watershed Characterization and Mapping Report for the Laurel Watershed Improvement District*. Whatcom County Planning & Development Services, August 2016. Accessed 6 September 2020 at <https://sites.google.com/site/wcwatershedag/home>.

Whatcom County Agriculture-Watershed Pilot Project. 2017. *Project summary*. Whatcom County Planning & Development Services, August 2016. Accessed 6 September 2020 at <https://sites.google.com/site/wcwatershedag/home>.

8. LOCAL CONTACTS

Whatcom Clean Water Program

<https://www.whatcomcounty.us/DocumentCenter/View/41596/WhatcomCleanWaterProgram>

Washington State Department of Health PIC Programs

<https://www.doh.wa.gov/CommunityandEnvironment/Shellfish/EPAGrants/PathogensGrant/PIC>

Department of Ecology Bellingham Field Office - Water Quality Program

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/wqhome.html>

EPA Region 10

<https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/epa-region-10-pacific-northwest>

WSDA Dairy Nutrient Management Program

<https://agr.wa.gov/departments/land-and-water/livestock-nutrients>

Whatcom County Public Works

<http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/308/Public-Works>

<http://wa-whatcomcounty.civicplus.com/1072/Water-Quality>

Whatcom County Health Department

<http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/360/Health-Department>

Whatcom County Planning & Development Services

<http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/358/Planning-Development-Services>

Nooksack Tribal Natural Resources

<http://nooksacktribe.org/departments/natural-resources/>

Lummi Nation Natural Resources

<https://www.lummi-nsn.gov/Website.php?PageID=1>

Whatcom Conservation District

<http://www.whatcomcd.org/>

Washington State Conservation Commission

<http://scc.wa.gov/>

Watershed Improvement Districts

<https://www.southlyndenwid.com/>

<https://www.bertrandwid.com/>

<https://www.laurelwid.com/>

Ag Water Board

<http://www.agwaterboard.com/>

Whatcom Family Farmers

<http://www.whatcomfamilyfarmers.org/>

Nooksack Salmon Enhancement Association

<http://www.n-sea.org/>

9. APPENDIX

Appendix A. Inputs to the spatial model. Each input represents a geographic information systems (GIS) data layer.

Feature	Description	Categories and associated ranking (1-5)	Data Source
Terrain Features			
Slope	Average slope of 100 ft by 100 ft area derived from LiDAR images. Slope categories are based on those used by Schilling et al. 2015.	0-1% slope = 1 1.01-2% slope = 2 2.01-5% slope = 3 5.01-10% slope = 4 >10% slope = 5	Derived from WA DNR LiDAR
Soil drainage class	Drainage class from NRCS soils layer	Gravel, Somewhat Excessively drained = 1 Well drained, Moderately Well drained = 2 Somewhat poorly drained = 3 Poorly drained = 4 River wash, Very poorly drained = 5	NRCS Soils
Precipitation	Annual rainfall (inches)	Less than 40 = 1 40.01-46 = 2 46.01-50 = 3 50.01-54 = 4 54.01-58 = 5	Texas A&M University
Proximity to waterways	Distance to waterways defined by waterway buffers within GIS. A shorter distance to a waterway is reflected as a higher ranking score.	100- 180 feet = 1 81- 100 feet = 2 41-80 feet = 3 11- 40 feet = 4 Less than 10 feet = 5	NW WA Waterways based on National Hydrography Dataset (NHD)
Flooding potential	FEMA flood maps categorized by flood zones (Percent annual flood risk corresponds to 500-year and 100-year floodplains)	Less than 0.2 % annual flood risk = 1 0.2% annual flood risk = 2 1% annual flood risk = 3 Regulatory floodways = 5	FEMA flood maps

Feature	Description	Categories and associated ranking (1-5)	Data Source
Land cover Features			
Land use category	WCD classifications based on Whatcom County and USDA layers, aerial imagery, and windshield surveys	28 categories (see Appendix B for categories and associated pollutant rankings)	Whatcom Conservation District 2020
Presence of livestock	Properties with livestock determined by windshield surveys, WCD and WCWP partners 2015-2020	No livestock observed = 1 Livestock observed = 5	Whatcom Conservation District 2020
Locations of septic systems	Onsite Septic Systems (OSS) in Whatcom County, including the OSS compliance status	No septic on parcel = 1 Status New or In-compliance (IN) = 2 Status Out of Compliance (Out, OutL) = 3 Status Septic Failing = 5	Whatcom County Health Department 2019
Miscellaneous			
Watersheds	Watershed boundaries based on LiDAR and National Hydrography Dataset (NHD)	NA	Whatcom Conservation District 2020
Parcels	Whatcom County parcel layer	NA	Whatcom County 2019

Appendix B. Land use categories with associated pollutant rankings and definitions.

Land Use Category		Pollutant Rankings					Definition of Land use Category
Primary	Secondary	Phosphorus	Nitrogen	Sediment	Pathogens	Combined	
Crop	Blueberry	2	4	3	1	3	Blueberry crop, all varieties and management.
Crop	Caneberry	2	4	4	1	3	All caneberries including raspberry, blackberry, currant.
Crop	Corn	4	4	4	4	4	All corn varieties including silage corn and sweet corn.
Crop	Fallow	2	2	5	1	3	Uncultivated land with no crop growing or field that has been plowed/harrowed but not planted in a crop for at least an entire growing season; not in short term transition to a second crop.
Crop	Forage	5	5	2	5	5	Perennial grass or other forage crop grown and harvested for silage or hay with at least one seasonal cutting; likely to have had at least one seasonal manure application; category does not include seasonal cover crop.
Crop	Pasture	4	4	4	4	4	Field is being managed as grazing land for the majority of the year; animals are actively grazed on the pasture; field can have one seasonal forage harvest, but must primarily be used for grazing.
Crop	Potatoes	4	4	5	1	4	Potatoes actively growing in field, even if short term rotation.
Crop	Orchard	2	2	2	1	2	Any type of crop grown in an orchard, including, but not limited to, apples, pears, cherries, grapes, etc.
Crop	Nursey	1	1	2	1	2	A managed setting where plants are propagated and grown to a desired age or size.
Crop	Unmanaged	1	1	2	1	2	No, or very low, management of field. Typically, a "wild" grass stand is growing. Material not harvested annually.
Crop	Small grain	4	4	4	3	4	All small grain crops including wheat and barley.
Crop	Strawberry	2	3	4	1	3	Strawberry
Crop	Vegetable	2	2	2	2	2	All vegetable crops grown for commercial sales.
Crop	Other	3	3	3	3	3	Any other type of crop not categorized in this list.
Developed	Gravel	1	1	2	1	2	Gravel mining area, active or inactive.
Developed	Commercial Turf Grass	2	4	2	1	3	Managed and fertilized turf grass including commercial turfgrass, golf courses, parks, sports fields, and cemeteries. Not residential turf grass.

Developed	Residential Turf Grass	2	3	1	1	2	Turf or lawn associated with residences; may be manicured and fertilized.
Developed	Roads	1	1	2	1	2	Paved, public roadways; does not include private, gravel or unmaintained roads
Developed	Commercial	1	1	2	1	2	Impermeable and permeable surfaces for commercial purposes, including businesses, industrial, driveway, and parking surfaces.
Developed	Residential	1	1	2	1	2	High or low density residential including impermeable (i.e., driveway, hardscaping) and permeable (i.e., lawn, garden) surfaces
Developed	Unmanaged	1	1	2	1	2	Unmanaged permeable areas associated with roadways, commercial, or residential properties.
Farmstead	Crop	1	1	2	1	2	A farmstead (i.e., buildings, house) associated with a crop farm.
Farmstead	Dairy	2	2	2	2	2	A farmstead (i.e., buildings, house, manure storage) associated with a dairy farm.
Farmstead	Other Animal	3	3	3	3	3	A farmstead (i.e., buildings, house, manure storage, heavy use area) associated with a livestock property (may include horses, beef cattle, pigs, goats, etc.).
Riparian	Riparian	1	1	2	2	2	Any area adjacent to a waterway or waterbody with permanent or semi-permanent vegetation.
Forest	Forest	1	1	2	2	2	Natural or managed forest stand.
Water	Water	1	1	1	1	1	Any waterbody including lakes, stream, river, or ditch (perennial or seasonal).
Wetland	Wetland	1	2	1	2	2	Seasonal or perennial wetlands.

Pollutant Rankings Key	
1	very unlikely to export pollutant (no pathway) / no or very low contribution
2	unlikely to export /low or very low contribution of pollutant
3	somewhat likely to export/ potential for a moderate contribution
4	likely export pathways/ potential for a moderate to high contribution
5	very likely an export pathways/ greatest contribution of pollutant

Appendix C. Critical Source Areas (CSA) by land use category. The total watershed acreage includes only the portion of the Wiser Watershed in WA.

Land Use Category	Total acres of land use in watershed (acres)	Land use acreage classified as CSA ¹ (acres)	Acreage classified as CSA within land use	Land use acreage classified as CSA / Total acres in watershed (9,363 acres)	Land use acreage classified as CSA / Total CSA acres in watershed (2,669 acres)
TOTAL	44,668	9,584	NA	21%	100%
Crop	28,437	7,378	26%	17%	77%
Blueberry	1,973	167	8%	0%	2%
Caneberry	4,261	161	4%	0%	2%
Corn	4,935	1,350	27%	3%	14%
Fallow	193	20	10%	0%	0%
Forage	9,731	3,908	40%	9%	41%
Nursery	346	14	4%	0%	0%
Orchard	23	1	6%	0%	0%
Other	1	0	28%	0%	0%
Pasture	2,149	919	43%	2%	10%
Potatoes	1,084	158	15%	0%	2%
Small Grain	89	19	21%	0%	0%
Strawberry	88	0	0%	0%	0%
Unmanaged	3,322	657	20%	1%	7%
Vegetable	122	4	4%	0%	0%
Farmstead	1,837	325	18%	1%	3%
Crop	380	19	5%	0%	0%
Dairy	663	161	24%	0%	2%
Other Animal	798	145	18%	0%	2%
Developed	6,789	295	4%	1%	3%
Commercial	675	13	2%	0%	0%
Gravel	472	3	1%	0%	0%
Residential	4,105	116	3%	0%	1%
Road	802	120	15%	0%	1%
Comm. Turf Grass	69	0	1%	0%	0%
Res. Turf Grass	360	19	5%	0%	0%
Unmanaged	311	23	7%	0%	0%
Natural	7,642	1,602	21%	4%	17%
Forest	4,256	383	9%	1%	4%
Riparian	2,191	749	34%	2%	8%
Water	1,158	463	40%	1%	5%
Wetland	41	7	18%	0%	0%

¹CSA = Critical Source Area with rating of medium-high or high.

Appendix D. NRCS surface water quality conservation management practices for cropland and farmstead by outreach audience type.

Audience	Cropland Practices												
	Irrigation Water Management	Structure for Water Control	Nutrient Management	Setbacks	Prescribed Grazing	Conservation Cover / Cover Crop / Conservation Crop Rotation	Field Border	Filter Strip	Riparian Forest Buffer	Vegetative Treatment Area	Waste Transfer	Underground Outlet (Ditch Cover) / Drainage Ditch Covering	Watering Facility/ Livestock pipeline
NRCS Practice Standard Code	449	587	590/634	590	528	327/340/328	386	393	391	635	634	620/775	614/516
Dairy *	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	M	
Cattle/Equine*	M	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	M
Potato	M	x	x	x		M	x	x	x			x	
Berry	x	x	x	x		M	x	x	M			M	

*Crops associated with Dairy include forage and corn; crop associated with Cattle and Equine is pasture.

Audience	Farmstead Practices						
	Roof Runoff Structure/ Outlet	Heavy Use Area	Fence	Waste Storage Facility	Waste Facility Closure	Roofs and Covers	Agrichemical Handling Facility
NRCS Practice Standard Code	558	561	382	313	360	367	309
Dairy	x		x	M		x	
Cattle/Equine	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Potato					M		x
Berry					M		x