Index

A - B

adoption
  barriers, 258
  motivation, 257
  rates of, 30, 33, 353
agrichemical management, 4
Agricultural Research Service, 4
agriculture, 15–16
algal blooms, 175, 236, 247, 298
AnnAGHPS, 253, 322–323
Annualized Agricultural Nonpoint Source Pollution model, 253, 322–323
APEX, 273–277
aquatic habitats, 330–332, *see also* fish
aquifers, 287
argillic horizons, 267
Arkansas, *see* Lincoln Lake Watershed
ARS, 4
atrazine, *see* herbicides
attitudes and values, 195–196, 257
bacteria, 18, 19–20
  postimplementation, 332
  preimplementation, 189, 207, 330, 360
best management practices, 171
BMPs, 171
buffer strips, 228
business people, 14, 20, 25, 27–28

C

Cannonsville Reservoir Watershed, 5, 9, 296–298
  conservation practices, 21, 41, 299–302
  modeling, 303–308
  outreach education, 26–27, 29, 309
  regional uniqueness, 15, 16
  socioeconomics, 128, 308–309
  water quality, 18, 64, 298–299, 302
cattle production, 173, 301, 323
CDs, 337
CEAP, *see* Conservation Effects Assessment Project
Central Platte Natural Resources District, 5, 9, 286–289
  conservation practices, 20, 22, 23, 24, 31, 41, 290–292
  outreach education, 28, 294
  regional uniqueness, 15, 17
  socioeconomics, 128, 293–294
  water quality, 18–19, 64, 289–290, 292–293
channel stabilization, 363–364
Cheney Lake Watershed, 5, 9, 246–248
  conservation practices, 21, 22–23, 24, 249–252
  modeling, 252–256
  outreach education, 26–27, 30, 258–259
  regional uniqueness, 15, 16–17
  socioeconomics, 127, 256–258
  water quality, 18, 64, 248–249, 252
cities, 18, 30, 246–248
claypan, 267
Clean Water Act, 3
climate, 15, *see also names of specific watersheds*
coastal plains, 187
communication, 33
communities, 16–17
compact disks, 337
CONCEPTS, 226–227
conservation assessment, 91–94
Conservation Channel Evolution and Pollution Transport System, 226–227
conservation education, 33
Conservation Effects Assessment Project, 4–9
  conservation practices, 53
  outreach education, 139–144, 151–167
  socioeconomics, 125–126
  water quality monitoring, 62–65, 68–70
  watershed modeling, 94–96

(c) SWCS. For Individual Use Only

conservation practices, 3–4, 36–55, *see also names of specific watersheds*
  before and after project, 30–32
  documentation and monitoring, 50–52
  effective, 20–26, 32, 33
  farmer adoption of, 4
  implementation, 6, 7, 46–50, 160–164
  increased awareness, 31
  lessons learned, 45–52
  optimal, 7
  selection of, 45–46
Conservation Reserve Program
  conversion, 203, 205
  economics, 195–196
  in forest, 192
  new practices, 32
  in prairie, 247
Conservation Security Program, 192
conservation tillage
  benefits, 20–21
  as business decision, 22–24
  effectiveness, 228
  erosion control, 225
  long-term, 332
  promotion of, 30, 319
contamination, *see* pollution
cost, 177
cost share programs
  desirability, 4, 228
  as incentive, 22, 31, 195–196, 308–309, 368
cost-benefit, 19, 30, 33, 171, 309
cover crops, 191, 237
cow-calf production, 188, 298
crop production, 15
  grain, 222, 236, 247, 288, 298, 317–318
  row crops, 188–189, 202–203, 266
  vegetables, 189, 222
cropland, 329, 359
  cropping systems, 14
  management plan, 205–206
  rotation, 225
CRP, *see* Conservation Reserve Program
CSP, 192

D - E

dairy operations, 298
data management, 191, 270
Demonstration Project Program, 4, 6
design of conservation programs, 160–166
designated use, 203
dissolved oxygen, 189, 330, 360
documentation, 50–52
Eagle Creek Watershed, 5, 9, 234–236
  conservation practices, 23, 30, 40, 237–238
  modeling, 239–241
  outreach education, 29, 243
  regional uniqueness, 15
  socioeconomics, 127, 241–243
  water quality, 18, 19, 20, 64, 236–239
economics, 6–7, 22, 28, 31, 178, *see also* socioeconomics
educational assistance, *see* outreach education
elected officials, 14, 15, 16
Environmental Quality Incentives Program, 177, 330
EQIP, 177, 330
equipment, 177
erosion, 20, 361
  control, 4, 21
  ephemeral, 252
  STEEP project, 224
  streambank, 204
estrogenics, 237
ethnicity, 17
eutrophication
  postimplementation, 238–239
  preimplementation, 172, 236, 247, 298, 318–319
experimental design, 6
extension service, 26–28, 32, 33
  outreach, 179–180, 309, 336
  personnel, 14, 20, 21, 26, 28, 174–175

F - G

fact sheets, 259, 368
families, 16–17
farm ponds, 191
farm promoters, 243
Farm Service Agency, 4
farmers
  on conservation practices: before and after, 31–32
  on educational assistance, 26–27, 28–29

(c) SWCS. For Individual Use Only

informant survey, 20–22, 24, 26–27, 31
on regional uniqueness, 14, 15–16
on success of conservation practices, 20, 21, 22, 24–25, 26
on water quality concerns, 20
farms, 15–16
federal agency personnel
on educational assistance, 28
informant survey, 14
on regional uniqueness, 14, 17
on success of conservation practices, 21, 24–25
on water quality concerns, 18–19, 20
feedlot operations, 236
fertilizer, 18–19, 22, 290–291
field days, 29, 309, 324
filter strips, 174, 191, 237
financial assistance, 4
fire, 22
fish
postimplementation, 207, 333–335, 352
preimplementation, 204, 236, 330–332, 345
flooding, 328
floodplains, 187
forests, 16, 188, 192, 222, 298, 317, 359
FSA, 4
funding, 7, 24–25, 27, 30, 33
Generalized Watershed Loading Function, 304
genetically modified seeds, 20
geographical information systems, 192, 259, 306–307
geography, 7
geomorphology, 7
Georgia, *see* Little River Watershed
GIS, 192, 259, 306–307
Goodwater Creek Watershed, 5, 9, 265–268
conservation practices, 21, 24, 31–32, 40, 270–272
modeling, 273–277
outreach education, 279–280
regional uniqueness, 17
socioeconomics, 127, 277–279
water quality, 18, 64, 268–270, 272–273
government agencies, influence of, 129–131
grassed waterways, 20, 21, 26, 30, 191, 271, 319
gravel stream crossings, 347
grazing, controlled, 174
grazing land, 363–364
grazing management, 4
ground water quality, 7, 16
gully plugs, 225, 228
GWLF, 304

H - K

herbicides, 17, 18, 20, 32
postimplementation, 238–239, 272–273
preimplementation, 204, 206–207, 236, 269
hogs, 247, 323
Hydrologic Unit Area Program, 4, 6
hydrology, 7, 14
Idaho, *see* Paradise Creek Watershed
immigrants, 17
Impact Analysis for Planning System, 177
IMPLAN, 177
incentives, 33, 136, 228
Indiana, *see* Eagle Creek Watershed
informants, key, 12–14
infrastructure, 19–20, 33
interviews, 8, 129–131
Iowa, *see* Walnut Creek and Squaw Creek Watersheds
irrigation practices, 18–19, 20, 288, 290, 291, 329
Kansas, *see* Cheney Lake Watershed
key informants, 12–14, 129–131
knowledge contributions
conservation practices, 42–45
outreach education, 144–146
socioeconomic, 126–132
water quality monitoring, 65–68
watershed modeling, 96–104
knowledge level, 177
knowledge transfer, 4

L

Lake Erie, 318–319
land treatment, *see* conservation practices
land use, 14–15, 32, 174–175, *see also names of specific watersheds*
lawsuits, 18
legume use, 174

(c) SWCS. For Individual Use Only

lessons learned, 5, 8
conservation practices, 45–52
NIFA-CEAP watershed studies, 152–160
outreach education, 146–148
socioeconomic, 132–135
water quality monitoring, 68–75
watershed modeling, 104–109
Lincoln Lake Watershed, 5, 9, 14, 171–173
conservation practices, 40, 174–175
modeling, 175–176
outreach education, 171, 177–179
regional uniqueness, 15
socioeconomics, 127, 177–179
water quality, 18, 64, 173, 175
litigation, 172–173
litter application, 174
Little Bear River Watershed, 5, 9, 358–360
conservation practices, 31, 41, 363–365, 369
modeling, 366
outreach education, 368
regional uniqueness, 15
socioeconomics, 128, 367
water quality, 19, 20, 64, 360–363, 365–366, 369
Little River Watershed, 5, 9, 187–189
conservation practices, 21, 22–23, 24, 31, 40, 191–193
modeling, 193–195
outreach education, 27–28, 29, 196–197
socioeconomics, 127, 195–196
water quality, 32, 64, 189–191, 193
livestock, 15–16
livestock production, 247, 266
cattle, 173, 323
hogs, 247, 323
poultry, 172–173, 189
sheep, 329
local agency personnel
on conservation practices, 22
on educational assistance, 28
on regional uniqueness, 14, 15, 17
on water quality, 20
on water quantity, 20
Lower Calapooia River Watershed, 5, 9, 327–329
conservation practices, 22, 24, 41, 332
modeling, 335–336
outreach education, 27, 336–337
regional uniqueness, 15, 16
socioeconomics, 128, 336
water quality, 20, 64, 330–335

M - N

mailings, 180, 279
manure management, 22, 30, 171, 173, 302, 363–364
media, 211, 337
meetings, 29, 258–259, 279, 280, 336, 354
Missouri, *see* Goodwater Creek Watershed
Model Implementation Program, 3–6
models and modeling, *see also names of specific watersheds and models*
application, 110–113
development, 110
economic factors, 133
integrate with monitoring, 164–166
recommendations, 75–77
selection of, 105–106
watershed, 84–113
mountains, 16, 221–222
narratives, 8
National Institute of Food and Agriculture, 4–9
objectives, 53, 68–70, 125–126
organization of assessments, 6
outreach education, 139–144
synthesis of watershed studies, 151–167
water quality monitoring, 62–65
watershed modeling, 94–96
National Nonpoint Source Monitoring Program, 4–6
National Wildlife Refuges, 203
Natural Resources Conservation Service, 4, 25–28, 32, 33
Nebraska, *see* Central Platte Natural Resources District
New York, *see* Cannonsville Reservoir Watershed
newsletters, 229, 279–280, 324
NIFA, *see* National Institute of Food and Agriculture
nitrate, *see* nitrogen
nitrogen, 17, 18–19, 22
management, 21–22
postimplementation, 238, 272, 292–293, 302, 320–322, 332–333, 351–352

(c) SWCS. For Individual Use Only

preimplementation, 173, 189–190, 204, 205, 206, 268, 287–289, 330
NNPSMP, 4–6
nonpoint source pollution, 17–18
agricultural, 203–204, 223
dairy operations, 298
forests, 223
grazing land, 223
research on impacts, 3
Rural Clean Water Program, 3–4
urban, 223
North Fork Ninnescah Watershed, 255–256
no-tillage, 20–21, 22–24, 30
nutrient loading, 193, 268
nutrient management, 4, 237
cornerstone practice, 300
failure of, 23
nitrogen, 18–19, 21–22, 290–291
phosphorus, 320
nutrient transport, 171

O - R

Ohio, *see* Rock Creek Watershed
Oregon, *see* Lower Calapooia River Watershed
outcome expectations, 353
outreach education, 4, 7, 8, 22, 24–30, 32, 33, 135–149, 159–160, *see also names of specific watersheds*
Paradise Creek Watershed, 5, 9, 221–223
conservation practices, 24, 32, 40, 224–225
modeling, 226–227
outreach education, 229–230
socioeconomics, 127, 227–229
water quality, 64, 223–224, 225–226
pastures, 171, 203, 236, 247, 359
pavement, 19
Pennsylvania, *see* Spring Creek Watershed
personal care products, 237
pesticides, 19, 268
pharmaceuticals, 237
phosphorus, 17, 18
postimplementation, 252, 272, 320–322, 351–352, 366
preimplementation, 173, 189–190, 207, 248, 268, 298, 330
pollution, 4, 16, 18, 21, 345, *see also names of specific pollutants*
population, 15, 17, 19
posters, 280
poultry production, 172–173, 174, 189
prairies, 203, 247
presentations, 180, 211, 229–230, 280, 309, 368
project management, 6
Project WET (Worldwide Water Education), 29
protocols, 78–79
quality of life, 16–17
rain gardens, 30
recommendations
conservation practices, 53–55
outreach education, 148–149
socioeconomic, 135–136
water quality monitoring, 75–77
watershed modeling, 110–113
recreation, 246, 266
regional uniqueness, 14–17, 32
regression-based models, 175, 252, 256, 366
regulation, 177
remediation, 4
remote sensing, 237–238, 306
research papers, 309
reservoirs, 15, 18, 360, *see also* Cannonsville Reservoir Watershed; Cheney Lake Watershed; Eagle Creek Watershed; Goodwater Creek Watershed
residents, 14, 20
Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation, 224, 252, 256
riparian buffers, 21, 30, 191, 225, 235, 332, 347, 363–364
riprap, 347
risk assessment, 179, 258
river terraces, 187, 288
Rock Creek Watershed, 5, 9, 23, 316–318
conservation practices, 20–21, 22, 30–31, 41, 319–320
modeling, 322–323
outreach education, 27, 28–29, 324
regional uniqueness, 15
socioeconomics, 128, 323
water quality, 19–20, 64, 318–319, 320–322
rolling hills, 173, 221–222
runoff, 4, 17, 19

(c) SWCS. For Individual Use Only

Rural Clean Water Program, 3–4, 6
RUSLE2, 224, 252, 256

S

schools, 29
sediment control, 4
sediment loading
  postimplementation, 225–226, 252
  preimplementation, 206, 268, 319
sediment transport, 171, 206
sedimentation, 17, 18, 19, 21, 173, 189, 223, 345
SedNet, 348–351
septic systems, 19–20
set-aside land, 22
sewage treatment, 17, 19–20
sheep, 329
site visits, 8
socioeconomics, 6–7, *see also names of specific watersheds*
  contributions to knowledge, 126–132
  economic considerations, 120–123
  lessons learned, 132–135
  recommendations, 135–136
  social considerations, 124–125
soil, 14
Soil and Water Assessment Tool, *see names of specific watersheds*
Soil and Water Conservation Districts, 27–28, 32, 33, 337
soil loss, 20
soil testing, 23, 174
soils, *see names of specific watersheds*
Solutions to Environmental and Economic Problems, 224
special projects, 294
Spring Creek Watershed, 5, 9, 342–345
  conservation practices, 24, 41, 347–348
  modeling, 348–351
  outreach education, 354
  regional uniqueness, 16
  socioeconomics, 128, 353–354
  water quality, 18, 19, 64, 345–347, 351–353
stakeholders, 4, 8, 171, 177–178, 180, *see also specific kinds of stakeholders*
state agency personnel, 14
  on conservation practices, 20–21, 23–25
  on regional uniqueness, 14
  on water quality, 19, 20
STEEP, 224
stewardship beliefs, 241–242
stream fencing, 21, 30, 174
stream restoration, 4, 21, 225
streambank stabilization, 363–364
strip cropping, 228
subsidy programs, 33–34
surface water quality, 7
survey informants, 12–14
surveys, 177–178, 180, 230, 324
SWAT, *see names of specific watersheds*
Synthesizing and Extending Lessons Learned, *see* Lessons Learned

T - V

technical assistance, *see* outreach education
templates, 7, 8
terraces, 20, 21, 26, 191, 271
tillage practices, 20–21, 22–24, 30
TMDL, 223, 225–226
topography, 14, 16, *see also names of specific watersheds*
total maximum daily load, 223, 225–226
total suspended solids, 330, 332–333, 351–352
tours, 309
tradeoffs, 178–179, 209
training, 309, 368
underground outlets, 21
United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)
  Model Implementation Program, 3–6
  Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), 4
United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 4–6
  Model Implementation Program, 3–6
Universal Soil Loss Equation, 208, 224, 252, 256
universities and university personnel, 14, 20, 21, 24, 26, 28
upland divides, 173
urban areas, 222, 234, 317
urban development, 15, 17, 189, 235
USLE, 208
Utah, *see* Little Bear River Watershed

(c) SWCS. For Individual Use Only

valleys, 328, 343
variable source area models, 303–307
Variable Source Loading Function, 304–305
voluntary compliance, 8
VSA, 303–307
VSLF, 304–305

W - Y

Walnut Creek and Squaw Creek Watersheds, 5, 9, 15, 201–203
  conservation practices, 22–23, 40, 205–206
  modeling, 207–208
  outreach education, 209–211
  regional uniqueness, 15
  socioeconomics, 127, 208–209
  water quality, 64, 203–205, 206–207
wastewater treatment, 236, 298
water chemistry, 330–331
Water Erosion Prediction Project, 226–227
water quality, *see also names of specific watersheds*
  changes, 6
  concerns, 17–20, 32–33
  monitoring, 3–4, 22, 23–24, 58–62, 65–75, 78–79
  protection/improvement, 158–159
water resources, 14
watershed association personnel
  on conservation practices, 22, 25, 31
  on educational assistance, 29
  informant survey, 14
  on regional uniqueness, 14
  on water quality, 19, 20
watershed modeling, 84–113, *see also names of specific watersheds*
  conservation practice implementation, 40
  contributions to knowledge, 96–104
  lessons learned, 104–109
  recommendations, 110–113
webinars, 354
WEEP, 226–227
wetlands, 21, 191, 225, 328
wildlife, 319–320
  postimplementation, 333–335, 351, 352
  preimplementation, 203, 205, 207, 246, 330–332, 344
wind erosion, 20
woodlands, 171
workshops, 29, 180, 197, 211
Worldwide Water Education, 29
yield benefits, 19

(c) SWCS. For Individual Use Only