# Northern Forest Watershed Incentives Project



Science at Work for a Sustainable World

State of the Bay October 21, 2010

John Gunn, Ph.D. Senior Program Leader Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences Brunswick, Maine jgunn@manomet.org



11/4/2010

Manomet Natural Capital Initiative

1

### **NF Watershed Incentives Project Goals**

- Restore, enhance, and protect aquatic resources in two important watersheds in Northern Forest
- Develop a replicable marketbased model for transactions to protect and enhance watershed services
- Highlight and enhance the connection between upstream <u>family forest owners</u> and downstream water users





# **Project Funding**

- Conservation Innovation Grant
  - \$500K Federal Funding
  - \$500K Project Match
  - 3-Years





### **Project Partners**

#### Crooked River Watershed





American Forest Foundation



Upper Connecticut River Watershed



John Gunn - jgunn@manomet.org

tgartner@wri.org

<sup>9</sup> David Sleeper - dsleeper@hbresearchfoundation.org



THE WESTERN FOOTHILLS LAND TRUST

Lee Dassler - wflt@megalink.net



Mary Russ - mary@whiteriverpartnership.org

11/4/2010

Manomet Natural Capital Initiative

# **Crooked River Watershed**

• Source of Portland Water District drinking water to 200,000 customers in 11 Maine communities (40% of Sebago volume)

• Basin covers approximately 275 square miles and is predominantly forested

• Priority watershed for forest conversion (*Forests, Water, and People* study)

• Sebago Lake (and Crooked River) supports indigenous populations of landlocked Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* sebago) and habitat for T&E species



### **Upper Connecticut River Watershed**

• Watershed spans portions of VT and NH and comprises 16 major tributaries, 12 of which drain 100 square miles or greater

• Numerous tributary dams create reservoirs, and groundwater provides drinking water to multiple municipal water suppliers

 32% of the Connecticut River watershed's known water-supply areas are protected

• American Heritage River, National Scenic Byway, Recreational resources

Major salmon restoration efforts and habitat for T&E species



### **Summary of Watershed Concerns**

- Forest conversion and fragmentation
- NPS water pollution from land management activities
- Pollution from aging municipal water treatment plants, septic, and storm event overflow
- Proposed dam construction
- Loss of flood plains
- Invasive species
- Loss of biodiversity
- CC impacts



# Making the Case

- Defining the Threats
- Understanding Beneficiaries and Marketplace Drivers
- Practices and Incentives
- What do we get for the \$?
- Telling the Story



# Beneficiaries

- Need to know:
  - Who uses the water
  - How they use it
  - How they benefit from "clean" water
  - How they fit into a broadly-defined market framework



#### First PMBus System Power Management and Protection IC





Improves reliability
Reduces power consumption

### **Demand Drivers**

- VT Law School Land Use Institute:
  - Regulatory Driver Review for VT, NH, ME
- Case Studies
  - VT LUI
  - Yale FES (Drinking Water)





#### 11/4/2010

Manomet Natural Capital Initiative

### What can we do? Example Practices

| Riparian Buffer                       | <ul> <li>Increase width beyond statutory minimums</li> <li>Increase forest cover within buffer</li> </ul> |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Culverts and Drainage<br>Improvements | <ul><li>Resize culvert</li><li>Rehabilitate drainage and vegetative buffers</li></ul>                     |  |  |
| Vegetative Cover                      | • Forest cover replaces agriculture or other land cover   |  |  |
| Road Retirement                       | • Discontinue non-essential forest or agricultural roads  |  |  |
| Silvicultural Practices               | <ul> <li>Higher retention</li> <li>Low-impact equipment (reduce rutting)</li> </ul>                       |  |  |
| Road Network                          | <ul><li>Upgrade road network</li><li>Permanent bridges</li></ul>  |  |  |

### Where should we focus our \$ and effort?

Priority Parcels for Source Water Protection Northern Forest Watershed Project Albany and parts of Bethel, Mason and Stoneham



- GIS Threats Assessment: Paul Barten, Bill VanDoren, UMass
- estimates of water quality changes associated with forest conversion and other land use impacts
- Conservation Priority Index - prioritization of parcels

### **Conservation Priority Index**

|                       | Landscape<br>characteristic          | Why is it important?  | Increasing<br>importance<br>3 | 2                      |                 | → Decreasing<br>importance |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Soils<br>(1/2 weight) | Land use                             | In the northeast,forest provides the best<br>source water quality   | Forest/wetland                | -                      | -               | All others                 |
|                       | Distance to streams<br>(feet)        | Vegetated, and especially, forested<br>riparian buffers are a "last chance" to<br>absorb nutrients and trap sediment: | 0-100                         | 100-200                | 200-300         | >300                       |
|                       | Distance to<br>ponds/wetlands (feet) | forested riparian areas also provide key<br>organic and structural inputs   | 0-100                         | 100-200                | 200-300         | > 300                      |
|                       | Depth to water table                 | Removing forest cover can increase soil water, increasing the likelihood of overland flow.                            | shallow                       | moderate               | deep            | _                          |
|                       | Permeability                         | Soils through which water infiltrates<br>slowly readily exhibit overland flow, which<br>decreases water quality       | poorly drained                | moderate               | well drained    | —                          |
|                       | Slope                                | Steep slopes are more at risk for erosion<br>when deep-rooted trees that anchor soil<br>are removed                   | steep<br>(>   5%)             | moderate<br>(5 – I 5%) | gentle<br>(<5%) | _                          |
|                       | Water – Forest –<br>Roads            | Roads area source of sediment, and a<br>forested buffer can mitigate sediment and<br>pollutants                       | yes                           | no                     | no              | no                         |

#### Manomet Natural Capital Initiative

# Where We're Going



- Develop (or enhance) <u>Infrastructure</u> for Direct Payments/Cost Share for Practices
- Gray vs. Green Infrastructure analysis
- Conservation Easements (evaluate vs. direct payments)
- Leveraging other ES Revenue Streams (e.g., carbon \$ for riparian restoration)
- Demonstrate
- Outreach and Education connecting people, forests, and water

### **Fundamental Challenges**

- Making the Case When Most Beneficiaries Don't Know There is a Problem (or soon will be)
- Communicating the Complexities to BOTH the Buyers and Sellers
- Assuring that we get what we pay for, and can keep it
- Creating Self-sustaining Systems (that can last until we get to Capitalism 3.0)

