By Corey Hanson, Red Lake Watershed District Water Quality Coordinator. 4/18/2018.

- ✓ Continuous dissolved oxygen monitoring results from the 2017 monitoring season
- ✓ Clearwater River Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy Project
- ✓ Thief River Falls Stormwater Water Quality Study
- ✓ Clearwater River Watershed Lakes Stressor Identification Report

#### Red Lake Watershed District Long-Term Monitoring Program

2017 dissolved oxygen logger data from the Mud River in Grygla was compiled, corrected, and summarized. Dissolved oxygen levels frequently (21 of 50 days with flow, 42%) dropped below 5 mg/L. As shown in the following chart, low dissolved oxygen levels typically coincided with low flows. Flow dropped to zero cubic feet per second at Highway 89 for five days in September.



#### Clearwater River Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy (WRAPS) Project

- Objective 10 Reports
  - Streams in the Clearwater River Watershed were classified for the prioritization of restoration and protection efforts using impairment status, fish index of biological integrity scores, macroinvertebrate index of biological integrity scores, *E. coli* data, dissolved oxygen, total phosphorus, Minnesota Stream Habitat Assessment scores, and total suspended solids data. Lakes were classified for restoration or protection priorities based on impairment status, total phosphorus

**March 2018** 

data, chlorophyll-a data, and Secchi disk transparency data.

- A monitoring plan was written for inclusion in the Clearwater River WRAPS and TMDL reports. Maps of long term water quality and flow monitoring sites were created for that section.
- o A map of Pfankuch streambank stability rating results was created.
- District staff reviewed a stressor identification report that was described the results of an investigation of factors that could be negatively affecting biology in Cross Lake and Hill River Lake. Neither Lake was officially impaired, but the lakes were relatively close to violating standards.
- When completed, Section 3.1 of the Clearwater River WRAPS was shared with core team members.
- Comments on Section 3.1 were received from MN DNR staff and the WRAPS report was edited to address those comments.
- 0.5 1 Ministry Lake (04-0295-00) Drainage Area Buzzle Township, Beltrami County

Wetland

• Long Lake (near Pinewood) description, drainage area delineation, and maps.

March 2018



• Stony Lake (near Pine Lake) description, drainage area delineation, and maps.

 MN DNR staff provided the District with a draft Clearwater River Watershed Fluvial Geomorphology Report and shared a completed Upper/Lower Red Lakes Watershed Fluvial Geomorphology Report. District staff reviewed the Clearwater River geomorphology report and added information from the report to sections in the WRAPS report about protection considerations, sediment sources, targeting of geographic areas, and restoration/protection strategies.

March 2018

Summary of methods used for a data-based categorization and prioritization of streams for restoration and protection:

				River Total		<u>Macro-</u> invertebrate		
	Total			Phosphorus	Fish Index	Index of		
	Suspended	E. coli	Dissolved	and River	of Biological	Biological	Habitat	
Parameter:	Solids	Bacteria	Oxygen	Eutrophication	Integrity	Integrity	Minimum MSHA	Pfankuch Stability
	í ,	i T	Percentage	· · ·	,		Minnesota	
	· '	1	of days with	Summer	IBI score	IBI score	Stream Habitat	
	1 1	Maximum	<5 mg/L daily	average TP,	minus	minus	Assessment	
	Exceedance	monthly	minimums	BOD, Chl-a,	impairment	impairment	(MSHA) score &	Pfankuch stability
Statistical Measurement:	rate	geomean	(DO_5)	and/or DO Flux	threshold	threshold	rating	rating
							Poor score (<45),	
							no IBI	
Poor Quality (not impaired) =	n/a	n/a	>10%	n/a	<0	<0	impairment	<0
Restoration (Impaired ) =	>12.5%	>157.5	>15%	>(125% of Std)	<-21.7	<-12.89	Poor score (<45)	TSS Impairment &
							& IBI Impairment	Unstable
	10% <x<12.5< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>Std<x<(125% of<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td>Fair score (&lt;66)</td><td></td></x<(125%></td></x<12.5<>			Std <x<(125% of<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td>Fair score (&lt;66)</td><td></td></x<(125%>			Fair score (<66)	
Nearly Restored (Impaired) =	%	126 <x<157.5< td=""><td>10%<x<15%< td=""><td>Std ( 125/05/</td><td>&lt;0</td><td>-12.89<x<0< td=""><td>or better and an</td><td>TSS impairment &amp;</td></x<0<></td></x<15%<></td></x<157.5<>	10% <x<15%< td=""><td>Std ( 125/05/</td><td>&lt;0</td><td>-12.89<x<0< td=""><td>or better and an</td><td>TSS impairment &amp;</td></x<0<></td></x<15%<>	Std ( 125/05/	<0	-12.89 <x<0< td=""><td>or better and an</td><td>TSS impairment &amp;</td></x<0<>	or better and an	TSS impairment &
	~			5.0,			IBI impairment	moderately unstable
								No TSS impairment &
Nearly Impaired =	7.5% <x<10%< td=""><td>94 5cx&lt;126</td><td>&gt;5%</td><td>Std</td><td>&lt;10.85</td><td>0cvc12.89</td><td></td><td>moderately unstable,</td></x<10%<>	94 5cx<126	>5%	Std	<10.85	0cvc12.89		moderately unstable,
itedity inputed	1.5/0~~~10/0	94.3~~120	25/0	-310	×10.05	0~~12.05	Fair score	unstable, or mixed
							(45 <msha<66)< td=""><td>results</td></msha<66)<>	results
Highest Quality =	<7.5%	<94.5	<5%	<(75% of Std)	>10.85	>12.89	Good score (>66)	Stable

March 2018

#### Categorization and prioritization of streams for restoration and protection (AUIDs '501 through '523):

			<u>River</u>								
			Nutrient				<b>D</b> <sup>1</sup> <b>T 1</b>		Macro-		
			<u>Region</u>	Total			<u>River Iotai</u>		Invertebrate		
Assessment	Waterbody		to Local	Suspended	E coli	Dissolved	and River	of Biological	Biological	Habitat	
Unit ID	Name	Reach Description	Planning)	Solids	Bacteria	Oxvgen	Eutrophication	Integrity	Integrity	Minimum MSHA	Pfankuch Stability
	Clearwater	Lower Badger Cr	<u></u>	Restoration	Highest	Highest	Nearly	<u></u>	<u></u>		
09020305-501	River	to Red Lake R	Central	(Impaired)	Quality	Quality	Impaired			63, Fair	Unstable
00020205 502	Lower	CD 14 to	Control	Nearly	Restoration	Highest	Highest	Nearly	Nearly		
09020303-302	Badger Crk	Clearwater R	Central	Impaired	(Impaired)	Quality	Quality	Impaired	Impaired	48.6, Fair	
09020305-504	Poplar River	Highway 59 to Lost	Central	Highest	Restoration	Nearly	Nearly	Highest	Nearly		
		R		Quality	(Impaired)	Impaired	Impaired	Quality	Impaired	69.3, Good	
09020305-508	County Ditch	Unnamed ditch to	Central	Highest	Nearly	De su Quellitu	Nearly				
	57 Walkor	Clearwater R		Quality	Impaired	Poor Quality	Impaired				
09020305-509	Brook	to Clearwater R	North			Poor Quality					
	DIOOR			Nearly		r oor Quarty					
09020305-511	Clearwater	Lost R to Beau	Central	Restored	Nearly	Highest	Nearly	Highest	Highest		
	River	Gerlot Cr		(Impaired)	Impaired	Quality	Impaired	Quality	Quality	57.8, Fair	Moderately Unstable
		Dino Ik to			Nearly						
09020305-512	Lost River	Anderson I k	Central	Highest	Restored	Highest	Highest	Nearly	Nearly		
		Anderson Ek		Quality	(Impaired)	Quality	Quality	Impaired	Impaired	66.5, Good	
09020305-513	Ruffy Brook	Headwaters to	Central	Highest	Restoration	Nearly	Nearly	Highest	Nearly		
	,	Clearwater R		Quality	(Impaired)	Impaired	Impaired	Quality	Impaired	73.8, Good	
00020205 517	Cleanwater	Headwaters to	North	Highost	Noarly	Postoration	Noarhu				
09020505-517	River	1140 K30VV 330,	NOTUI	Quality	Impaired	(Impaired)	Impaired				
	niver			Quanty	Inpuncu	(impaned)	inipanea	Nearly			
09020305-518	Poplar River	Spring Lk to	Central	Highest	Nearly	Restoration	Nearly	Restored	Restoration		
	· ·	Highway 59		Quality	Impaired	(Impaired)	Impaired	(Impaired)	(Impaired)	52.9, Fair	Stable
00020205 522	Dalk CD 14	Maple Lake to	Control	Highest	Highest	Highest	Highest	Nearly	Nearly		
09020305-523	POIK CD 14	Lower Badger Cr	Central	Quality	Quality	Quality	Quality	Impaired	Impaired	43, Poor	
Poor Quality =	= AUID failed t	o meet numerical st	tandards du	ie to non-poll	utant factors	, but it is not o	n the Draft 2018	List of Impair	ed Waters.	Poor quality	
Restoration (I	Impaired ) = A	UID is listed on the I	Draft 2018 L	ist of Impaire	d Waters					Poor quality and I	mpaired
Nearly Restor	ed = AUID fail	ed to meet numeric	al standard	s, but is relati	vely close to	the impairme	nt threshold			Fair to Good quali	ty and impaired
Nearly Impair	ed = AUID me	t numerical standar	ds, but only	y by a small m	argin					Poor to fair qualit	y, not impaired
<b>Highest Quali</b>	ty = AUID met	numerical standard	s by a relat	ively significa	nt margin					Good quality, not	impaired

			<u>River</u>									
			Nutrient Region				River Total		<u>Macro-</u> invertebrate			
			(Applied	Total			Phosphorus	Fish Index	Index of			
Assessment	Waterbody		to Local	Suspended	E. coli	Dissolved	and River	of Biological	Biological	Habitat		
Unit ID	Name	Reach Description	Planning)	Solids	Bacteria	Oxygen	Eutrophication	Integrity	Integrity	Minimum MSHA	Pfankuch Stability	
	Unnamed				Nearly							
09020305-526	Creek (Clear	Headwaters to	Central	Highest	Restored	Restoration	Nearly					
	Brook)	Silver Cr		Quality	(Impaired)	(Impaired)	Impaired					
		Headwaters to							Nearly			
09020305-527	Silver Creek	Anderson Lk	North	Nearly	Restoration	Highest	Nearly	Nearly	Restored		Stable, Moderately	
		74.40.00004.047		Impaired	(Impaired)	Quality	Impaired	Impaired	(Impaired)	56.1, Fair	Unstable	
00000005 500		T148 R38W S17,		and the second	De la contraction	Destauration	11.1.1.1.1.1	111-1	the second			
09020305-529	Lost River	south line to Pine	Central	Hignest	Restoration	Restoration	Hignest	Hignest	Hignest			
		LK Uppamod cr to		Quality	(impaired)	(impaired)	Quality	Quality	Quality	53, Fdlf		
00020205-530		T1/18 P38/M/ \$20	Control		Restoration	Nearly						
09020303-330	Lost River	north line	Central		(Impaired)	Impaired				48.7 Fair		
	LOST NIVEL	Hill River I k to		Highest	Restoration	Highest	Highest	Nearly	Nearly	40.7, Full		
09020305-539	Hill River	Lost R	Central	Quality	(Impaired)	Quality	Quality	Restored	Impaired	59.5. Fair		
	Unnamed											
09020305-541	Creek (Bee	Eighteen Lk to Bee	Central									
	Lake Inlet)	Lk				Poor Quality						
00020305-542	Unnamed	Mitchell Lk to	Central									
09020303-342	Creek (JD73)	Badger Lk	Central			Poor Quality						
09020305-543	Poplar River	Unnamed ditch to	Central									
00020000 0 10	Diversion	Badger Lk				Poor Quality						
	Unnamed	T148 R38W S28,		Nearly								
09020305-545	crk (Nassett	south line to Lost	Central	Restored	Restoration	Restoration						
	Creek)	R Tanaanali Uli ta		(Impaired)	(Impaired)	(Impaired)	1 link a st					
09020305-549	Crook (1D73)	Manlo Ik	Central	Ouplity	Ouplity	Poor Quality	Ouplity					
Door Quality		iviaple LK	tandarde di		Quality	hut it is not a	Quality	list of Impoir	ad Watars	Door quality		
Restoration (I	- AOID failed t	IID is listed on the I	Draft 2018	ist of Impaire	d Waters	but it is not o	in the Drait 2018	List of impair	eu waters.	Poor quality and I	mnaired	
Nearly Restor	ed = AUID faile	ed to meet numeric	al standard	s, but is relati	vely close to	the impairme	nt threshold			Fair to Good quali	ty and impaired	
Nearly Impair	ed = AUID met	t numerical standard	ds. but only	by a small ma	argin					Poor to fair quality, not impaired		
Highest Quali	ty = AUID met	numerical standard	s by a relat	ively significa	nt margin					Good quality, not	impaired	

			<u>River</u> Nutrient						Macro-			
			Region	<b>-</b>			<u>River Total</u>	et de la de	invertebrate			
Assessment	Waterbody		(Applied	<u>Iotal</u> Suspended	E coli	Dissolved	Phosphorus and River	Fish Index	Biological	Habitat		
Unit ID	Name	Reach Description	Planning)	Solids	Bacteria	Oxygen	Eutrophication	Integrity	Integrity	Minimum MSHA	Pfankuch Stability	
<u></u>	<u></u>	Private ditch near	<u></u>			<u></u>		<u></u>	<u></u>		<u> </u>	
09020305-550	JD 73	187th Ave NE to	Central	Highest	Restoration	Restoration	Highest	Highest	Nearly			
		Tamarack Lk		Quality	(Impaired)	(Impaired)	Quality	Quality	Impaired	27.8, Poor		
	Unnamed											
09020305-551	crk (Bee		Central									
	Lake Outlet)	Bee Lk to JD 73				Poor Quality						
	Trib. To	Gerdin I k to						Nearly				
09020305-561	Poplar R.	Poplar R Diversion	Central					Restored				
	Diversion							(Impaired)		28.5, Poor		
09020305-574	Terrebonne		Central	Highest	Restoration	Nearly	Highest					
	Creek	CD 4 to CD 58		Quality	(Impaired)	Impaired	Quality					
00020205 570	Duestie		Control		Nearly							
09020305-578	Brooks	Unnamed cr to Hill	Central		Restored							
	Creek	K Unnamod ditch to			(impaired)			Noarly	Highost			
09020305-590	SD 61	Lost R	Central					Impaired	Quality	45, Fair		
00020205 502	Unnamed	Near Red Lake	Control					Poor				
09020303-392	ditch	Nation Wild Rice	Central					Quality				
	Unnamed	Ditch draining										
09020305-641	ditch (Hill R.	wetlands by S.	Central					Poor				
	tributary)	Connection Lake						Quality	Poor Quality			
09020305-643	JD 72 Outlet	Unnamed ditch to	Central					Highest	Nearly			
		Lost R				N I		Quality	Impaired	37.5, Poor		
		Anderson Lk to		1 Calcarat	Needla	Nearly	1 U als a st	Nearly	1 Viels a st			
0920305-645	Lost River	Unnamed cr	Central	Hignest	Inearly	(Impoind)	Hignest	Restored	Hignest		Madarataly Unstable	
De en Oveliter			have allowed a set	Quality		(impaired)	Quality	(impaired)	Quality	47.5, Fair		
Poor Quality	= AUID Talled L	UD is listed on the	Droft 2019	ist of Impairo		, but it is not o	n the Drait 2018	List of impair	eu waters.	Poor quality	maairad	
Nearly Restor	$red = \Delta I IID fail$	ed to meet numeric	al standard	s but is relati	vely close to	the impairme	nt threshold			Fair to Good quali	ty and impaired	
Nearly Impair	red = AUID mer	t numerical standar	ds but only	by a small m	argin					Fair to Good quality and impaired		
Highest Quali	tv = AUID met	numerical standard	s by a relat	ively significa	nt margin					Good quality, not	impaired	

			<u>River</u> Nutrient Region				River Total		<u>Macro-</u>		
			(Applied	<u>Total</u>			Phosphorus	Fish Index	Index of		
Assessment	Waterbody		to Local	Suspended	<u>E. coli</u>	Dissolved	and River	of Biological	Biological	<u>Habitat</u>	
<u>Unit ID</u>	Name	Reach Description	Planning)	<u>Solids</u>	<u>Bacteria</u>	<u>Oxygen</u>	Eutrophication	Integrity	Integrity	Minimum MSHA	Pfankuch Stability
09020305-646	Lost River	Unnamed cr to Hill R	Central	Nearly Impaired	Nearly Impaired	Highest Quality	Highest Quality	Nearly Impaired	Nearly Impaired	43.5, Poor	Stable, Moderately Unstable
09020305-647	Clearwater River	Ruffy Bk to JD 1	Central	Nearly Restored (Impaired)	Restoration (Impaired)	Nearly Impaired	Restoration (Impaired)	Nearly Impaired	Nearly Impaired	39, Poor	Moderately Unstable
09020305-648	Clearwater River	JD 1 to Lost R	Central	Restoration (Impaired)	Highest Quality	Highest Quality	Nearly Impaired	Highest Quality	Highest Quality	54.5, Fair	Stable
09020305-649	Clearwater River	Clearwater Lk to Unnamed cr	North	Highest Quality	Highest Quality	Highest Quality	Highest Quality	Nearly Impaired	Nearly Impaired	70.5, Good	
09020305-650	Clearwater River	Unnamed cr to Ruffy Bk	North		Highest Quality	Highest Quality	Highest Quality	Highest Quality	Highest Quality	64.1, Fair	Unstable, Stable
09020305-651	Unnamed crk (Bee L. Outlet)	Bee Lk to JD 73	Central	Highest Quality	Restoration (Impaired)		Highest Quality				
09020305-652	Beau Gerlot Creek	-96.1947 47.8413 to Clearwater R	Central			Highest Quality		Restoration (Impaired)	Nearly Restored (Impaired)	56.4, Fair	Moderately Unstable
09020305-653	Clearwater River	T148 R35W S31, west line to Unnamed cr	North	Highest Quality	Highest Quality	Restoration (Impaired)	Nearly Impaired	Nearly	Nearly Impaired	44, Poor	Stable
09020305-654	Clearwater River	Unnamed cr to Clearwater Lk	North					Highest Quality	Highest Quality	63.4, Fair	
09020305-655	Hill River (CD68/81)	Cross L. to Br 4 CD 81 near Olga	Central			Nearly Impaired					
09020305-656	Hill River	Unnamed cr to Hill River Lk	Central	Highest Quality	Nearly Impaired	Restoration (Impaired)	Nearly Impaired	Restoration (Impaired)	Nearly Impaired	59.6, Fair	
09020305-658	Red Lake CD 23	-96.1479 47.8855 to Clearwater R	Central					Restoration (Impaired)		55, Fair	Stable
Poor Quality	= AUID failed t	o meet numerical st	tandards du	ue to non-poll	utant factors,	, but it is not c	on the Draft 2018	List of Impair	ed Waters.	Poor quality	
Restoration (I	Impaired ) = Al	UID is listed on the I	Draft 2018 L	ist of Impaire	d Waters					Poor quality and I	mpaired
Nearly Restor	red = AUID fail	ed to meet numeric	al standard	s, but is relati	ively close to	the impairme	nt threshold			Fair to Good quali	ty and impaired
Nearly Impair	red = AUID me	t numerical standar	ds, but only	y by a small m	argin					Poor to fair qualit	y, not impaired
<b>Highest Quali</b>	ty = AUID met	numerical standard	ls by a relat	ively significa	nt margin					Good quality, not	impaired

		ТР	Summer		Chlorophyll-a	Summer Avg		Secchi	Secchi	
		Standard	Average		Standard	Chlorophyll-a	Chlorophyll-a	Standard	Depth	
Lake ID	Lake Name	(mg/L)	TP (mg/L)	TP Classification	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	Classification	(m)	(m)	Secchi Class
	Long Lake			Restoration			Restoration			Nearly Restored
04-0295-00	(Buzzle Twp.)	0.03	0.044	(Impaired)	9	18.90	(Impaired)	2	2.04	(Impaired)
04-0297-00	Buzzle Lake	0.03	0.009	Highest Quality	9	2.22	Highest Quality	2	4.03	Highest Quality
04-0298-00	Little Buzzle	0.03	0.010	Highest Quality	9	2.25	Highest Quality	2	4.62	Highest Quality
04-0299-00	Funkley	0.03	0.019	Highest Quality	9	4.11	Highest Quality	2	2.69	Highest Quality
04-0300-00	Whitefish	0.03	0.019	Highest Quality	9	5.37	Highest Quality	2	3.15	Highest Quality
	Spring Lake									
04-0303-00	(Buzzle Twp.)	0.03	0.014	Highest Quality	9	6.33	Highest Quality	2	3.24	Highest Quality
04-0343-00	Clearwater Lake	0.03	0.019	Highest Quality	9	7.01	Nearly Impaired	2	2.82	Highest Quality
	East Four-Legged									
15-0027-00	Lake	0.06	0.014	Highest Quality	20	2.67	Highest Quality	1	2.03	Highest Quality
	West Four-									
15-0028-00	Legged Lake	0.06	0.013	Highest Quality	20	3.87	Highest Quality	1	2.28	Highest Quality
15-0035-00	Spike Lake	0.03	0.028	Nearly Impaired	9	7.83	Nearly Impaired	2	2.94	Highest Quality
15-0037-00	Nels Olson Lake	0.06	0.026	Highest Quality	20	4.25	Highest Quality	1	2.60	Highest Quality
15-0038-00	Falk Lake	0.04	0.022	Highest Quality	14	6.44	Highest Quality	1.4	3.05	Highest Quality
15-0040-00	Bagley Lake	0.03	0.021	Highest Quality	9	6.78	Nearly Impaired	2	3.00	Highest Quality
	Long Lake									
15-0050-00	(Clover Twp.)	0.03	0.010	Highest Quality	9	2.56	Highest Quality	2	5.52	Highest Quality
15-0060-00	Walker Brook L.	0.03	0.024	Nearly Impaired	9	9.49	Nearly Impaired	2	3.30	Highest Quality
15-0081-00	Lomond Lake	0.03	0.022	Highest Quality	9	6.84	Nearly Impaired	2	3.20	Highest Quality
15-0083-00	Peterson Lake	0.04	0.020	Highest Quality	14	18.99	Nearly Impaired	1.4	3.70	Highest Quality
15-0086-00	Jonnson Lake	0.03	0.026	Nearly Impaired	9	11.48	Nearly Impaired		2.36	Nearly Impaired
15-0090-00	Deep Lake	0.04	0.009	Highest Quality	14	2.50	Highest Quality	1.4	4.03	Highest Quality
15-0104-00	Lone Lake	0.04	0.009	Highest Quality	14	1.67	Highest Quality	1.4	0.11	Highest Quality
15-0137-00	Saho Lako	0.03	0.019	Highest Quality	9	0.95	Highost Quality	2	3.09	Highest Quality
15-0130-00	Sabe Lake	0.03	0.020	Nearly Impaired	9	0.22	Noarly Impaired	2	2.30	Highost Quality
15-0135-00	First Lake	0.03	0.023	Nearly Impaired	9	10.02	Nearly Impaired	2	2.73	Noarly Impaired
15-0140-00	Lindborg Lake	0.03	0.028	Nearly Impaired	14	10.92	Nearly Impaired	1 /	2.37	Highest Quality
15-0149-00	Pine Lake	0.04	0.035	Highest Quality	20	6.80	Highest Quality	1.4	2.52	Highest Quality
13-0145-00		0.00	0.025	Restoration	20	0.00	Restoration		2.20	Nearly Restored
15-0156-00	Stony Lake	0.06	0.137	(Impaired)	20	46.40	(Impaired)	1	2.10	(Impaired)
	Spring Lake	0.00	01107	(iniparica)		10110	(inipalied)			(iniparica)
60-0012-00	(Lengby)	0.04	0.034	Nearly Impaired	14	9.90	Highest Quality	1.4	1.94	Highest Quality
	(877			Nearly Impaired						
60-0015-00	Whitefish Lake	0.06	0.065	<12 Data Points	20	35.23	Nearly Impaired	1	1.18	Nearly Impaired
	Cross Lake (Main			Nearly Impaired			, i			, i
60-0027-02	Basin)	0.06	0.059	<12 Data Points	20	20.08	Nearly Impaired	1	1.33	Nearly Impaired
60-0032-00	Turtle Lake	0.06	0.033	<b>Highest Quality</b>	20	23.87	Nearly Impaired	1	1.00	Nearly Impaired
				Restoration			Restoration			Restoration
60-0189-00	Cameron Lake	0.06	0.094	(Impaired)	20	57.94	(Impaired)	1	0.41	(Impaired)
60-0214-00	Badger Lake	0.06	0.022	<b>Highest Quality</b>	20	7.32	<b>Highest Quality</b>	1	2.69	<b>Highest Quality</b>
60-0305-00	Maple Lake	0.06	0.039	<b>Highest Quality</b>	20	14.14	<b>Highest Quality</b>	1	1.29	Nearly Impaired
Classificatio	on Calculation:	Con	centration	/ Standard	Con	centration / St	andard	Stand	lard / Av	erage Depth
				>1.25			>1.25			>1.25
Restoration	(Impaired)			Impaired			Impaired			Impaired
				<1.25			<1.25			<1.25
Nearly Rest	ored (Impaired)			Impaired			Impaired			Impaired
				>.75			>.75			>.75
Nearly Impa	aired			Not impaired			Not impaired			Not impaired
				<.75			<.75			<.75
<b>Highest Qua</b>	ality			Not impaired			Not impaired			Not impaired























#### **Clearwater Lakes Stressor Identification Report**

The MPCA and MN DNR coordinated to collect and assess biological data from lakes in the Clearwater River Watershed. Index of biological integrity (IBI) scores were calculated to assess the quality of fish populations within lakes. Of the lakes that were formally assessed, no lakes were found to be impaired during the assessment. There were some lakes that had low fish IBI scores but were not assessed due to recent winterkills (Pine Lake and Badger Lake). Cross Lake and Hill River Lake were considered vulnerable due to their proximity to the impairment threshold. Those lakes were the focus of the stressor identification report due to their vulnerability to future impairment.

The shoreline habitat of Cross and Hill River Lakes has been only minimally altered by development. Connectivity could be an issue that is affecting the fish populations in these lakes. The Hill River connects those two lakes and portions of the river are impaired by low dissolved oxygen levels and poor fish IBI scores downstream of each of those lakes. Evidence suggests that land use and nutrient loading from the contributing watersheds of those two lakes may be having the greatest impact upon fish communities. The report recommends water quality data collection within the lakes, enhancement of lakeshore habitat, improvement of lakeshore buffers, and an examination of fish passage at the Hill River Lake Dam.

DOW	Lake Name	Coι	unty	Nearshore Survey Year(s)	re Notes MNDNR FIBI % FIBI GIS Acres Tool Littoral Score(s)		Below Impairme Threshol				
04-0300-00	Whitefish	Belt	rami	2015	Repea (Jun	ted within year e and August)	125	4	42	77, 66	No, No
04-0343-00	Clearwater	Belt	rami	2013			999	2	34	73	No
15-0060-00	Walker Brook	Clear	water	2015	Small; Low effort – 1 of 10 stations seined		95	4	42	48	No
15-0081-00	Lomond	Clear	water	2013	Small; Low effort – 1 of 10 stations seined		95	4	47	59	No
15-0137-00	Minnow	Clear	water	2014	Low effort – 4 of 10 stations seined		110	5	87	71	No
15-0149-00	Pine	Clear	water	2014	Low effort – 7 of 18 stations seined; recent winterkill		1238	5	100	15	Yes
60-0012-00	Spring	Pc	olk	2014			130	4	33	67	No
60-0015-00	Whitefish	Рс	olk	2015	Repea (Jun	ted within year e and August)	243	7	81	43, 43	No
60-0027-00	Cross	Po	olk	2014			166	7	90	40	No
60-0142-00	Hill River	Po	olk	2014			103	5	68	28	No
60-0214-00	Badger	Рс	olk	2010	Not assessable – recent winterkill		255	5	100	6	Yes
60-0305-00	Maple	Рс	olk	2010, 2015			1576	7	100	31, 67	Yes, No
≤ lower CL > lower CL & ≤ Threshold > threshold & ≤ upper CL > upper CL NA = No						NA = Not a	available				

#### **Thief River Stormwater Study**

The Pennington SWCD received funding from BWSR to complete a study of stormwater runoff within the City of Thief River Falls. The project was a partnership among the SWCD and the city. Houston Engineering, Inc. was hired as a consultant. The study found that a majority of the city's stormwater runoff enters the Thief and Red Lake Rivers untreated. Eroding river banks are also contributing large amounts of sediment and phosphorus to the rivers. The study targeted, identified, and prioritized surface water treatment projects based on feasibility, potential water quality benefits, and cost effectiveness. The information in the report can be used to apply for grant funding.

The potential projects and best management practices were ranked based on their cost effectiveness for reducing sediment and phosphorus runoff. Detailed maps were created to identify locations where the most pollutant runoff is occurring and where treatment projects would be most effective.

	BMP		Land	TSS TP Reduction Reduction		Capital	TSS Value	TP Value	Rank Scale <sup>c</sup>
Rank	U	Project Name	Authority	(tons/yr)	(Ibs/yr)	Cost Est.	(\$/ton/yr)	(\$/lbs/yr)	(0-10)
1	SS2	Hartz Park	City	165.0	140.0	\$144,240	\$ 870	\$ 1,030	9.7
2	SS3	Greenwood	City	137.0	157.0	\$121,410	\$ 890	\$ 770	9.6
3	SS1	Wenzloff	City	83.0	70.0	\$140,160	\$ 1,690	\$ 2,000	7.3
4	4	Hwy 59 Pond A	Private	20.6	56.3	\$ 360,200	\$ 17,520	\$ 6,400	6.1
5	5	Arctic Cat Wetland	Private	4.3	19.0	\$ 251,000	\$ 57,980	\$ 13,220	5.0
6	9	Oxbow Wetland <sup>B</sup>	City Easement	3.3	24.4	\$ 389,000	\$ 116,760	\$ 15,960	4.9
7	11	NCTC 2 Pond w/Reuse	College	3.3	15.2	\$ 235,000	\$ 71,620	\$ 15,480	4.9
8	3	Hartz Park Filter	City	4.2	24.9	\$ 530,000	\$ 125,120	\$ 21,310	4.8
9	8	Fairgrounds Pond	County	2.7	11.2	\$179,000	\$ 67,240	\$ 16,040	4.8
10	2	Hartz Wearhouse Pond A	Private	2.4	9.4	\$161,800	\$ 68,690	\$ 17,170	4.8
11	12	Labree & 12th St Pond	City	1.2	4.8	\$ 78,000	\$ 63,230	\$ 16,090	4.7
12	7	Sherwood Ave Filter	City	1.8	9.7	\$169,000	\$ 92,690	\$ 17,380	4.7
13	1	Sports Field UG Reuse	School	2.3	5.7	\$ 242,000	\$ 104,890	\$ 42,470	4.3
14	10	NCTC 1 Biofiltration	College	0.4	2.0	\$ 85,000	\$ 204,360	\$ 42,400	3.9
15	6	Downtown Tree Trench	City	0.4	2.0	\$ 397,000	\$ 942,100	\$197,040	0.0

Table 11. Ranking of BMP's.

<sup>A</sup> Includes the cost of required private land acquisition cost based on 2017 tax appraisal (see Table 6).

<sup>B</sup> Does not include the cost of lime-sludge disposal (see Table 6).

<sup>c</sup> Rank Scale is the equal rating of rank for four categories: TSS Reduction, TP Reduction, TSS Value, and TP Value. The values in each category were proportionally scaled to fit a range of 0 to 10 (0 being the least desirable) so that values could be averaged across all categories. For example, if a BMP had the highest value for each category, it would be assigned a 10 for each category and, thus, a Rank Scale of 10.

March 2018

Figure 3: Existing average annual TSS delivered yield



March 2018



Figure 7: BMP Location Targeting Heatmap and Potential BMPs

#### Thief River One Watershed One Plan (1W1P)

- A meeting of the policy committee, advisory committee, and the project work group was held on March 14, 2018.
- District staff reviewed and commented on the rough draft Strategies and Actions tables.
- District staff reviewed a draft Section 2 of the Thief River 1W1P.

### **Other Notes**

- A water quality report for November December 2017 was completed.
  - <u>http://www.redlakewatershed.org/waterquality/MonthlyWQReport/2017%2011%</u> 2012%20Nov-Dec%20Water%20Quality%20Report.pdf
- Water quality related notes from the March 13, 2018 Red Lake Watershed District Board of Mangers meeting:
  - Administrator Jesme stated that the District and Agassiz National NWR received the signed grant agreement for a Conservation Partners Legacy Grant in the amount of \$242,000 for cattail management to enhance wildlife habitat and increase biodiversity in more than 26,000 acres of non-forested wetlands. Work will also consist of repairs to water control structures.
  - Manager Dwight stated that he attended a meeting regarding the Bartlett Lake near Northome. Dwight indicated that the MPCA completed a sediment study and has hired Emmons and Olivier Resources, Inc. to identify projects for implementation to help the lake recover.
- District staff provided MPCA staff with additional information and photos about the Poplar River Diversion channel. The Polar River Diversion between the Poplar River and Badger Lake was listed as impaired by low dissolved oxygen on the Draft 2018 List of Impaired Waters. The MPCA has decided to change the classification of the reach so that it is still listed as impaired but will not require a TMDL. The impairment is caused by non-pollutant factors.
- Articles were written for the 2017 Red Lake Watershed District Annual Report.
- Contract extension amendments for the Thief River WRAPS and Red Lake River WRAPS were received from the MPCA and signed by the District Administrator. The MPCA is preparing the Thief River WRAPS and TMDL for the public notice process. The MPCA will then finish a review of the Red Lake River WRAPS so that it can also progress to the public notice phase.
- District staff reviewed the Thief River Falls (Stormwater) Water Quality Study that was completed by the Pennington SWCD and the City of Thief River Falls.

### March 2018 Meetings and Events

- March 1, 2018 Thief River 1W1P Planning Work Group conference call
- March 12, 2018 Pennington County Water Resources Advisory Committee meeting
  - SSTS Grants: The Pennington SWCD is working to get a homeowner with septic issues hooked up to the city sewer.

- Ditch Inventory Grant: RLWD staff will be working on the Polk County ditch inventory.
- City of Thief River Falls Stormwater Assessment: SWCD staff shared the results (Table 11 and the maps shown earlier in this report).
- The SWCD is working on a gully control and buffer implementation in the CD 96, CD 221, and CD 16 drainage systems. They will be starting with the CD 16 system and working with the county (drainage authority).
- Ditch outlet analysis with drones: Weather complications prevented the completion of the flyovers last year. Many days were too windy to fly the drones.
- Thief River PTMApp: Ashley Hitt reported that PTMApp is running and generating output data (catchments, loading, BMP suitability, and cost analysis).
- o Updates on the Thief River and Red Lake River One Watershed One Plans
- An Ecofootprint Grant will be used to install side water inlets in Pennington County.
- The SWCD is getting ready for tree planting and 12,000 trees have been ordered.
- The Annual Pennington SWCD Banquet is scheduled for April 12.
- BWSR has hired someone to conduct compliance work in the northern part of the state that did not elect to take jurisdiction over implementation of the Buffer Law.
- The next meeting was scheduled for June 11, 2018 at the RLWD meeting room.
- March 14, 2018 Thief River 1W1P Advisory Committee, Policy Committee, and Project Work Group Meeting(s)
- March 15, 2018 East Polk Soil and Water Conservation District Board Meeting
  - District staff attended the meeting to discuss potential projects in the Clearwater River Watershed. The board chose to focus on initiating projects to improve water quality within Cameron Lake and to install sediment basins in the Clearwater River Watershed portion of the county (as they have recently done in the Sand Hill River Watershed).
- March 19, 2018 Red Lake Watershed District Overall Advisory Committee meeting
- March 28, 2018 Polk County Water Resources Advisory Committee Meeting
  - A Minnesota Conservation Corps crew will be cleaning out the Sand Hill River in 2017 (clearing and snagging).
  - o Jenilynn Marchand gave a presentation on Wellhead Protection Plans.
    - The aquifer that supplies drinking water for the City of Crookston is recharged in the Maple Lake area.
    - Cameron Lake is part of the Erskine Drinking Water Supply Management Area (DWSMA). Even though it is downstream of the town in terms of surface runoff, seepage from Cameron Lake recharges the aquifer that supplies the town's drinking water. Maybe historical residents of the city would have thought differently about disposing wastewater into the lake if they knew it would eventually be recycled into their drinking water.
    - Crookston used to get its drinking water from surface water.
    - Most public wells were old railroad water stop wells. Early steam engine trains had to stop to get water for steam once every 7-10 miles.
    - Polk County groundwater generally follows the path of Highway 2 (or vice-versa)

- The Minnesota Well Index can be viewed online. Wells can be located using an interactive map. <u>http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/cwi/</u>
- The Polk County Wellhead Protection Plan is almost done.
- The "age" of drinking water (how long it has been underground in an aquifer) varies by location. The water used by the towns of Beltrami and Shelly has been in the ground for more an estimated 10,000 years.
- Grants are available from the Minnesota Department of Health for source water protection and well management. Those grants can be used to help fund educational water festivals.
- It is important to attend public hearings and information meetings for source water protection plans. Local protection teams are created from the attendees of those meetings.
- The different levels of well vulnerability were discussed. Wells that are protected by at least 50 feet of clay are considered to have a low level of vulnerability. Water supplies that are shallow and have interaction between surface and groundwater are considered have a high vulnerability.
- Water within the Erskine wellhead protection area takes 10 years to reach the well. That is a relatively short period of time. The Erskine water supply is considered to be very vulnerable.
- Nicole Bernd provided an update on the "We are Water" traveling exhibit. The exhibit is currently on display at the Hjemkomst Center in Moorhead, MN.
- Sarah Mielke is the Lakes Program Coordinator for the East Polk SWCD and will be collecting monthly (May through September) lakes samples during the summer of 2018.
- The next meeting was scheduled for June 12, 2018.
- March 29, 2018 Thief River 1W1P Planning Work Group conference call

#### Quote of the Month:

"The common denominator for success is work."

- John D. Rockefeller

Red Lake Watershed District Monthly Water Quality Reports are available online: <u>http://www.redlakewatershed.org/monthwq.html</u>.

Learn more about the Red Lake Watershed District at <u>www.redlakewatershed.org</u>.

Learn more about the watershed in which you live (Red Lake River, Thief River, Clearwater River, Grand Marais Creek, or Upper/Lower Red Lakes) at <u>www.rlwdwatersheds.org</u>.

"Like" the Red Lake Watershed District on <u>Facebook</u> to stay up-to-date on RLWD reports and activities.