

2004 Assessments – Missouri River Basin

Professional judgment group transparency form for assessed streams

This form does not include AUIDs that have only Mercury FCA information

Revision Date: 5/25/2004

Introduction to the Process Transparency Document

(For a full description of the process for assessing water quality in Minnesota under the Clean Water Act, see “Guidance Manual for Assessing the Quality of Minnesota Surface Waters”, MPCA, January, 2004. This document is available from the MPCA or to read and download from the MPCA Web site at: <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/publications/manuals/tmdl-guidancemanual04.pdf>)

In general, the assessment process compares monitoring data with applicable water quality standards by stream reach. The Professional Judgment Group is composed of assessment staff who know how the preliminary assessments were done, and monitoring staff who advise on the correct interpretation of monitoring data collected by them or their organization.

The stream assessment Process Transparency Document is designed to provide both a template for considering preliminary assessments at the major river basin Professional Judgment Group (PJG) meetings, and also to provide an enduring record of any special factors discussed or involved in making an assessment on a stream reach.

This document builds on two technical reports, a Data Summary Report and a Preliminary Assessment Report, which are produced in an automated manner using the assessment methodology described in the guidance document referenced above. Often, the application of the methodology produces an assessment that is reviewed without additional comment. When additional factors must be considered, or additional review is performed, or recommendations are made, these are noted on the Process Transparency Document, along with significant comments that reinforce or pertain to the assessment for the reach.

Use the “find” capability when using this document in electronic format to find a particular AUID or stream name. The order of the notes varies according to how they were used in the PJG meeting.

Abbreviation Key:

AUID	Assessment Unit Identification Code – incorporates the 8-digit HUC (ie. 07020001 517)
NS	Non-supporting
FS	Fully-supporting
PS	Partially-supporting
NA	Not Assessed
IAR	Integrated Assessment Reporting

2004 Assessments – Missouri River Basin

Professional judgment group transparency form for assessed streams

This form does not include AUIDs that have only Mercury FCA information

Revision Date: 5/25/2004

HUC AUID Seg Miles Reach Name Reach Description
10170204-509 027 13.13 Rock R Champepadan Cr to Elk Cr
Aquatic life—preliminary assessment FS Final assessment FS Based on _____
AQL assessment quality (Excellent, good, fair, poor) Fair
Factors used, please describe
A. Timing of exceedances _____
B. Magnitude of exceedances _____
C. Seasonality of exceedances _____
D. Naturally occurring conditions _____
E. Combination of narrative and numeric standards _____
F. Known point and nonpoint influences in the watershed _____
G. Additional data City of Luverne has collect data up- and down stream
Aquatic recreation use—preliminary assessment NA Final assessment NA
Aquatic recreation assessment quality (Excellent, good, fair, poor) _____
Fish consumption use NS
1998 TMDL listing (Y/N) Y Which pollutants Mercury FCA
2002 TMDL listing (Y/N) Y Which pollutants Mercury FCA
2004 Impairment (4 or 5) (Y/N) Y Which pollutants Mercury FCA
Delisting status (if applicable) _____
IAR category 5
Additional Comments _____

HUC AUID Seg Miles Reach Name Reach Description
10170204-501 025 11.76 Rock R Elk Cr to MN/IA border
Aquatic life—preliminary assessment NS Final assessment NS Based on Turbidity
AQL assessment quality (Excellent, good, fair, poor) Good
Factors used, please describe
A. Timing of exceedances _____
B. Magnitude of exceedances _____
C. Seasonality of exceedances _____
D. Naturally occurring conditions _____
E. Combination of narrative and numeric standards _____
F. Known point and nonpoint influences in the watershed No nearby point sources
G. Additional data _____
Aquatic recreation use—preliminary assessment NS Final assessment PS
Aquatic recreation assessment quality (Excellent, good, fair, poor) Fair
Fish consumption use NS
1998 TMDL listing (Y/N) Y Which pollutants Fecal Coliform, Ammonia, Mercury
2002 TMDL listing (Y/N) Y Which pollutants Ammonia, Fecal Coliform, Mercury, Turbidity
2004 Impairment (4 or 5) (Y/N) Y Which pollutants Turbidity, Ammonia, Fecal Coliform, Mercury
Delisting status (if applicable) Review ammonia for delisting; 0/36 exceedance in most recent samplings
IAR category 5
Additional Comments _____

2004 Assessments – Missouri River Basin

Professional judgment group transparency form for assessed streams

This form does not include AUIDs that have only Mercury FCA information

Revision Date: 5/25/2004

HUC AUID Seg Miles Reach Name Reach Description
10170203*-514 03 035 North Br Pipestone Cr Headwaters to Pipestone Cr
Aquatic life—preliminary assessment PS Final assessment NA Based on ____
AQL assessment quality (Excellent, good, fair, poor)____
Factors used, please describe
A. Timing of exceedances _____
B. Magnitude of exceedances _____
C. Seasonality of exceedances _____
D. Naturally occurring conditions _____
E. Combination of narrative and numeric standards _____
F. Known point and nonpoint influences in the watershed _____
G. Additional data _____
Aquatic recreation use—preliminary assessment NS Final assessment PS
Aquatic recreation assessment quality (Excellent, good, fair, poor) Good
Fish consumption use NA
1998 TMDL listing (Y/N) N Which pollutants _____
2002 TMDL listing (Y/N) N Which pollutants _____
2004 Impairment (4 or 5) (Y/N) Y Which pollutants fecal coliform
Delisting status (if applicable) _____
IAR category 5
Additional Comments disc with Muriel R that sample design is appropriate for assessment
*** this was originally noted erroneously as 10170204-514.**

HUC AUID Seg Miles Reach Name Reach Description
10170203*-527 2.03 Main Ditch CD A to Pipestone Cr
Aquatic life—preliminary assessment PS Final assessment NA Based on ____
AQL assessment quality (Excellent, good, fair, poor)____
Factors used, please describe
A. Timing of exceedances _____
B. Magnitude of exceedances _____
C. Seasonality of exceedances _____
D. Naturally occurring conditions _____
E. Combination of narrative and numeric standards _____
F. Known point and nonpoint influences in the watershed _____
G. Additional data _____
Aquatic recreation use—preliminary assessment NS Final assessment PS
Aquatic recreation assessment quality (Excellent, good, fair, poor) Good
Fish consumption use NA
1998 TMDL listing (Y/N) N Which pollutants _____
2002 TMDL listing (Y/N) N Which pollutants _____
2004 Impairment (4 or 5) (Y/N) Y Which pollutants fecal coliform
Delisting status (if applicable) _____
IAR category 5
Additional Comments disc with Muriel R that sample design is appropriate for assessment
*** this was originally noted erroneously as 10170204-527.**

2004 Assessments – Missouri River Basin

Professional judgment group transparency form for assessed streams

This form does not include AUIDs that have only Mercury FCA information

Revision Date: 5/25/2004

HUC AUID Seg Miles Reach Name Reach Description
10170203*-501 033 7.61 Pipestone Cr North Branch Pipestone Cr to MN/ND

Aquatic life—preliminary assessment NS Final assessment NS Based on turbidity

AQL assessment quality (Excellent, good, fair, poor) Good

Factors used, please describe

A. Timing of exceedances _____

B. Magnitude of exceedances _____

C. Seasonality of exceedances _____

D. Naturally occurring conditions _____

E. Combination of narrative and numeric standards _____

F. Known point and nonpoint influences in the watershed _____

G. Additional data _____

Aquatic recreation use—preliminary assessment NS Final assessment NS

Aquatic recreation assessment quality (Excellent, good, fair, poor) Good

Fish consumption use NS

1998 TMDL listing (Y/N) Y Which pollutants Turbidity, fecal coliform

2002 TMDL listing (Y/N) Y Which pollutants Turbidity, fecal coliform

2004 Impairment (4 or 5) (Y/N) Y Which pollutants Mercury, Turbidity, fecal coliform

Delisting status (if applicable) _____

IAR category 5

Additional Comments disc with Muriel R that sample design is appropriate for assessment

*** this was originally noted erroneously as 10170204-501.**
