


# Patoka River Watershed Restoration Action Strategy

Part I: Characterization and Responsibilities



*Prepared by*  
Indiana Department of  
Environmental Management  
Office of Water Management  
*June 2000*

## **FOREWORD**

The First Draft (October 1999) of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy (WRAS) was reviewed internally by IDEM and revised accordingly. The Second Draft (Spring 2000) was reviewed by stakeholders and revised accordingly. This Third Draft (June 2000) is intended to be a living document to assist restoration and protection efforts of stakeholders in their sub-watersheds. As a "living document" information contained within the WRAS will need to be revised and updated periodically.

The WRAS is divided into two parts: Part I, Characterization and Responsibilities and Part II, Concerns and Recommendations.

---

Andy Ertel, Resource Conservationist  
IDEM Office of Water Management  
100 N. Senate Avenue  
P.O. Box 6015  
Indianapolis, IN 46206-6015

[Andy.Ertel@in.usda.gov](mailto:Andy.Ertel@in.usda.gov)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD.....	1
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	4
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT .....	6
1.2 GUIDE TO THE USE OF THIS DOCUMENT .....	6
1.3 STAKEHOLDER GROUPS IN THE WATERSHED .....	7
<b>2 GENERAL WATERSHED DESCRIPTION.....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED OVERVIEW .....	9
2.2 LAND COVER, POPULATION, AND GROWTH TRENDS .....	12
2.3 PLANNING WITHIN THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED .....	14
2.4 AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES IN THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED.....	14
2.5 FOREST LANDS AND MANAGEMENT IN THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED .....	17
2.6 SURFACE AND SUBSURFACE MINING IN THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED .....	17
2.7 SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS IN THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED.....	18
2.8 SURFACE WATER USE DESIGNATIONS AND CLASSIFICATIONS .....	20
2.6 US GEOLOGICAL SURVEY WATER USE INFORMATION FOR THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED .....	21
<b>3 CAUSES AND SOURCES OF WATER POLLUTION .....</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 CAUSES OF POLLUTION.....	23
3.2 POINT SOURCES OF POLLUTION .....	26
3.3 NONPOINT SOURCES OF POLLUTION .....	31
<b>4. WATER QUALITY AND USE SUPPORT RATINGS IN THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED ....</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1 WATER QUALITY MONITORING PROGRAMS.....	34
4.2 SUMMARY OF AMBIENT MONITORING DATA FOR THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED.....	35
4.3 FISH CONSUMPTION ADVISORIES .....	37
4.4 CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 305(B) REPORT.....	38
4.5 CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 305(B) ASSESSMENT AND USE-SUPPORT: METHODOLOGY .....	38
<b>5 STATE AND FEDERAL WATER PROGRAMS .....</b>	<b>41</b>
5.1 INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT WATER QUALITY PROGRAMS.....	41
5.1.2 INDIANA’S POINT SOURCE CONTROL PROGRAM .....	42
5.2 INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES WATER PROGRAMS .....	48
5.3 USDA/NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE WATER QUALITY PROGRAMS.....	49
REFERENCES.....	53

## List of Tables

TABLE 2-1 PATOKA RIVER COUNTY POPULATION PROJECTIONS 1990-2020.....	13
TABLE 2-2 PATOKA RIVER CITY AND TOWN POPULATION ESTIMATES.....	13
TABLE 2-3 LIVESTOCK IN THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED .....	16
TABLE 2-4 CROPS PRODUCED IN THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED .....	17
TABLE 2-5 PATOKA RIVER WATERBODIES ON THE OUTSTANDING RIVERS LIST FOR INDIANA .....	19
TABLE 2-6 1990 & 1995 WATER USE INFORMATION FOR THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED.....	22
TABLE 3-1 CAUSES OF WATER POLLUTION AND CONTRIBUTING ACTIVITIES.....	23
TABLE 3-2 NPDES PERMITTED FACILITIES PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED .....	28
TABLE 4-1 SEASONAL KENDALL ANALYSIS FOR THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED 1986 TO 1995 .....	36
TABLE 4-2 CRITERIA FOR USE SUPPORT ASSESSMENT.....	40
TABLE 5-1 TYPES OF PERMITS ISSUED UNDER THE NPDES PROGRAM .....	44

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The overall goal and purpose of Part I of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy (WRAS) is to provide a reference point and map to assist local citizens with improving water quality. The major water quality concerns and recommended management strategies will be addressed in Part II: Concerns and Recommendations of the WRAS.

This Strategy broadly covers the entire watershed; therefore, it is intended to be an overall strategy and does not dictate management and activities at the stream site or segment level. Water quality management decisions and activities for individual portions of the watershed are most effective and efficient when managed through sub-watershed plans. However, these sub-watershed plans must also consider the impact on the watershed as a whole.

This Strategy is intended to be a fluid document in order to respond to the changing and dynamic quality of our environment. Therefore, this Strategy will require revision when updated information becomes available.

### **Overview of the Patoka River Watershed**

The Patoka River watershed is located in Southwest Indiana. The primary waterbody is the Patoka River which receives rainfall runoff from eight different counties. The Patoka River originates in Orange and Crawford Counties and flows westward 162 miles, discharging into the Wabash River. Patoka Lake is located in the headwaters of the Patoka River, while the Patoka South Fork joins the Patoka River closer towards the end.

Beginning in 1836, coal mining became a major industry in Pike County with a large concentration of mines in the 52,000 acre drainage area of the Patoka South Fork. During the following fifty years, over 20,000 acres were surfaced mined and left abandoned and unreclaimed, resulting in acid mine drainage in Pike County.

Land use in the watershed is predominately agriculture and forestry, which represents approximately 90 percent of the total land cover. Corn, soybeans, and hay comprise the majority of crops produced, while various hardwood species comprise the majority of the forested land. Other land uses include urban, wetland vegetation and open water areas.

Jasper and Princeton are the two major urban areas within the watershed area. Patoka Reservoir is the third largest body of water in Indiana at 8,880 surface water acres. There are approximately 35,000 acres of federal and state owned properties within the Patoka River watershed available for recreation, hunting, and fishing.

Patoka River from Patoka Reservoir to its confluence with Vernon Fork Muscatatuck is on the Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana for having outstanding ecological, recreational, or scenic importance.

### **Current Status of Water Quality in the Patoka River Watershed**

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act requires states to identify waters that do not meet, or are not expected to meet, applicable water quality standards. The Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for Indiana provides a basis for understanding the current status of water quality in the Patoka River Watershed. The following waterbodies are on Indiana's 1998 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list submitted to and approved by EPA:

- ◆ **Patoka River** fish consumption advisory for Mercury
- ◆ **Patoka Reservoir** fish consumption advisory for Mercury and PCB
- ◆ **South Fork Patoka River** for Impaired Biotic Communities

### **Water Quality Goal**

The overall water quality goal for the Patoka River Watershed is that all waterbodies meet the applicable water quality standards for their designated uses as determined by the State of Indiana, under the provisions of the Clean Water Act.

# Patoka River Watershed Restoration Action Strategy

## Part I: Characterization and Responsibilities

---

### 1. Introduction

The Clean Water Action Plan states that "States and tribes should work with public agencies and private-sector organizations and citizens to develop, based on the initial schedule for the first two years, Watershed Restoration Action Strategies, for watersheds most in need of restoration." A WRAS is essentially a large-scale coordination plan for an eight-digit hydrologic unit watershed targeted by the Unified Watershed Assessment. In Indiana, 11 such units, including the Patoka watershed, were designated for restoration by the FFY 1999 Unified Watershed Assessment. Each year, the Assessment will be refined further as additional information becomes available, and targeted areas will become more specific. This will require amendments to the WRAS, which must be flexible and broad enough to accommodate change. The WRAS will also foster greater cooperation among State and Federal agencies, which should result in more effective use of personnel and resources.

The WRAS provides an opportunity to assemble, in one place, projects and monitoring that has been completed or is on going within a watershed. It also allows agencies and stakeholders to compare watershed goals and provides a guide for future work within a watershed.

The WRAS for the Patoka River watershed contains two parts. Part I provides a characterization of water quality in the watershed and agency responsibilities. Part II provides a discussion of resource concerns and recommended strategies.

#### 1.1 Purpose of This Document

The overall goal and purpose of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy Part I is to provide a reference point and roadmap to assist with improving water quality. Part I is a compilation of information, facts, and local concerns in this watershed. It will serve as a reference document for watershed groups and others involved in the assessment and planning of watershed restoration activities.

Part I of the Strategy is intended to be a fluid document in order to respond to the changing and dynamic quality of our environment. Therefore, it will require revision when updated information becomes available.

#### 1.2 Guide to the Use of This Document

**Chapter 1: Introduction** - This Chapter provides a non-technical description of the purpose of Part 1 of the Strategy. This Chapter also provides an overview of stakeholder groups in the Patoka River watershed.

**Chapter 2: General Watershed Description**- Some of the specific topics covered in this chapter include:

- An overview of the watershed
- Hydrology of the watershed
- A summary of land use within the watershed
- Natural resources in the watershed
- Population statistics
- Major water uses in the watershed
- Water quality classifications and standards

**Chapter 3: Causes and Sources of Water Pollution** - This Chapter describes a number of important causes of water quality impacts including biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), toxic substances, nutrients, E. coli bacteria and others. This Chapter also describes both point and nonpoint sources of pollution.

**Chapter 4: Water Quality and Use Support Ratings** - This Chapter describes the various types of water quality monitoring conducted by IDEM. It summarizes water quality in the watershed based on Office of Water Management data, and presents a summary of use support ratings for those surface waters that have been monitored or evaluated.

**Chapter 5: State and Federal Water Quality Programs** - Chapter 5 summarizes the existing State and Federal point and nonpoint source pollution control programs available to address water quality problems. These programs are management tools available for addressing the priority water quality concerns and issues that are discussed in Part II of the Strategy. Chapter 5 also describes the concept of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). TMDLs represent management strategies aimed at controlling point and nonpoint source pollutants. IDEM's TMDL Strategy will also be discussed.

### 1.3 Stakeholder Groups in the Watershed

The Patoka River watershed contains several stakeholder groups that have different missions (Appendix C). Many of these groups have a long history of conservation work in the Patoka River watershed. The following discussions briefly describe some of the watershed groups.

#### *Southwest Indiana Brine Coalition*

The Southwest Indiana Brine Coalition is a volunteer resource committee associated with the Four Rivers Resource Conservation & Development. Their mission is to identify and provide technical assistance to landowners with land areas that have soils of high saline concentration from old mining operations. Thus far, 140 people including local residents, organizations and natural resource agencies have been involved with this project. The Coalition is presently targeting brine sites that do not have an identified oil well operator. Many of these sites are 20 years or older and with impacts ranging from ½ to 5 acres. A coordinator has been hired through an EPA Section 319 grant to locate and assess the brine sites and give suggestions toward improving the soil fertility.

#### *Patoka South Fork Watershed Steering Committee*



The Patoka South Fork Watershed Steering Committee is a volunteer resource committee associated the Four Rivers Resource Conservation & Development. The goal of the Patoka South Fork Watershed Steering Committee is "the improvement of the environment and the water quality of the Patoka South Fork Watershed, and to provide grassroots access to the various and numerous people living in the area for the purpose of assisting and guiding the various organizations and agencies in their efforts to help the committee in achieving our goal." (Patoka South Fork Watershed Steering Committee Brochure, No date)

## 2 General Watershed Description

This Chapter provides a general description of Patoka River and its watershed and includes the following:

- Section 2.1 Patoka River Watershed Overview
- Section 2.2 Land Cover, Population, and Growth Trends
- Section 2.3 Planning within the Patoka River Watershed
- Section 2.4 Agricultural Activities in the Patoka River Watershed
- Section 2.5 Forest Lands and Management in the Patoka River Watershed
- Section 2.6 Surface and Subsurface Mining in the Patoka River Watershed
- Section 2.7 Significant Natural Areas in the Patoka River Watershed
- Section 2.8 Surface Water Use Designations and Classifications
- Section 2.9 US Geological Survey Water Use Information for the Patoka River Watershed

### 2.1 Patoka River Watershed Overview

The Patoka River watershed is an 8 digit (05120209) hydrologic unit code (HUC) watershed located in southwest Indiana (Figure 2-1). It lies within the Southern Bottomlands and Southwestern Lowland Natural Regions, and includes rainfall runoff from parts of eight different counties. The Patoka River watershed is subdivided into 61 subbasins represented on the map by 14 digit HUCs (figure 2-2). Flowing westward, 162 miles through four counties in southwestern Indiana, the Patoka River represents a classic meandering midwestern stream. Its floodplain contains some of the finest examples of bottomland forested wetland remaining in the State (Patoka River National Wildlife Refuge, 1998). The landscape provides a variety of scenic areas that range from flat bottomland fields with numerous meandering streams to steeply rolling hills and valleys covered with hardwoods and outcropping limestone ledges.

Part of the Hoosier National Forest is located in the eastern part of the Patoka River Watershed. Small oil pumping stations, some are active and others abandoned are located in Gibson and Pike counties.

The Patoka South Fork flows northwest 17 miles before its confluence with the Patoka River near the east side of the Gibson County boundary line. Beginning in 1836, coal mining became a major industry in Pike County with a large concentration of mines in the 52,000 acre drainage area of the Patoka South Fork. During the next fifty years, over 20,000 acres were surface mined and left abandoned and unreclaimed, resulting in acid mine drainage in Pike County. Furniture manufacturing is a significant industry in the area and is concentrated around the town of Jasper, a community of predominantly German influence (Patoka Lake, Indiana, Brochure, No date). Jasper and Princeton are the largest communities within the Patoka River watershed.

#### *Geology and Soils*

The Patoka River watershed area covers a vast landscape of various landforms. The majority of the watershed is underlain with interbedded sandstone, shale and siltstone of Mississippi and

Pennsylvanian-age. The dominant soil types are Zanesville, Gilpin, Wellston, Tilsit and Berks. Gilpin and Berks soils are formed in loamy residuum. Zanesville, Wellston and Tilsit soils are formed in thin loess over loamy residuum. These soils are mainly used for pasture and woodland, and to a lesser extent cropland.


A small portion of the watershed area, mostly in eastern Pike county and western Dubois county, is a loess covered lakebed of the Illinoian stage. Common soils associated with the lakebed are Otwell, Haubstadt and Dubois. These soils are formed in loess over lacustrine deposits. These soils are mainly used for cropland and pasture.

The western part of the watershed in Gibson county and western Pike county is a loess hill landform. Common soils associated with the loess hills are Hosmer, Alford, and Sylvan. These soils are formed in five feet or more of loess. These soils are mainly used for cropland and pasture.

The flood plains within this area are dominated by silty, acid alluvial soils. Common soil types are Stendal, Steff, Cuba, and Bonnie. In the western part of the Patoka flood plain, some non-acid, silty alluvial soils are present. Common soils are Wakeland and Bonnie. Cropland and woodland are the dominant uses. (USDA -NRCS, 1999)

SOIL EROSION POTENTIAL

-  Low
-  Medium
-  High
-  Very high



**Figure 43**  
Map showing soil erosion potential of Indiana soil associations.

Figure 2-3 Erosion Potential \*

\* from *The Indiana Water Resource*, IDNR, 1980

## *Climate*

Average yearly precipitation for the watershed is approximately 45 inches and average yearly snowfall is approximately 17 inches. In winter the average temperature is 32° F, while in the summer the average temperature is 73° F (USDA, 1984).

## **2.2 Land Cover, Population, and Growth Trends**

### *2.2.1 General Land Cover*

The U.S. Geological Survey - Biological Resources Division and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are overseeing the National Gap Analysis Program (GAP). In Indiana, Indiana State University and Indiana University are carrying out the Indiana GAP Project which involves an analysis of current vegetative land cover through remote sensing (ISU 1999). This analysis provides vegetative land cover data in 30 by 30-meter grids (Figure 2-4). The following is a summary of vegetative cover in the watershed determined from the GAP image:

1.80%	Urban (impervious, low and high density)
50.90%	Agricultural vegetation (row crop and pasture)
39.22%	Forest vegetation (shrubland, woodland, forest)
5.70%	Wetland vegetation (Palustrine: forest, shrubland, herbaceous)
2.22%	Open Water

The forest vegetation in the Patoka River watershed is comprised of both upland and bottomland mixed hardwood species in varied stages of succession. The upland hardwoods include a variety of red, white and black oaks, sugar maples, beech, and hickories, etc., while the bottomland species include swamp white oak, swamp chestnut oak, pin oak, cottonwood and sycamore.

Active mining operations are located in the western part of the watershed. There are also many abandoned mines that are slowly reverting back to a dense cover of brush and trees. Located throughout these mining areas are lakes and pits that provide water for a variety of wildlife.

### *2.2.2 Population*

The 1990 total population in the eight counties that have land portions in the watershed was 184,000 (IRBC 1993). Table 2-1 shows a break down of population by county and estimated population projections. It should be noted that these numbers do not reflect the actual population living in the Patoka River watershed. For example, only a portion of Warrick County is within the land area of the Patoka River watershed (Figure 2-1). A better estimate of the population within the Patoka River watershed may be the 1990 and 1995 U.S. Geological Survey Water Use Reports, which show a total population in the watershed of 47,030 in 1990 and 52,410 in 1995 (Table 2-6). These reports indicate that the population in the watershed appears to have grown by about 11.4 percent between 1990 and 1995.

The U.S. Census and the Indiana Business Research Center also provide information about the population in cities and towns. Table 2-2 contains population estimates for various cities and towns located wholly within the watershed. Jasper is the largest city located in the watershed in terms of population.

**TABLE 2-1  
PATOKA RIVER COUNTY POPULATION PROJECTIONS 1990-2020\***

County	1990	2000	2010	2020	Percent Change (1990 to 2020)
Crawford	9,900	10,200	10,600	10,800	+9.0
Dubois	36,600	38,200	39,800	41,000	+12.0
Gibson	31,900	31,300	31,400	31,400	-1.5
Martin	10,400	10,300	10,400	10,600	+1.9
Orange	18,400	18,300	18,500	18,400	0
Pike	12,500	12,100	12,000	11,800	-5.6
Spencer	19,500	19,600	20,000	20,100	+3.0
Warrick	44,900	47,200	48,700	49,100	+9.3

IBRC 1993

**TABLE 2-2  
PATOKA RIVER CITY AND TOWN POPULATION ESTIMATES\***

City/Town	Census 1990	Estimate 1996	Percent Change (1990 to 1996)
Ferdinand	2,318	2,385	2.9
Huntingburg	5,236	5,247	0.2
Jasper	10,030	10,995	9.6
Oakland City	2,810	2,902	3.3
Spurgeon	149	148	-0.7
Winslow	875	880	0.6
Princeton	8,127	7,273	-10.5

\* IBRC 1997

### 2.3 Planning within the Patoka River Watershed

Only Warrick and Spencer Counties use planning and zoning ordinances. Crawford, Gibson, Martin, Orange, Pike and Dubois Counties have not adopted planning and zoning ordinances.

### 2.4 Agricultural Activities in the Patoka River Watershed


Agriculture is the dominant land use in the Patoka River Watershed. Section 2.2.1 shows that 50.90 percent of land cover in the watershed is agricultural vegetation. This section provides an overview of the agricultural activities in the watershed.

#### 2.4.1 Livestock Operations

Confined feeding is the raising of animals for food, fur or recreation in lots, pens, ponds, sheds or buildings, where they are confined, fed and maintained for at least 45 days during any year, and where there is no ground cover or vegetation present over at least half of the animals' confinement area. Livestock markets and sale barns are generally excluded (IDEM 1999).

Indiana law defines a confined feeding operation as any livestock operation engaged in the confined feeding of at least 300 cattle, or 600 swine or sheep, or 30,000 fowl, such as chickens, ducks and other poultry. The IDEM regulates these confined feeding operations, as well as smaller livestock operations which have violated water pollution rules or laws, under IC 13-18-10.

As of October 1999, there were 399 livestock producers operating under the Confined Feeding Rules in the eight counties of the watershed (IDEM 1999). The following chart shows the permitted farms by county:



In the Patoka River watershed, Dubois County has the majority of animal operations. Listed are the number of different livestock operations located in Dubois County (Pitstick, 1999):

Poultry	160 Facilities
Swine	160 Facilities
Cattle	80 Facilities

Dubois County is the number one poultry producer and the seventh ranked hog and pig producer in Indiana. Most of the poultry industry is owned by Purdue Farms, who sub-contracts much of the operation to the public. Most of the swine operations in the county are following a manure management plan and use a lagoon system to manage manure. (Jim Peters, 1999) Smaller livestock operations do not require a permit from IDEM. Table 2-3 lists the 1997 distribution of livestock throughout the eight counties in the watershed. Turkeys and Poultry make up the largest number of domestic animal raised in the Patoka River watershed.

#### *2.4.2 Crop Production*

As discussed previously, the soils of the Patoka River watershed are good for crop production. Table 2-4 lists the 1997 acres of the major crops produced in 1997 throughout the eight counties in the watershed. For 1997, total acres of corn edged out total acres of soybeans as the number one crop produced in the eight counties are clearly the primary crops produced in the watershed on basis of total acres.

Land used for forage within the Patoka River watershed has been steadily declining. In Dubois county alone, there were approximately 50,000 acres of forage in 1978. In 1992 that number fell to 30,000 acres, and in 1997 it was down to 16,215 acres. (Pitstick, 1999)



**TABLE 2-3  
LIVESTOCK IN THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED**

1997 Livestock Inventory*								
Hogs and pigs			Cattle and calves		Sheep and lamb		Turkeys	
County	Number	State Rank**	Number	State Rank**	Number	State Rank**	Number	State Rank**
Crawford	1,230	90	4,180	56	--	--	--	--
Dubois	206,896	7	14,967	12	--	--	4,548,262	1
Gibson	71,493	37	3,137	66	110	78	88,800	16
Martin	46,433	50	4,481	52	34	90	767,700	4
Orange	36,696	59	6,561	33	--	--	(D)	11
Pike	13,539	77	1,903	76	59	86	354,789	9
Spencer	103,343	28	6,805	29	--	--	415,000	7
Warrick	22,717	70	1,787	79	(D)	85	--	--

\* USDA-NASS 1997

@ indicates specie is not in the top 4 for this county

\*\* State Rank is out of a total of 92 counties in Indiana

(D) Numbers not disclosed by USDA-NASS

**TABLE 2-4  
CROPS PRODUCED IN THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED**

County	1997 Crops*							
	Corn for grain		Soybeans for beans		Wheat		Hay crops	
	Acres	State Rank**	Acres	State Rank**	Acres	State Rank**	Acres	State Rank**
Crawford	713	92	968	92	(D)	90	10,362	24
Dubois	59,549	63	38,911	63	9,845	10	16,215	7
Gibson	95,804	13	85,338	16	30,044	3	4,562	60
Martin	16,105	81	12,623	83	2,165	77	6,838	34
Orange	22,017	76	17,977	82	3,719	61	12,170	10
Pike	29,996	74	27,609	72	4,942	39	2,857	81
Spencer	55,715	56	53,838	48	12,781	5	11,415	16
Warrick	33,671	70	34,408	66	5,867	30	5,504	50

\* USDA-NASS 1997

\*\* State Rank is out of a total of 92 counties in Indiana

## 2.5 Forest Lands and Management in the Patoka River Watershed

The Patoka watershed in Orange County is located within the Hoosier National Forest. There is very little cropland in this area of the watershed and much of that cropland has been abandoned and is slowly reverting back to brush and trees. There are a small number of cattle pastured however, those numbers are falling (Cheatham, 1999). The Conservation Reserve Program has made an impact within this area since 1985, with many landowners enrolling their cropland fields into 10-15 year set asides. These areas are typically grassed or forested.

IDNR State District and Private Consultant Foresters are very active and administer state funded cost share programs and provide harvest management plans to the landowners in the Patoka River watershed.

## 2.6 Surface and Subsurface Mining in the Patoka River Watershed

Beginning in 1836, underground coal mining became a major industry in Pike County. During the following fifty years, over 20,000 acres were surfaced mined and left abandoned and unreclaimed in Pike County. Problems such as acid mine drainage have become more prevalent. Acid mine drainage eradicated all fish in long stretches of the Patoka River, and the entire

length of the 17 mile long South Fork Tributary (Patoka South Fork Watershed Steering Committee Brochure, No date). In the 1920s, surface mining began to replace deep mining. Fifty years ago there were approximately 140 different mining operations, presently there are three. (Salkeld, 1999)

## 2.7 Significant Natural Areas in the Patoka River Watershed

In 1993, the Indiana Natural Resources Commission (NRC) adopted its "Outstanding Rivers" List for Indiana. This listing is referenced in the standards for utility line crossings within floodways, formerly governed by IC 14-28-2 and now controlled by 310 IAC 6-1-16 through 310 IAC 6-1-18. Except where incorporated into a statute or rule, the "Outstanding Rivers List" is intended to provide guidance rather than to have regulatory application (NRC 1997). To help identify the rivers and streams which have particular environmental or aesthetic interest, a special listing has been prepared by IDNR's Division of Outdoor Recreation. This listing is a corrected and condensed version of a list compiled by American Rivers and dated October 1990. The NRC has adopted the IDNR listing as an official recognition of the resource values of these waters. A river included in the "Outstanding Rivers List" qualifies under one or more of 22 categories. Table 2-5 presents the rivers in the Patoka River watershed which are on the "Outstanding Rivers List" and their significance.

### *Other Special Areas*

**Patoka Reservoir** was designed and built by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in July 1972. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers built the reservoir for flood control. It is the third largest body of water in Indiana, providing an 8,880 acre (surface area) water supply, also used for fish, wildlife and recreational activities.

The Patoka Reservoir dam is built from earth and rock fill, with a maximum height of 84 feet and is 1550 feet in length. The drainage area above the dam is 168 square miles. The area around Patoka Lake is at least 50% forested (Patoka Lake, Indiana – US Army Corps of Engineers Brochure, No date).

Patoka Reservoir is the drinking water supply for the town of Jasper, IN. The wastewater from the homes around Patoka Reservoir including the community of Dubois, is treated by the Patoka Regional Sewer and Water District.

**Sugar Ridge Fish and Wildlife Area** consists of six separate areas totaling approximately 7,300 acres in Pike County. Much of the area has been strip mined and contains 100 pits and lakes and rows of overburden mounds. The un-mined portion is mostly rough and rolling (Sugar Ridge Fish and Wildlife Area, Property Map, No date).

Patoka River National Wildlife Refuge and Management Area includes a 30 mile stretch of the Patoka River and covers 22,000 acres of land in Pike County. Although somewhat degraded by past drainage efforts and nearby abandoned mine lands, the array of wetlands and other habitat types continues to support a rich diversity of fish and wildlife species. There is nearly 7,000 acres of bottomland forested wetland, which is the most endangered of all our Nation's wetlands (Patoka River National Wildlife, Brochure). As a testimony to the intrinsic biological value of the area's habitat diversity, at least 20 plant species classified by Indiana as threatened

or endangered have been found within project boundaries. More than 380 species of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish and mollusks are known or expected to occur here. (Patoka River National Wildlife, Brochure, No date).

Ferdinand State Forest - In 1933, a local conservation club raised funds to buy 900 acres to build a lake and establish an area to hunt and fish. They offered management of the project to the Indiana Department of Conservation the following year, and this marked the establishment of Ferdinand State Forest. The area has four lakes which provide swimming, fishing, boating, etc. There is numerous wildlife throughout the forest which can be enjoyed on any of the 9 miles of hiking trails. (IDNR- Division of Forestry, No Date)

Pike State Forest consists of 2,939 acres located in Pike County, Indiana. Acquisition of the land that makes up Pike State Forest began in the 1930s, and continued through the 1950s. Most of the buildings on the property were constructed by the Works Progress Administration (WPA) using material cut from local timber stands. Topography at Pike State Forest varies from hilly uplands to the low bottomlands of the Patoka River. Because of the diversity of the sites, a wide variety of plant and animal life live in the Pike State Forest. Several recreational opportunities are available at Pike State Forest, including hunting, horseback riding, picnicking, bird watching and hiking. (IDNR- Division of State Parks, No Date)

**Buffalo Flats** is a protected wetland located in Dubois County. It provides habitat for many ducks, birds, reptiles, and amphibians. The water moccasin snake, which is on Indiana's Endangered Species List, also inhabits the area. Buffalo Flats is managed by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources-Division of Nature Preserves.

**TABLE 2-5  
WATERS OF THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED ON THE  
OUTSTANDING RIVERS LIST FOR INDIANA\***

River Segment	County	Significance
Patoka River: Patoka Reservoir to confluence with Vernon Fork Muscatatuck	Dubois, Gibson, Pike	Rivers identified as having outstanding ecological, recreational, or scenic importance.

\*NRC 1997

## 2.8 Surface Water Use Designations and Classifications

The following uses are designated by the Indiana Water Pollution Control Board (327 IAC 2-1-3):

- ◆ Surface waters of the state are designated for full-body contact recreation during the recreational season (April through October).
- ◆ All waters, except limited use waters, will be capable of supporting a well-balanced, warm water aquatic community.
- ◆ All waters, which are used for public or industrial water supply, must meet the standards for those uses at the point where water is withdrawn.
- ◆ All waters, which are used for agricultural purposes, must meet minimum surface water quality standards.
- ◆ All waters in which naturally poor physical characteristics (including lack of sufficient flow), naturally poor or reversible man-induced conditions, which came into existence prior to January 1, 1983, and having been established by use attainability analysis, public comment period, and hearing may qualify to be classified for limited use and must be evaluated for restoration and upgrading at each triennial review of this rule.
- ◆ All waters, which provide unusual aquatic habitat, which are an integral feature of an area of exceptional natural beauty or character, or which support unique assemblages of aquatic organisms may be classified for exceptional use.

All waters of the state, at all times and at all places, including the mixing zone, shall meet the minimum conditions of being free from substances, materials, floating debris, oil, or scum attributable to municipal, industrial, agricultural, and other land use practices, or other discharges:

- ◆ that will settle to form putrescent or otherwise objectionable deposits,
- ◆ that are in amounts sufficient to be unsightly or deleterious,
- ◆ that produce color, visible oil sheen, odor, or other conditions in such degree as to create a nuisance,
- ◆ which are in amounts sufficient to be acutely toxic to, or to otherwise severely injure or kill aquatic life, other animals, plants, or humans, or
- ◆ which are in concentrations or combinations that will cause or contribute to the growth of aquatic plants or algae to such degree as to create a nuisance, be unsightly, or otherwise impair designated uses.

### 2.8.1 Surface Water Classifications in the Patoka River Watershed

The statewide classifications discussed in Section 2.5 apply to all stream segments in the Patoka River watershed, with the following exception: An unnamed stream in Dubois County, which is the outlet of Huntingburg City Lake, from the City Lake Dam downstream to its confluence with Ell Creek is designated as a **limited water use**.

## **2.6 US Geological Survey Water Use Information for the Patoka River Watershed**

The U.S. Geological Survey's (USGS) National Water-Use Information Program is responsible for compiling and disseminating the nation's water-use data. The USGS works in cooperation with local, State, and Federal environmental agencies to collect water-use information at a site-specific level. USGS also compiles the data from hundreds of thousands of sites to produce water-use information aggregated up to the county, state, and national levels. Every five years, data at the state and hydrologic region level are compiled into a national water-use data system. Table 2-6 shows the USGS Water-Use information for the Patoka River Watershed for 1990 and 1995.

**TABLE 2-6  
1990 & 1995 Water Use Information for the Patoka River Watershed**

<b>Population and Water Use totals</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1995</b>
Total population in the watershed (thousands)	47.03	52.41
<b>Public Water Supply</b>		
Population served by public groundwater supply (thousands)	12.42	13.61
Population served by surface water supply (thousands)	24.38	31.34
Total population served by public water supply (thousands)	36.8	44.95
Total groundwater withdrawals (mgd)	1.21	0.09
Total surface water withdrawals (mgd)	5.61	6.99
Total water withdrawals (mgd)	6.82	7.08
Total per capita withdrawal (gal/day)	185.33	157.51
Population self-supplied with water (thousands)	10.23	7.46
<b>Commercial Water Use</b>		
Groundwater withdrawal for commercial use (mgd)	0.01	0.01
Surface water withdrawal for commercial use (mgd)	0.02	0.25
Deliveries from public water supplies for commercial use (mgd)	0.9	0.42
Total commercial water use (mgd)	0.93	0.68
<b>Industrial Water Use</b>		
Groundwater withdrawal for industrial use (mgd)	0	0
Surface water withdrawals for industrial use (mgd)	0.07	0
Deliveries from public water suppliers for industrial use (mgd)	4.84	2.48
Total industrial water use (mgd)	4.91	2.48
<b>Agricultural Water Use</b>		
Groundwater withdrawals for livestock use (mgd)	1.23	1.33
Surface water withdrawals for livestock use (mgd)	0.5	0.44
Total livestock water use (mgd)	1.73	1.77
Groundwater withdrawals for irrigation (mgd)	0	0
Surface water withdrawals for irrigation (mgd)	0.01	0
Total irrigation water use (mgd)	0.01	0
<b>Mining Use</b>		
Groundwater withdrawals	0	0
Surface water withdrawals	6.58	1.87
Total withdrawals (mgd)	6.58	1.87

**Notes:**

mgd million gallon per day  
gal/day gallon per day

- The water-use information presented in this table was compiled from information provided in the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water-Use Information Program data system for 1990 and 1995. The National Water-Use Information Program is responsible for compiling and disseminating the nation's water-use data. The U.S. Geological Survey works in cooperation with local, State, and Federal environmental agencies to collect water-use information at a site-specific level. Every five years, the U.S. Geological Survey compiles data at the state and hydrologic region level into a national water-use data system and are published in a national circular.

### 3 Causes and Sources of Water Pollution

A number of substances including nutrients, bacteria, oxygen-demanding wastes, metals, and toxic substances, cause water pollution. Sources of these pollution-causing substances are divided into two broad categories: point sources and nonpoint sources. Point sources are typically piped discharges from wastewater treatment plants, large urban and industrial stormwater systems, and other facilities. Nonpoint sources can include atmospheric deposition, groundwater inputs, and runoff from urban areas, agricultural lands and others. Chapter 3 includes the following:

- Section 3.1 Causes of Pollution
- Section 3.2 Point Sources of Pollution
- Section 3.3 Nonpoint Sources of Pollution

#### 3.1 Causes of Pollution

“Causes of pollution” refer to the substances which enter surface waters from point and nonpoint sources and result in water quality degradation and impairment. Major causes of water quality impairment include biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), nutrients, toxicants (such as heavy metals, polychlorinated biphenyls [PCBs], chlorine, pH and ammonia) and E. coli bacteria. Table 3-1 provides a general overview of causes of impairment and the activities that may lead to their introduction into surface waters. Each of these causes is discussed in the following sections.

**TABLE 3-1  
CAUSES OF WATER POLLUTION AND CONTRIBUTING ACTIVITIES**

Cause	Activity associated with cause
<b>Nutrients</b>	Fertilizer on agricultural crops and residential/ commercial lawns, animal wastes, leaky sewers and septic tanks, direct septic discharge, atmospheric deposition, wastewater treatment plants
<b>Toxic Chemicals</b>	Pesticide applications, disinfectants, automobile fluids, accidental spills, illegal dumping, urban stormwater runoff, direct septic discharge, industrial effluent
<b>Oxygen-Consuming Substances</b>	Wastewater effluent, leaking sewers and septic tanks, direct septic discharge, animal waste
<b>E. coli</b>	Failing septic systems, direct septic discharge, animal waste (including runoff from livestock operations and impacts from wildlife), improperly disinfected wastewater treatment plant effluent



### 3.1.1 *E. coli* Bacteria

*E. coli* bacteria are associated with the intestinal tract of warm-blooded animals. They are widely used as an indicator of the potential presence of waterborne disease-causing (pathogenic) bacteria, protozoa, and viruses because they are easier and less costly to detect than the actual pathogenic organisms. The presence of waterborne disease-causing organisms can lead to outbreaks of such diseases as typhoid fever, dysentery, cholera, and cryptosporidiosis. The detection and identification of specific bacteria, viruses, and protozoa, (such as *Giardia*, *Cryptosporidium*, and *Shigella*) require special sampling protocols and very sophisticated laboratory techniques which are not commonly available.

*E. coli* water quality standards have been established in order to ensure safe use of waters for water supplies and recreation. 327 IAC 2-1-6 Section 6(d) states that *E. coli* bacteria, using membrane filter count (MF), shall not exceed 125 per 100 milliliters as a geometric mean based on not less than five samples equally spaced over a 30 day period nor exceed 235 per 100 milliliters in any one sample in a 30 day period.

*E. coli* bacteria may enter surface waters from nonpoint source runoff, but they also come from improperly treated discharges of domestic wastewater. Common potential sources of *E. coli* bacteria include leaking or failing septic systems, direct septic discharge, leaking sewer lines or pump station overflows, runoff from livestock operations, urban stormwater and wildlife. *E. coli* bacteria in treatment plant effluent are controlled through disinfection methods including chlorination (often followed by dechlorination), ozonation or ultraviolet light radiation.

### 3.1.2 Toxic Substances

327 IAC 2-1-9(45) defines toxic substances as substances, which are or may become harmful to plant or animal life, or to food chains when present in sufficient concentrations or combinations. Toxic substances include, but are not limited to, those pollutants identified as toxic under Section 307 (a)(1) of the Clean Water Act. Standards for individual toxic substances are listed 327 IAC 2-1-6. Toxic substances frequently encountered include chlorine, ammonia, organics (hydrocarbons and pesticides) heavy metals and pH. These materials are toxic to different organisms in varying amounts, and the effects may be evident immediately or may only be manifested after long-term exposure or accumulation in living tissue.

Whole effluent toxicity testing is required for major NPDES dischargers (discharge over 1 million gallons per day or population greater than 10,000). This test shows whether the effluent from a treatment plant is toxic, but it does not identify the specific cause of toxicity. If the effluent is found to be toxic, further testing is done to determine the specific cause. This follow-up testing is called a toxicity reduction evaluation. Other testing, or monitoring, done to detect aquatic toxicity problems include fish tissue analyses, chemical water quality sampling and assessment of fish community and bottom-dwelling organisms such as aquatic insect larvae. These monitoring programs are discussed in Chapter 4.

Each of the substances below can be toxic in sufficient quantity or concentration.

#### Metals

Municipal and industrial dischargers and urban runoff are the main sources of metal contamination in surface water. Indiana has stream standards for many heavy metals, but the

most common ones in municipal permits are cadmium, chromium, copper, nickel, lead, mercury, and zinc. Standards are listed in 327 IAC 2-1-6. Point source discharges of metals are controlled through the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit process. Mass balance models are employed to determine allowable concentrations for a permit limit. Municipalities with significant industrial users discharging wastes to their treatment facilities limit the heavy metals from these industries through a pretreatment program. Source reduction and wastewater recycling at waste water treatment plants (WWTP) also reduces the amount of metals being discharged to a stream. Nonpoint sources of pollution are controlled through best management practices.

In Indiana, as well as many other areas of the country, mercury contamination in fish has caused the need to post widespread fish consumption advisories. The source of the mercury is unclear; however, atmospheric sources are suspected and are currently being studied.

#### Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) were first created in 1881 and subsequently began to be commercially manufactured around 1929 (Bunce 1994). Because of their fire-resistant and insulating properties, PCBs were widely used in transformers, capacitors, and in hydraulic and heat transfer systems. In addition, PCBs were used in products such as plasticizers, rubber, ink, and wax. In 1966, PCBs were first detected in wildlife, and were soon found to be ubiquitous in the environment (Bunce 1994). PCBs entered the environment through unregulated disposal of products such as waste oils, transformers, capacitors, sealants, paints, and carbonless copy paper. In 1977, production of PCBs in North America was halted. Subsequently, the PCB contamination present in our surface waters and environment today is the result of historical waste disposal practices.

#### Ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>)

Point source dischargers are one of the major sources of ammonia. In addition, discharge of untreated septic effluent, decaying organisms which may come from nonpoint source runoff and bacterial decomposition of animal waste also contribute to the level of ammonia in a waterbody. Standards for ammonia are listed in 327 IAC 2-1-6.

### *3.1.3 Oxygen-Consuming Wastes*

Oxygen-consuming wastes include decomposing organic matter or chemicals, which reduce dissolved oxygen in water through chemical reactions. Raw domestic wastewater contains high concentrations of oxygen-consuming wastes that need to be removed from the wastewater before it can be discharged into a waterway. Maintaining a sufficient level of dissolved oxygen in the water is critical to most forms of aquatic life.

The concentration of dissolved oxygen in a water body is one indicator of the general health of an aquatic ecosystem. 327 IAC Section 6 (b)(3) states that concentrations of dissolved oxygen shall average at least five milligrams per liter per calendar day and shall not be less than four milligrams per liter at any time. Dissolved oxygen concentrations are affected by a number of factors. Higher dissolved oxygen is produced by turbulent actions, such as waves, which mix air and water. Lower water temperatures also generally allows for retention of higher dissolved oxygen concentrations. Low dissolved oxygen levels tend to occur more often in warmer,

slow-moving waters. In general, the lowest dissolved oxygen concentrations occur during the warmest summer months and particularly during low flow periods.

Sources of dissolved oxygen depletion include wastewater treatment plant effluent, the decomposition of organic matter (such as leaves, dead plants and animals) and organic waste matter that is washed or discharged into the water. Sewage from human and household wastes is high in organic waste matter. Bacterial decomposition can rapidly deplete dissolved oxygen levels unless these wastes are adequately treated at a wastewater treatment plant. In addition, excess nutrients in a water body may lead to an over-abundance of algae and reduce dissolved oxygen in the water through algal respiration and decomposition of dead algae. Also, some chemicals may react with and bind up dissolved oxygen. Industrial discharges with oxygen consuming wasteflow may be resilient instream and continue to use oxygen for a long distance downstream.

### *3.1.4 Nutrients*

The term "nutrients" in this Strategy refers to two major plant nutrients, phosphorus and nitrogen. These are common components of fertilizers, animal and human wastes, vegetation, and some industrial processes. Nutrients in surface waters come from both point and nonpoint sources. Nutrients are beneficial to aquatic life in small amounts. However, in over-abundance and under favorable conditions, they can stimulate the occurrence of algal blooms and excessive plant growth in quiet waters or low flow conditions. The algal blooms and excessive plant growth often reduce the dissolved oxygen content of surface waters through plant respiration and decomposition of dead algae and other plants. This is accentuated in hot weather and low flow conditions because of the reduced capacity of the water to retain dissolved oxygen.

## **3.2 Point Sources of Pollution**

As discussed previously, sources of water pollution are divided into two broad categories: point sources and nonpoint sources. This section focuses on point sources. Section 3.3.1 defines point sources and Section 3.3.2 discusses point sources in the Patoka River Watershed.

### *3.2.1 Defining Point Sources*

Point sources refer to discharges that enter surface waters through a pipe, ditch or other well-defined point of discharge. The term applies to wastewater and stormwater discharges from a variety of sources. Wastewater point source discharges include municipal (city and county) and industrial wastewater treatment plants and small domestic wastewater treatment systems that may serve schools, commercial offices, residential subdivisions and individual homes. Stormwater point source discharges include stormwater collection systems for medium and large municipalities which serve populations greater than 100,000 and stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity as defined in the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR 122.26(a)(14)). The primary pollutants associated with point source discharges are Oxygen demanding wastes, nutrients, sediment, color and toxic substances including chlorine, ammonia and metals.

Point source dischargers in Indiana must apply for and obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the state. Discharge permits are issued under the NPDES program, which is delegated to Indiana by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). See Chapter 5 for a description of the NPDES program and permitting strategies.

### *3.2.2 Point Source Discharges in the Patoka River Watershed*

As of June 1999, there were 137 active NPDES permits within the Patoka River watershed (Table 3-2, Figure 3-1). See Chapter 5 for definition of minor dischargers.

In addition to the NPDES permitted dischargers in the watershed, there may be many unpermitted, illegal discharges to the Patoka River system. Illegal discharges of residential wastewater (septic tank effluent) to streams and ditches from straight pipe discharges and old inadequate systems are a problem within the watershed.

**Table 3-2  
NPDES PERMITTED FACILITIES  
PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED**

<b>NPDES</b>	<b>Facility Name</b>	<b>Maj/Mi</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Status</b>
ING040025	Solar Sources, Oatsville Mine	Minor	Oatsville	Pike	Active
ING040037	Black Beauty Coal, Francisco	Minor	Francisco	Gibson	Active
ING040039	Old Ben Coal Co, Mine #1	Minor	Spurgeon	Pike	Inactive
ING040040	Old Ben Coal Co, Mine #2	Minor	Petersburg	Pike	Inactive
ING040043	Phoenix Nr, Heitz Mine	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Active
ING040044	Phoenix Nr, Hunley Mine	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Active
ING040047	Phoenix Nr, Kohlenlager Pit	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Active
ING040050	Phoenix Nr, Satellite Mine	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Active
ING040051	Phoenix Nr, Upper Ell Cr Mine	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Active
ING040060	Black Beauty Coal, Columbia Mn	Minor	Oakland City	Gibson	Active
ING040065	Foertsch Constr. Tretter Mine	Minor	Mariah Hill	Spencer	Active
ING040083	Phoenix Nr, Backbone Pit	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Active
ING040086	Baron Coal Company	Minor	Lamar	Gibson	Active
ING040107	Triad Mining, Patoka River Min	Minor	Francisco	Gibson	Active
ING040111	United Minerals, Mallard Marsh	Minor	Velpen	Pike	Active
ING040118	Black Beauty Coal, Halo Run	Minor	Ferdinand	Dubois	Inactive
ING040124	Foertsch Constr. Co, Aml #1087	Minor	Velpen	Pike	Inactive
ING040129	Kindill Mine #2	Minor	Petersburg	Pike	Active
ING040130	Kindill Mine #1	Minor	Oakland City	Gibson	Active
ING040141	Gibson County Coal Corp.	Minor	Princeton	Gibson	Active
ING040142	Solar Sources, Cup Creek Mine	Minor	Velpen	Pike	Inactive
ING040150	Foertsch Const, Hunley Cr Mine	Minor	Mariah Hill	Spencer	Active
ING040160	Foertsch Construction AML 1101	Minor	Augusta	Pike	Active
ING340023	Teppco Princeton Terminal	Minor	Oakland City	Gibson	Active
ING670012	Amoco Pipeline Co., Francisco	Minor	Francisco	Gibson	Active
INP000127	Wabash Valley Produce, Inc.	Minor	Dubois	Dubois	Active
IN0001317	Old Ben Coal, Log Creek Field	Minor	Oakland City	Pike	Inactive
IN0001325	Old Ben Coal Inc-blackfoot #5	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0002399	AMAX Coal Company, Ayrcoe Mine	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0003042	Wabash Valley Produce Inc	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0003093	Huntingburg Public Water Sup.	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Active
IN0003808	Farbest Foods, Inc.	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Active
IN0020648	Ferdinand Municipal STP	Minor	Ferdinand	Dubois	Active
IN0020834	Jasper Municipal STP	Major	Jasper	Dubois	Active
IN0021687	Oakland City Municipal STP	Minor	Oakland City	Gibson	Active
IN0021881	Southern Railway Co	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0023124	Huntingburg Municipal STP	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Active
IN0025917	Haysville Wtr Utilities Inc.	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0029653	Mulzer Crushed Stone, Eckerty	Minor	Tell City	Crawford	Inactive
IN0029661	Mulzer Crushed Stone, Temple Q	Minor	Temple	Crawford	Active
IN0030058	Old Ben Coal Co-outfall 002	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0030066	Old Ben Coal Co-outfall 003	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0031682	Winslow Elementary and High Sc	Minor	Winslow	Pike	Inactive
IN0031691	Otwell Elem. School	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0031704	Pike Central mid & High School	Minor	Petersburg	Pike	Active
IN0033626	Old Ben Coal, Northwest Field	Minor	Oakland City	Gibson	Inactive
IN0033634	Old Ben Coal, Hardy Yager Field	Minor	Oakland City	Pike	Inactive

Table 3-2 (Continued)

NPDES	Facility Name	Maj/Mi	City	County	Status
IN0035840	Northeast Dubois School Corp	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0036595	Jasper Municipal Utl	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0036757	Northland Oil & Refining Co	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0036927	Sunrise Village M.H.P.	Minor	Jasper	Dubois	Inactive
IN0037788	Sun Oil Co of Pennsylvania	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0037931	Sun Oil Co of Pennsylvania	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0038717	Old Ben Coal, Tipple #2 Mine	Minor	Petersburg	Pike	Inactive
IN0040045	Francisco Municipal STP	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0040487	Patoka Municipal STP	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0040789	Winslow Municipal STP	Minor	Winslow	Pike	Active
IN0041378	Spurgeon Public Water Supply	Minor	Oakland City	Pike	Inactive
IN0041661	Spurgeon Municipal STP	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0041751	Old Ben Coal, West Field	Minor	Oakland City	Gibson	Inactive
IN0041769	Old Ben Coal, Tipple #1 Mine	Minor	Oakland City	Pike	Inactive
IN0042161	AMAX Coal Co-ayrcoe Mine Disc	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0042170	AMAX Coal Co., Ayrcoe Mine	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0042536	Winslow Public Water Supply	Minor	Winslow	Pike	Active
IN0042935	Patoka Town of W T P	Minor	Patoka	Gibson	Inactive
IN0044091	Dubois County 4-H Park	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0044695	N. East Dubois Co Sch Corp	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0045586	Old Ben Coal, Peterburg Field	Minor	Petersburg	Pike	Inactive
IN0045713	Dixon Present Coal Company	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0046256	Phoenix Nr, Heitz Mine	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Inactive
IN0046281	Old Ben Coal, S. Cup Ck Field	Minor	Oakland City	Pike	Inactive
IN0046311	IDNR Site 130, Blackfoot/pike	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0046361	Jefferson Township R S D	Minor	Otwell	Pike	Active
IN0046531	Old Ben Coal, Venturi #17 Pit	Minor	Cannelburg	Pike	Inactive
IN0046566	Super Block Coal, Hunley Ck Mi	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0046710	IDNR Site 309, Mill Creek Aml	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0046744	E & M Coal, Oak Hill Railsidin	Minor	Oakland City	Gibson	Inactive
IN0046892	Dyer Enterprises, Lockhart M.	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Inactive
IN0047104	Blackgold Associates, Inc.	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0047155	Phoenix Nr, Kohlenlager Pit	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Inactive
IN0047163	Clarkson Company, Inc.	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0047252	Phoenix Nr, Satellite Pit	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Inactive
IN0047465	Northeast Dubois Cnty School C	Minor	Dubois	Dubois	Active
IN0047872	Parke Coal Co., Nixon Pit	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0047937	Phoenix Nr, Ackerman Pit	Minor	Jasper	Dubois	Inactive
IN0048216	Black Beauty Coal, Ell Creek M	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Inactive
IN0048437	Midwestern Mining Consultants,	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0048500	Phoenix Nr, Backbone Pit	Minor	Jasper	Dubois	Inactive
IN0048828	Gibson County Coal Corporation	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0049239	Solar Sources, Inc. - Pit 14	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0049255	Energy Supply, Hunley Cr. #2	Minor		Spencer	Inactive
IN0049263	Energy Supply, Mariah Hill Pit	Minor	Mariah Hill	Spencer	Inactive
IN0049379	Parke Coal Co., August Pit	Minor	Winslow	Pike	Inactive

Table 3-2 (Continued)

NPDES	Facility Name	Maj/Mi	City	County	Status
IN0049816	Ohio Valley Co., Blackfoot #2	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0050482	Francisco Elementary School	Minor	Francisco	Gibson	Active
IN0051071	Jasper Engine & Transmission E	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0051209	Hasenour & Sternberg Inc. - Np	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0051268	Old Erin Coal Co.	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0051527	Three States Trucking	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0051934	Jasper Corporation, the	Minor	Jasper	Dubois	Inactive
IN0051942	Jasper Wood Products Co., Inc.	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0052361	Will Construction Company, Inc	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0052558	Three States Trucking Inc	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0052591	Three States Trucking Inc	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0052655	Spencer Coal Corp, Nr Duff	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0052698	Patoka Lake Reg. Wat. & Sew. D	Minor	Dubois	Dubois	Active
IN0052744	Spencer Coal Corp	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0052957	B&Is Contr., Ferdinand Mine	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0053007	Amax Coal Company Ayrcoe Mine	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0053163	Pine Ridge Elementary School	Minor	Birdseye	Dubois	Active
IN0053473	Dubois County Concrete Product	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Inactive
IN0053597	B.f.c. Coal Co., Cup Cr. Mine	Minor	Augusta	Pike	Inactive
IN0053716	Clarkson Company, Inc.	Minor		Dubois	Inactive
IN0053775	United Minerals, Mallard Marsh	Minor	Velpen	Pike	Inactive
IN0053872	Energy Supply, Cedar Hill Mine	Minor	Ferdinand	Dubois	Inactive
IN0054283	Cajun Coal Co., Johnson Pit	Minor	Winslow	Pike	Inactive
IN0054496	Peabody Coal, Oakland Cty Mine	Minor	Oakland City	Gibson	Inactive
IN0054950	Idnr Site , Fuhs Mine	Minor	Jasonville	Dubois	Inactive
IN0055204	Chesapeake Packaging Company	Minor	Saint Anthony	Dubois	Active
IN0055352	Old Ben Coal, Wh Church Field	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0055361	Vigo Coal Co., Columbia Mine	Minor	Oakland City	Gibson	Inactive
IN0055581	United Minerals, Halo Run Mine	Minor	Ferdinand	Spencer	Inactive
IN0055883	Solar Sources, Oatsville Mine	Minor	Petersburg	Pike	Inactive
IN0055972	Wallace Enterprises, Grandview	Minor	Grandview	Spencer	Inactive
IN0056260	Francisco Car Wash	Minor	Princeton	Gibson	Active
IN0056332	Phoenix Nr, Upper Ell Creek Mi	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Inactive
IN0056553	Phoenix Nr, Hunley Pit	Minor	Huntingburg	Dubois	Inactive
IN0057061	Baron Coal Company	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0057142	Idnr Site 306, Aml Nr Stendal	Minor		Pike	Inactive
IN0057231	Idnr Site 147, Wheeler Crk Aml	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0057428	Black Beauty Coal, Francisco M	Minor		Gibson	Inactive
IN0057690	Idnr Site 1005, Barn Run Creek	Minor	Near Alfordsville	Martin	Inactive
IN0058866	American Disposal Services	Minor	Winslow	Pike	Active
IN0060003	Gibson County Coal Corp. WWTP	Minor	Princeton	Gibson	Active

### 3.3 Nonpoint Sources of Pollution

Nonpoint source pollution refers to runoff that enters surface waters through stormwater runoff, contaminated ground water, snowmelt or atmospheric deposition. There are many types of land use activities that can serve as sources of nonpoint source pollution including land development, construction, mining operations, crop production, animal feeding lots, timber harvesting, failing septic systems, landfills, roads and paved areas. Stormwater from large urban areas (greater than 100,000 people) and from certain industrial and construction sites is technically considered a point source since NPDES permits are required for discharges of stormwater from these areas.

Sediment and nutrients are major pollution causing substances associated with nonpoint source pollution. Others include *E. coli* bacteria, heavy metals, pesticides, oil and grease, and any other substance that may be washed off the ground or removed from the atmosphere and carried into surface waters. Unlike point source pollution, nonpoint pollution sources are diffuse in nature and occur at random time intervals depending on rainfall events. Below is a brief description of major areas of nonpoint sources of pollution in the Patoka River watershed.

#### 3.3.1 Agriculture

There are a number of activities associated with agriculture that can serve as potential sources of water pollution. Land clearing and tilling make soils susceptible to erosion, which can then cause stream sedimentation. Pesticides and fertilizers (including synthetic fertilizers and animal wastes) can be washed from fields or improperly designed storage or disposal sites. Construction of drainage ditches on poorly drained soils enhances the movement of oxygen consuming wastes, sediment and soluble nutrients into groundwater and surface waters.

Concentrated animal operations can be a significant source of nutrients, biochemical oxygen demand and *E. coli* bacteria if wastes are not properly managed. Impacts can result from over application of wastes to fields, from leaking lagoons and from flows of lagoon liquids to surface waters due to improper waste lagoon management. Also there are potential concerns associated with nitrate-nitrogen movement through the soil from poorly constructed lagoons and from wastes applied to the soil surface.

Grassed waterways, conservation tillage, and no-till practices are several common practices used by many farmers to minimize soil loss. Maintaining a vegetated buffer between fields and streams is another excellent way to minimize sediment and nutrient loads to streams.

#### 3.3.2 Urban/Residential

Runoff from urbanized areas, as a rule, is more localized and can often be more severe in magnitude than agricultural runoff. Any type of land-disturbing activity such as land clearing or excavation can result in soil loss and sedimentation. The rate and volume of runoff in urban areas is much greater due both to the high concentration of impervious surface areas and to storm drainage systems that rapidly transport stormwater to nearby surface waters. This increase in volume and rate of runoff can result in streambank erosion and sedimentation in surface waters.



Urban drainage systems, including curb and guttered roadways, also allow urban pollutants to reach surface waters quickly and with little or no filtering. Pollutants include lawn care pesticides and fertilizers; automobile fluids; lawn and household wastes; road salts, and E. coli bacteria (from animals and failing septic systems). The diversity of these pollutants makes it very challenging to attribute water quality degradation to any one pollutant.

Replacement of natural vegetation with pavement and removal of buffers reduces the ability of the watershed to filter pollutants before they enter surface waters. The chronic introduction of these pollutants and increased flow and velocity into a stream results in degraded waters. Many waters adjacent to urban areas are rated as biologically poor. This degradation also exists in lakes, which have been heavily influenced by adjacent urban development.

The population figures discussed in Section 2.3.2 are good indicators of where urban development and potential urban water quality impacts are likely to occur. Concentrated areas where urban development is high may lead to further water quality problems associated with the addition of impervious surfaces next to surface waters.

### *3.3.3 Onsite Wastewater Disposal*

Septic systems contain all of the wastewater from a household or business. A complete septic system consists of a septic tank and an absorption field to receive effluent from the septic tank. The septic tank removes some wastes, but the soil absorption field provides further absorption and treatment. Septic systems can be a safe and effective method for treating wastewater if they are sized, sited, and maintained properly. However, if the tank or absorption field malfunction or are improperly placed, constructed or maintained, nearby wells and surface waters may become contaminated.

Some of the potential problems from malfunctioning septic systems include:

- **Polluted groundwater:** Pollutants in septic effluent include bacteria, nutrients, toxic substances, and oxygen-consuming wastes. Nearby wells can become contaminated by failing septic systems.
- **Polluted surface water:** Groundwater often carries the pollutants mentioned above into surface waters, where they can cause serious harm to aquatic ecosystems. Leaking septic tanks can also leak into surface waters through or over the soil. In addition, some septic tanks may directly discharge to surface waters.
- **Risks to human health:** Septic system malfunctions can endanger human health when they contaminate nearby wells, drinking water supplies, and fishing and swimming areas.

Pollutants associated with onsite wastewater disposal may also be discharged directly to surface waters through direct pipe connections between the septic system and surface waters (straight pipe discharge). However, 327 IAC 5-1-1.5 specifically states that "point source discharge of sewage treated or untreated, from a dwelling or its associated residential sewage disposal system, to the waters of the state is prohibited".

### *3.3.4 Construction*

Construction activities that involve excavation, grading or filling can produce significant sedimentation if not properly controlled. Sedimentation from developing urban areas can be a major source of pollution due to the cumulative number of acres disturbed in a watershed. Construction of single family homes in rural areas can also be a source of sedimentation when homes are placed in or near stream corridors.

As a pollution source, construction activities are typically temporary, but the impacts on water quality can be severe and long lasting. Construction activities tend to be concentrated in the more rapidly developing areas of the watershed.

## 4. Water Quality and Use Support Ratings in the Patoka River Watershed

This section provides a detailed overview of water quality monitoring, water quality, and use support ratings in the Patoka River watershed and includes the following:

- Section 4.1 Water Quality Monitoring Programs
- Section 4.2 Summary of Ambient Monitoring Data for the Patoka River Watershed
- Section 4.3 Fish Consumption Advisories
- Section 4.4 Clean Water Act Section 305(b) Report
- Section 4.5 Clean Water Act Section 305(b) Assessment and Use-Support: Methodology

### 4.1 Water Quality Monitoring Programs

This section discusses water quality monitoring programs. Specifically, Section 4.1.1 describes IDEM's Office of Water Management monitoring programs and Section 4.1.2 discusses other monitoring efforts in the watershed.

#### *4.1.1 Office of Water Management Programs*

The Water Quality Assessment Branch of the Office of Water Management is responsible for assessing the quality of water in Indiana's lakes, rivers and streams. This assessment is performed by field staff from the Survey Section and the Biological Studies Section. Virtually every element of IDEM's surface water quality management program of IDEM is directly or indirectly related to activities currently carried out by this Branch. The biological and surface water monitoring activities identify stream reaches, watersheds or segments where physical, chemical and/or biological quality has been or would be impaired by either point or nonpoint sources. This information is used to help allocate waste loads equitably among various sources in a way that would ensure that water quality standards are met along stream reaches in each of the nearly 100 stream segments in Indiana.

The purpose of the Surveys Section is to provide the water quality and hydrological data required for the assessment of Indiana's waters by conducting Watershed/Basin Surveys and Stream Reach Surveys. In 1996, the Section began a five-year synoptic study (Basin Monitoring Strategy) of the State's ten major watersheds. Information from these studies will be integrated with data from biological and nonpoint source studies as well as the Fixed Station Monitoring Program to make a major assessment of the State's waters. Such surveys determine the extent to which water quality standards are being met and whether the fishable, swimmable and water supply uses are being maintained.

Information derived from this strategy will contribute significantly to improved planning processes throughout the Office of Water Management. This plan should initiate the development of interrelated action plans, which encompass the wide range of responsibilities, such as rule making, permitting, compliance, nonpoint source issues, and wastewater treatment facility oversight.

The Biological Studies Section conducts studies of fish and macroinvertebrate communities as well as stream habitats to establish biological conditions to which other streams may be compared in order to identify impaired streams or watersheds. The Biological Studies Section also conducts fish tissue and sediment sampling to pinpoint sources of toxic and bioconcentrating substances. Fish tissue data serve as the basis for fish consumption advisories, which are issued, through the Indiana State Department of Health, to protect the health of Indiana citizens. This Section also participates in the development of site-specific water quality standards.

The Biological Studies Section relies on the Volunteer Water Quality Monitoring Programs to provide additional data on lakes and wetlands that may not be sampling sites in the Monitoring Strategy. Volunteer collected data provides IDEM scientists with an overall view of water quality trends and early warning of problems that may be occurring in a lake or wetland. If volunteers detect that a lake or wetland is severely degraded, professional IDEM scientists will conduct follow up investigation.

#### *4.1.2 Other Monitoring Efforts*

There are not any known local volunteer monitoring programs actively working throughout the Patoka River watershed. The Pike County Soil and Water Conservation District hired an education coordinator to teach Boy and Girl Scouts and other organizations about water quality. They do have a water quality testing kit available.

Also, the Dubois County SWCD has a water quality monitoring kit available for use by Riverwatch trained users. Staff members are monitoring the Patoka River on a quarterly basis.

IDNR's Hoosier Riverwatch will provide assistance for any interested group that may want to develop a volunteer monitoring program. There are two different levels of training available. The first level is a basic understanding of the waters chemical and physical characteristics and is used primarily as an educational method. Level II is a new, higher level of volunteer monitoring training. Volunteer monitors receiving Hoosier Riverwatch's Level II training will be certified and be able to collect and produce data at consistent, higher level of quality.

## **4.2 Summary of Ambient Monitoring Data for the Patoka River Watershed**

The fixed station-monitoring program managed by IDEM's Office of Water Management has been monitoring surface water chemistry throughout the state since 1957. The data set from 1986 to 1995 was analyzed using the Seasonal Kendall test. This test deduces if a statistical change in the surface water chemistry occurred over a time period. The results of the Seasonal Kendall analysis for stations located in the Patoka River watershed are provided in Table 4-1. The data collected from 1991 to 1997 from this monitoring program was also analyzed to determine benchmark characteristics. The results of the benchmark characteristic analysis for stations located in the Patoka River watershed are provided in Appendix B. For a more in depth discussion of this analysis, please refer to the Indiana Fixed Station Statistical Analysis 1997 (IDEM 32/02/005/1998), published in May 1998 by the Assessment Branch of the Office of Water Management - IDEM.

**TABLE 4-1  
RESULTS OF SEASONAL KENDALL ANALYSIS FOR STATIONS LOCATED  
IN THE PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED 1986 TO 1995**

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>P-35 Patoka River Near Oakland City, S.R. 57 Bridge, North of Oakland City</b>	<b>P-76 Patoka River at Huntingburg on Huntingburg Road</b>
Biological Oxygen Demand		
Chemical Oxygen Demand	←	
Dissolved Oxygen	←	↗
E. coli	←	←
Ammonia		←
Nitrite + Nitrate	←	←
Total phosphorus		←
Total Residue		←
Total Residue, Filterable	?	?
Total Residue, Nonfilterable	←	←
Copper	?	
Cyanide (total)	←	←

Notes

- ← No Statistical Change; significance < 80% or reported slope = 0.00000
- ↓ Statistically Decreasing; significance >95% with a negative slope
- ↘ Potentially Decreasing; significance >80% with a negative slope
- ↗ Potentially Increasing; significance >80% with a positive slope
- ↑ Statistically Increasing; significance >95 % with a positive slope
- ? Insufficient Data for analysis

### 4.3 Fish Consumption Advisories

Since 1972, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, the IDEM, and the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH) have worked together to create the Indiana Fish Consumption Advisory. Each year members from these three agencies meet to discuss the findings of recent fish monitoring data and to develop the new statewide fish consumption advisory.

The 1998 advisory is based on levels of PCBs and mercury found in fish tissue. Fish are tested regularly only in areas where there is suspected contamination. In each area, samples were taken of bottom-feeding fish, top-feeding fish, and fish feeding in between. Over 1,600 fish tissue samples collected throughout the state were analyzed for PCBs, pesticides, and heavy metals. Of those samples, 99 percent contained mercury. Criteria for placing fish on the 1996 Indiana Fish Consumption Advisory have changed from using the Food and Drug Administration guidelines to using the Great Lakes Task Force risk-based approach.

The ISDH defines the Advisory Groups as follows:

<b>Group 1</b>	Unrestricted consumption
<b>Group 2</b>	One meal per week (52 meals per year) for adult males and females. One meal per month for women who are pregnant or breastfeeding, women who plan to have children, and children under the age of 15.
<b>Group 3</b>	One meal per month (12 meals per year) for adult males and females. Women who are pregnant or breastfeeding, women who plan to have children, and children under the age of 15 do not eat.
<b>Group 4</b>	One meal every two months (six meals per year) for adult males and females. Women who are pregnant or breastfeeding, women who plan to have children, and children under the age of 15 do not eat.
<b>Group 5</b>	No consumption (DO NOT EAT)

Carp generally are contaminated with both PCBs and mercury. Except as otherwise noted, carp in all Indiana rivers and streams fall under the following risk groups:

- Carp, 15-20 inches - Group 3
- Carp, 20-25 inches - Group 4
- Carp over 25 inches - Group 5

In the Patoka River Watershed, the following waterbodies are under the 1999 fish consumption advisory:

Waterbody/County	Species	Size	Contaminant	Group
Patoka Reservoir, Orange County	Bluegill	5-6	Mercury	2
		6 +		3
Patoka Reservoir, Dubois County	Largemouth Bass	13+	Mercury	2
		Largemouth		13+

#### 4.4 Clean Water Act Section 305(b) Report

Section 305(b) of the Clean Water Act requires states to prepare and submit to the EPA a water quality assessment report of state water resources. A new surface water monitoring strategy for the Office of Water Management was implemented in 1996 with the goal of monitoring all waters of the state by 2001 and reporting the assessments by 2003. Each year approximately 20 percent of the waterbodies in the state will be assessed and reported the following year. Indiana 305(b) Report 1994-95" provides the most recent comprehensive report on Indiana water quality and is the baseline report for areas of the state for which water quality assessments have not yet been updated (IDEM 1994-95). The methodology of the Clean Water Act Section 305(b) assessment and use support ratings are discussed in Section 4.5.

The Patoka River assessment was updated during the summer of 1996 as part of the five year, rotating basin, monitoring strategy. The results of the 1996 assessment are reported in the 1998 305(b) report, titled *Indiana Water Quality Report 1998* (IDEM, 1998). The 1998 305(b) report is the most current and comprehensive assessment of the Patoka River watershed.

Appendix B contains the listing of the Patoka River watershed waterbodies assessed, status of designated use support, probable causes of impairment, and stream miles affected. This assessment was based on data collected during the summer of 1996.

#### 4.5 Clean Water Act Section 305(b) Assessment and Use-Support: Methodology

The Office of Water Management determines use support status for each stream and waterbody in accordance with the assessment guidelines provided by EPA (1997). Results from four monitoring programs are integrated to provide an assessment for each stream and waterbody:

Physical/chemical water column results,  
Benthic aquatic macroinvertebrate community assessments,  
Fish tissue and surficial aquatic sediment contaminant results, and  
*E. coli* monitoring results.

The assessment process was applied to each data sampling program. The individual assessments were integrated into an overall assessment for each waterbody by use designation: aquatic life support, fish consumption, and recreational use. River miles in a watershed appear as one waterbody while each lake in a watershed is reported as a separate waterbody.

Physical/chemical data for toxicants (total recoverable metals), conventional water chemistry parameters (dissolved oxygen, pH, and temperature), and bacteria (*E. coli*) were evaluated for

exceedance of the Indiana Water Quality Standards (327 IAC 2-1-6). U.S. EPA 305(b) Guidelines were applied to sample results as indicated in Table 4-3 (U.S. EPA 1997b).



**TABLE 4-2  
CRITERIA FOR USE SUPPORT ASSESSMENT\***

Parameter	Fully Supporting	Partially Supporting	Not Supporting
<b>Aquatic Life Use Support</b>			
<b>Toxicants</b>	Metals were evaluated on a site by site basis and judged according to magnitude of exceedance and the number of times exceedances occurred.		
<b>Conventional inorganics</b>	There were very few water quality violations, almost all of which were due to natural conditions.		
<b>Benthic aquatic macroinvertebrate Index of Biotic Integrity (mIBI)</b>	mIBI ≥ 4.	mIBI < 4 and ≥ 2.	mIBI < 2.
<b>Qualitative habitat use evaluation (QHEI)</b>	QHEI ≥ 64.	QHEI < 64 and ≥ 51.	QHEI < 51.
<b>Fish community (fIBI) (Lower White River only)</b>	IBI ≥ 44.	IBI < 44 and ≥ 22	IBI < 22.
<b>Sediment (PAHs = polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons. AVS/SEM = acid volatile sulfide/ simultaneously extracted metals.)</b>	All PAHs ≤ 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile. All AVS/SEMs ≤ 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile. All other parameters ≤ 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile.	PAHs or AVS/SEMs > 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile. (Includes Grand Calumet River and Indiana Harbor Canal sediment results, and so is a conservative number.)	Parameters > 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile as derived from IDEM Sediment Contaminants Database.
<b>Indiana Trophic State Index (lakes only)</b>	Nutrients, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, algal growth, and sometimes pH were evaluated on a lake-by-lake basis. Each parameter judged according to magnitude.		
<b>Fish Consumption</b>			
Fish tissue	No specific Advisory*	Limited Group 2 - 4 Advisory*	Group 5 Advisory*
* Indiana Fish Consumption Advisory, 1997, includes a state wide advisory for carp consumption. This was not included in individual waterbody reports because it obscures the magnitude of impairment caused by other parameters.			
<b>Recreational Use Support (Swimmable)</b>			
Bacteria (cfu = colony forming units.)	No more than one grab sample slightly > 235 cfu/100ml, and geometric mean not exceeded.	No samples in this classification.	One or more grab sample exceeded 235 cfu/100ml, and geometric mean exceeded.

\*From Indiana Water Quality Report for 1998

## 5 State and Federal Water Programs

This Chapter summarizes the existing point and nonpoint source pollution control programs available for addressing water quality problems in the Patoka River watershed. Chapter 5 includes:

- Section 5.1 Indiana Department of Environmental Management Water Quality Programs
- Section 5.2 Indiana Department of Natural Resources Water Programs
- Section 5.3 USDA/Natural Resources Conservation Service Water Programs

### 5.1 Indiana Department of Environmental Management Water Quality Programs

This Section describes the water quality programs managed by the Office of Water Management within IDEM and includes:

- Section 5.1.1 State and Federal Legislative Authorities for Indiana's Water Quality Program
- Section 5.1.2 Indiana's Point Source Control Program
- Section 5.1.3 Indiana's Nonpoint Source Control Programs
- Section 5.1.4 Integrating Point and Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Strategies
- Section 5.1.5 Potential Sources of Funding for Water Quality Projects

#### *5.1.1 State and Federal Legislative Authorities for Indiana's Water Quality Program*

Authorities for some of the programs and responsibilities carried out by the Office of Water Management are derived from a number of federal and state legislative mandates outlined below. The major federal authorities for the state's water quality program are found in sections of the Clean Water Act. State authorities are from state statutes.

#### Federal Authorities for Indiana's Water Quality Program

- ◆ The Clean Water Act Section 301 - Prohibits the discharge of pollutants into surface waters unless permitted by EPA.
- ◆ The Clean Water Act Section 303(c) - States are responsible for reviewing, establishing and revising water quality standards for all surface waters.
- ◆ The Clean Water Act Section 303(d) - Each state shall identify waters within its boundaries for which the effluent limits required by 301(b)(1) A and B are not stringent enough to protect any water quality standards applicable to such waters.
- ◆ The Clean Water Act Section 305(b) - Each state is required to submit a biennial report to the EPA describing the status of surface waters in that state.
- ◆ The Clean Water Act Section 319 - Each state is required to develop and implement a nonpoint source pollution management program.

- ◆ The Clean Water Act Section 402 - Establishes the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program. Allows for delegation of permitting authority to qualifying states (which Indiana has received).
- ◆ The Clean Water Act Section 404/401 - Section 404 regulates the discharge of dredge and fill materials into navigable waters and adjoining wetlands. Section 401 requires the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to receive a state Water Quality Certification prior to issuance a 404 permit.

#### State Authorities for Indiana's Water Quality Program

IC 13-13-5 Designation of Department for Purposes of Federal Law: Designates the Indiana Department of Environmental Management as the water pollution agency for Indiana for all purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) effective January 1, 1988, and the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f through 300j) effective January 1, 1988.

### **5.1.2 Indiana's Point Source Control Program**

The State of Indiana's efforts to control the direct discharge of pollutants to waters of the State were inaugurated by the passage of the Stream Pollution Control Law of 1943. The vehicle currently used to control direct discharges to waters of the State is the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) permit program. This was made possible by the passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (also referred to as the Clean Water Act). These permits place limits on the amount of pollutants that may be discharged to waters of the State by each discharger. These limits are set at levels protective of both the aquatic life in the waters which receive the discharge and human health.

The State of Indiana was granted primacy from U.S. EPA to issue NPDES permits on January 1, 1975 through a Memorandum of Agreement.

U.S. EPA, Region V, has oversight authority for the NPDES permits program. Under terms of the Memorandum of Agreement, Region V has the right to comment on all draft Major discharger permits. In addition to NPDES, the Office of Water Management Permits Section has a pretreatment group which regulates municipalities in their development of municipal pretreatment programs and indirect discharges, or those discharges of process wastewater to municipal sewage treatment plants through Industrial Waste Pretreatment permits and regulation of Stormwater, CSO's, and variance requests through a special projects group currently known as the Urban Wet Weather Group. Land Application of waste treatment plant sludge is no longer a part of the Office of Water Management but is now a part of the Office of Land Quality (formerly, Office of Solid and Hazardous Waste).

The purpose of the NPDES permit is to control the point source discharge of pollutants into the waters of the State such that the quality of the water of the State is maintained in accordance with the standards contained in 327 IAC 2. The NPDES permit requirements must ensure that the minimum amount of control is imposed upon any new or existing point source through the application of technology-based treatment requirement contained in 327 IAC 5-5-2. According to 327 IAC 5-2-2, "Any discharge of pollutants into waters of the State as a point source discharge, except for exclusions made in 327 IAC 5-2-4 is prohibited unless in conformity with a

valid NPDES permit obtained prior to discharge." This is the most basic principal of the NPDES permit program.

The majority of NPDES permits have existed since 1974. This means that most of the permit writing is for permit renewals. Approximately 10 percent of each year's workload is attributed to new permits, modifications and requests for estimated limits. NPDES permits are designed to be re-issued every five years but are administratively extended in full force and effect indefinitely if the permittee applied for a renewal before the current permit expires.

There are several different types of permits that are issued in the NPDES permitting program. Table 5-1 lists and describes the various permits.

**TABLE 5-1  
TYPES OF PERMITS ISSUED UNDER THE NPDES PROGRAM**

Type of Permit	Subtype	Comment
<b>Municipal, Semi-Public or State (sanitary discharger)</b>	Major	A facility owned by a municipality with a design flow Municipal of 1 MGD or greater (Cities, Towns, Regional Sewer Districts)
	Minor	Any municipally owned facility with a design flow of less than 1 MGD (Cities, Towns, Regional Sewer Districts)
	Semipublic	Any facility not municipally, State or Federally owned (i.e.- mobile home parks, schools, restaurants, etc.)
	State Owned	A facility owned or managed by a State agency (State parks, prisons, etc.)
	Federally Owned	A facility owned by a federal agency (military Owned installation, national park, federal penitentiary, etc.)
<b>Industrial (Wastewater generated in the process of producing a product)</b>	Major	Any point source discharger designated annually by agreement between the commissioner and EPA. Classification of discharger as a major involves consideration of factors relating to significance of impact on the environment, such as: Nature and quantity of pollutants discharged; Character and assimilative capacity of receiving waters; Presence of toxic pollutants in discharge; Compliance history of discharger.
	Minor	All dischargers which are not designated as major dischargers.
	General	General permit rule provides streamlined NPDES permitting process for certain categories of industrial point source discharges under requirements of the applicable general permit rule, rather than requirements of an individual permit specific to a single discharge. General permit rules: 327 IAC 15-7 Coal mining, coal processing, and reclamation activities; 327 IAC 15-8 Non-contact cooling water; 327 IAC 15-9 Petroleum product terminals; 327 IAC 15-10 Groundwater petroleum remediation systems; 327 IAC 15-11 Hydrostatic testing of commercial pipelines; 327 IAC 15-12 Sand, gravel, dimension stone or crushed stone operations.
	Cooling Water	Water which is used to remove heat from a product or process; the water may or may not come in contact with the product.
Public Water Supply	Wastewater generated from the process of removing pollutants from ground or surface water for the purpose of producing drinking water.	
<b>Pretreatment Urban Wet Weather Group</b> (Associated with NPDES but do not fall under same rule.)	Stormwater-related	Wastewater resulting from precipitation coming in contact with a substance which is dissolved or suspended in the water.
	Industrial Wastewater Pre-treatment	Processed wastewater generated by Industries that contribute to the overall wastewater received by the wastewater treatment plant.
	Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO)	Wastewater discharged from combined storm and sanitary sewers due to precipitation events. Municipal and Industrial Urban Wet Weather Programs

### 5.1.3 Nonpoint Source Control Programs

Nonpoint source (NPS) pollution is so named because the pollutants do not originate at single point sources, such as industrial and municipal waste discharge pipes. Instead, NPS pollutants are carried over fields, lawns, and streets by rainwater, wind, or snowmelt. This runoff may carry with it such things as fertilizer, road salt, sediment, motor oil, or pesticides. These pollutants either enter lakes and streams or seep into groundwater. While some NPS pollution is naturally occurring, most of it is a result of human activities.

Reducing NPS pollution requires careful attention to land use management and local geographic and economic conditions. The NPS Program was established to fully integrate methods for coping with the state's varied NPS water pollution problems. While a number of agencies and organizations currently have their own programs for addressing specific NPS issues, overall NPS coordination is being aided through the consolidated NPS Management Plan that was developed in the early stages of the Program's formation. Approximately, over 180 NPS-related projects have been funded and managed by the NPS Program since 1990. The NPS Management Plan was prepared in 1989, partially based on findings from the NPS Assessment Report, which was also completed that year. The NPS Management Plan was updated and received EPA approval in 1999. Some of the objectives of the Management Plan included the education of land users, the reduction and remediation of NPS pollution caused by erosion and sedimentation of forested and agricultural lands, and urban runoff. Other objectives addressed pesticide and fertilizer use, land application of sludge, animal waste practices, past and present mining practices, on-site sewage disposal, and atmospheric deposition.

The state's NPS Program, administered by the IDEM Office of Water Management's Watershed Management Section, focuses on the assessment and prevention of NPS water pollution. The program also provides for the exchange of education and information in order to improve the way land is managed. Through the use of federal funding for the installation of best management practices (BMPs), the NPS Program effectively reaches out to citizens and assists in the development of BMPs to manage land in such a way that less pollution is generated. The NPS program promotes a non-regulatory, voluntary approach to solving water quality problems.

The many nonpoint source projects funded through the Office of Water Management are a combination of local, regional, and statewide efforts sponsored by various public and not-for-profit organizations. The emphasis of these projects has been on the local, voluntary implementation of NPS water pollution controls. Since the inception of the program in the late 1980s, it has utilized over \$12 million of federal funds for the development of over 180 projects.

The federal Clean Water Act contains nonpoint source provisions in several sections of the Act including the Section 319 Nonpoint Source Program, the Section 314 Clean Lakes Program (no longer funded), the Section 104(b)(3) Watershed Management Program, and the Section 205(j) Water Quality Planning Program. The Section 319 program provides for various voluntary projects throughout the state to prevent water pollution and also provides for assessment and management plans related to water bodies in Indiana impacted by NPS pollution. Section 314 has assessment provisions that assist in determining the nonpoint and point source water quality impacts on lakes and provides recommendations for improvements, but no longer receives funding. Section 104(b)(3) provides assistance in the development of watershed management planning efforts and education/information and implementation projects. Section 604(b) provides for planning activities relating to the improvement of water quality from

nonpoint and point sources. The Watershed Management Section within the Planning Branch of the Office of Water Management provides for the administration of the Section 319 funding source for the NPS-related projects. The Financial Management Services Branch of the Office of Water Management administers the Section 104(b)(3) and Section 604(b) grants.

Clean Water Act Section 319(h) grant monies are made available to the states on an annual basis by EPA. Agencies and organizations in the state that deal with NPS problems submit proposals to the Office of Water Management each year for use of these funds in various projects.

One of the most important aspects of all NPS pollution prevention programs is the emphasis on the watershed approach to these programs. This calls for users in the watershed to become involved in the planning and implementation of practices, which are designed to prevent pollution. By looking at the watershed as a whole, all situations causing the degradation of water quality will be addressed, not just a few. Appendix C lists the conservation partners and local stakeholders located in the Patoka River watershed.

#### *5.1.4 Integrating Point and Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Strategies*

Integrating point and nonpoint source pollution controls and determining the amount and location of the remaining assimilative capacity in a watershed are key long-term objectives of watershed management. The information is used for a number of purposes including: determining if and where new or expanded municipal or industrial wastewater treatment facilities can be allowed; setting the recommended treatment level at these facilities; and identifying where point and nonpoint source pollution controls must be implemented to restore capacity and maintain water quality standards.

##### Total Maximum Daily Loads

The Clean Water Act mandates an integrated point and nonpoint source pollution control approach. This approach, called a total maximum daily load (TMDL), uses the concept of determining the total pollutant loading from point and nonpoint sources that a waterbody can assimilate while still maintaining its designated use (maintaining water quality standards). EPA is responsible for ensuring that TMDLs are completed by States and for approving the completed TMDLs.

Under the TMDL approach, waterbodies that do not meet water quality standards are identified. States establish priorities for action, and then determine reductions in pollutant loads or other actions needed to meet water quality goals. The approach is flexible and promotes a watershed approach driven by local needs and directed by the State's list of priority waterbodies. The overall goal in establishing the TMDL is to establish the management actions on point and nonpoint sources of pollution necessary for a waterbody to meet water quality standards.

The Office of Water Management at IDEM is in the process of reorganizing its work activities around a five year rotating basin schedule. The waters of the state have been grouped geographically into major river basins, and water quality data and other information will be collected and analyzed from each basin, or group of basins, once every five years. The schedule for implementing the TMDL Strategy is proposed to follow this rotating basin plan to the extent possible. The TMDL Strategy discusses activities to be accomplished in three phases. Phase One involves planning, sampling and data collection and would take place the first year. Phase Two involves TMDL development and would occur in the second year, and Phase Three is

the TMDL implementation and would occur the third year. It is expected that some phases, especially implementation of TMDLs (Phase Three) in the basin(s), may take more than one year to fully accomplish.

Initially, as part of the TMDL Strategy in a watershed, the IDEM TMDL Program Manager, in coordination with the IDEM Basin Coordinator of the target basin, will develop an activity reference guide for each TMDL. This activity reference guide will provide: (1) a list of the necessary activities and tasks, (2) a schedule for completing activities and tasks associated with an individual TMDL, and (3) a roster that indicates which Section, staff, and /or contractor are responsible for completion of each activity/task.

In Phase Three, the TMDL scenario chosen in conjunction with watershed stakeholders during Phase Two will be used to develop a plan to implement the TMDL. During this process, stakeholder participation will be essential. The Basin Coordinator, in conjunction with the stakeholder groups, will develop a plan to implement the TMDL. Once the draft plan has been finalized through comments from stakeholder groups and IDEM, the plan becomes a draft-final and open public review. Public meetings will be held in areas affected to solicit comments.

#### *5.1.5 Potential Sources of Funding for Water Quality Projects*

There are numerous sources of funding for all types of water quality projects. The sources of funding include federal and state agencies, nonprofits, and private funding. Funds may be loans, cost-share projects, or grants. Section 319(h) grants and other funding sources are discussed below.

If a local government, environmental group, university researcher, or other individual or agency wants to find funding to address a local water quality problem, it is well worth the time to prepare a thorough but concise proposal and submit it to applicable funding agencies. Even if a project is not funded, follow-up should be done to determine what changes may be needed in order to make the application more competitive.

#### Section 319(h) Grants

EPA offers to the state Clean Water Act Section 319(h) grant moneys on an annual basis. These grants must be used to fund projects that address nonpoint source pollution issues. Some projects which the Office of Water Management has funded with this money in the past include best management practice (BMP) demonstrations, watershed water quality improvements, data management, educational programs, modeling, stream restoration, and riparian buffer establishment. Units of government, nonprofit groups, and universities in the state that have expertise in nonpoint source pollution problems are invited to submit Section 319(h) proposals to the Office of Water Management.

Office of Water Management staff review proposals for minimum 319 eligibility criteria such as:

- ◆ Does it support the state NPS Management Program milestones?
- ◆ Does the project address targeted, high priority watersheds?
- ◆ Is there sufficient non-federal cost-share match available (25% of project costs)?
- ◆ Are measurable outputs identified?
- ◆ Is monitoring required? Is there a Quality Assurance/Quality Control plan for monitoring?
- ◆ If a Geographical Information System is used, is it compatible with that of the state?



- ◆ Is there a commitment for educational activities and a final report?
- ◆ Are upstream sources of NPS pollution addressed?
- ◆ Are stakeholders involved in the project?

Office of Water Management staff separately review and rank each proposal which meets the minimum 319 eligibility criteria. In their review, members consider such factors as: technical soundness; likelihood of achieving water quality results; degree of balance lent to the statewide NPS Program in terms of project type; and competence/reliability of contracting agency. They then convene to discuss individual project merits, to pool all rankings and to arrive at final rankings for the projects. Comments are also sought from outside experts in other governmental agencies, nonprofit groups, and universities. The Office of Water Management seeks a balance between geographic regions of the state and types of projects. All proposals that rank above the funding target are included in the annual grant application to EPA, with EPA reserving the right to make final changes to the list. Actual funding depends on approval from EPA and yearly congressional appropriations.

To obtain more information about applying for a Section 319(h) grant, contact:

Susan McCloud, Watershed Management Section Chief  
IDEM Office of Water Management  
100 N. Senate Avenue  
P.O. Box 6015  
Indianapolis, IN 46206-6015  
(317) 232-0019

#### Other Sources of Funding

Besides Section 319(h) funding, there are numerous sources of funding for all types of water quality projects. The sources of funding include federal and state agencies, nonprofit, and private funding. Funds may be loans, cost-shares, or grants. Appendix D provides a summary list of agencies and funding opportunities.

## **5.2 Indiana Department of Natural Resources Water Programs**

### *5.2.1 Division of Soil Conservation*

The Division of Soil Conservation's mission is to ensure the protection, wise use, and enhancement of Indiana's soil and water resources. The Division's employees are part of Indiana's Conservation Partnership, which includes the 92 soil and water conservation districts (SWCDs), the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, and the Purdue University Cooperative Extension Service. Working together, the partnership provides technical, educational, and financial assistance to citizens to solve erosion and sediment-related problems occurring on the land or impacting public waters.

The Division administers the Clean Water Indiana soil conservation and water quality program under guidelines established by the State Soil Conservation Board, primarily through the SWCDs in direct service to landusers. The Division staff includes field-based resource specialists who work closely with landusers, assisting in the selection, design, and installation of practices to reduce soil erosion on their land. Regional Urban Conservation Specialists work primarily with

developers, contractors, and others to address erosion and sediment concerns in urban settings, developments under construction, and in landfills. The Lake and River Enhancement staff (LARE) oversee all administrative, operational, and technical aspects of the LARE program, which provides financial assistance to local entities concerned with improving and maintaining water quality in public-access lakes, rivers, and streams.

### *5.2.2 Division of Water*

The IDNR, Division of Water (DOW) is charged by the State of Indiana to maintain, regulate, collect data, and evaluate Indiana's surface and ground water resources.

The Engineering Branch of the DOW includes Dam and Levee Safety, Project Development, Surveying, Drafting, and Computer Services. The Dam and Levee Safety Section performs geotechnical and hydraulic evaluation on existing and proposed dams and levees throughout the State. The Project Development Section provides technical support to locally funded water resource projects along with engineering leadership and construction management to State funded water resource projects. The remaining sections provide support services to all Sections within the DOW such as reservoir depth mapping, topographic mapping, highwater marks, design of publications and brochures, and computer procurement and maintenance.

The Planning Branch of the DOW consists of Basin Studies, Coastal Coordination, Floodplain Management, Ground Water, Hydrology and Hydraulics, and Water Rights. Basin Studies are comprehensive reports on surface-and ground-water availability and use. Coastal Coordination is a communication vehicle to address Lake Michigan's diverse shoreline issues. Floodplain Management involves various floodplain management aspects including coordination with the National Flood Insurance Program and with State and Federal Emergency Management agencies during major flooding events. The Ground Water Section maintains the water-well record computer database and publishes reports and maps on the ground-water resource for the State. Hydrology and Hydraulics Section develops and reviews floodplain mapping and performs hydrologic studies and modeling. The Water Rights Section investigates and mediates groundwater/surface water rights issues, licenses water-well drillers, and develops well construction and abandonment procedures.

The Regulations Branch of DOW is made up of Stream Permits, Lake Permits, Permit Administration, Public Assistance, and Legal Counsel. The Stream Permits Section is responsible for reviewing permit applications for construction activity in the 100-year regulatory floodway along Indiana's waterways. The Lake Permits Section reviews construction projects at or below the legal lake level for all of Indiana's public freshwater lakes. Permit Administration Section provides administrative support to Branch staff, maintains the application database, and coordinates the application review process with other Divisions. The Public Assistance Section provides technical assistance on possible permit applications on proposed construction projects, investigates and mediates unpermitted construction activities and in some cases with the support of Legal Counsel pursues legal action for violation of State laws.

## **5.3 USDA/Natural Resources Conservation Service Water Quality Programs**

While there are a variety of USDA programs available to assist people with their conservation needs. The following assistance programs are the principal programs available.

### Conservation Technical Assistance (CTA)

The purpose of the program is to assist landusers, communities, units of state and local government, and other Federal agencies in planning and implementing conservation systems. The purpose of the conservation systems are to reduce erosion, improve soil and water quality, improve and conserve wetlands, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, improve air quality, improve pasture and range condition, reduce upstream flooding, and improve woodlands.

The objective of the program is to: Assist individual landusers, communities, conservation districts, and other units of State and local government and Federal agencies to meet their goals for resource stewardship and assist individuals to comply with State and local requirements. NRCS assistance to individuals is provided through conservation districts in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Governor of the State, and the conservation district. Assistance is provided to landusers voluntarily applying conservation and to those who must comply with local or State laws and regulations. Assistance is also provided to agricultural producers to comply with the highly erodible land (HEL) and wetland (Swampbuster) provisions of the 1985 Food Security Act as amended by the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 3801 et. seq.); the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, and wetlands requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. NRCS makes HEL and wetland determinations and helps land users develop and implement conservation plans to comply with the law. They also provide technical assistance to participants in USDA cost-share and conservation incentive programs. NRCS collects, analyzes, interprets, displays, and disseminates information about the condition and trends of the Nation's soil and other natural resources so that people can make good decisions about resource use and about public policies for resource conservation. They also develop effective science-based technologies for natural resource assessment, management, and conservation.

### Conservation of Private Grazing Land Initiative (CPGL)

The Conservation of Private Grazing Land initiative will ensure that technical, educational, and related assistance is provided to those who own private grazing lands. It is not a cost-share program. This technical assistance will offer opportunities for: better grazing land management; protecting soil from erosive wind and water; using more energy-efficient ways to produce food and fiber; conserving water; providing habitat for wildlife; sustaining forage and grazing plants; using plants to sequester greenhouse gases and increase soil organic matter; and using grazing lands as a source of biomass energy and raw materials for industrial products.

### Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)

NRCS provides technical assistance to landowners interested in participating in the Conservation Reserve Program administered by the USDA Farm Service Agency. The Conservation Reserve Program reduces soil erosion, protects the Nation's ability to produce food and fiber, reduces sedimentation in streams and lakes, improves water quality, establishes wildlife habitat, and enhances forest and wetland resources. It encourages farmers to convert highly erodible cropland or other environmentally sensitive acreage to vegetative cover, such as tame or native grasses, wildlife plantings, trees, filterstrips, or riparian buffers. Farmers receive an annual rental payment for the term of the multi-year contract. Cost-share funding is provided to establish the vegetative cover practices.

### Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)

The Environmental Quality Incentives Program provides technical, educational, and financial assistance to eligible farmers and ranchers to address soil, water, and related natural resource concerns on their lands in an environmentally beneficial and cost effective manner. The program provides assistance to farmers and ranchers in complying with Federal, State, and tribal environmental laws, and encourages environmental enhancement. The program is funded through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The purposes of the program are achieved through the implementation of a conservation plan, which includes structural, vegetative, and land management practices on eligible land. Five to ten year contracts are made with eligible producers. Cost-share payments may be made to implement one or more eligible structural or vegetative practices, such as animal waste management facilities, terraces, filter strips, tree planting, and permanent wildlife habitat. Incentive payments can be made to implement one or more land management practices, such as nutrient management, pest management, and grazing land management.

Fifty percent of the funding available for the program is targeted at natural resource concerns relating to livestock production. The program is carried out primarily in priority areas that may be watersheds, regions, or multi-state areas, and for significant statewide natural resource concerns that are outside of geographic priority areas.

### Watershed Surveys and Planning

The Watershed and Flood Prevention Act, P.L. 83-566, August 4, 1954, (16 U.S.C. 1001-1008) authorized this program. Prior to fiscal year 1996, small watershed planning activities and the cooperative river basin surveys and investigations authorized by Section 6 of the Act were operated as separate programs. The 1996 appropriations act combined the activities into a single program entitled the Watershed Surveys and Planning program. Activities under both programs are continuing under this authority.

The purpose of the program is to assist Federal, State, and local agencies and tribal governments to protect watersheds from damage caused by erosion, floodwater, and sediment and to conserve and develop water and land resources. Resource concerns addressed by the program include water quality, opportunities for water conservation, wetland and water storage capacity, agricultural drought problems, rural development, municipal and industrial water needs, upstream flood damages, and water needs for fish, wildlife, and forest-based industries.

Types of surveys and plans include watershed plans, river basin surveys and studies, flood hazard analyses, and flood plain management assistance. The focus of these plans is to identify solutions that use land treatment and non-structural measures to solve resource problems.

### Watershed Program and Flood Prevention Program (WF 08 or FP 03)

The Small Watershed Program works through local government sponsors and helps participants solve natural resource and related economic problems on a watershed basis. Projects include watershed protection, flood prevention, erosion and sediment control, water supply, water quality, fish and wildlife habitat enhancement, wetlands creation and restoration, and public recreation in watersheds of 250,000 or fewer acres. Both technical and financial assistance are available.

### Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP)

The Wetlands Reserve Program is a voluntary program to restore wetlands. Participating landowners can establish conservation easements of either permanent or 30 year duration, or can enter into restoration cost-share agreements where no easement is involved. In exchange for establishing a permanent easement, the landowner receives payment up to the agricultural value of the land and 100 percent of the restoration costs for restoring the wetlands. The 30 year easement payment is 75 percent of what would be provided for a permanent easement on the same site and 75 percent of the restoration cost. The voluntary agreements are for a minimum 10 year duration and provide for 75 percent of the cost of restoring the involved wetlands. Easements and restoration cost-share agreements establish wetland protection and restoration as the primary land use for the duration of the easement or agreement. In all instances, landowners continue to control access to their land.

### Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)

The Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program provides financial incentives to develop habitat for fish and wildlife on private lands. Participants agree to implement a wildlife habitat development plan and USDA agrees to provide cost-share assistance for the initial implementation of wildlife habitat development practices. USDA and program participants enter into a cost-share agreement for wildlife habitat development. This agreement generally lasts a minimum of 10 years from the date that the contract is signed.

## REFERENCES

- Bunce, Nigel J. 1994. *Environmental Chemistry*. Second Edition. Wuerz Publishing Ltd. Winnipeg, Canada.
- Cheatham, Michael. 1999. Personal communication between Michael Cheatham, NRCS Resource Conservationist, and Andy Ertel, Regional Watershed Conservationist USDA-NRCS-IDEM, about water quality concerns, agricultural and forestry information, and conservation activities within the Patoka watershed area in Orange County. October 1.
- Indiana Business Research Center (IBRC). 1993. Indiana County Population Projections 1990-2030. <http://www.statelib.lib.in.us/www/ri/projections.HTML>
- IBRC. 1997. Indiana Cities and Towns Population. <http://www.iupui.edu/it/ibrc/Population/CITYEST/allcities.html> Last Updated: November
- Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM). 1998. Indiana 305(b) Report Update. Office of Water Management
- IDNR. Division of State Parks. <http://www.state.in.us/dnr/forestry/htmldocs/ferdind.html> Last Updated: No date. <http://www.state.in.us/dnr/forestry/htmldocs/pike.html> Last Update: No date.
- IDEM. 1999. Confined Feeding Operations. As presented on <http://www.stat.in.us/idem/oshwm/confined.html> Last update: April.
- Indiana State University (ISU). 1999. Indiana GAP Analysis Home Page. <http://139.102.7.220/h1/bertha/gap/> Last accessed: June
- Natural Resources Commission (NRC). 1997. Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana. As presented on <http://www.ai.org/nrc/outstand.htm> Last update: October.
- Patoka Lake, IN. (no date) Brochure US Army Corp of Engineers
- Patoka River National Wildlife. (no date) Brochure US Fish and Wildlife Service
- Patoka South Fork Watershed Steering Committee Brochure. No date.
- Peters, Jim. 1999. Personal communication between Jim Peters, Purdue University Cooperative Extension Service, and Andy Ertel, Regional Watershed Conservationist USDA-NRCS-IDEM, about animal waste management systems and other agricultural conditions in Dubois County. September 3.
- Pitstick, Bart. 1999. Personal communication between Bart Pitstick, District Conservationist USDA-NRCS, and Andy Ertel, Regional Watershed Conservationist USDA-NRCS-IDEM, about water quality and agricultural information, and conservation activities in Dubois County. September 3.
- Salkeld, Ken. 1999. Personal communication between Ken Salkeld, Pike County Purdue Cooperative Extension Service, and Andy Ertel, Regional Watershed Conservationist

USDA-NRCS-IDEM, about water quality concerns and mining information in Pike County. November 16.

Sugar Ridge Fish and Wildlife Area. (no date) Property Map

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 1997. 1997 Census of Agriculture Profiles: Indiana State and County Profiles Ranked Items and Other County Summary Data.  
<http://www.nass.usda.gov/census/census97/profiles/in/inb.htm>

USDA. 1984. Soil Survey of Orange County

USDA. 1999. Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Soils Inventory Data Base.

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1997a. Guidelines for Preparation of the State WaterQuality Assessments (305[b] Reports) and Electronic Updates: Report Contents. Washington, DC: U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. *EPA-841-B-97-002A*.

Walker, William. 1999. Personal communication between Bill Walker, Pike County Health Department, and Andy Ertel, Regional Watershed Conservationist USDA-NRCS-IDEM, about water quality concerns and septic system information in Pike County. October 7.

# Patoka River Watershed Restoration Action Strategy

## Part II: Concerns and Recommendations

*Prepared by*

Indiana Department of  
Environmental Management  
Office of Water Management

*June 2000*



## Foreword

The First Draft (October 1999) of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy (WRAS) was reviewed internally by IDEM and revised accordingly. The Second Draft (Spring 2000) was reviewed by stakeholders and revised accordingly. This Third Draft (June 2000) is intended to be a living document to assist restoration and protection efforts of stakeholders in their sub-watersheds. As a "living document" information contained within the WRAS will need to be revised and updated periodically.

The WRAS is divided into two parts: Part I, Characterization and Responsibilities and Part II, Concerns and Recommendations.

---

Andy Ertel, Resource Conservationist  
IDEM Office of Water Management  
100 N. Senate Avenue  
P.O. Box 6015  
Indianapolis, IN 46206-6015

[Andy.Ertel@nrca.usda.gov](mailto:Andy.Ertel@nrca.usda.gov)

# Patoka River Watershed Restoration Action Strategy

## Part II: Concerns and Recommendations

---

Part II of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy discusses the water quality concerns identified for the Patoka River Watershed and lists recommended management strategies to address these concerns.

Part II includes:

Section 1	Water Quality Concerns and Priority Issues Identified by Stakeholder Groups
Section 2	Water Quality Concerns and Priority Issues Identified by State and Federal Agencies
Section 3	Identification of Impaired Waters
Section 4	Priority Issues and Recommended Management Strategies
Section 5	Future Actions and Expectations

### 1 Water Quality Concerns and Priority Issues Identified by Stakeholder Groups

The Patoka River watershed contains potential stakeholder groups that have different missions. Many of these groups have a long history of working in the Patoka River watershed. The following discussion briefly describes some of the watershed groups and lists their priorities and concerns.

#### *SWCD's & NRCS & IDNR Div. of Soil Agencies*

In Dubois, Gibson, and Pike Counties, the field office personnel of the Natural Resources Conservation Service and IDNR Division of Soil Conservation, along with the Soil and Water Conservation Districts have identified that soil erosion and animal waste are concerns in the Patoka River watershed.

In Orange, Crawford, Martin and Warrick Counties, the field office personnel of the Natural Resources Conservation Service and IDNR Division of Soil Conservation, along with the Soil and Water Conservation Districts did not identify any major natural resource concerns in the Patoka watershed areas in their counties.

Within some areas of the Patoka River watershed, a big concern is the large amount of manure being produced by the poultry and turkey industry. Soil phosphorus levels need to be aggressively managed because some of the fields are reaching 1000 parts per million (Pitstick 1999). Some of the livestock operations store the manure on the top or side of a hill until an opportunity to spread it becomes available. A few producers do not maintain a grass filter area below the manure and it washes down to waterbodies. Several of the poultry and turkey operations are located on sites where spreading acreage is limited. Many of the livestock operations in Dubois County need a dry stacking manure system to help manage the manure problem (Pitstick 1999).

Dead poultry are presently being buried or stored in holding tanks in the ground. While some of these tanks get cleaned out, others are left in the ground and may leak in time. Livestock operations would benefit from an animal composting system (Pitstick 1999).

Every spring and fall, the Dubois County Purdue Cooperative Extension Service receives numerous complaints of hog manure odor. Many homes are being constructed closer to existing animal feeding operations (Peters, 1999).

### ***Local Board of Health Departments***

The County Health Departments within the Patoka River watershed are constantly challenged in assisting homeowners with their septic systems. In all of the counties of the Patoka River watershed, the two most common septic system related problems are poorly drained soils with fragipans and seasonal high water tables. Also, some home sites have slopes of 15% or greater, which makes percolation very difficult.

Many of the counties are using alternative septic systems or modified techniques. For example, in Dubois county, approximately 45 sand mound systems are typically installed per year because the standard system will not work (Oeding, 1999). Many of the systems in Pike County are constructed with the filtering line trenches at twice the normal width because of the clay content and closeness to shale (Walker, 1999). Most of the newer systems are installed with more linear footage in the adsorption area and a perimeter drain.

Every county varies in the number of septic system permits issued. In counties like Dubois, urban growth continues with approximately 130 – 150 new permits a year. (Oeding, 1999)

Jasper, the largest community in the Patoka River watershed, has a separate sewer system, however, it needs to expand due to growth and the future addition of the town of Ireland into their treatment system. The Dubois County Health Department averages 160 septic system failures per year around the Jasper community (Oeding, 1999).

Many septic systems receive too much water at one time, and therefore do not function properly. This happens because 90% of the households in Dubois County are served with public water (Oeding, 1999).

Other possible reasons why septic systems fail are:

- lot sizes are too small
- poor soils
- lack of septic system management (such as emptying tank every 2 to 5 years)
- filter field is too small
- weather (too much rain causing soil saturation)
- poor site selection
- decomposing bacteria die from grease and other harmful items
- laundry (should be done in little amounts and more often)

Overall, there is an undetermined number of failing septic systems within the Patoka River watershed. Some of these systems are straight pipe outlets that discharge the septic effluent on the soil surface, in road ditches, in drainage field tile, down hill sides, etc. These systems create a health hazard from the possibility of spreading disease and are illegal.

There are two ways these illicit discharges get upgraded to county standards:

1. the owner sells the property and must disclose it
2. a complaint is filed

To help homeowners understand more about their septic systems, the environmental health specialists provide individual assistance and educational material when permits are issued and/or during site visits

Funding from the Build Indiana and the State Revolving Loan Funds, along with local business & industry donations have secured enough money to connect the towns of Celestine, St. Anthony, St. Marks, Schnellville, and Bretzville to the Patoka Regional Sewer and Water District.

### ***Southwest Indiana Brine Coalition***

The Southwest Indiana Brine Coalition is presently targeting brine sites located in Posey, Daviess, Dubois, Vanderburg, Warrick, Gibson, and Pike Counties, that do not have an identified oil operator. They provide technical and possibly financial assistance to landowners with land areas that have soils of high saline concentration from old mining operations. These areas are called brine sites and range from ½ to 5 acres.

Oil and gas drilling activities are quite prolific in Pike and Gibson Counties. In the process of extraction, oil related problems such as salt water and oil spills have impaired water and soil quality. Brine sites on hillsides, cause deep gully erosion from the lack of a vegetative cover and the contaminated sediment moves downhill which continues to sterilize more acres. (Hazlewood,1999) Sites that are close to watercourses are a high priority. The number of brine sites within the seven counties has yet to be determined.

The next phase of the Brine Coalition is to provide more education and possibly technical cost share assistance toward improving the brine sites. The best solution, thus far, is building up the soil organic content by incorporating animal manure, wood chips, grass clippings, etc. The best vegetation that may somewhat grow on these areas has been Tall wheat. (Hazlewood, 1999)

### ***Patoka South Fork Watershed Steering Committee***

The South Fork of the Patoka River Watershed is considered the most heavily impacted watershed in the State of Indiana (Patoka South Fork Watershed Steering Committee Brochure, no date). Of the approximately 52,000 acre watershed, between 60 and 75 percent has been impacted or impaired with acid mine drainage. The environmental degradation from acid mine drainage has been well documented by numerous scientific studies. These studies have documented the loss of fish, aquatic insects, and plants due to the inflow of water with low pH, heavy metals, suspended sediments, and precipitates that coat the stream bottoms. (Patoka South Fork Watershed Steering Committee Brochure)

The Committee is mostly working with mined sites that date 1977 and earlier. Located throughout the abandoned mining areas are creeks, streams, pits and ponds. Many of these water sources are very acidic with pH levels of 1 or 2. Heavy iron levels are also present which gives an orange color to the water. The thousands of acres of rolling spoil banks act like

sponges during rainfall, and then slowly release the acid water in the form of seeps and streams.

One solution being implemented is the application of calcium hydroxide in the streams, pits and ponds, which raises the pH levels to 7, 8, or 9. The calcium hydroxide is produced in the forms of liquid or solid material. Other solutions are to apply limestone to the site areas, cover with dirt and plant vegetation or create limestone rock filter basins which neutralize the acid. (Mosley, 1999)

The Committee uses a geographic information system (GIS) and has completed inventorying the area. Prioritization of sites is done on a continual basis, and implementation as funding becomes available. Financial assistance for the implementation of these solutions comes from the Abandon Mine Lands Fund and/or the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative. The cost of implementation can range from one thousand to half a million dollars per project area.

The Committee also organizes trash pick up and educational activities, such as Adopt-a-River or Adopt-a-Highway events.

Currently, the South Fork tributary has some river segments that support aquatic vegetation and fish. (Mosley, 1999)

### ***Pike County Extension Service***

Purdue University and the Pike County Extension Service are producing a document called "Watershed Connections, Water Resources of Pike County, Indiana." The document contains information about the watersheds and water resources of Pike County. It provides detail about point and nonpoint sources of water pollution and lists some things that citizens can do in protecting surface and ground water quality. The document should be available by January 2000.

## **2 Water Quality Concerns and Priority Issues Identified by State and Federal Agencies**

This section presents the combined efforts of state and federal agencies, and universities (such as IDEM, IDNR, USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service, Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, Purdue University, Indiana University, Indiana Geologic Survey, and US Geological Survey) to assess water quality concerns and priority issues in the Patoka River Watershed. This multi-organization effort formed the basis of the Unified Watershed Assessment for Indiana. At this time, the Unified Watershed Assessment has been completed for 1998 and 2000-2001, as described below.

### **Indiana's 1998 Unified Watershed Assessment (UWA)**

The UWA workgroup gathered a wide range of water quality data that could be used to characterize Indiana's water resources. These data were used in Alayers@ in order to sort the 8-digit HUC watersheds according to the present condition of the water in lakes, rivers, and

streams. The workgroup used only those data which concerned the water column, organisms living in the water, or the suitability of the water for supporting aquatic ecosystems. Each layer of information/data was partitioned by percentiles into scores. The scores ranged between one and five, with a score of one indicative of good water quality or minimum impairment, and a score of five indicating heavily impacted or degraded water quality. The scoring derived through the UWA process is presented in Table 2-1.

The data layers listed in Table 2-1 can be defined as:

- ◆ Lake Fishery: Large mouth bass community information for lakes
- ◆ Stream Fishery: Small mouth bass community information for streams
- ◆ Aquatic Life Use Support: The livability of the water column for aquatic life, determined from evaluation of chemical and physical water data, and assessment of aquatic life
- ◆ Fish Consumption Advisories: Site specific advisories based on current data
- ◆ Fish Index of Biotic Integrity: Based on fish community diversity and fish health
- ◆ Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index: Measure of whether the aquatic habitat is suitable for diverse communities, based on visual observations
- ◆ Lake Trophic Scores: Indicator for the rate at which a lake is aging due to inputs of nutrients and other factors
- ◆ Sediment Potential: Indicator of potential sediment input to waterbodies in the watershed

The sources and additional information for these data layers include:

- ◆ Lake Fishery: From IDNR fisheries surveys of lakes and reservoirs from 1972 to 1994. Raw scores were averaged for all lakes in the watershed
- ◆ Stream Fishery: From IDNR fisheries surveys of streams from 1970 to 1994. Raw scores were averaged for all streams in the watershed
- ◆ Aquatic Life Use Support: IDEM, Office of Water Management, Assessment Branch
- ◆ Fish Consumption Advisories: ISDH and IDEM, Office of Water Management, Assessment Branch
- ◆ Fish Index of Biotic Integrity: IDEM, Office of Water Management, Assessment Branch
- ◆ Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index: IDEM, Office of Water Management, Assessment Branch
- ◆ Lake Trophic Scores: Indiana Clean Lakes Program through IDEM, Office of Water Management, Assessment Branch. This score was based on information gathered from sampling conducted in the 1970's and 1980's
- ◆ Sediment Potential: U.S. Geological Survey scored the population rate of change and the 1996 Conservation Tillage Transect data. The scores were then added and normalized to produce a sediment yield indicator for each watershed

**TABLE 2-1**  
**RESULTS OF THE UNIFIED WATERSHED ASSESSMENT**  
**FOR PATOKA RIVER**

<b>Data/Information Layer</b>	<b>Patoka River (05120209) Score</b>
Stream Fishery	5
Aquatic Life Use Support	2
Fish Consumption Advisories	3
Recreational/Swimming	1
Lake Trophic Scores	2
Sediment Potential	5

Note:

The UWA scores range from one to five, with a score of one indicating good water quality and a score of five indicating severe impairment.

### Indiana's 2000-2001 Unified Watershed Assessment (UWA)

During summer 1999 the UWA workgroup used additional layers of information to identify the **resource concerns and stressors** for each of the 361 11-digit watersheds in Indiana. Examination of the human activities that have the potential to impact the ecosystem will help planners to focus on those areas where restoration may be most critical. Organizations can identify opportunities to use their programs and resources to address those areas.

This focusing process will illuminate areas where the interests of two or more partner agencies may converge. It is intended that this will lead to more effective allocation of resources for restoration and protection activities. At the local level, this information can assist groups to prioritize watershed activities and provide some discussion points for planning.

This amended assessment has the following benefits:

- ◆ Provides a logical process for targeting funds, which may be expanded or updated without changing the basic framework.
- ◆ Provides information at a finer resolution (11-digit hydrologic units) to agencies and local groups interested in watershed assessment.
- ◆ Identifies data gaps.
- ◆ Can be used as a compliment to other assessments, such as the 305(b) Report and 303(d) List.

Table 2-2 and Figure 2-1 show the results of the 2000-2001 UWA for the Patoka River watershed.

### 3 Identification of Impaired Waters

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act requires states to identify waters that do not or are not expected to meet applicable water quality standards with federal technology based standards alone. States are also required to develop a priority ranking for these waters taking into account the severity of the pollution and the designated uses of the waters. Indiana's 303(d) list was approved by EPA on February 16, 1999.

Once the Section 303(d) list and ranking of waters is completed, the states are required to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for these waters in order to achieve compliance with the water quality standards. The TMDL is an allocation that determines the point and nonpoint source (plus margin of safety) load reductions required in order for the waterbody to meet water quality standards. IDEM's Office of Water Management has and continues to perform point source waste load allocations for receiving waters. Part I of the WRAS briefly outlines IDEM's strategy for developing TMDLs.

The following Patoka River Watershed waterbodies are on Indiana's 1998 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list submitted and approved by EPA 303(d) list (Figure 3-1):

- **Patoka Reservoir** fish consumption advisory for Mercury (Severity Ranking: Low)
- **Patoka River** fish consumption advisories for Mercury and PCB (Severity Ranking: Medium)
- **South Fork Patoka River** for Impaired Biotic Communities (Severity Ranking: High)

### 4 Priority Issues and Recommended Management Strategies

Part I provided the existing water quality information for the Patoka River watershed and Part II lists priority issues and concerns from local, state, and federal stakeholders in the watershed. This section pulls together the priority issues and concerns held by all stakeholders and recommends management strategies. Underlying all discussions of priority issues and concerns is the fact that improving water quality in the Patoka River Watershed will also enhance the natural and recreational values of Patoka River. Each subsection below focuses on a single priority issue.

#### 4.1 Data\Information and Targeting

In the Patoka River watershed many of the stakeholders groups have identified numerous concerns. Some groups have targeted and identified problem areas on geographic information systems, while other groups are targeting areas on topographic or other types of maps. It appears that there is enough information that a watershed plan could be written and implementation started.

**Recommended Management Strategy 1:** Make sure that communication continues between the local SWCD's, the natural resource agencies, local county government agencies, and other active stakeholder groups, focusing on present accomplishments and future planning.



Continue to inform the watershed community about the past, present, and future desired condition of the watershed area that is being worked on.

**Recommended Management Strategy 2:** Develop a watershed plan. Involve every active stakeholder group and list all their efforts and accomplishments. Pull these items into one document looking at the broad watershed picture, while managing and implementing at smaller workable units. If possible, work with smaller land units such as 14 digit HUC watershed areas (Figure 2-2 of Part I) where positive improvements may be noticed and publicized.

## 4.2 Failing Septic Systems and Straight Pipe Discharges

Local county health departments and other stakeholders have identified failing septic systems and straight pipe discharge from septic tanks as sources of water pollution in the Patoka River watershed. Straight pipe discharges from septic tanks and septic tanks connected to drainage tiles are illegal (327 IAC 5-1-1.5), however, these practices are ongoing in the Patoka River watershed.

**Recommended Management Strategy:** : All of the environmental specialists of the local health departments have stressed that more education is needed pertaining to septic system management. Developing a workshop for the rural customers which provides information on septic system maintenance, the impacts of failed septic systems, regulations, alternative treatment systems, and financial assistance (if any) may be a good start. Local stakeholders could possibly partner to help share in the cost of the program. To further these educational efforts, the direct impact of communities discharging their septic tank effluent to waterbodies needs to be adequately characterized. This will involve coordination between the Office of Water Management, local health departments, Indiana State Department of Health, and other stakeholders. The option of choice to eliminate the illegal discharges will be a cooperative effort between homeowners and local, state, and federal stakeholders. If a cooperative solution can not be reached, illegal dischargers will be required to cease discharge until they obtain an appropriate NPDES permit.

## 4.3 Water Quality - General

The Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list presented in Section 6.3 lists water quality-limited waterbodies for the Patoka River watershed.

**Recommended Management Strategy:** The Clean Water Act requires states to complete TMDLs for waterbodies listed on the Section 303(d) list. The Office of Water Management is currently evaluating and exploring the modeling process and data needs required to complete TMDLs for the Section 303(d) listed waterbodies in the Patoka River watershed. Completion of a TMDL will involve loading allocations of a pollutant to both point and nonpoint sources. The Office of Water Management is currently drafting a TMDL strategy that involves stakeholder input throughout the process.

## 4.4 Fish Consumption Advisories

As noted in Part I and Part II, fish consumption advisories are a concern within the Patoka River watershed.

**Recommended Management Strategy 1:** Any person eating fish from the Patoka Reservoir or the Patoka River or its tributaries, should check the fish consumption advisory every year and follow the recommendations. Soil and Water Conservation Districts could run yearly spring articles about fish consumption recommendations through local media sources or their newsletter.

#### **4.5 Nonpoint Source Pollution - General**

Nonpoint source pollution contributions are often difficult to assess or quantify. Currently, loadings of nonpoint source pollutants to water are often inferred by examination of land use practices, without actual measurements. In addition, the actual water quality impairments related to nonpoint source pollutants have not been well characterized in the Patoka River watershed. Finally, very few regulatory control mechanisms exist to control nonpoint source pollution.

**Recommended Management Strategy 1:** Numerous funding mechanisms, such as Conservation Reserve Program, Environmental Quality Incentive Program, Lake and River Enhancement program, and 319(h) grants, exist to promote practices to reduce nonpoint source pollution in the watershed.

#### **4.6 Point Sources - General**

**Recommended Management Strategy:** The Permitting and Compliance Branch of the Office of Water Management is responsible for issuing and monitoring compliance of NPDES permit holders. Clearly, more emphasis and resources are needed to identify and correct illegal point sources and noncomplying point sources. Improving compliance of NPDES dischargers and identifying illicit dischargers will involve fostering a working relationship with other local, state, and federal stakeholders to monitor compliance and report unusual discharges or stream appearance. In regards to illicit discharges, the Office of Water Management will work with local, state, and federal stakeholders to identify and eliminate these sources of water pollution.

## 5 Future Expectations and Actions

As discussed in Part I, this Watershed Restoration Action Strategy is intended to be fluid document that will be revised or amended as new information becomes available. Section 5.1 discusses expectations derived from the Strategy and how progress will be measured. Specific revisions and amendments to the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy are discussed in Section 5.2. Finally, the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy will be reviewed by all stakeholders before it becomes final, as described in Section 5.3.

### 5.1 Expectations and Measuring Progress

The Patoka River Strategy provides a starting point to address water quality concerns held by local, state, and federal stakeholders. Part II provides recommended management strategies to address these concerns. Through cooperative efforts with stakeholders, all of the recommended management strategies listed will begin implementation by the summer of 2000.

Measurement of progress is critical to the success of any plan. Water quality improvements will not take place overnight. Measuring of progress in terms of water quality will be provided through the Office of Water Management Assessment Branch's rotating basin monitoring strategy. Specifically, they will be conducting sampling again in 2001. This will allow an assessment of progress in improving water quality.

### 5.2 Expected Revisions and Amendments

This Watershed Restoration Action Strategy is intended to provide a starting point to improve water quality and measure the improvement. Hence, this document will require revisions and amendments as new information becomes available. The future revisions and amendments have been divided into those that are expected within the next year (Section 5.2.1) and those that will occur over a long-term basis (Section 5.2.2).

#### *5.2.1 Short Term Revisions and Amendments*

The most significant revisions and amendments will likely occur during 2001 and after, as a result of the rotating basin assessments to be completed during 2001. The Section 305(b) assessments will be completed by late 1999 or early 2000. Local, state, and federal stakeholder comments regarding the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy will be addressed in future revisions of the document.

#### *5.2.2 Long Term Revisions and Amendments*

The Office of Water Management is moving toward adopting a watershed management approach to solve water quality problems. Part of the watershed approach is the use of a rotating basin management cycle. The Assessment Branch of the Office of Water Management has already adopted this rotating basin cycle in its intensive monitoring and assessment of

Indiana waterbodies (this is in addition to the already established fixed monitoring station monitoring which occurs on a monthly basis). Based on the cycle the Assessment Branch is using, the next intensive monitoring of the Patoka River watershed will occur during the sampling season of 2001. The information from the 2001 monitoring effort will be incorporated into the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy.

In addition, the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy may be revised or amended prior to 2001, if sufficient information becomes available.


### **5.3 Review of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy**

Before this Watershed Restoration Action Strategy becomes final, it will undergo rigorous review. The first stage of review will be performed internally by the Office of Water Management. Once the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy has been revised to address internal Office of Water Management comments, it will be circulated to local, state, and federal stakeholders in the watershed and meetings within the watershed will be held to discuss the document. Written comments from local, state, and federal stakeholders will be addressed and the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy will again be revised to incorporate applicable comments. Once internal and external comments have been addressed, the final version of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy will be released.

TABLE 2-2

HYDROLOGIC UNIT SCORES for Each Parameter Used in the Unified Watershed Assessment [2000-2001]																
11 Digit Hydrologic Unit	Mussel Diversity and Occurrence	Aquatic Life Use Support	Recreational Use Attainment	Stream Fishery	Lake Fishery	Eurasian Milfoil Infestation Status	Lake Trophic Status	Critical Biodiversity Resource	Aquifer Vulnerability	Population Using Surface Water for Drinking Water	Residential Septic System Density	Degree of Urbanization	Density of Livestock	% Cropland	Mineral Extraction Activities	
	Patoka	05120209010	nd	1	nd	nd	nd	nd	3	5	4	1	2	4	1	2
05120209020		nd	nd	nd	nd	3	nd	2	2	4	4	2	2	5	2	2
05120209030		nd	1	nd	nd	nd	nd	2	2	5	4	2	2	5	2	3
05120209040		nd	1	nd	nd	5	nd	2	3	3	4	2	2	5	2	4
05120209050		nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	2	2	2	4	1	2	4	2	5
05120209060		nd	1	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	4	3	4	2	2	3	1	5
05120209070		nd	nd	1	nd	nd	nd	nd	2	3	4	3	2	3	1	5
05120209080		nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	4

Figure 2-1



# APPENDIX A

BENCHMARK CHARACTERISTIC ANALYSIS  
OF DATA FROM FIXED STATIONS IN THE  
PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED  
1991 TO 1997

Station P-35

	Valid N	Mean	Confid. -95.000%	Confid. +95.000%	Median	Sum	Minimum	Maximum	Lower Quartile	Upper Quartile	Range	Quantile Range	Variance	Std.Dev.	Standard Error	Skewness	Std.Err.	Kurtosis	Std.Err.
Alkalinity (mg/l)	21	78.38095	66.04245	86.71948	68	1604	47	135	63	80	68	17	515.8476	22.71228	4.956226	1.487879	0.501195	1.655832	0.971941
Ammonia (mg/l as N)	21	0.092857	0.060441	0.125273	0.05	1.95	0.05	0.3	0.05	0.1	0.25	0.05	0.005071	0.071214	0.015554	1.788285	0.501195	2.479771	0.871941
BOD (mg/l)	17	1.682353	1.058119	2.306587	1.6	28.6	0.5	5.9	1.1	1.9	5.4	0.8	1.474044	1.214102	0.294463	2.758452	0.549747	9.867504	1.063199
COD (mg/l)	21	16.30476	13.32293	19.2866	15.2	342.4	9.4	40	11.7	18.4	30.6	6.7	42.91148	6.550685	1.429477	2.476835	0.501195	8.364612	0.971941
Cyanide (mg/l)	19	0.005368	0.004681	0.005856	0.005	0.102	0.005	0.009	0.005	0.005	0.004	0	1E-06	0.001012	0.000232	3.100086	0.523767	9.874891	1.01427
Nitrate (mg/l as N)	21	1.780952	1.300183	2.261742	1.8	37.4	0.4	4.7	1	2.4	4.3	1.4	1.115619	1.058229	0.230488	0.988211	0.501195	1.453309	0.971941
Total Phosphorus (mg/l as P)	21	0.161905	0.104586	0.219223	0.15	3.4	0.05	0.63	0.1	0.17	0.58	0.07	0.015838	0.125921	0.027478	2.869704	0.501195	9.849793	0.971941
Total Solids (mg/l)	21	343.0952	282.3705	403.8199	306	7205	194	605	236	473	411	237	17798.59	133.4039	29.11111	0.663529	0.501195	-1.0074	0.971941
Suspended Solids (mg/l)	21	69.18048	47.29727	91.08369	56	1453	16	198	28	93	180	65	2313.282	48.08638	10.49549	1.195109	0.501195	1.055386	0.971941
Dissolved Solids (mg/l)	7	255.2857	166.3838	344.1878	231	1787	151	438	179	311	287	132	9240.238	98.12616	36.33227	1.212407	0.783725	1.592119	1.587451
Sulfate (mg/l)	7	105.8571	50.97232	160.742	87	741	43	220	63	140	177	77	3521.81	59.34484	22.43024	1.308002	0.793725	1.779437	1.587451
TKN (mg/l as N)	7	0.757143	0.558375	0.95591	0.8	5.3	0.4	1	0.6	1	0.6	0.4	0.04619	0.21492	0.081232	-0.48927	0.793725	-0.18257	1.587451
E. coli (CFU/100ml)	21	999.0478	23.77111	774.3241	100	8380	5	3600	30	240	3595	210	679686.5	824.431	179.9058	3.317774	0.501195	12.09559	0.971941
TOC (mg/l)	7	4.371429	2.882346	5.860511	3.9	30.6	2.5	7.4	3.3	5.4	4.9	2.1	2.592381	1.610087	0.608558	1.155799	0.783725	1.480489	1.587451
Hardness (mg/l)	21	164.1429	138.7084	189.5773	153	3447	76	286	128	200	210	72	3122.129	55.87601	12.19315	0.656962	0.501195	-0.01571	0.971941
Chloride (mg/l)	7	7	5.150309	8.849691	6	49	5	10	5	9	5	4	4	2	0.755929	0.525	0.783725	-1.55	1.587451
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	15	8.732	7.488439	9.975581	8.48	130.98	5.14	12.93	6.8	9.75	7.79	2.95	5.042631	2.24558	0.579808	0.305396	0.580119	-0.43782	1.120897
pH	15	7.468	7.2702	7.6618	7.48	111.99	6.84	8.02	7.2	7.67	1.18	0.47	0.125011	0.35357	0.091291	-0.2401	0.580119	-0.48401	1.120897
Copper (ug/l)	9	3.344444	1.756484	4.932405	2	30.1	2	6.6	2	5	4.6	3	4.267778	2.06586	0.68862	1.018664	0.717137	-1.06255	1.399708
Iron (ug/l)	8	2081.25	1004.698	3117.802	1550	16490	990	4900	1400	2350	3910	950	1597155	1263.786	448.8159	1.999874	0.752101	4.116197	1.48088
Zinc (ug/l)	9	14.75556	8.16133	21.34978	9.4	132.8	7.3	32	9	20	24.7	11	73.59528	8.578789	2.85959	1.163084	0.717137	0.478662	1.399708



Station: P-76

	Valid N	Mean	Confid.	Confid.	Median	Sum	Minimum	Maximum	Lower	Upper	Quantile	Range	Quantile	Variance	Std Dev.	Standard	Skewness	Std Err.	Kurtosis	Std Err.
Alkalinity (mg/l)	22	81.72727	-95.000%	+95.000%	87.5	1798	48	249	60	71	71	201	71	2065.446	45.44718	9.669371	2.823845	0.480862	9.033258	0.95278
Ammonia (mg/l as N)	22	0.284091	0.140584	0.427498	0.2	6.25	0.05	1.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	1.15	0.3	0.104616	0.323444	0.068958	2.015243	0.490862	3.465811	0.95278
BOD (mg/l)	19	2.068421	1.205764	2.931078	1.5	39.3	0.5	7.6	1.	2.4	2.4	7.1	1.4	3.203392	1.789802	0.410609	1.993114	0.523767	4.281236	1.01427
COD (mg/l)	22	15.64545	12.46583	19.82508	14.95	344.2	8	39	11.4	15.5	15.5	31	4.1	51.42926	7.17142	1.528952	2.25524	0.490862	5.572184	0.95278
Cyanide (mg/l)	20	0.0061	0.004621	0.007579	0.005	0.122	0.005	0.019	0.005	0.0055	0.0055	0.014	0.0005	1E-05	0.003161	0.00707	3.95454	0.512103	16.534	0.992384
Nitrate (mg/l as N)	22	2.118182	1.478498	2.757866	1.7	46.6	0.2	5	1	3.2	3.2	4.8	2.2	2.081558	1.442761	0.307598	0.587012	0.490862	-0.71138	0.95278
Total Phosphorus (mg/l as P)	22	0.174545	0.113819	0.235272	0.135	3.84	0.06	0.61	0.09	0.2	0.2	0.55	0.11	0.018759	0.136965	0.023201	2.388063	0.490862	5.688222	0.95278
Total Solids (mg/l)	22	269.5	204.151	334.849	234.5	5929	148	816	177	275	275	668	98	21723.79	147.3899	31.42363	2.693657	0.490862	8.874354	0.95278
Suspended Solids (mg/l)	22	77.40909	40.39838	114.4198	49	1703	10	380	24	103	103	370	79	6968.063	83.47492	17.79691	2.551727	0.490862	7.948043	0.95278
Dissolved Solids (mg/l)	7	135.2857	105.0299	165.5416	127	947	103	181	108	177	177	78	69	1070.238	32.71449	12.36492	0.637934	0.793725	-1.52129	1.587451
Sulfate (mg/l)	7	26.14286	19.01037	33.27534	26	183	14	36	20	34	34	22	14	59.47619	7.712081	2.914893	-0.2879	0.793725	-0.58419	1.587451
TKN (mg/l as N)	22	1.018182	0.758339	1.278025	0.8	22.4	0.4	2.4	0.6	1.5	1.5	2	-0.9	0.343463	0.585057	0.124948	1.033739	0.490862	-0.0485	0.95278
E. coli (CFU/100ml)	22	413.4091	96.0086	730.8096	105	9095	5	2500	60	350	350	2495	290	512474.7	715.8734	152.6247	2.3932	0.490862	4.973605	0.95278
TOC (mg/l)	7	2.971429	2.522412	3.420445	3	20.8	2.4	3.6	2.4	3.4	3.4	1.2	1	0.235714	0.485504	0.183503	-0.06242	0.793725	-1.87093	1.587451
Hardness (mg/l)	22	123.0455	84.91713	151.1738	104	2707	48	350	90	138	138	302	48	4024.807	63.44137	13.52575	2.551998	0.490862	7.836782	0.95278
Chloride (mg/l)	7	6.071429	2.226281	9.916576	5	42.5	2.5	13	2.5	10	10.5	10.5	7.5	17.28571	4.157609	1.571429	0.831643	0.793725	-0.66326	1.587451
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	17	8.591178	7.581084	9.601269	8.2	146.05	5.7	12.17	7.21	9.58	9.58	6.47	2.37	3.859581	1.984577	0.47648	0.390369	0.549747	-0.58233	1.063198
pH	17	7.366471	7.211442	7.561499	7.34	125.57	6.5	8.03	7.27	7.6	7.6	1.51	0.33	0.115887	0.340421	0.082564	-0.59065	0.549747	2.187631	1.063198
Copper (ug/l)	20	3.68	2.509068	4.850932	2	73.6	2	10	2	5.15	5.15	8	3.15	6.259579	2.501915	0.559445	1.430886	0.512103	1.213861	0.992384
Iron (ug/l)	8	1725	981.5925	2468.408	1400	13800	800	3000	1000	2600	2600	2200	1600	790714.3	889.2212	314.3872	0.494327	0.512103	-1.81653	1.48088
Zinc (ug/l)	20	14.9325	9.214562	20.65044	10	298.65	2.25	50	7.35	20	20	47.75	12.65	149.2659	12.21744	2.731903	1.623662	0.512103	2.336702	0.992384

# APPENDIX B

PATOKA RIVER WATERS ASSESSED IN THE  
CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 305(B) REPORT  
1996 TO 1998

Overall Use Support Status Report  
06-04-98

Waterbody ID : IN05120209010 Segment Number: 00  
 Waterbody Name: Patoka River Basin (headwaters to reservoir)  
 Waterbody Type: River Size: 84.10 Miles  
 Basin: PATOKA RIVER


----- Description of the Waterbody -----

No description available

Assessment Date: 9804

----- Use Support -----

Designated Use	Fully Supp	Threat	Partial Supp	Not Supported	Not Attained	Not Assessed
AQUATIC LIFE SUPPORT	84.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SWIMMABLE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	84.10



--- Nonattainment Causes ---

Cause  
No causes listed

Nonattainment Sources ---

Source  
No sources listed

Size Mag

Overall Use Support Status Report  
06-04-98

Waterbody ID : IN05120209020 Segment Number: 00  
 Waterbody Name: Patoka River Basin (including Lick Creek)  
 Waterbody Type: River Size: 125.00 Miles  
 Basin: PATOKA RIVER


----- Description of the Waterbody -----

No description available

Assessment Date: 9804

----- Use Support

Designated Use	Fully Supp	Threat	Partial Supp	Not Supported	Not Attained	Not Assessed
AQUATIC LIFE SUPPORT	0.00	125.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SWIMMABLE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	125.00



Nonattainment Causes

Cause	Size Mag
1500-FLOW ALTERATIONS	125.00 T

Nonattainment Sources -----

Source	Size Mag
7000-HYDROMODIFICATION	125.00

Overall Use Support Status Report  
06-04-98

Waterbody ID : IN05120209030 Segment Number: 00  
 Waterbody Name: Hall Creek Basin  
 Waterbody Type: River Size: 58.30 Miles  
 Basin: PATOKA RIVER


----- Description of the Waterbody -----

No description available

Assessment Date: 9804

----- Use Support -----

Designated Use	Fully Supp	Threat	Partial Supp	Not Supported	Not Attained	Not Assessed
AQUATIC LIFE SUPPORT	58.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FISH CONSUMPTION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	58.30
SWIMMABLE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	58.30



Nonattainment Causes ----

Cause Size Mag

No causes listed

Nonattainment Sources ---

Source Size Mag

No sources listed

Overall Use Support Status Report  
06-04-98

Waterbody ID : IN05120209040 Segment Number: 00  
 Waterbody Name: Hunley Creek Basin  
 Waterbody Type: River Size: 67.40 Miles  
 Basin: PATOKA RIVER


----- Description of the Waterbody

No description available

Assessment Date: 9804

Use Support --

Designated Use	Fully Supp	Threat	Partial Supp	Not Supported	Not Attained	Not Assessed
AQUATIC LIFE SUPPORT	67.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FISH CONSUMPTION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	67.40
SWIMMABLE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	67.40



-- Nonattainment Causes

Cause  
No causes listed

Size Mag

- Nonattainment Sources -

Source  
No sources listed

Size Mag

Overall Use Support Status Report  
06-04-98

Waterbody ID : IN05120209050 Segment Number: 00  
 Waterbody Name: Patoka River Basin (Hunley Cr to SR 61)  
 Waterbody Type: River Size: 90.80 Miles  
 Basin: PATOKA RIVER


----- Description of the Waterbody -----

No description available

Assessment Date: 9804

----- Use Support -----

Designated Use	Fully Supp	Threat	Partial Supp	Not Supported	Not Attained	Not Assessed
AQUATIC LIFE SUPPORT	0.00	90.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FISH CONSUMPTION	0.00	0.00	35.90	0.00	0.00	54.90
SWIMMABLE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	90.80



-- Nonattainment Causes --

Cause	Size Mag
0410-PCBs	35.90 S
0500-METALS	35.90 S
1600-HABITAT ALTER. (non-flow)	90.80 T

Nonattainment Sources

Source	Size Mag
9000-SOURCE UNKNOWN	35.90 S

Overall Use Support Status Report  
06-04-98

Waterbody ID : IN05120209060 Segment Number  
 Waterbody Name: Flat Creek Basin  
 Waterbody Type: River Size: 41.60 Miles  
 Basin: PATOKA RIVER


----- Description of the Waterbody

No description available

Assessment Date: 9804

Use Support

Designated Use	Fully Supp	Threat	Partial Supp	Not Supported	Not Attained	Not Assessed
AQUATIC LIFE SUPPORT	41.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FISH CONSUMPTION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	41.60
SWIMMABLE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	41.60



Nonattainment Causes -----

Cause Size Mag

No causes listed

----- Nonattainment Sources

Source Size Mag

No sources listed



Overall Use Support Status Report  
06-04-98

Waterbody ID : IN05120209070 Segment Number: 00  
 Waterbody Name: Patoka River Basin (Pike Co to confluence)  
 Waterbody Type: River Size: 189.80 Miles  
 Basin: PATOKA RIVER


Description of the Waterbody

No description available

Assessment Date: 9804

----- Use Support

Designated Use	Fully Supp	Threat	Partial Supp	Not Supported	Not Attained	Not Assessed
AQUATIC LIFE SUPPORT	150.80	0.00	0.00	39.00	0.00	0.00
FISH CONSUMPTION	0.00	0.00	41.30	0.00	0.00	148.50
SWIMMABLE	189.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00



----- Nonattainment Causes -----

Cause	Size	Mag
0410-PCBs	41.30	S
0500-METALS	41.30	S
2400-TOTAL TOXICS	39.00	H
0560-Mercury	41.30	S

----- Nonattainment Sources -----

Source	Size	Mag
9000-SOURCE UNKNOWN	41.30	S
5000-RESOURCE EXTRACTION	39.00	H
5800-Acid Mine Drainage	39.00	H

Overall Use Support Status Report  
06-04-98

Waterbody ID : IMP091001 Segment Number: 00  
 Waterbody Name: PATOKA RESERVOIR  
 Waterbody Type: Lake, Reservoir Size: 8880.00 Acres  
 Lake Latitude/Longitude: 38.43/ 86.67  
 Significant Publicly Owned Lake => Y  
 Basin: PATOKA RIVER


----- Description of the Waterbody

PATOKA RIVER IMPOUNDMENT 3 MI N OF BIRDSEYE.

Assessment Date: 9804

----- Use Support -----

Designated Use	Fully Supp	Threat	Partial Supp	Not Supported	Not Attained	Not Assessed
FISH CONSUMPTION	0.00	0.00	8880.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
AQUATIC LIFE SUPPORT	4440.00	4440.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SWIMMABLE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8880.00
DRINKING WATER SUPPLY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8880.00
AGRICULTURE	8880.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00



-- Nonattainment Causes ---

Cause	Size Mag
0500-METALS	8880.00 S
0560-Mercury	8880.00 S
1200-ORGANIC ENRICHMENT/LOW DO	4440.00 S
2210-EXCESS ALGAL GROWTH/CHL-A	8880.00 T

Nonattainment Sources ---

Source	Size Mag
9000-SOURCE UNKNOWN	8880.0 S
1000-AGRICULTURE	8880.0 T
7900-MARINAS AND RECREATIONAL BOATING	8880.0 T

Comments on the Assessment

168 SQ MI DRAINAGE AREA. 30 FT MAX DEPTH. MORE THAN HALF THE WATER COLUMN TURNS ANOXIC DURING THE SUMMER. US A.C.E. MONITORED TEMPERATURE AND D.O. PROFILES, AND FLOW THROUGH 1997. MINIMAL ALGAE GROWTH CONSISTS ALMOST ENTIRELY OF BLUE-GREEN SPECIES.

# APPENDIX C

## Potential Stakeholders in the Patoka River Watershed

# Potential Stakeholders in the Patoka River Watershed

## Crawford County

Crawford Co. SWCD  
306 Oak Hill Circle  
P.O. Box 189  
English, IN 47118  
Ph: 812-338-3224 ext.258

USDA  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
1855 Gardner Lane, N.W.  
Corydon, IN 47112  
Ph: 812-738-8121

## Dubois County

Patoka Lake  
Park Manager  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Route 1, Box 263  
Dubois, Indiana 47527  
Ph: 812-678-3761

Reservoir Manager  
IDNR  
Rural Route 1  
Birdseye, Indiana 47513  
Ph: 812-685-2211

Patoka River National Wildlife Refuge  
510 ½ West Morton  
P.O. Box 217  
Oakland City, IN 47660  
Ph: 812-743-3333

Ronald Boehm  
IDNR Ag. Conservation Specialist  
1486 Executive Blvd  
Suite A  
Jasper, IN 47546-9300  
Ph: 812-482-1171

Dubois County SWCD  
1486 Executive Blvd  
Suite A

Jasper, IN 47546-9300  
Ph: 812-482-1171

Kenneth Eck  
Purdue Education Specialist  
1486 Executive Blvd  
Suite A  
Jasper, IN 47546-9300  
Ph: 812-482-1171

USDA  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
1486 Executive Blvd  
Suite A  
Jasper, IN 47546-9300  
Ph: 812-482-1171

## Gibson County

USDA  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
229 S. Second Ave  
Suite 3  
Princeton, IN 47670  
Ph: 812-385-5033

Gibson Co. SWCD  
229 S. Second Ave  
Suite 3  
Princeton, IN 47670  
Ph: 812-385-5033

Gary Seibert  
IDNR Resource Specialist  
229 S. Second Ave  
Suite 3  
Princeton, IN 47670  
Ph: 812-385-5033

## Martin County

Martin Co. SWCD  
203 Main Street  
P.O. Box 34

Shoals, IN 47581  
Ph: 812-247-2423

USDA  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
203 Main Street  
P.O. Box 34  
Shoals, IN 47581  
Ph: 812-247-2423

## Orange County

Orange Co. SWCD  
573 S.E. Main Street, Suite 1  
Paoli, IN 47454  
Ph: 812-723-3311

Fred Hodges  
IDNR Resource Specialist  
573 S.E. Main Street, Suite 1  
Paoli, IN 47454  
Ph: 812-723-3311

USDA  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
573 S.E. Main Street, Suite 1  
Paoli, IN 47454  
Ph: 812-723-3311

## Pike County

Pike County SWCD  
2101 East Main Street  
Petersburg, IN 47567-8870  
Ph: 812-354-6120

Michael Shawhan  
IDNR Resource Specialist  
2101 East Main Street  
Petersburg, IN 47567-8870  
Ph: 812-354-6120

Sugar Ridge Fish & Wildlife Area  
R.R. 1  
Box 314  
Winslow, IN 47598  
Ph: 812-789-2724

Patoka South Fork Watershed  
Steering Committee  
3728 East St. Rd. 64  
Winslow, IN 47598

(812) 789-5059

Southwest Indiana Brine Coalition  
3728 East St. Rd. 64  
Winslow, IN 47598  
(812) 789-5059

Triad Mining  
14521 East St. Rd 58  
Edwardsport, IN 47567  
(812) 328-2117

Kindill Mining  
1592 North St Rd. 64  
Petersburg, IN 47567  
(812) 354-8746

Pike Co. Farm Bureau  
P.O. Box 435  
Petersburg, IN 47567  
(812) 354-8488

Pike County Health Depart  
801 Main Street  
Petersburg, IN 47567  
(812) 354-8796

Pike State Forest  
Pike County  
Winslow, IN

Pike Co. Extension Service  
801 Main Street  
Petersburg, IN 47567  
(812) 354-6838

USDA  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
2101 East Main Street  
Petersburg, IN 47567-8870  
Ph: 812-354-6120

Pike County Solid Waste  
703 East Main  
Petersburg, IN 47567  
(812) 354-2924

## Spencer County

Spencer Co. SWCD  
201 Elm Street  
Rockport, IN 47635  
Ph: 812-649-9136

USDA  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
201 Elm Street  
Rockport, IN 47635  
Ph: 812-649-9136

#### Warrick County

Warrick Co. SWCD  
1124 South 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Boonville, IN 47601  
(812) 897-2840

USDA Natural Resource Cons. Service  
1124 South 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Boonville, IN 47601  
(812) 897-2840

IDNR – Division of Soil Cons  
1124 South 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Boonville, IN 47601  
(812) 897-2840

Indiana Farm Bureau  
225 S East St  
Indianapolis, IN 46202

**Indiana Department of Environmental  
Management**  
100 N. Senate Ave  
P.O. Box 6015  
Indianapolis, IN 46206-6015

IDEM Switchboard  
(317) 232-8603 or (800) 451-6027

Agricultural Liaison (317) 232-8587

Air Management (317) 233-0178

Community Relations (317) 232-8128

Compliance and  
Technical Assistance (317) 232-8172

Criminal  
Investigations (317) 232-8128

Enforcement (317) 233-5529

Legal Counsel (317) 232-8493

Media and  
Communication  
Services (317) 232-8560

Pollution Prevention  
And Technical  
Assistance (317) 232-8172

Solid and Hazardous  
Waste Management (317)233-3656

Water Management (317) 232-8670

#### **Indiana Department of Natural Resources**

402 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2748

*IDNR Field Representatives are located in the  
individual*

Division of Engineering(317) 232-4150

Division of Entomology  
And Plant Pathology (317) 232-4120

Division of Fish & Wildlife (317) 232-4080

Division of Forestry (317) 232-4105

Division of Historic  
Preservation & Archaeology (317) 232-1646

Division of Law Enforcement (317) 232-4010

Division of Nature Preservation(317) 232-4052

Division of Oil and Gas (317) 232-4055

Division of Outdoor Recreation(317) 232-4070

Division of Public  
Information and Education (317) 232-4200

Division of Reclamation (317) 232-1547

Division of Safety and Training(317) 232-4145

Division of Soil Conservation (317) 232-3870  
*County SWCD's*

Indiana State Department of Health  
2 North Meridian St  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
(317) 233-1325

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service  
6013 Lakeside Blvd  
Indianapolis, IN 46278  
(317) 290-3200

*NRCS Field Representatives are located  
in the counties.*

U.S. EPA Region 5  
77 West Jackson Blvd  
Chicago, IL 60604  
(312) 353-2000  
(800) 632-8431

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**  
**Louisville District**  
Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Place  
Louisville, KY 40202

Division of State  
Parks and Reservoirs (317) 232-4124

Division of Water (317) 232-4160

# APPENDIX D

## FUNDING SOURCES



# FUNDING SOURCES

This listing of funding sources was derived from the November 1998 *Watershed Action Guide for Indiana*, which is available from the Watershed Management Section of IDEM.

## FEDERAL CONSERVATION AND WATERSHED PROGRAMS

### *Environmental Protection Agency*

#### Section 319, 604(b), and 104(b)3 Grants

Grants for conservation practices, water body assessment, watershed planning, and watershed projects. Available to non-profit or governmental entities. These monies, enabled by the Clean Water Act, are funneled through the Indiana Department of Environmental Management. *For details see IDEM below.*

### *U.S. Department of Agriculture (See county listings for local federal agency contacts.)*

**EQIP:** Environmental Quality Incentive Program. Administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Conservation cost-share program for implementing Best Management Practices, available to agricultural producers who agree to implement a whole-farm plan that addresses major resource concerns. Up to \$50,000 over a 5- to 10- year period. Some parts of the state are designated Conservation Priority Areas and receive a larger funding allotments.

**WRP:** Wetland Reserve Program. Administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Easement and restoration program to restore agricultural production land to wetland. Easements may be for 10 years, 30 years, or permanent. Longer easements are preferred. Partnerships with other acquisition programs are encouraged. Restoration and legal costs are paid by NRCS. Landowner retains ownership of the property and may use the land in ways that do not interfere with wetland function and habitat, such as hunting, recreational development, and timber harvesting.

**CRP:** Conservation Reserve Program. Administered by the Farm Service Agency with technical assistance from NRCS. Conservation easements in certain critical areas on private property. Agricultural producers are eligible. Easements are for 10 or 15 years, depending on vegetative cover, and compensation payments are made yearly to replace income lost through not farming the land. Cost share is available for planting vegetative cover on restored areas.

**WHIP:** Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program. Administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Cost share to restore habitat on previously farmed land. Private landowners who are agricultural producers are eligible. Cost share up to 75%, and contracts are for 10 years.

**FIP:** Forestry Incentive Program. Administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Cost-share to assist forest management on private lands. Funds may be limited.

*U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service*

**Partners for Wildlife:** assistance for habitat restoration.

## STATE CONSERVATION AND WATERSHED PROGRAMS

*IDNR Division of Soil Conservation*

**LARE:** Lake & River Enhancement Program. Funds diagnostic and feasibility studies in selected watersheds and cost-share programs through local Soil & Water Conservation Districts. Project oversight provided through county-based Resource Specialists and Lake & River Enhancement Watershed Coordinators. Funding requests for Watershed Land Treatment projects must come from Soil & Water Conservation Districts. If a proposed project area includes more than one district, the affected SWCDs should work together to develop an implementation plan. The SWCDs should then apply for the funding necessary to administer the watershed project. Before applying for funding, the SWCDs should contact the Lake & River Enhancement Coordinators to determine (1) the appropriate watershed to include in the project, (2) if the proposed project meets the eligibility criteria, and (3) if funding is available.

*IDNR Division of Fish & Wildlife*

**Classified Wildlife Habitat Program:** Incentive program to foster private wildlife habitat management through tax reduction and technical assistance. Landowners need 15 or more acres of habitat to be eligible. IDNR provides management plans and assistance through District Wildlife Managers. See county listings.

**Wildlife Habitat Cost-share Program:** Similar to above.

*IDNR Division of Forestry*

**Classified Forest Program:** Incentive program to foster private forest management through tax reduction and technical assistance. Landowners need 10 or more acres of woods to be eligible. IDNR provides management plans and assistance through District Foresters. (See county listings.)

**Classified Windbreak Act:** Establishment of windbreaks at least 450 feet long adjacent to tillable land. Provides tax incentive, technical assistance through IDNR District Foresters.

**Forest Stewardship Program & Stewardship Incentives Program:** Cost share and technical assistance to encourage responsibly managed and productive private forests.

*IDNR Division of Reclamation*

**Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative:** Funds for acid mine drainage abatement.

*IDNR Division of Nature Preserves*

**State Nature Preserve Dedication:** Acquisition and management of threatened habitat.

*IDEM Office of Water Management*

**State Revolving Fund:** Available to municipalities and counties for facilities development. Will be available in 1999 for nonpoint source projects as well. Funding is through very low-interest loans.

**Section 319 Grants:** Available to nonprofit groups, municipalities, counties, and institutions for implementing water quality improvement projects that address nonpoint source pollution concerns. Twenty-five percent match is required, which may be cash or in-kind. Maximum grant amount is \$112,500. Projects are allowed two years for completion. Projects may be for land treatment through implementing Best Management Practices, for education, and for developing tools and applications for state-wide use.

**Section 205(j) Grants, formerly called 604(b) Grants:** Available to municipalities, counties, conservation districts, drainage districts. These are for water quality management projects such as studies of nonpoint pollution impacts, nonagricultural NPS mapping, and watershed management projects targeted to Northwest Indiana (including BMPs, wetland restoration, etc.)

**Section 104(b)(3) Grants:** These are watershed project grants for innovative demonstration projects to promote statewide watershed approaches for permitted discharges, development of storm water management plans by small municipalities, projects involving a watershed approach to municipal separate sewer systems, and projects that directly promote community based environmental protection. NOTE: the application time frame for IDEM grant programs is annually, by March 31<sup>st</sup>.

## PRIVATE FUNDING SOURCES

*National Fish and Wildlife Foundation*

1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 900, Washington DC 20036. Nonprofit, established by Congress 1984, awards challenge grants for natural resource conservation. Federally appropriated funds are used to match private sector funds. Six program areas include wetland conservation, conservation education, fisheries, migratory bird conservation, conservation policy, and wildlife habitat.

*Individual Utilities*

Check local utilities such as IPALCO, CInergy, REMC, NIPSCO. Many have grants for educational and environmental purposes.

*Indiana Hardwood Lumbermen's Association*

Indiana Tree Farm Program

*The Nature Conservancy*

*Land acquisition and restoration.*

Southern Lake Michigan Conservation Initiative

Blue River Focus Area

Fish Creek Focus Area

Natural Areas Registry

Hoosier Landscapes Capitol Campaign

*Conservation Technology Information Center (CTIC)*

'*Know Your Watershed*' educational materials are available

*Indiana Heritage Trust*

*Land acquisition programs*

*Ducks Unlimited*

*Land acquisition and habitat restoration assistance*

*Quail Unlimited*

*Pheasants Forever*

*Sycamore Land Trust*

*Acres Inc.*

*Land trust*

*Oxbow, Inc.*

*Land trust*


**SOURCES OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES**

***Catalog of Federal Funding Sources for Watershed Protection***


EPA Office of Water (EPA841-B-97-008) September 1997

**GrantsWeb: <http://web.fie.com/cws/sra/resource.htm>**

**FIGURE 2-1  
PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED**




**FIGURE 2-2**  
**14-DIGIT HYDROLOGIC UNIT CODE WATERSHEDS**  
**PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED**




**IDEM** Indiana Department of Environmental Management  
Office of Water Management  
Data Management Section  
Prepared By: Jennifer Koel  
Date Prepared: 11/15/09

**FIGURE 2-3  
VEGETATIVE LAND COVER  
PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED**




**FIGURE 3-1  
NPDES DISCHARGES  
PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED**



**IDEM**  
Indiana Department of Environmental Management  
Office of Water Management  
Data Management Section  
Prepared By: Jennifer Koel  
Date Prepared: 11/05/09




**FIGURE 3-1  
LARE, 319, AND EQUIP AREAS  
PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED**



**IDEM** Office of Water Management  
 Data Management Section  
 Prepared By: Jennifer Kord  
 Date Prepared: 1/17/09

**FIGURE 3-1  
CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 303(d) LISTED STREAMS  
PATOKA RIVER WATERSHED**



**IEM** Office of Water Management  
Data Management Section  
Prepared By: Jennifer Scott  
Date Prepared: 11/18/09