UPPER MISSISSINEWA RIVER
WATERSHED PARTNERSHIP
GRANT | BLACKFORD | DELAWARE | JAY | RANDOLPH | DARKE

UPPER MISSISSINEWA RIVER WATERSHED
WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN
March 13, 2018

DELAWARE COUNTY SWCD
3641 N. Briarwood Lane
Muncie, Indiana 47304
delaware.iaswcd.org
765. 747. 5531

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
TABLE OF TABLES	8
TABLE OF MAPS	12
TABLE OF FIGURES	13
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	14
1. WATERSHED COMMUNITY INITIATIVE	20
2. PUBLIC INPUT	25
3. WATERSHED INVENTORY	37
4. OTHER PLANNING EFFORTS	78
5. WATERSHED INVENTORY SUMMARY	85
6. UNDERSTANDING WATER QUALITY	92
7. HISTORIC WATER QUALITY	101
8. CURRENT WATER QUALITY	111
9. BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENTS	148
10. SUBWATERSHED DISCUSSIONS	159
11. WATERSHED INVENTORY SUMMARY	190
12. STAKEHOLDER CONCERNS	198
13. ANALYSIS OF CONCERNS	208
14. CRITICAL AREAS	221
15. IMPLEMENTATION	241
16. GOALS & ACTION STRATEGY	251
17. TRACKING EFFECTIVENESS	282
18. FUTURE ACTIVITY	284
19. REFERENCES	285

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	14
1. WATERSHED COMMUNITY INITIATIVE	20
1.1 INTRODUCTION	20
1.2 PROJECT INITIATION RATIONALE	22
1.3 LOCAL LEADERSHIP	23
1.4 PROJECT ORGANIZATION	24
1.5 STEERING COMMITTEE	24
2. PUBLIC INPUT	25
2.1 WATERSHED CONCERNS / RESULTS	27
2.2 LAND-USE CONCERNS	30
2.3 GEOGRAPHIC RESULTS	31
2.4 BEST-MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	33
2.5 SOCIAL SURVEY DISCUSSION	33
2.6 PUBLIC INPUT CONCLUSIONS	34
2.7 CRITICAL AREA PUBLIC INPUT	35
3. WATERSHED INVENTORY	37
3.1 GATHERING WATERSHED DATA	37
3.2 BASIC GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY OF THE REGION	39
3.3 SUBWATERSHEDS AND THEIR GEOMORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS	41
3.4 CURRENT AND HISTORIC HYDROLOGY	42
3.5 HISTORIC AND CURRENT LAND USE	51
3.6 WILDLIFE AND ECOLOGY	66
3.7 FUNCTIONAL USES OF THE RIVER	69
3.8 DESKTOP SURVEY	73
3.9 WINDSHIELD SURVEY	75
4. OTHER PLANNING EFFORTS	78
4.1 EXISTING WATERSHED PLANNING EFFORTS	78
4.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLANNING EFFORTS	82
5. WATERSHED INVENTORY SUMMARY	85
6. UNDERSTANDING WATER QUALITY	92
6.1 UNDERLYING REASON FOR WATER QUALITY MONITORING	92
6.2 WATER QUALITY PARAMETERS FOR MONITORING BENEFICIAL USES	92
6.3 THREATS TO RECREATION AND DOMESTIC DRINKING WATER	97
6.4 WATER QUALITY TARGETS	98
7. HISTORIC WATER QUALITY	101
7.1 INTRODUCTION TO HISTORICAL WATER QUALITY DATA SETS	101
7.2 IDEM'S ASSESSMENT INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (AIMS) DATABASE	103
7.3 A STATEWIDE COMPARISON OF RIVERS (USING IDEM'S DATA SET)	106
7.4 STORET DATASET	107
7.5 LARE DATASET	109
7.6 HOOSIER RIVERWATCH DATASET	110

8. CURRENT WATER QUALITY	111
8.1 ANALYSIS OF CURRENT WATER QUALITY DATA	116
8.2 NITRATE	117
8.3 PHOSPHORUS	122
8.4 SEDIMENT	127
8.5 BACTERIOLOGICAL	132
8.6 DISSOLVED OXYGEN	137
8.7 Temperature	141
8.8 pH	141
9. BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENTS	148
9.1 BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENTS	148
10. SUBWATERSHED DISCUSSIONS	159
10.1 BIG LICK CREEK HUC 10	160
10.2 HALFWAY CREEK HUC 10	166
10.3 PIKE CREEK HUC 10	172
10.4. HEADWATERS MISSISSINEWA HUC 10	178
10.5 MASSEY CREEK HUC 10	183
11. WATERSHED INVENTORY SUMMARY	190
12. STAKEHOLDER CONCERNS	198
13. ANALYSIS OF CONCERNS	208
13.1 DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK	208
13.2 PROBLEMS AND CAUSES	208
13.3 SOURCES	210
13.4 SOURCES: SEDIMENT	210
13.5 SOURCES: NUTRIENTS	215
13.6 SOURCES: E. COLI	218
14. CRITICAL AREAS	221
14.1 CRITICAL AREA SELECTION	221
14.2 PRIORITIZATION OF CRITICAL AREAS	227
14.3 TIER I SELECTION RATIONALE	227
14.4 HUC 12 SUBWATERSHED REDUCTION GOALS AND INDICATORS,	232
14.5 LOAD REDUCTIONS NEEDED FOR CRITICAL AREAS, LISTED BY HUC 10	238
15. IMPLEMENTATION	241
15.1 IMPLEMENTATION	241
15.3 IOWA STRATEGY TO REDUCE NUTRIENT LOSS: PHOSPHORUS PRACTICES	243
15.4 IOWA STRATEGY TO REDUCE NUTRIENT LOSS: NITROGEN PRACTICES	244
15.5 MODELING DISCUSSION—MEETING ULTIMATE GOALS	246
16. GOALS & ACTION STRATEGY	251
16.1 Goal #1: PROVIDE EDUCATION AND FORM PARTNERSHIPS	251
16.2 Goal #2-#5: IMPROVE WATER QUALITY OF THE UPPER MISSISSINEWA RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES	253
16.3 CRITICAL AREAS AND BMPS, LISTED BY COUNTY	256
17. TRACKING EFFECTIVENESS	282
17.1 TRACKING EFFECTIVENESS	282
18. FUTURE ACTIVITY	284
19. REFERENCES	285

APPENDIX	
A. PUBLIC INPUT	A7
B. GEOLOGY & HYDROLOGY	A8
C. LAND USE	A11
D. DEMOGRAPHICS	A14
E. DESKTOP SURVEY	A19
F. ENDANGERED SPECIES	A22
G. OTHER RELEVANT HISTORICAL STUDIES	A28
H. EXISTING IDEM DATA	A35
I. EXISTING STORET DATA	A42
J. EXISTING LARE DATA	A46
K. SAMPLE SITE DATA	A51
L. NITRATE DATA	A53
M. PHOSPHORUS DATA	A60
N. TSS DATA	A67
O. E. COLI DATA	A74
P. DISSOLVED OXYGEN DATA	A81
Q. BIOLOGICAL DATA	A82
R. LOAD REDUCTION SCENARIOS	A83
S. MEETING ULTIMATE GOALS—MODELS	A92
T. MISC TABLES/FIGURES	A102
U. BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	A109
V. SSO OVERFLOWS	A111

TABLE OF TABLES

Contents	
TABLE 0.1 | Critical HUC 12 Tributary Subwatersheds	16
TABLE 0.2 | Landowner Interest in Best Management Practices (750 people surveyed)	18
TABLE 1.1 | Steering Committee	24
TABLE 2.1 | Blackford County concerns	27
TABLE 2.2 | Grant County concerns	28
TABLE 2.3 | Delaware County concerns	28
TABLE 2.4 | Jay County concerns	28
TABLE 2.5 | Darke County concerns	29
TABLE 2.6 | Randolph County concerns	29
TABLE 2.7 | Interest in Best Management Practices	30
TABLE 2.8 | Response rate by subwatershed	31
TABLE 2.9 | Best Management Practices with Most Stakeholder Interest	33
TABLE 2.10 | Grant County focus concerns	35
TABLE 2.11 | Randolph County and Delaware County focus concerns	36
TABLE 3.1 | HUC delineations	41
TABLE 3.2 | USGS discharge data Marion	42
TABLE 3.3 | USGS discharge data Ridgeville	42
TABLE 3.4 | Watershed land use within floodplain	46
TABLE 3.5 | Documented/Estimated Legal Drain Miles in Watershed	48
TABLE 3.6 | Land use in watershed	53
TABLE 3.7 | Simplified land use categorization	53
TABLE 3.8 | Nitrate contribution by watershed	55
TABLE 3.9 | No-till by county	55
TABLE 3.10 | Conventional tillage loss	55
TABLE 3.11 | Cover crops per county, based on 2015 Tillage Transect Data	56
TABLE 3.12 | Employment in the watershed	59
TABLE 3.13 | 2010 populations	59
TABLE 3.14 | CSOs located in watershed	61
TABLE 3.15 | Descriptions of the five logjam conditions	71
TABLE 3.16 | Sites identified through desktop survey	72
TABLE 3.17 | Sites identified through deskstop survey	73
TABLE 3.18 | Count of sites with inadequate stream buffers and with streambank erosion observed on windshield survey	75
TABLE 3.19 | Count of sites with rills observed on windshield survey	76
TABLE 3.20 | Count of sites with possible E. coli sources observed on windshield survey	76
TABLE 4.1 | Potential Priority Implementation Area (PPIA) Rankings and Recommended Implementation Actions from the Draft TMDL Report for the Upper Mississinewa River Watershed	80
TABLE 5.1 | Recreational/Human Health Concerns	89
TABLE 5.2 | Socio Economic Concerns	89
TABLE 5.3 | Fish and Aquatic Wildlife Concerns	90
TABLE 5.4 | Fish and Aquatic Wildlife Concerns Continued	90
TABLE 6.1 | Water quality targets	98
TABLE 6.2 | Reference conditions for Ecoregion VI. Based on 25th percentiles* only5	99
TABLE 6.3 | Water temperature limits, from IAC 327 2-1-6	100
TABLE 7.1 | Averages of combined data from sites sampled at the highest frequencies (data from IDEM AIMS database)	103

TABLE 7.2 | Averages of data from sites sampled at the highest frequencies (data from IDEM AIMS database)	103
TABLE 7.3 | Annual Averages of All Samples Collected at All Thirteen Mainstem Mississinewa Sites*	104
TABLE 7.4 | Parameter averages and rankings for 14 high quality recreational streams. Data obtained from IDEM AIMS database.	105
TABLE 7.5 | Avg. Water Quality Results for Streams of the Central Till Plain Ecoregion (IDEM Fixed Station Data, 1990-010)2	106
TABLE 7.6 | STORET and IDEM Averages for Water Quality Parameters	107
TABLE 7.7 | Averages for STORET Sample Sites	107
TABLE 7.8 | Averages for impairment. Streams highlighted in yellow had the highest frequency of sampling.	108
TABLE 7.9 | STORET, IDEM and LARE Averages for Eleven Water Quality Parameters	109
TABLE 7.10 | LARE Mississinewa River averages (from all four LARE studies)	110
TABLE 7.11 | Hoosier Riverwatch parameter averages	110
TABLE 8.1 | Sample sites used in current water quality analysis	112
TABLE 8.2 | Average cfs, used as the division between high flow and low flow	115
TABLE 8.3 | Nitrate averages for tributary subwatershed and mainstem subwatershed sites	118
TABLE 8.4 | Nitrate load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	119
TABLE 8.5 | Nitrate load reduction needed at mainstem sites	119
TABLE 8.6 | Phosphorus averages for tributary subwatershed and mainstem subwatershed sites	123
TABLE 8.7 | Phosphorus load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	124
TABLE 8.8 | Phosphorus load reduction needed at mainstem sites	124
TABLE 8.9 | TSS averages for tributary subwatershed and mainstem subwatershed sites	128
TABLE 8.10 | Sediment load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	129
TABLE 8.11 | Sediment load reduction needed at mainstem sites	129
TABLE 8.12 | E. coli averages for subwatershed and mainstem sites	133
TABLE 8.13 | E. coli load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	134
TABLE 8.14 | E. coli load reduction needed at mainstem sites	134
TABLE 9.1 | Biological results from IDEM	149
TABLE 9.2 | Statewide biological comparison	149
TABLE 9.3 | Consumption groups and advisories for fish consumption advisory	150
TABLE 9.4 | IBI results	152
TABLE 9.5 | IBI scores and narratives	152
TABLE 9.6 | mIBI scores and narratives	153
TABLE 9.7 | QHEI results from the Bureau of Water Quality and IDEM	155
TABLE 9.8 | mIBI Results Drainage >100 sq. mi.	156
TABLE 9.9 | mIBI Results Drainage <100 sq. mi.	156
TABLE 9.10 | QHEI scores and narratives. Headwaters have drainage areas equal to or less than 20 sq. mi.	156
TABLE 9.11 | Subwatersheds with poor biological scores	157
TABLE 9.12 | Biological and habitat results*	158
TABLE 10.1 | Average exceedances per subwatershed	159
TABLE 10.2 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	160
TABLE 10.3 | Desktop Survey Results	162
TABLE 10.4 | Desktop Survey Results	162
TABLE 10.5 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	164
TABLE 10.6 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 Subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	166
TABLE 10.7 | Desktop Survey Results	169
TABLE 10.8 | Desktop Survey Results	169
TABLE 10.9 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	170
TABLE 10.10 | Pike Creek HUC 10 Subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	172

TABLE 10.11 | Desktop Survey Results	175
TABLE 10.12 | Desktop Survey Results	175
TABLE 10.13 | Pike Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	176
TABLE 10.14 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 data exceeding water quality targets	178
TABLE 10.15 | Desktop Survey Results	180
TABLE 10.16 | Desktop Survey Results	180
TABLE 10.17 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 watershed concerns	181
TABLE 10.18 | Massey Creek HUC 10 Subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	184
TABLE 10.19 | Desktop Survey Results	186
TABLE 10.20 | Desktop Survey Results	186
TABLE 10.21 | Massey Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	188
TABLE 11.1 | Mississinewa Means	195
TABLE 12.1 | State Mandated Beneficial Uses of Waterways	198
TABLE 12.2 | UMRWP's Simplified Beneficial Use Categories	198
TABLE 12.3 | Fish and aquatic wildlife concerns	200
TABLE 12.4 | Recreational/human health concerns	202
TABLE 12.5 | Socioeconomic concerns	206
TABLE 13.1 | Key Concerns and their associated problem	209
TABLE 13.2 | Modified IDEM Inventory of Causes (of Watershed/Water Quality Problems)	209
TABLE 13.3 | Modified IDEM source table	211
TABLE 13.4 | Major sources per impairment	211
TABLE 13.5 | Sediment as leading pollutant	213
TABLE 13.6 | Sediment (Total Suspended Solids) sources	214
TABLE 13.7 | Nutrient sources	217
TABLE 13.8 | Category of water usage (http://www.in.gov/legislative/iac/20120208-IR-318120053ONA.xml.html)	219
TABLE 13.9 | 303(d) list	220
TABLE 13.10 | E. coli sources	220
TABLE 14.1 | Critical areas by county	221
TABLE 14.2 | Overall ranking of mainstem subwatersheds, with "1" being the highest priority, and "15" being the lowest priority	222
TABLE 14.3 | Overall ranking of tributary subwatersheds, with "1" being the highest priority, and "15" being the lowest priority	222
TABLE 14.4 | Critical tributary subwatersheds: Tier I, II, and III	227
TABLE 14.5 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Pike Creek HUC 10 (Delaware County)	232
TABLE 14.6 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Headwaters Mississinewa (Darke and Randolph counties)	233
TABLE 14.7 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Halfway Creek HUC 10 (Jay County)	233
TABLE 14.8 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Headwaters Mississinewa (Darke and Randolph counties)	234
TABLE 14.9 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Big Lick Creek HUC 10 (Blackford County)	235
TABLE 14.10 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	236
TABLE 14.11 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	237
TABLE 14.12 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 (Blackford County)	238
TABLE 14.13 | Headwaters Mississinewa HUC 10 (Darke and Randolph counties)	239
TABLE 14.14 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 (Jay County)	240
TABLE 14.15 | Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	240
TABLE 14.16 | Pike Creek HUC 10 (Delaware County)	240

TABLE 15.1 | Iowa Strategy To Reduce Nutrient Loss: Phosphorus Practices	243
TABLE 15.2 | Iowa Strategy To Reduce Nutrient Loss: Nitrogen Practices	244
TABLE 15.3 | Priority areas for nonpoint source reduction	246
TABLE 15.4 | Financial requirements for nonpoint source reduction	246
TABLE 15.5 | Nitrate loading data	248
TABLE 15.6 | BMPs, rates of use, and resulting nitrate load reductions	248
TABLE 15.7 | Landowner Interest in Best Management Practices	250
TABLE 16.1 | Blackford County	256
TABLE 16.2 | Pike Creek HUC 10 (Delaware County)	256
TABLE 16.3 | Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	257
TABLE 16.4 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 (Jay County)	257
TABLE 16.5 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 (Darke and Randolph counties)	258
TABLE 16.6 | Goal #1, Objective #1 (Build local capacity for volunteers for monitoring, etc.)	259
TABLE 16.7 | Goal #1, Objective #2 (Provide education and form partnerships with Agricultural Landowners)	260
TABLE 16.8 | Goal #1, Objective #3 (Provide education and form partnerships with Ecological Landowners)	261
TABLE 16.9 | Goal #1, Objective #4 (Provide education and form partnerships with Recreational Enthusiasts)	262
TABLE 16.10 | Goal #1, Objective #5 (Provide education and form partnerships with Health Departments)	263
TABLE 16.11 | Goal #1, Objective #6 (Provide education and form partnerships with County Drainage Boards/ Surveyor)	263
TABLE 16.12 | Goal #1, Objective #7 (Perform policy research and develop educational resources to promote citizen involvement in county/municipal planning and policy-making)	264
TABLE 16.13 | Action Register for Gray Branch Subwatershed	265
TABLE 16.14 | Action Register for Halfway Creek Subwatershed	269
TABLE 16.15 | Action Register for Deer Creek Subwatershed	271
TABLE 16.16 | Action Register for Bush Creek Subwatershed	275
TABLE 16.17 | Action Register for Halfway Creek Subwatershed	279
TABLE 17.1 | Total Costs for Watershed Management Plan Goals	283

TABLE OF MAPS

Contents	
MAP 0.1 | Water Quality and Habitat/Biology Results	17
MAP 1.1 | Watershed boundary	21
MAP 2.1 | Target landowners (Darke County not shown due to lack of parcel data)	26
MAP 2.2 | Response rate concentrations	32
MAP 3.1 | HUC10 watersheds	40
MAP 3.2 | Hydric soils	44
MAP 3.3 | NRCS Soil type classifications	45
MAP 3.4 | Open Legal Drain Map	49
MAP 3.5 | Land use map	52
MAP 3.6 | Highly erodible soils map	57
MAP 3.7 | Regulated point sources in watershed	60
MAP 3.8 | Septic suitability map	63
MAP 3.9 | Residential areas and density concentration map	65
MAP 3.10 | Projected long-term ecological areas	67
MAP 3.11 | Locations of logjams identifed through surveys	71
MAP 4.1 | Locations of previous watershed planning efforts	81
MAP 4.2 | Location of governmental planning efforts	84
MAP 6.1 | IDEM sample sites	94
MAP 8.2 | NITRATE HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	120
MAP 8.3 | NITRATE LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	120
MAP 8.4 | NITRATE HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHED	121
MAP 8.5 | NITRATE LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHED	121
MAP 8.6 | PHOSPHORUS HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	125
MAP 8.7 | PHOSPHORUS LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	125
MAP 8.8 | PHOSPHORUS HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	126
MAP 8.9 | PHOSPHORUS LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	126
MAP 8.10 | TSS HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	130
MAP 8.11 | TSS LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	130
MAP 8.12 | TSS HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	131
MAP 8.13 | TSS LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	131
MAP 8.14 | E. COLI HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	135
MAP 8.15 | E. COLI LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	135
MAP 8.16 | E. COLI HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHED	136
MAP 8.17 | E. COLI LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHED	136
MAP 10.1 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 Watershed	165
MAP 10.2 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 Watershed	171
MAP 10.3 | Pike Creek HUC 10 Watershed	177
MAP 10.4 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 Watershed	182
MAP 10.5 | Massey Creek HUC 10 Watershed	189
MAP 11.1 | Priority Watersheds, Based on Water Quality and Habitat/Biology Results	197
MAP 14.1 | E. COLI CRITICAL AREAS	223
MAP 14.2 | NITROGEN CRITICAL AREAS	224
MAP 14.3 | PHOSPHORUS CRITICAL AREAS	225
MAP 14.4 | TSS CRITICAL AREAS	226

TABLE OF FIGURES

Contents	
FIG. 1.1 | Project organization	24
FIG. 2.1 | Landowner feedback	28
FIG. 2.2 | Feedback on land management types	30
FIG. 3.1 | Erosion sites	47
FIG. 3.2 | Erosion sites gradient	47
FIG. 3.3 | NHD Missing Stream Buffers	47
FIG. 3.4 | NHD Missing Stream Buffers Gradient	47
FIG. 3.5 | Aquifer Capacity	47
FIG. 3.6 | Unconsolidated aquifer depth	47
FIG. 3.7 | Livestock in streams	54
FIG. 3.8 | Livestock in streams gradient	54
FIG. 3.9 | Runoff	54
FIG. 3.10 | Runoff gradient	54
FIG. 3.11 | Rill/gully formation	54
FIG. 3.12 | Rill/gully formation gradient	54
FIG. 3.13 | Highly erodible soils gradient	57
FIG. 3.14 | Ecological potential gradient	69
FIG. 3.15 | Ecological % gradient	69
FIG. 5.1 | Color Chart	91
FIG. 6.1 | Cumulative impacts of water quality impairments (HRW)	95
FIG. 6.2 | Chemical forms of nitrogen in water. (From Frankenberger, Monitoring Water in Indiana, 76.)	95
FIG. 6.3 | Chemical forms of phosphorus in water (From Frankenberger, Monitoring Water in Indiana, 76.)	97
FIG. 6.4 | “Percent Share of Nitrogen and Phosphorus to the Gulf of Mexico based on SPARROW modeling.”3	99
FIG. 6.5 | “Schematic diagram of the relative amount of different N forms	99
FIG. 7.1 | Sampling frequency recommendations	102
FIG. 7.2 | Parameters can very within a stream, even at the “same location” as defined by GPS coordinates.	102
FIG. 7.3 - 7.6 | Yearly averages for E.coli, Nitrogen, TSS, and Phosphorus using IDEM data	105
FIG. 8.1 | X Times Target, % Reduction, and Tons/yr. reduction (TR).	118
FIG. 8.2 - 8.7 | Dissolved Oxygen Levels on HUC 12 Tributary Subwatersheds	138
FIG. 8.8 - 8.13 | Temperature on HUC12 Tributary Subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC10	142
FIG. 8.14 - 8.19 | pH levels on HUC 12 Tributary Subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC10	145
FIG. 9.1 | Efficacy of chemical and biological assessments	148
FIG. 9.2 | IBI results	154
FIG. 9.3 | mIBI results	154
FIG. 9.4 | Relationship between QHEI and drainage area	156
FIG. 9.5 | Average QHEI scores	156
FIG. 13.1 | 303d Listed Streams	219
FIG. 13.2 | 303(d) listed streams (GRADIENT)	219
FIG. 15.1 | “Top down” approach for BMP implementation	242
FIG. 15.2 | BMPs, ordered by numbers of stakeholders within UMRW interested in them.	250

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN

PREPARED FOR: UPPER MISSISSINEWA RIVER WATERSHED PARTNERSHIP
Delaware County Soil and Water Conservation District
USDA Service Center
3641 N. Briarwood Lane
Muncie, In 47304
765-747-5531 Ext 3

PREPARED BY: FLATLAND RESOURCES
PO Box 1293
Muncie, Indiana 47308
765-284-2328

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Upper Mississinewa River Watershed Project is a community based initiative funded through the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) Clean Water Act Section 205(j) Program with local financial support from the Ball Brothers Foundation and the George and Frances Ball Foundation. It is administered locally by the Delaware County Soil and Water Conservation District (DCSWCD) in partnership with regional SWCDs.

This project has been funded wholly or in part by the United States Environmental Protection Agency under a 205(j) assistance agreement to the Indiana Department of Environmental Management. The Contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

FlatLand Resources, a planning and design-build civil engineering firm based out of Muncie, Indiana, conducted fieldwork, data collection, report writing and mapping, facilitated public meetings and outreach, and provided project oversight. The FlatLand Resources team consisted of Phil Tevis, Colby Gray, Clair Burt, Barb Frost, Candace Kindt, David Heilman, Kristin Riga, Chris Tomsic, Jacob Riddle, Luke Waltz, Paige Story, and Amanda Arnold.

Special thanks to Mississinewa River landowners who participated in our public concerns and implementation drive, public input meetings, and social indicators survey, and to individuals who provided project support/consultation or contributed data to this report.

Ball Brothers Foundation
George and Frances Ball Foundation
Partner SWCDs
Landowners
Delaware Co. GIS Department
Water Quality Indiana (BSU Geology)
BSU NREM Department
Army Corps of Engineers
NRCS District Conservationist
City of Marion MS4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
TABLE OF TABLES	8
TABLE OF MAPS	12
TABLE OF FIGURES	13
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	14
1. WATERSHED COMMUNITY INITIATIVE	20
2. PUBLIC INPUT	25
3. WATERSHED INVENTORY	37
4. OTHER PLANNING EFFORTS	78
5. WATERSHED INVENTORY SUMMARY	85
6. UNDERSTANDING WATER QUALITY	92
7. HISTORIC WATER QUALITY	101
8. CURRENT WATER QUALITY	111
9. BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENTS	148
10. SUBWATERSHED DISCUSSIONS	159
11. WATERSHED INVENTORY SUMMARY	190
12. STAKEHOLDER CONCERNS	198
13. ANALYSIS OF CONCERNS	208
14. CRITICAL AREAS	221
15. IMPLEMENTATION	241
16. GOALS & ACTION STRATEGY	251
17. TRACKING EFFECTIVENESS	282
18. FUTURE ACTIVITY	284
19. REFERENCES	285

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	14
1. WATERSHED COMMUNITY INITIATIVE	20
1.1 INTRODUCTION	20
1.2 PROJECT INITIATION RATIONALE	22
1.3 LOCAL LEADERSHIP	23
1.4 PROJECT ORGANIZATION	24
1.5 STEERING COMMITTEE	24
2. PUBLIC INPUT	25
2.1 WATERSHED CONCERNS / RESULTS	27
2.2 LAND-USE CONCERNS	30
2.3 GEOGRAPHIC RESULTS	31
2.4 BEST-MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	33
2.5 SOCIAL SURVEY DISCUSSION	33
2.6 PUBLIC INPUT CONCLUSIONS	34
2.7 CRITICAL AREA PUBLIC INPUT	35
3. WATERSHED INVENTORY	37
3.1 GATHERING WATERSHED DATA	37
3.2 BASIC GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY OF THE REGION	39
3.3 SUBWATERSHEDS AND THEIR GEOMORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS	41
3.4 CURRENT AND HISTORIC HYDROLOGY	42
3.5 HISTORIC AND CURRENT LAND USE	51
3.6 WILDLIFE AND ECOLOGY	66
3.7 FUNCTIONAL USES OF THE RIVER	69
3.8 DESKTOP SURVEY	73
3.9 WINDSHIELD SURVEY	75
4. OTHER PLANNING EFFORTS	78
4.1 EXISTING WATERSHED PLANNING EFFORTS	78
4.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLANNING EFFORTS	82
5. WATERSHED INVENTORY SUMMARY	85
6. UNDERSTANDING WATER QUALITY	92
6.1 UNDERLYING REASON FOR WATER QUALITY MONITORING	92
6.2 WATER QUALITY PARAMETERS FOR MONITORING BENEFICIAL USES	92
6.3 THREATS TO RECREATION AND DOMESTIC DRINKING WATER	97
6.4 WATER QUALITY TARGETS	98
7. HISTORIC WATER QUALITY	101
7.1 INTRODUCTION TO HISTORICAL WATER QUALITY DATA SETS	101
7.2 IDEM'S ASSESSMENT INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (AIMS) DATABASE	103
7.3 A STATEWIDE COMPARISON OF RIVERS (USING IDEM'S DATA SET)	106
7.4 STORET DATASET	107
7.5 LARE DATASET	109
7.6 HOOSIER RIVERWATCH DATASET	110

8. CURRENT WATER QUALITY	111
8.1 ANALYSIS OF CURRENT WATER QUALITY DATA	116
8.2 NITRATE	117
8.3 PHOSPHORUS	122
8.4 SEDIMENT	127
8.5 BACTERIOLOGICAL	132
8.6 DISSOLVED OXYGEN	137
8.7 Temperature	141
8.8 pH	141
9. BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENTS	148
9.1 BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENTS	148
10. SUBWATERSHED DISCUSSIONS	159
10.1 BIG LICK CREEK HUC 10	160
10.2 HALFWAY CREEK HUC 10	166
10.3 PIKE CREEK HUC 10	172
10.4. HEADWATERS MISSISSINEWA HUC 10	178
10.5 MASSEY CREEK HUC 10	183
11. WATERSHED INVENTORY SUMMARY	190
12. STAKEHOLDER CONCERNS	198
13. ANALYSIS OF CONCERNS	208
13.1 DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK	208
13.2 PROBLEMS AND CAUSES	208
13.3 SOURCES	210
13.4 SOURCES: SEDIMENT	210
13.5 SOURCES: NUTRIENTS	215
13.6 SOURCES: E. COLI	218
14. CRITICAL AREAS	221
14.1 CRITICAL AREA SELECTION	221
14.2 PRIORITIZATION OF CRITICAL AREAS	227
14.3 TIER I SELECTION RATIONALE	227
14.4 HUC 12 SUBWATERSHED REDUCTION GOALS AND INDICATORS,	232
14.5 LOAD REDUCTIONS NEEDED FOR CRITICAL AREAS, LISTED BY HUC 10	238
15. IMPLEMENTATION	241
15.1 IMPLEMENTATION	241
15.3 IOWA STRATEGY TO REDUCE NUTRIENT LOSS: PHOSPHORUS PRACTICES	243
15.4 IOWA STRATEGY TO REDUCE NUTRIENT LOSS: NITROGEN PRACTICES	244
15.5 MODELING DISCUSSION—MEETING ULTIMATE GOALS	246
16. GOALS & ACTION STRATEGY	251
16.1 Goal #1: PROVIDE EDUCATION AND FORM PARTNERSHIPS	251
16.2 Goal #2-#5: IMPROVE WATER QUALITY OF THE UPPER MISSISSINEWA RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES	253
16.3 CRITICAL AREAS AND BMPS, LISTED BY COUNTY	256
17. TRACKING EFFECTIVENESS	282
17.1 TRACKING EFFECTIVENESS	282
18. FUTURE ACTIVITY	284
19. REFERENCES	285

APPENDIX	
A. PUBLIC INPUT	A7
B. GEOLOGY & HYDROLOGY	A8
C. LAND USE	A11
D. DEMOGRAPHICS	A14
E. DESKTOP SURVEY	A19
F. ENDANGERED SPECIES	A22
G. OTHER RELEVANT HISTORICAL STUDIES	A28
H. EXISTING IDEM DATA	A35
I. EXISTING STORET DATA	A42
J. EXISTING LARE DATA	A46
K. SAMPLE SITE DATA	A51
L. NITRATE DATA	A53
M. PHOSPHORUS DATA	A60
N. TSS DATA	A67
O. E. COLI DATA	A74
P. DISSOLVED OXYGEN DATA	A81
Q. BIOLOGICAL DATA	A82
R. LOAD REDUCTION SCENARIOS	A83
S. MEETING ULTIMATE GOALS—MODELS	A92
T. MISC TABLES/FIGURES	A102
U. BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	A109
V. SSO OVERFLOWS	A111

TABLE OF TABLES

Contents	
TABLE 0.1 | Critical HUC 12 Tributary Subwatersheds	16
TABLE 0.2 | Landowner Interest in Best Management Practices (750 people surveyed)	18
TABLE 1.1 | Steering Committee	24
TABLE 2.1 | Blackford County concerns	27
TABLE 2.2 | Grant County concerns	28
TABLE 2.3 | Delaware County concerns	28
TABLE 2.4 | Jay County concerns	28
TABLE 2.5 | Darke County concerns	29
TABLE 2.6 | Randolph County concerns	29
TABLE 2.7 | Interest in Best Management Practices	30
TABLE 2.8 | Response rate by subwatershed	31
TABLE 2.9 | Best Management Practices with Most Stakeholder Interest	33
TABLE 2.10 | Grant County focus concerns	35
TABLE 2.11 | Randolph County and Delaware County focus concerns	36
TABLE 3.1 | HUC delineations	41
TABLE 3.2 | USGS discharge data Marion	42
TABLE 3.3 | USGS discharge data Ridgeville	42
TABLE 3.4 | Watershed land use within floodplain	46
TABLE 3.5 | Documented/Estimated Legal Drain Miles in Watershed	48
TABLE 3.6 | Land use in watershed	53
TABLE 3.7 | Simplified land use categorization	53
TABLE 3.8 | Nitrate contribution by watershed	55
TABLE 3.9 | No-till by county	55
TABLE 3.10 | Conventional tillage loss	55
TABLE 3.11 | Cover crops per county, based on 2015 Tillage Transect Data	56
TABLE 3.12 | Employment in the watershed	59
TABLE 3.13 | 2010 populations	59
TABLE 3.14 | CSOs located in watershed	61
TABLE 3.15 | Descriptions of the five logjam conditions	71
TABLE 3.16 | Sites identified through desktop survey	72
TABLE 3.17 | Sites identified through deskstop survey	73
TABLE 3.18 | Count of sites with inadequate stream buffers and with streambank erosion observed on windshield survey	75
TABLE 3.19 | Count of sites with rills observed on windshield survey	76
TABLE 3.20 | Count of sites with possible E. coli sources observed on windshield survey	76
TABLE 4.1 | Potential Priority Implementation Area (PPIA) Rankings and Recommended Implementation Actions from the Draft TMDL Report for the Upper Mississinewa River Watershed	80
TABLE 5.1 | Recreational/Human Health Concerns	89
TABLE 5.2 | Socio Economic Concerns	89
TABLE 5.3 | Fish and Aquatic Wildlife Concerns	90
TABLE 5.4 | Fish and Aquatic Wildlife Concerns Continued	90
TABLE 6.1 | Water quality targets	98
TABLE 6.2 | Reference conditions for Ecoregion VI. Based on 25th percentiles* only5	99
TABLE 6.3 | Water temperature limits, from IAC 327 2-1-6	100
TABLE 7.1 | Averages of combined data from sites sampled at the highest frequencies (data from IDEM AIMS database)	103

TABLE 7.2 | Averages of data from sites sampled at the highest frequencies (data from IDEM AIMS database)	103
TABLE 7.3 | Annual Averages of All Samples Collected at All Thirteen Mainstem Mississinewa Sites*	104
TABLE 7.4 | Parameter averages and rankings for 14 high quality recreational streams. Data obtained from IDEM AIMS database.	105
TABLE 7.5 | Avg. Water Quality Results for Streams of the Central Till Plain Ecoregion (IDEM Fixed Station Data, 1990-010)2	106
TABLE 7.6 | STORET and IDEM Averages for Water Quality Parameters	107
TABLE 7.7 | Averages for STORET Sample Sites	107
TABLE 7.8 | Averages for impairment. Streams highlighted in yellow had the highest frequency of sampling.	108
TABLE 7.9 | STORET, IDEM and LARE Averages for Eleven Water Quality Parameters	109
TABLE 7.10 | LARE Mississinewa River averages (from all four LARE studies)	110
TABLE 7.11 | Hoosier Riverwatch parameter averages	110
TABLE 8.1 | Sample sites used in current water quality analysis	112
TABLE 8.2 | Average cfs, used as the division between high flow and low flow	115
TABLE 8.3 | Nitrate averages for tributary subwatershed and mainstem subwatershed sites	118
TABLE 8.4 | Nitrate load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	119
TABLE 8.5 | Nitrate load reduction needed at mainstem sites	119
TABLE 8.6 | Phosphorus averages for tributary subwatershed and mainstem subwatershed sites	123
TABLE 8.7 | Phosphorus load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	124
TABLE 8.8 | Phosphorus load reduction needed at mainstem sites	124
TABLE 8.9 | TSS averages for tributary subwatershed and mainstem subwatershed sites	128
TABLE 8.10 | Sediment load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	129
TABLE 8.11 | Sediment load reduction needed at mainstem sites	129
TABLE 8.12 | E. coli averages for subwatershed and mainstem sites	133
TABLE 8.13 | E. coli load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	134
TABLE 8.14 | E. coli load reduction needed at mainstem sites	134
TABLE 9.1 | Biological results from IDEM	149
TABLE 9.2 | Statewide biological comparison	149
TABLE 9.3 | Consumption groups and advisories for fish consumption advisory	150
TABLE 9.4 | IBI results	152
TABLE 9.5 | IBI scores and narratives	152
TABLE 9.6 | mIBI scores and narratives	153
TABLE 9.7 | QHEI results from the Bureau of Water Quality and IDEM	155
TABLE 9.8 | mIBI Results Drainage >100 sq. mi.	156
TABLE 9.9 | mIBI Results Drainage <100 sq. mi.	156
TABLE 9.10 | QHEI scores and narratives. Headwaters have drainage areas equal to or less than 20 sq. mi.	156
TABLE 9.11 | Subwatersheds with poor biological scores	157
TABLE 9.12 | Biological and habitat results*	158
TABLE 10.1 | Average exceedances per subwatershed	159
TABLE 10.2 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	160
TABLE 10.3 | Desktop Survey Results	162
TABLE 10.4 | Desktop Survey Results	162
TABLE 10.5 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	164
TABLE 10.6 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 Subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	166
TABLE 10.7 | Desktop Survey Results	169
TABLE 10.8 | Desktop Survey Results	169
TABLE 10.9 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	170
TABLE 10.10 | Pike Creek HUC 10 Subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	172

TABLE 10.11 | Desktop Survey Results	175
TABLE 10.12 | Desktop Survey Results	175
TABLE 10.13 | Pike Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	176
TABLE 10.14 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 data exceeding water quality targets	178
TABLE 10.15 | Desktop Survey Results	180
TABLE 10.16 | Desktop Survey Results	180
TABLE 10.17 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 watershed concerns	181
TABLE 10.18 | Massey Creek HUC 10 Subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	184
TABLE 10.19 | Desktop Survey Results	186
TABLE 10.20 | Desktop Survey Results	186
TABLE 10.21 | Massey Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	188
TABLE 11.1 | Mississinewa Means	195
TABLE 12.1 | State Mandated Beneficial Uses of Waterways	198
TABLE 12.2 | UMRWP's Simplified Beneficial Use Categories	198
TABLE 12.3 | Fish and aquatic wildlife concerns	200
TABLE 12.4 | Recreational/human health concerns	202
TABLE 12.5 | Socioeconomic concerns	206
TABLE 13.1 | Key Concerns and their associated problem	209
TABLE 13.2 | Modified IDEM Inventory of Causes (of Watershed/Water Quality Problems)	209
TABLE 13.3 | Modified IDEM source table	211
TABLE 13.4 | Major sources per impairment	211
TABLE 13.5 | Sediment as leading pollutant	213
TABLE 13.6 | Sediment (Total Suspended Solids) sources	214
TABLE 13.7 | Nutrient sources	217
TABLE 13.8 | Category of water usage (http://www.in.gov/legislative/iac/20120208-IR-318120053ONA.xml.html)	219
TABLE 13.9 | 303(d) list	220
TABLE 13.10 | E. coli sources	220
TABLE 14.1 | Critical areas by county	221
TABLE 14.2 | Overall ranking of mainstem subwatersheds, with "1" being the highest priority, and "15" being the lowest priority	222
TABLE 14.3 | Overall ranking of tributary subwatersheds, with "1" being the highest priority, and "15" being the lowest priority	222
TABLE 14.4 | Critical tributary subwatersheds: Tier I, II, and III	227
TABLE 14.5 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Pike Creek HUC 10 (Delaware County)	232
TABLE 14.6 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Headwaters Mississinewa (Darke and Randolph counties)	233
TABLE 14.7 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Halfway Creek HUC 10 (Jay County)	233
TABLE 14.8 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Headwaters Mississinewa (Darke and Randolph counties)	234
TABLE 14.9 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Big Lick Creek HUC 10 (Blackford County)	235
TABLE 14.10 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	236
TABLE 14.11 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	237
TABLE 14.12 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 (Blackford County)	238
TABLE 14.13 | Headwaters Mississinewa HUC 10 (Darke and Randolph counties)	239
TABLE 14.14 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 (Jay County)	240
TABLE 14.15 | Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	240
TABLE 14.16 | Pike Creek HUC 10 (Delaware County)	240

TABLE 15.1 | Iowa Strategy To Reduce Nutrient Loss: Phosphorus Practices	243
TABLE 15.2 | Iowa Strategy To Reduce Nutrient Loss: Nitrogen Practices	244
TABLE 15.3 | Priority areas for nonpoint source reduction	246
TABLE 15.4 | Financial requirements for nonpoint source reduction	246
TABLE 15.5 | Nitrate loading data	248
TABLE 15.6 | BMPs, rates of use, and resulting nitrate load reductions	248
TABLE 15.7 | Landowner Interest in Best Management Practices	250
TABLE 16.1 | Blackford County	256
TABLE 16.2 | Pike Creek HUC 10 (Delaware County)	256
TABLE 16.3 | Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	257
TABLE 16.4 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 (Jay County)	257
TABLE 16.5 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 (Darke and Randolph counties)	258
TABLE 16.6 | Goal #1, Objective #1 (Build local capacity for volunteers for monitoring, etc.)	259
TABLE 16.7 | Goal #1, Objective #2 (Provide education and form partnerships with Agricultural Landowners)	260
TABLE 16.8 | Goal #1, Objective #3 (Provide education and form partnerships with Ecological Landowners)	261
TABLE 16.9 | Goal #1, Objective #4 (Provide education and form partnerships with Recreational Enthusiasts)	262
TABLE 16.10 | Goal #1, Objective #5 (Provide education and form partnerships with Health Departments)	263
TABLE 16.11 | Goal #1, Objective #6 (Provide education and form partnerships with County Drainage Boards/ Surveyor)	263
TABLE 16.12 | Goal #1, Objective #7 (Perform policy research and develop educational resources to promote citizen involvement in county/municipal planning and policy-making)	264
TABLE 16.13 | Action Register for Gray Branch Subwatershed	265
TABLE 16.14 | Action Register for Halfway Creek Subwatershed	269
TABLE 16.15 | Action Register for Deer Creek Subwatershed	271
TABLE 16.16 | Action Register for Bush Creek Subwatershed	275
TABLE 16.17 | Action Register for Halfway Creek Subwatershed	279
TABLE 17.1 | Total Costs for Watershed Management Plan Goals	283

TABLE OF MAPS

Contents	
MAP 0.1 | Water Quality and Habitat/Biology Results	17
MAP 1.1 | Watershed boundary	21
MAP 2.1 | Target landowners (Darke County not shown due to lack of parcel data)	26
MAP 2.2 | Response rate concentrations	32
MAP 3.1 | HUC10 watersheds	40
MAP 3.2 | Hydric soils	44
MAP 3.3 | NRCS Soil type classifications	45
MAP 3.4 | Open Legal Drain Map	49
MAP 3.5 | Land use map	52
MAP 3.6 | Highly erodible soils map	57
MAP 3.7 | Regulated point sources in watershed	60
MAP 3.8 | Septic suitability map	63
MAP 3.9 | Residential areas and density concentration map	65
MAP 3.10 | Projected long-term ecological areas	67
MAP 3.11 | Locations of logjams identifed through surveys	71
MAP 4.1 | Locations of previous watershed planning efforts	81
MAP 4.2 | Location of governmental planning efforts	84
MAP 6.1 | IDEM sample sites	94
MAP 8.2 | NITRATE HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	120
MAP 8.3 | NITRATE LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	120
MAP 8.4 | NITRATE HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHED	121
MAP 8.5 | NITRATE LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHED	121
MAP 8.6 | PHOSPHORUS HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	125
MAP 8.7 | PHOSPHORUS LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	125
MAP 8.8 | PHOSPHORUS HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	126
MAP 8.9 | PHOSPHORUS LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	126
MAP 8.10 | TSS HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	130
MAP 8.11 | TSS LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	130
MAP 8.12 | TSS HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	131
MAP 8.13 | TSS LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	131
MAP 8.14 | E. COLI HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	135
MAP 8.15 | E. COLI LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	135
MAP 8.16 | E. COLI HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHED	136
MAP 8.17 | E. COLI LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHED	136
MAP 10.1 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 Watershed	165
MAP 10.2 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 Watershed	171
MAP 10.3 | Pike Creek HUC 10 Watershed	177
MAP 10.4 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 Watershed	182
MAP 10.5 | Massey Creek HUC 10 Watershed	189
MAP 11.1 | Priority Watersheds, Based on Water Quality and Habitat/Biology Results	197
MAP 14.1 | E. COLI CRITICAL AREAS	223
MAP 14.2 | NITROGEN CRITICAL AREAS	224
MAP 14.3 | PHOSPHORUS CRITICAL AREAS	225
MAP 14.4 | TSS CRITICAL AREAS	226

TABLE OF FIGURES

Contents	
FIG. 1.1 | Project organization	24
FIG. 2.1 | Landowner feedback	28
FIG. 2.2 | Feedback on land management types	30
FIG. 3.1 | Erosion sites	47
FIG. 3.2 | Erosion sites gradient	47
FIG. 3.3 | NHD Missing Stream Buffers	47
FIG. 3.4 | NHD Missing Stream Buffers Gradient	47
FIG. 3.5 | Aquifer Capacity	47
FIG. 3.6 | Unconsolidated aquifer depth	47
FIG. 3.7 | Livestock in streams	54
FIG. 3.8 | Livestock in streams gradient	54
FIG. 3.9 | Runoff	54
FIG. 3.10 | Runoff gradient	54
FIG. 3.11 | Rill/gully formation	54
FIG. 3.12 | Rill/gully formation gradient	54
FIG. 3.13 | Highly erodible soils gradient	57
FIG. 3.14 | Ecological potential gradient	69
FIG. 3.15 | Ecological % gradient	69
FIG. 5.1 | Color Chart	91
FIG. 6.1 | Cumulative impacts of water quality impairments (HRW)	95
FIG. 6.2 | Chemical forms of nitrogen in water. (From Frankenberger, Monitoring Water in Indiana, 76.)	95
FIG. 6.3 | Chemical forms of phosphorus in water (From Frankenberger, Monitoring Water in Indiana, 76.)	97
FIG. 6.4 | “Percent Share of Nitrogen and Phosphorus to the Gulf of Mexico based on SPARROW modeling.”3	99
FIG. 6.5 | “Schematic diagram of the relative amount of different N forms	99
FIG. 7.1 | Sampling frequency recommendations	102
FIG. 7.2 | Parameters can very within a stream, even at the “same location” as defined by GPS coordinates.	102
FIG. 7.3 - 7.6 | Yearly averages for E.coli, Nitrogen, TSS, and Phosphorus using IDEM data	105
FIG. 8.1 | X Times Target, % Reduction, and Tons/yr. reduction (TR).	118
FIG. 8.2 - 8.7 | Dissolved Oxygen Levels on HUC 12 Tributary Subwatersheds	138
FIG. 8.8 - 8.13 | Temperature on HUC12 Tributary Subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC10	142
FIG. 8.14 - 8.19 | pH levels on HUC 12 Tributary Subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC10	145
FIG. 9.1 | Efficacy of chemical and biological assessments	148
FIG. 9.2 | IBI results	154
FIG. 9.3 | mIBI results	154
FIG. 9.4 | Relationship between QHEI and drainage area	156
FIG. 9.5 | Average QHEI scores	156
FIG. 13.1 | 303d Listed Streams	219
FIG. 13.2 | 303(d) listed streams (GRADIENT)	219
FIG. 15.1 | “Top down” approach for BMP implementation	242
FIG. 15.2 | BMPs, ordered by numbers of stakeholders within UMRW interested in them.	250

APPENDIX	
A. PUBLIC INPUT	A7
B. GEOLOGY & HYDROLOGY	A8
C. LAND USE	A11
D. DEMOGRAPHICS	A14
E. DESKTOP SURVEY	A19
F. ENDANGERED SPECIES	A22
G. OTHER RELEVANT HISTORICAL STUDIES	A28
H. EXISTING IDEM DATA	A35
I. EXISTING STORET DATA	A42
J. EXISTING LARE DATA	A46
K. SAMPLE SITE DATA	A51
L. NITRATE DATA	A53
M. PHOSPHORUS DATA	A60
N. TSS DATA	A67
O. E. COLI DATA	A74
P. DISSOLVED OXYGEN DATA	A81
Q. BIOLOGICAL DATA	A82
R. LOAD REDUCTION SCENARIOS	A83
S. MEETING ULTIMATE GOALS—MODELS	A92
T. MISC TABLES/FIGURES	A102
U. BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	A109
V. SSO OVERFLOWS	A111

TABLE OF TABLES

Contents	
TABLE 0.1 | Critical HUC 12 Tributary Subwatersheds	16
TABLE 0.2 | Landowner Interest in Best Management Practices (750 people surveyed)	18
TABLE 1.1 | Steering Committee	24
TABLE 2.1 | Blackford County concerns	27
TABLE 2.2 | Grant County concerns	28
TABLE 2.3 | Delaware County concerns	28
TABLE 2.4 | Jay County concerns	28
TABLE 2.5 | Darke County concerns	29
TABLE 2.6 | Randolph County concerns	29
TABLE 2.7 | Interest in Best Management Practices	30
TABLE 2.8 | Response rate by subwatershed	31
TABLE 2.9 | Best Management Practices with Most Stakeholder Interest	33
TABLE 2.10 | Grant County focus concerns	35
TABLE 2.11 | Randolph County and Delaware County focus concerns	36
TABLE 3.1 | HUC delineations	41
TABLE 3.2 | USGS discharge data Marion	42
TABLE 3.3 | USGS discharge data Ridgeville	42
TABLE 3.4 | Watershed land use within floodplain	46
TABLE 3.5 | Documented/Estimated Legal Drain Miles in Watershed	48
TABLE 3.6 | Land use in watershed	53
TABLE 3.7 | Simplified land use categorization	53
TABLE 3.8 | Nitrate contribution by watershed	55
TABLE 3.9 | No-till by county	55
TABLE 3.10 | Conventional tillage loss	55
TABLE 3.11 | Cover crops per county, based on 2015 Tillage Transect Data	56
TABLE 3.12 | Employment in the watershed	59
TABLE 3.13 | 2010 populations	59
TABLE 3.14 | CSOs located in watershed	61
TABLE 3.15 | Descriptions of the five logjam conditions	71
TABLE 3.16 | Sites identified through desktop survey	72
TABLE 3.17 | Sites identified through deskstop survey	73
TABLE 3.18 | Count of sites with inadequate stream buffers and with streambank erosion observed on windshield survey	75
TABLE 3.19 | Count of sites with rills observed on windshield survey	76
TABLE 3.20 | Count of sites with possible E. coli sources observed on windshield survey	76
TABLE 4.1 | Potential Priority Implementation Area (PPIA) Rankings and Recommended Implementation Actions from the Draft TMDL Report for the Upper Mississinewa River Watershed	80
TABLE 5.1 | Recreational/Human Health Concerns	89
TABLE 5.2 | Socio Economic Concerns	89
TABLE 5.3 | Fish and Aquatic Wildlife Concerns	90
TABLE 5.4 | Fish and Aquatic Wildlife Concerns Continued	90
TABLE 6.1 | Water quality targets	98
TABLE 6.2 | Reference conditions for Ecoregion VI. Based on 25th percentiles* only5	99
TABLE 6.3 | Water temperature limits, from IAC 327 2-1-6	100
TABLE 7.1 | Averages of combined data from sites sampled at the highest frequencies (data from IDEM AIMS database)	103

TABLE 7.2 | Averages of data from sites sampled at the highest frequencies (data from IDEM AIMS database)	103
TABLE 7.3 | Annual Averages of All Samples Collected at All Thirteen Mainstem Mississinewa Sites*	104
TABLE 7.4 | Parameter averages and rankings for 14 high quality recreational streams. Data obtained from IDEM AIMS database.	105
TABLE 7.5 | Avg. Water Quality Results for Streams of the Central Till Plain Ecoregion (IDEM Fixed Station Data, 1990-010)2	106
TABLE 7.6 | STORET and IDEM Averages for Water Quality Parameters	107
TABLE 7.7 | Averages for STORET Sample Sites	107
TABLE 7.8 | Averages for impairment. Streams highlighted in yellow had the highest frequency of sampling.	108
TABLE 7.9 | STORET, IDEM and LARE Averages for Eleven Water Quality Parameters	109
TABLE 7.10 | LARE Mississinewa River averages (from all four LARE studies)	110
TABLE 7.11 | Hoosier Riverwatch parameter averages	110
TABLE 8.1 | Sample sites used in current water quality analysis	112
TABLE 8.2 | Average cfs, used as the division between high flow and low flow	115
TABLE 8.3 | Nitrate averages for tributary subwatershed and mainstem subwatershed sites	118
TABLE 8.4 | Nitrate load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	119
TABLE 8.5 | Nitrate load reduction needed at mainstem sites	119
TABLE 8.6 | Phosphorus averages for tributary subwatershed and mainstem subwatershed sites	123
TABLE 8.7 | Phosphorus load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	124
TABLE 8.8 | Phosphorus load reduction needed at mainstem sites	124
TABLE 8.9 | TSS averages for tributary subwatershed and mainstem subwatershed sites	128
TABLE 8.10 | Sediment load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	129
TABLE 8.11 | Sediment load reduction needed at mainstem sites	129
TABLE 8.12 | E. coli averages for subwatershed and mainstem sites	133
TABLE 8.13 | E. coli load reduction needed at tributary subwatershed sites	134
TABLE 8.14 | E. coli load reduction needed at mainstem sites	134
TABLE 9.1 | Biological results from IDEM	149
TABLE 9.2 | Statewide biological comparison	149
TABLE 9.3 | Consumption groups and advisories for fish consumption advisory	150
TABLE 9.4 | IBI results	152
TABLE 9.5 | IBI scores and narratives	152
TABLE 9.6 | mIBI scores and narratives	153
TABLE 9.7 | QHEI results from the Bureau of Water Quality and IDEM	155
TABLE 9.8 | mIBI Results Drainage >100 sq. mi.	156
TABLE 9.9 | mIBI Results Drainage <100 sq. mi.	156
TABLE 9.10 | QHEI scores and narratives. Headwaters have drainage areas equal to or less than 20 sq. mi.	156
TABLE 9.11 | Subwatersheds with poor biological scores	157
TABLE 9.12 | Biological and habitat results*	158
TABLE 10.1 | Average exceedances per subwatershed	159
TABLE 10.2 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	160
TABLE 10.3 | Desktop Survey Results	162
TABLE 10.4 | Desktop Survey Results	162
TABLE 10.5 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	164
TABLE 10.6 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 Subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	166
TABLE 10.7 | Desktop Survey Results	169
TABLE 10.8 | Desktop Survey Results	169
TABLE 10.9 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	170
TABLE 10.10 | Pike Creek HUC 10 Subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	172

TABLE 10.11 | Desktop Survey Results	175
TABLE 10.12 | Desktop Survey Results	175
TABLE 10.13 | Pike Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	176
TABLE 10.14 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 data exceeding water quality targets	178
TABLE 10.15 | Desktop Survey Results	180
TABLE 10.16 | Desktop Survey Results	180
TABLE 10.17 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 watershed concerns	181
TABLE 10.18 | Massey Creek HUC 10 Subwatershed data exceeding water quality targets	184
TABLE 10.19 | Desktop Survey Results	186
TABLE 10.20 | Desktop Survey Results	186
TABLE 10.21 | Massey Creek HUC 10 watershed concerns	188
TABLE 11.1 | Mississinewa Means	195
TABLE 12.1 | State Mandated Beneficial Uses of Waterways	198
TABLE 12.2 | UMRWP's Simplified Beneficial Use Categories	198
TABLE 12.3 | Fish and aquatic wildlife concerns	200
TABLE 12.4 | Recreational/human health concerns	202
TABLE 12.5 | Socioeconomic concerns	206
TABLE 13.1 | Key Concerns and their associated problem	209
TABLE 13.2 | Modified IDEM Inventory of Causes (of Watershed/Water Quality Problems)	209
TABLE 13.3 | Modified IDEM source table	211
TABLE 13.4 | Major sources per impairment	211
TABLE 13.5 | Sediment as leading pollutant	213
TABLE 13.6 | Sediment (Total Suspended Solids) sources	214
TABLE 13.7 | Nutrient sources	217
TABLE 13.8 | Category of water usage (http://www.in.gov/legislative/iac/20120208-IR-318120053ONA.xml.html)	219
TABLE 13.9 | 303(d) list	220
TABLE 13.10 | E. coli sources	220
TABLE 14.1 | Critical areas by county	221
TABLE 14.2 | Overall ranking of mainstem subwatersheds, with "1" being the highest priority, and "15" being the lowest priority	222
TABLE 14.3 | Overall ranking of tributary subwatersheds, with "1" being the highest priority, and "15" being the lowest priority	222
TABLE 14.4 | Critical tributary subwatersheds: Tier I, II, and III	227
TABLE 14.5 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Pike Creek HUC 10 (Delaware County)	232
TABLE 14.6 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Headwaters Mississinewa (Darke and Randolph counties)	233
TABLE 14.7 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Halfway Creek HUC 10 (Jay County)	233
TABLE 14.8 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Headwaters Mississinewa (Darke and Randolph counties)	234
TABLE 14.9 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Big Lick Creek HUC 10 (Blackford County)	235
TABLE 14.10 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	236
TABLE 14.11 | Goals and indicators for HUC 12 subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	237
TABLE 14.12 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 (Blackford County)	238
TABLE 14.13 | Headwaters Mississinewa HUC 10 (Darke and Randolph counties)	239
TABLE 14.14 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 (Jay County)	240
TABLE 14.15 | Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	240
TABLE 14.16 | Pike Creek HUC 10 (Delaware County)	240

TABLE 15.1 | Iowa Strategy To Reduce Nutrient Loss: Phosphorus Practices	243
TABLE 15.2 | Iowa Strategy To Reduce Nutrient Loss: Nitrogen Practices	244
TABLE 15.3 | Priority areas for nonpoint source reduction	246
TABLE 15.4 | Financial requirements for nonpoint source reduction	246
TABLE 15.5 | Nitrate loading data	248
TABLE 15.6 | BMPs, rates of use, and resulting nitrate load reductions	248
TABLE 15.7 | Landowner Interest in Best Management Practices	250
TABLE 16.1 | Blackford County	256
TABLE 16.2 | Pike Creek HUC 10 (Delaware County)	256
TABLE 16.3 | Massey Creek HUC 10 (Grant County)	257
TABLE 16.4 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 (Jay County)	257
TABLE 16.5 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 (Darke and Randolph counties)	258
TABLE 16.6 | Goal #1, Objective #1 (Build local capacity for volunteers for monitoring, etc.)	259
TABLE 16.7 | Goal #1, Objective #2 (Provide education and form partnerships with Agricultural Landowners)	260
TABLE 16.8 | Goal #1, Objective #3 (Provide education and form partnerships with Ecological Landowners)	261
TABLE 16.9 | Goal #1, Objective #4 (Provide education and form partnerships with Recreational Enthusiasts)	262
TABLE 16.10 | Goal #1, Objective #5 (Provide education and form partnerships with Health Departments)	263
TABLE 16.11 | Goal #1, Objective #6 (Provide education and form partnerships with County Drainage Boards/ Surveyor)	263
TABLE 16.12 | Goal #1, Objective #7 (Perform policy research and develop educational resources to promote citizen involvement in county/municipal planning and policy-making)	264
TABLE 16.13 | Action Register for Gray Branch Subwatershed	265
TABLE 16.14 | Action Register for Halfway Creek Subwatershed	269
TABLE 16.15 | Action Register for Deer Creek Subwatershed	271
TABLE 16.16 | Action Register for Bush Creek Subwatershed	275
TABLE 16.17 | Action Register for Halfway Creek Subwatershed	279
TABLE 17.1 | Total Costs for Watershed Management Plan Goals	283

TABLE OF MAPS

Contents	
MAP 0.1 | Water Quality and Habitat/Biology Results	17
MAP 1.1 | Watershed boundary	21
MAP 2.1 | Target landowners (Darke County not shown due to lack of parcel data)	26
MAP 2.2 | Response rate concentrations	32
MAP 3.1 | HUC10 watersheds	40
MAP 3.2 | Hydric soils	44
MAP 3.3 | NRCS Soil type classifications	45
MAP 3.4 | Open Legal Drain Map	49
MAP 3.5 | Land use map	52
MAP 3.6 | Highly erodible soils map	57
MAP 3.7 | Regulated point sources in watershed	60
MAP 3.8 | Septic suitability map	63
MAP 3.9 | Residential areas and density concentration map	65
MAP 3.10 | Projected long-term ecological areas	67
MAP 3.11 | Locations of logjams identifed through surveys	71
MAP 4.1 | Locations of previous watershed planning efforts	81
MAP 4.2 | Location of governmental planning efforts	84
MAP 6.1 | IDEM sample sites	94
MAP 8.2 | NITRATE HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	120
MAP 8.3 | NITRATE LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	120
MAP 8.4 | NITRATE HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHED	121
MAP 8.5 | NITRATE LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHED	121
MAP 8.6 | PHOSPHORUS HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	125
MAP 8.7 | PHOSPHORUS LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	125
MAP 8.8 | PHOSPHORUS HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	126
MAP 8.9 | PHOSPHORUS LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	126
MAP 8.10 | TSS HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	130
MAP 8.11 | TSS LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	130
MAP 8.12 | TSS HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	131
MAP 8.13 | TSS LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHEDS	131
MAP 8.14 | E. COLI HIGH FLOW MAINSTEM	135
MAP 8.15 | E. COLI LOW FLOW MAINSTEM	135
MAP 8.16 | E. COLI HIGH FLOW SUBWATERSHED	136
MAP 8.17 | E. COLI LOW FLOW SUBWATERSHED	136
MAP 10.1 | Big Lick Creek HUC 10 Watershed	165
MAP 10.2 | Halfway Creek HUC 10 Watershed	171
MAP 10.3 | Pike Creek HUC 10 Watershed	177
MAP 10.4 | Headwaters Mississinewa River HUC 10 Watershed	182
MAP 10.5 | Massey Creek HUC 10 Watershed	189
MAP 11.1 | Priority Watersheds, Based on Water Quality and Habitat/Biology Results	197
MAP 14.1 | E. COLI CRITICAL AREAS	223
MAP 14.2 | NITROGEN CRITICAL AREAS	224
MAP 14.3 | PHOSPHORUS CRITICAL AREAS	225
MAP 14.4 | TSS CRITICAL AREAS	226

TABLE OF FIGURES

Contents	
FIG. 1.1 | Project organization	24
FIG. 2.1 | Landowner feedback	28
FIG. 2.2 | Feedback on land management types	30
FIG. 3.1 | Erosion sites	47
FIG. 3.2 | Erosion sites gradient	47
FIG. 3.3 | NHD Missing Stream Buffers	47
FIG. 3.4 | NHD Missing Stream Buffers Gradient	47
FIG. 3.5 | Aquifer Capacity	47
FIG. 3.6 | Unconsolidated aquifer depth	47
FIG. 3.7 | Livestock in streams	54
FIG. 3.8 | Livestock in streams gradient	54
FIG. 3.9 | Runoff	54
FIG. 3.10 | Runoff gradient	54
FIG. 3.11 | Rill/gully formation	54
FIG. 3.12 | Rill/gully formation gradient	54
FIG. 3.13 | Highly erodible soils gradient	57
FIG. 3.14 | Ecological potential gradient	69
FIG. 3.15 | Ecological % gradient	69
FIG. 5.1 | Color Chart	91
FIG. 6.1 | Cumulative impacts of water quality impairments (HRW)	95
FIG. 6.2 | Chemical forms of nitrogen in water. (From Frankenberger, Monitoring Water in Indiana, 76.)	95
FIG. 6.3 | Chemical forms of phosphorus in water (From Frankenberger, Monitoring Water in Indiana, 76.)	97
FIG. 6.4 | “Percent Share of Nitrogen and Phosphorus to the Gulf of Mexico based on SPARROW modeling.”3	99
FIG. 6.5 | “Schematic diagram of the relative amount of different N forms	99
FIG. 7.1 | Sampling frequency recommendations	102
FIG. 7.2 | Parameters can very within a stream, even at the “same location” as defined by GPS coordinates.	102
FIG. 7.3 - 7.6 | Yearly averages for E.coli, Nitrogen, TSS, and Phosphorus using IDEM data	105
FIG. 8.1 | X Times Target, % Reduction, and Tons/yr. reduction (TR).	118
FIG. 8.2 - 8.7 | Dissolved Oxygen Levels on HUC 12 Tributary Subwatersheds	138
FIG. 8.8 - 8.13 | Temperature on HUC12 Tributary Subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC10	142
FIG. 8.14 - 8.19 | pH levels on HUC 12 Tributary Subwatersheds within Massey Creek HUC10	145
FIG. 9.1 | Efficacy of chemical and biological assessments	148
FIG. 9.2 | IBI results	154
FIG. 9.3 | mIBI results	154
FIG. 9.4 | Relationship between QHEI and drainage area	156
FIG. 9.5 | Average QHEI scores	156
FIG. 13.1 | 303d Listed Streams	219
FIG. 13.2 | 303(d) listed streams (GRADIENT)	219
FIG. 15.1 | “Top down” approach for BMP implementation	242
FIG. 15.2 | BMPs, ordered by numbers of stakeholders within UMRW interested in them.	250