

## Collaborative for Sediment Source Reduction – Greater Blue Earth River Basin Summary of Findings

The Collaborative for Sediment Source Reduction (CSSR) was a five-year effort to evaluate strategies for sediment source reduction in the Greater Blue Earth River Basin. With support from local, state, agribusiness, and environmental organizations, a diverse stakeholder group met nine times to evaluate watershed strategies for reducing sediment loading to the Minnesota River and beyond.


**CSSR Goal:** *To identify a strategy for reducing sediment loading in the Greater Blue Earth watershed using a decision framework that incorporates the best available scientific information, accounts for uncertainty, and provides a model for decision making throughout the Minnesota River Basin. We hope that the strategy developed will be effective, cost-efficient, fair, and supported by all stakeholders.*

There are numerous reasons to be concerned about sediment loading from the Blue Earth River Basin. The Minnesota River and many of its tributaries, including the Blue Earth, are known to be impaired for suspended solids. This causes problems downstream. Sediment causes deposition problems on the lower Minnesota River, degrades water quality in the Mississippi River, and increases the rate at which Lake Pepin is filling. Although the Minnesota River delivers only about one-third of the water to the Mississippi River and Lake Pepin, it delivers more than two-thirds of the sediment. The largest source of sediment to the Minnesota River is the Blue Earth River Basin, which includes the Watonwan and Le Sueur Rivers.

The citizens of Minnesota are committing considerable public funding to improve water quality in the Minnesota River, particularly with the passage of the 2008 Clean Water Land and Legacy Amendment. It is important that these funds are spent effectively, such that the benefit of cleaner water is realized for all. In terms of sediment and turbidity, that means we need to identify the most cost-effective conservation practices and locations for reducing excess soil and sediment erosion, along with associated phosphorus. We also need to think more broadly in order to set priorities for conservation investment throughout the watershed.

The Collaborative for Sediment Source Reduction (CSSR) was launched with the goal of developing an agreed-upon strategy for reducing sediment delivery from the Blue Earth River Basin. At the heart of CSSR was a group of local, state, and industry stakeholders with whom we developed a model to forecast changes in sediment loading in response to different combinations of conservation practices. Combined with information on the cost and effectiveness of different management options, the group used the model to evaluate watershed strategies for reducing sediment loading.

In addition to identifying the best methods and locations for reducing excess erosion and sediment delivery, solving the loading problem depends on a shared understanding of the issues among stakeholders, including farmers, producer groups, conservation groups, and regulatory agencies. CSSR provided a forum for different interests to work together to evaluate different conservation strategies. We focused on understanding how the landscape works, rather than assigning responsibility for its current condition or tackling the social challenges of funding and implementation. We hoped that a common understanding would lead to an agreed-upon strategy that would drive action to address this important problem. The watershed is large and there were many considerations. A key question concerned the best balance between directly reducing erosion of local sources (fields, ravines, streambanks, and bluffs) and indirectly reducing erosion by controlling runoff and reducing high river flows.



**The setting and the challenge**

The Minnesota River has always been a large source of sediment. At the end of the last Ice Age, about 13,400 years ago, the ancestral Minnesota River experienced enormous floods from a temporary glacial lake impounded by the remains of the continental ice sheet to the north. These floods caused the river bed to scour by as much as 200 ft. When the Minnesota River dropped in elevation, its tributaries steepened and began carving the valleys that we see today along the Minnesota River around the city of Mankato. These tributaries are among the most rapidly downcutting rivers in the world. Their rates of erosion and sediment loading are considerably larger than other rivers in the state.

As large as this natural background sediment supply has been, the rates of soil erosion and sediment supply increased five-fold as the region was developed for row-crop agriculture in the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century and into the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Despite extensive improvements in soil conservation over the past 80 years, this high rate of sediment supply continues today. As the amount of sediment from upland soil erosion decreased, the amount of sediment derived from the ravines and steep bluffs along the river channels increased over the last half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The largest source of sediment shifted from fields to the steep bluffs along the incised river valleys. The cause of this increase in near-channel sediment supply is an increase in river flow. Higher flows produce deeper water and swifter currents, as well as more channel shifting that can direct erosive flows against the channel banks and bluffs. As we evaluated solutions to reduce sediment loading, we considered not only actions to reduce upland soil erosion and stabilize bluffs, but also actions to reduce the peak river flows.



Google Earth image of an incised portion of the Blue Earth Watershed south of Mankato, MN

**The CSSR Model**

In order to evaluate the cost and effectiveness of different combinations of practices to reduce sediment loading, we needed a model that could link sediment loading to conservation practice. The scope of the model is large – the Blue Earth River Basin (including the Le Sueur and the Watonwan Rivers) drains 2,265,500 acres. We aimed for a model that would be simple and fast, while still reliably capturing sediment delivery from the Basin. By building the model with input from CSSR stakeholders, we hoped to include conservation practices that were both effective and acceptable.

Not all eroded sediment makes its way downstream to the mouth of the watershed and into the Minnesota River. In fact, often only a small fraction of it is transported all the way downstream because there are many locations along the way that trap sediment. We addressed this well-known “sediment delivery problem” using modern high-resolution topography and a sediment budget to estimate sediment delivery throughout the watershed. Another key part of the model is a relation between river flow and the rate of sediment loss from near-channel sources, particularly bluffs. We used the extensive monitoring conducted by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and its partners to determine how the rate of near-channel sediment supply increases with flow. We found that the flows currently producing most of the near-channel sediment are more common today than in the past. For example, the high flows estimated to produce more than two-thirds of the near-channel sediment supply today occur about 5 days per year on average. Flows of that size occurred less than one day per year, on average, 60 years ago. We used the relation between flow and near-channel sediment loss to estimate how reductions in runoff might reduce sediment loading from those sources.

The CSSR model is designed to estimate annual cost and sediment load reductions associated with different combinations of conservation practices. It does not explicitly consider other factors, such as the challenges of implementing different conservation practices at the watershed scale, or additional benefits to wildlife, water quality, or recreation. The CSSR model provides a starting point for these broader considerations.



## CSSR Findings

A final CSSR workshop was held on March 7, 2017 at Minnesota State University in Mankato, Minn. The meeting included stakeholders who had participated throughout the five year project, as well as invited attendees who broadened the perspective and experience of the group. After a recap of the primary findings of the supporting research, the group explored different conservation scenarios with the simulation model and discussed the outcomes. The meeting concluded with a discussion of findings, reported here.

Some ravines produce very large amounts of sediment from a small area. Conservation practices that reduce flow and erosion from ravines are among the most cost-effective. A range of practices can be considered, including water storage and stabilization at ravine tips and stabilization and revegetation within ravines with a large amount of stored sediment. Although ravines are locally prolific sources of sediment, their number is not large enough to account for more than about 10% of the sediment loading to the Blue Earth River and its tributaries.

***Ravines that are large local sources of sediment can be targeted. Investment in stabilizing these ravines is worthwhile, but not sufficient to reduce sediment loading to meet water quality standards.***

A solution to the sediment loading problem must address the largest source of sediment: the steep bluffs along the incised lower portions of the Blue Earth River Basin. Bluffs contribute about 60% of the sediment delivered from the watershed to the Minnesota River. Sediment loss from bluffs can be reduced by mechanically stabilizing the bluff toe or by reducing the frequency and magnitude of flood flows that erode the bluff. Either of these approaches may be cost effective, although other factors must also be considered. For example, toe stabilization, like any engineered solution, will have a limited lifespan. Also, the river channel may shift away from a protected bluff and initiate erosion elsewhere. Some bluffs are relatively inaccessible, making construction work difficult. Bluff protection may be worthwhile in specific locations, particularly where homes or roads and bridges are threatened by rapid bluff retreat, but it is neither desirable nor feasible to address sediment supply from bluff erosion through mechanical protection alone.

***Eroding bluffs that threaten infrastructure and produce exceptionally large amounts of sediment can be targeted. Investment in stabilizing these bluffs is worthwhile, but bluff stabilization is not the most effective solution for long-term reduction in sediment loading across the watershed.***

Although targeted treatment of particularly erosive ravines and bluffs is worthwhile, water management actions that reduce peak river flows offer a potentially long-term solution that targets the cause of the problem. Sediment erosion from persistently higher flood flows produces the majority of the elevated sediment supply. Water storage for reducing high flows is most likely to be effective when placed in upland areas above the lower, incised parts of the watershed. Water storage (including short and longer term detention) can include a wide range of practices, including wetland restoration and various types of detention basins and impoundments. Cover crops, winter annual crops, and perennials can also contribute to flow reductions. Many water storage practices also offer other benefits, such as increased wildlife habitat and nutrient load reduction.

***Achieving water quality standards will require priority investment in more temporary water storage to reduce high river flows and bluff erosion. This is a critical component of a strategy to reduce sediment in the Minnesota River.***

Optimism was expressed at the final workshop that many within the agricultural community may be open to water storage practices, especially when activities that increase water holding capacity of productive farmlands are combined with targeted practices such as storage basins and wetlands. It is now possible to evaluate the effects of upstream water storage on downstream erosion and to target conservation practices with more precision. It was stressed that implementation plans should support precision targeting and streamlined coordination among agencies and with front-line practitioners in order to direct conservation investment to the most promising and effective locations.



## CSSR Participants

The people listed below attended the final meeting of the CSSR workgroup, or reviewed the meeting materials and outcomes, and indicate that this report is an accurate account of the findings of the workgroup.

David Ward	Farmer, Mapleton, MN	Ed Lenz	BWSR
Steve Sodeman	Farmer, Consultant, St James, MN	Shaina Keseley	BWSR
Dave Bucklin	GBERBA, Cottonwood SWCD	Al Kean	BWSR
Eric Gulbransen	Waseca SWCD	Jill Sackett Eberhart	BWSR
Wayne Cords	Waseca SWCD	Paul Davis	MN Pollution Control Agency
Leann Buck	MN Association of SWCD	Chris Lenhart	Univ. Minnesota
Julie Conrad	Blue Earth County	Brad Gordon	Univ. Minnesota
Warren Formo	MN Ag Water Resources Center	Les Everett	UM Water Resources Center
Adam Birr	MN Corn Growers Assoc.	Ann Lewandowski	UM Water Resources Center
Paul Meints	MN Corn Growers Assoc.	Scott Sparlin	Coalition for a Clean MN River
Heidi Peterson	MN Dept. Agriculture	Duane Ninneman	Clean Up the River Environment
Jon Lore	MN Dept. Natural Resources	Carrie Jennings	Freshwater Society
Linda Loomis	Lwr MN R Watershed District	Rebecca Seal Soileau	US Army Corps of Engineers
		Kimberly Musser	MNSU Water Resources Center

## For further information

- Belmont, P., Gran, KB, Schottler, SP, Wilcock, PR, Day, SS, Jennings, C., Lauer, JW, Viparelli, E, Willenbring, J., Engstrom, DR, Parker, G, 2011. Large shift in source of fine sediment in the Upper Mississippi River. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 45, 8804–8810.
- Engstrom, DR, Almendinger, JE, Wolin, JA, 2009. Historical changes in sediment and phosphorus loading to the upper Mississippi River: mass-balance reconstructions from the sediments of Lake Pepin. *J Paleolimnology*, 41, 563–588.
- Gran, KB, Finnegan, N, Johnson, AL, Belmont, P, Wittkop, C, Rittenour, T, 2013. Landscape evolution, valley excavation, and terrace development following abrupt postglacial base-level fall. *Geological Society of America Bulletin* B30772–1.
- Lenhart, CF, Brooks, KN, Heneley, D, and Magner, JA, 2010. Spatial and temporal variation in suspended sediment, organic matter, and turbidity in a Minnesota prairie river: implications for TMDLs. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 165(1), 435-447.
- Lenhart, CF, Verry, ES, Brooks, KN, and Magner, JA, 2012. Adjustment of prairie pothole streams to land use, drainage and climate changes and consequences for turbidity impairment. *River Research and Applications*, 28(10), 1609-1619.
- Lenhart, CF, ML Titov, JS Ulrich, JL Nieber, BJ Suppes, 2013, The Role of Hydrologic Alteration and Riparian Vegetation Dynamics in Channel Evolution Along the Lower Minnesota R, *Transactions*, Am. Soc. of Ag. Biol. Engineers, 56(2): 549-561.
- Schottler, SP, Ulrich, J, Belmont, P, Moore, R, Lauer, J, Engstrom, DR, Almendinger, JE, 2013. Twentieth century agricultural drainage creates more erosive rivers. *Hydrological Processes* 1–11.
- Wilcock, P, on behalf of the Minnesota River Sediment Colloquium Committee, 2009. Identifying Sediment Sources in the Minnesota River Basin: Synthesis Report for Minnesota River Sediment Colloquium. MPCA, <https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-b3-43.pdf>, 16 p.
- Wilcock, P, 2015. Sediment, science, and stakeholders – clearing the muddy waters of the Minnesota River. Moos Family Lecture, Freshwater Society. January 20, 2015. Video available at <https://freshwater.org/moos-family-lecture-series/>
- Wilcock, P, SJ Cho, K Gran, B Hobbs, P Belmont, M Bevis, B Heitkamp, J Marr, S Mielke, N Mitchell, and K Kumarasamy, 2016. Final Report: Collaborative for Sediment Source Reduction, Greater Blue Earth River Basin. Report to Minnesota Pollution Agency, Minnesota Dept. of Agriculture, and Minnesota Agricultural Water Resources Center. 86p.

## CSSR – Lead Investigators

Peter Wilcock, Patrick Belmont, Utah State University  
 Se Jong Cho, Ben Hobbs, Johns Hopkins University      Karen Gran, University of Minnesota Duluth  
 Jeff Marr, Barbara Heitkamp, UM St. Anthony Falls Laboratory

## Contacts

Prof. Karen Gran, Dept. of Earth & Environmental Sciences, University of Minnesota, Duluth. [kgran@d.umn.edu](mailto:kgran@d.umn.edu)  
 Prof. Patrick Belmont, Dept. of Watershed Sciences, Utah State University, [patrick.belmont@usu.edu](mailto:patrick.belmont@usu.edu)  
 Jeff Marr, Associate Director of Engineering and Facilities, UM St. Anthony Falls Laboratory, [jmarr@umn.edu](mailto:jmarr@umn.edu)  
 Dr. Se Jong Cho, Research Associate, UM St. Anthony Falls Laboratory, [se.j.cho@gmail.com](mailto:se.j.cho@gmail.com)

The CSSR project was supported in part by the National Science Foundation through a Water Sustainability & Climate Grant to SAFL, U Minnesota.

