

# Cottonwood River

# Restoration Project



*October 1999*

## **Final Report**

*Prepared by*  
**Redwood-Cottonwood Rivers Control Area**

## FOREWARD

This study of the Cottonwood River Watershed represents the first step in a long process. The idea that rivers and streams are independent of human activities is no longer valid, and people now realize that water quality depends on what we, as watershed residents, do to the surrounding landscape. The completion of this study signals beginning of us taking responsibility for the future condition of the Cottonwood River.

A study of this type requires input from many sources and dedication of many individuals. Staff of the Redwood-Cottonwood Rivers Control Area (RCRCA) were responsible for gathering most of the information needed to complete the diagnostic portion of the report and writing and assembling the Final Report. Heather Offerman, in particular, provided significant contributions in the form of overseeing the sampling program, developing loading estimates, generating watershed maps, and researching watershed characteristics. Su Beran was instrumental in suggesting and developing many of the outreach components of the Implementation Plan, and, along with Sharon Voeks provided expert assistance in the final stages of editing.

Other individuals making notable contributions included Jim Doering, who, through his position with MPCA provided consistent, reliable support to the sampling program, making sure the equipment always functioned. Pat Baskfield, MPCA, also assisted with equipment needs related to the sampling program. Greg Payne of the U.S. Geological Survey offered guidance in setting up the monitoring network and provided insight into the meaning of the water quality data. Joe Magner, MPCA, devised the tailored integrated stream and watershed assessment (TISWA) methodology and guided us in its application. Cis Berg at the Water Resources Center in Mankato developed GIS data layers and guided us in their use.

Others, too numerous to mention had a hand in shaping the goals and objectives of the Implementation Plan and for their support and encouragement we are thankful. Not the least of those involved are the many watershed residents that, over the years, have expressed a desire to do something that would benefit the Cottonwood River. Finally, support of the RCRCA Board of Directors cannot be overlooked, because for it is because of the vision and commitment of the Board that an opportunity existed to pursue this watershed study.

The point of doing a study and developing a watershed plan is that we care about the Cottonwood River, today, and into the future. We think other watershed residents care as well and that they are committed to making this plan successful and the Cottonwood River healthier.

Robert Finley  
Executive Director, RCRCA

# Table of Contents

RCRCA Board of Directors.....	i
Project Staff Directory.....	ii
Executive Summary	iv
1.INTRODUCTION	1
History of the Watershed.....	1
History of the Project.....	2
Project Milestones .....	6
Project Costs.....	7
2.DIAGNOSTIC STUDY	8
METHODS.....	8
Stream Monitoring.....	8
Water Quality Monitoring Equipment.....	11
Discharge Ratings.....	11
Field Instruments .....	12
Water Sample Analysis .....	12
Quality Assurance Objective .....	13
Watershed Assessments.....	13
Minnesota River Assessment Project (MRAP) Survey .....	13
Geographic Information System (GIS).....	13
Tailored Integrated Stream Watershed Assessment (TISWA) .....	14
Fishery Surveys .....	17
Data Management and Statistics.....	18
Data Sets.....	18
Flow Data .....	18
Sampling Data .....	18
Flow Measurements.....	18
FLUX Calculations.....	19
RESULTS.....	19
Description of the Project Area .....	19
Topography.....	19
Hydrogeology .....	22
State Observation Wells .....	23
Population.....	23
Land Use.....	26
Soils .....	32
Crop Residue Survey Results .....	33
Fertilizer/Pesticide Use.....	34
Precipitation.....	38
Drainage .....	43
Runoff.....	43
Flooding.....	43
Wetlands .....	44
Community Water Supplies.....	47
Unsewered Cities and Areas.....	49
Unique Features and Scenic Areas .....	50
Official Historical Sites .....	51

Scientific and Natural Areas .....	51
Recreational Land Uses and Parks.....	51
Flandrau State Park      53	
Stream Classifications .....	53
Protected Flow .....	54
Permitted Withdrawal Applications.....	54
Lakes.....	55
Brown County Lakes      55	
Cottonwood County Lakes      57	
Lyon County Lakes      58	
Murray County Lakes      58	
Protected Waters and Shoreland Classifications.....	59
Ecological and Management Classifications .....	60
Wildlife Management Areas.....	61
Hazardous Waste Sites .....	62
Landfills/Dumps .....	62
Feedlots.....	62
WATER QUALITY MONITORING RESULTS.....	65
Main Stem .....	65
Cottonwood River near New Ulm (PLC001) .....	65
Cottonwood River near Leavenworth (PLC010).....	66
Cottonwood River near Revere (PTCO15).....	68
Tributaries.....	70
Sleepy Eye Creek near Leavenworth (PLS005) .....	70
Sleepy Eye Creek near Clements (SUS030).....	71
Highwater/Dutch Charley Creek (SLH020) .....	72
Plum Creek (TUP).....	73
Lone Tree Creek (TUL).....	74
Meadow Creek (TUMC).....	74
Mound Creek (TUM).....	75
Hydrology.....	76
Main Stem .....	77
Cottonwood River at New Ulm (PLC001) .....	77
Cottonwood River near Leavenworth (PLC010).....	78
Cottonwood River near Revere (PTC015).....	78
Tributaries.....	79
Sleepy Eye Creek near Leavenworth (PLS005) .....	79
Highwater/Dutch Charley Creek (SLH020) .....	80
Plum Creek (TUP).....	80
Lone Tree Creek (TUL).....	81
Meadow Creek (TUMC).....	81
Sleepy Eye Creek near Clements (SUS030).....	81
Watershed Assessments.....	82
Geographic Information System (GIS).....	82
Tailored Integrated Stream Watershed Assessment (TISWA) .....	82
Land Use and Landscape Results   83	
Pollutant Sources               84	
Riparian Zone and Channel Morphology   86	
Biotic and Abiotic Indicators       89	
Final Results                 91	
Fishery Assessments.....	93
Tributaries Fishery Assessment.....	99
Plum Creek             99	
Dry Creek             99	
Dutch Charley       100	
Sleepy Eye Creek       100	

Related Research Results.....	101
Streambank Erosion.....	105
POLLUTANT LOADING ESTIMATES.....	107
Main Stem .....	108
Cottonwood River near New Ulm (PLC001), 1997 .....	108
Cottonwood River near Leavenworth (PLC010), 1997-1998.....	108
Cottonwood River near Revere (PTC015), 1997-1998 .....	108
Tributaries .....	109
Sleepy Eye Creek near Leavenworth (PLS005), 1997-1998 .....	109
Sleepy Eye Creek near Clements (SUS030), 1997.....	109
Highwater/Dutch Charley Creeks (SLH020), 1997-1998.....	109
Plum Creek (TUP), 1997-1998.....	110
Lone Tree Creek (TUL), 1997.....	110
Meadow Creek (TUMC), 1997.....	110
Sediment Yields.....	110
DISCUSSION .....	113
Assessment of Water Quality .....	113
Main Stem .....	114
Tributaries .....	116
Sleepy Eye Creek            116	
Highwater/Dutch Charley Creeks  116	
Plum Creek            117	
Lone Tree Creek118	
Meadow Creek  119	
Summary of Pollutant Loads .....	120
Goals.....	123
Main Stem .....	126
Tributaries .....	127
CONCLUSIONS .....	129
3. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN    130	
INTRODUCTION.....	130
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.....	131
PRIORITY MANAGEMENT AREAS.....	132
Identification and Summary of Program Elements.....	136
Program Element 1: BMP/Resource Implementation.....	136
Program Element 2: Monitoring.....	136
Program Element 3: Outreach .....	137
Program Element 4: Evaluation.....	137
Program Element 5: Administration.....	137
Best Management Practice (BMP) Alternatives and Analysis .....	137
Nutrient Management .....	137
Residue Management .....	138
Wetland Restoration .....	138
Riparian Buffer Strips.....	138
Water and Sediment Control Basins.....	138
Livestock Waste Management.....	139
Individual Sewage Treatment Systems (Septic Systems).....	139
Grassed Waterways .....	140
Streambank Restoration.....	140
Terraces .....	142
Contour Farming .....	143
Diversion .....	143
Grade Control Structure.....	143
Pasture Management .....	143
Rock Inlets.....	144
Urban Practices.....	144

Related Resource Implementation.....	145
BMP Selection and Justification.....	147
Coteau Streams.....	148
Terraces.....	149
Grassed Waterways.....	149
Rock Inlets.....	149
Livestock Waste Management.....	149
Riparian Buffer Strips.....	149
Residue Management.....	150
Nutrient Management.....	150
Septic Systems.....	150
Water and Sediment Control Basins.....	150
Urban Practices.....	151
Sleepy Eye Creek.....	151
Residue Management.....	151
Nutrient Management.....	151
Rock Inlets.....	151
Riparian Buffer Strips.....	151
Individual Sewage Treatment Systems.....	152
Wetland Restoration.....	152
Urban Practices.....	152
Lower Cottonwood Main Stem.....	152
Streambank Restoration.....	152
Riparian Buffer Strips.....	153
Water and Sediment Control Basins.....	153
Terraces.....	153
Grassed Waterways.....	153
Wetland Restoration.....	153
Individual Sewage Treatment Systems.....	153
Urban Practices.....	154
Evaluation.....	155
Water Quality Monitoring.....	155
Program Evaluation.....	156
Roles and Responsibilities of Project Participants.....	158
Redwood-Cottonwood Rivers Control Area (RCRCA).....	158
Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs).....	158
Counties (Brown, Cottonwood, Lyon, Murray, Redwood).....	159
Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).....	159
Farm Service Agency (FSA).....	159
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR).....	159
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA).....	159
Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR).....	159
Minnesota Extension Service (MES).....	159
Southwest Research and Outreach Center (SW-ROC).....	159
Area II Minnesota River Basin Projects, Inc. (Area II).....	159
BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan.....	160
Information and Outreach Program.....	160
Media.....	162
Forums and Specialty Groups.....	162
Materials.....	162
Publications.....	162
Legal Authorities and Permits Required for Completion of Project.....	163
Project Staffing.....	163
Watershed Technician (2.5).....	164
Water Quality Technician (.5).....	164
Watershed Coordinator (.5).....	164

Milestone Schedule .....	165
Implementation Plan Budget .....	166
4.REFERENCES	167
5.APPENDICES	170
APPENDIX A	
Discharge Curve Equations	
Flow Records	
Sampling Results	
Rating Curves	
Flux Results	
Mound Creek data from Brown-Nicollet-Cottonwood Water Quality Board	
APPENDIX B	
TISWA Document	
TISWA Data Sheets	
TISWA Values	
APPENDIX C	
Cottonwood River Organizational Chart	
Townships served by the Red Rock Rural Water System	
Population of Cities and Townships	
Permitted Withdrawals	
Operation and Maintenance Plan for BMPs	

## List of Figures

Figure 2.01	Average Precipitation – 38
Figure 2.02	TSS Concentration at PLC001 during Storm Events in 1997 – 66
Figure 2.03	TSS Concentration at PLC001 during Base Flows in 1997 – 66
Figure 2.04	1997 TSS Levels during Snowmelt (sm), Base Flow Grabs (b), or Storm Event (e) Sampling, PLC010 – 67
Figure 2.05	1998 Base Flow TSS Concentrations at PLC010 – 68
Figure 2.06	TSS Levels at PTC015 in 1997 during Snowmelt (sm), Base Flow Grabs (b), or Storm Events (e) Sampling TSS Levels at PTC015 in 1997 – 69
Figure 2.07	Figure 2.07: TSS Levels at PTC015 in 1998, during either Base Flow Grabs (b), or Storm Events (e) Sampling – 69
Figure 2.08	Total Phosphorus Concentrations at PLS005, June 1997 – 71
Figure 2.09	Nitrate-Nitrite Levels at SUS030, 1997, Storm and Base Flow Samples – 72
Figure 2.10	Total Phosphorus Concentrations at SLH020, 1997 – 73
Figure 2.11	Average Nitrate-Nitrite Levels at Mound Creek, 1992-1998 – 76
Figure 2.12	PLC010 Flow Characteristics – 78
Figure 2.13	PTC015 Flow Characteristics – 79
Figure 2.14	PLS005 Flow Characteristics – 79
Figure 2.15	SLH020 Flow Characteristics – 80
Figure 2.16	TUP Flow Characteristics – 81
Figure 2.17	TISWA Totals for Land Use and Landscape – 84
Figure 2.18	TISWA Totals for Pollutants – 86
Figure 2.19	TISWA Totals for Riparian Zone and Channel Morphology – 89
Figure 2.20	TISWA Totals for Biotic and Abiotic – 91
Figure 2.21	TISWA Final Totals – 91
Figure 2.22	Main Stem Sediment Yields – 111
Figure 2.23	Tributary Sediment Yields – 112
Figure 2.24	Sediment Yield 1997 vs. 1998 – 112
Figure 2.25	Cottonwood River at Leavenworth, June 30, 1997 – 115
Figure 2.26	Highwater/Dutch Charley Creek, June 23, 1997 – 117

## List of Maps

Map 1.01	Cottonwood River Watershed – 4
Map 1.02	Cottonwood River Watershed Subwatersheds and Monitoring Sites – 5
Map 2.01	Cottonwood River Sampling Locations 1997-1998 – 9
Map 2.02	TISWA Points – 15
Map 2.03	Beginning of the Cottonwood River – 20
Map 2.04	Slope – 21
Map 2.05	Wells – 24
Map 2.06	State Observation Wells – 25
Map 2.07	Land Use – 27
Map 2.08	Erodible Soil – 31
Map 2.09	1997 Total Precipitation Amounts – 35
Map 2.10	1998 Total Precipitation Amounts – 37
Map 2.11	Digitized Ditching – 40
Map 2.12	Areas with Soil Types Characteristic of Drained Wetlands – 45
Map 2.13	Wetlands and Lakes – 46
Map 2.14	Community Water Supplies – 48
Map 2.15	Recreational Features – 52
Map 2.16	Lakes and Streams – 56
Map 2.17	Solid Waste Sites – 63
Map 2.18	Permitted Feedlots – 64
Map 2.19	Land Use Indicators – 85
Map 2.20	Pollutant Indicators – 87
Map 2.21	Riparian Indicators – 88
Map 2.22	Biotic Indicators – 90
Map 2.23	TISWA Final Rankings – 92
Map 2.24	Impaired Reach of the Cottonwood River from JD 30 – 104
Map 3.01	Priority Management Area Coteau Streams – 133
Map 3.02	Priority Management Area Sleepy Eye Creek Subwatershed – 134
Map 3.03	Priority Management Area Lower Cottonwood – 135
Map 3.04	Cottonwood River Watershed 2000-2006 Sampling Locations – 157

# List of Tables

Table 1.01	Cottonwood River Characteristics – 3
Table 1.02	Project Budget – 7
Table 2.01	State Observation Wells – 26
Table 2.02	Land Use by Subwatershed – 28
Table 2.03	Erodible Soil by Subwatershed – 32
Table 2.04	Crop Residue Survey Results – 33
Table 2.05	Precipitation Totals from May – September 1997 – 34
Table 2.06	Precipitation Totals from May – September 1998 – 36
Table 2.07	Ditches in Cottonwood Watershed Portion of Cottonwood County – 42
Table 2.08	Wetland Acreage – 47
Table 2.09	Municipal and Wastewater Treatment Facilities – 49
Table 2.10	Unsewered Cities – 50
Table 2.11	MPCA Stream Classifications – 53
Table 2.12	Permitted Withdrawals – 54
Table 2.13	Lakes – 59
Table 2.14	Wildlife Management Areas – 61
Table 2.15	Landfills – 62
Table 2.16	PLC001 Summary Monitoring Data, 1997 – 65
Table 2.17	PLC010 Summary Monitoring Data, 1997-1998 – 67
Table 2.18	PTC015 Summary Monitoring Data, 1997-1998 – 68
Table 2.19	PLS005 Summary Monitoring Data, 1997-1998 – 70
Table 2.20	SUS030 Summary Monitoring Data, 1997 – 71
Table 2.21	SLH020 Summary Monitoring Data, 1997-1998 – 72
Table 2.22	TUP Summary Monitoring Data, 1997-1998 – 74
Table 2.23	TUL Summary Monitoring Data, 1997 – 74
Table 2.24	TUMC Summary Monitoring Data, 1997 – 75
Table 2.25	Statistics from USGS site on the Cottonwood River at New Ulm – 76
Table 2.26	Average Daily Flow for Streams in Cottonwood Watershed in cfs – 77
Table 2.27	Flow Comparisons for TUL, TUMC, and SUS030, 1997 – 81
Table 2.28	Records of Fish Stocking in the Cottonwood River – 97
Table 2.29	Fish Species and Year Found in the Cottonwood River – 98
Table 2.30	NPS Survey Results for Cottonwood River Watershed Lakes – 105
Table 2.31	NPS Survey Results for Cottonwood River Watershed Streams – 105
Table 2.32	Sediment Yield, 1997-1998, from FLUX Loading Calculations – 111
Table 2.33	Subwatershed Loadings – 122
Table 2.34	Water Quality of Minimally Impacted Streams, WCBP – 124
Table 2.35	Study Findings Compared to Ecoregion Values (75 <sup>th</sup> percentile) – 125
Table 2.36	Summary of Reductions Necessary to Meet Water Quality Goals – 128
Table 3.01	Appropriate Bioengineering Streambank Protection Measures – 142
Table 3.02	Benefits Associated with BMPs – 154
Table 3.03	Priority Area BMP Reference – 155
Table 3.04	Six-Year Implementation Budget – 166

# RCRCA Board of Directors

*October, 1999*

## Executive Committee

### **Chairman**

LeRoy Stensgaard                      Pipestone Soil and Water Conservation District

### **Vice Chair**

Eugene House                      Yellow      Medicine      County      Board      of  
Commissioners

### **Secretary**

Ray Traen                              Lyon Soil and Water Conservation District

### **Treasurer**

Darold Neperman                      Redwood County Board of Commissioners

### **Public Relations**

Clark Lingbeek                      Cottonwood Soil and Water Conservation District

### **Member at Large**

Robert Bloch                              Lincoln County Board of Commissioners

### **Other Members**

Donald Wellner                      Brown County Board of Commissioners

Ernie Vogel                              Brown Soil and Water Conservation District

Kenneth Elg                              Cottonwood County Board of Commissioners

Glen Sorensen                      Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation District

Jasper Vandelanotte                      Lyon County Board of Commissioners

Steve Johnson                      Murray County Board of Commissioners

Paul Posthuma                      Murray Soil and Water Conservation District

Eric Petersen                              Pipestone County Board of Commissioners

Danny Potter                      Redwood Soil and Water Conservation District  
Burton Kuehn                      Yellow Medicine Soil and Water Conservation  
District

## **Project Staff Directory**

Redwood-Cottonwood Rivers Control Area  
Executive Directory: Bob Finley  
Water Quality Technician: Heather Offerman  
Watershed Educator: Su Beran \_\_\_\_\_ 507/637-2142

Brown County Soil and Water Conservation District  
District Program Manager: Tom Maher  
District Office Manager: Kathy Krzmarzick \_\_\_\_\_ 507/794-2553

Cottonwood County Soil and Water Conservation District  
District Administrator/Tech. Assistant: Kay Clark  
District Technician: David Bucklin \_\_\_\_\_ 507/831-1153

Lyon County Soil and Water Conservation District  
District Administrator: Rose Anderson  
District Technician: Merle Behrens \_\_\_\_\_ 507/537-0396

Murray County Soil and Water Conservation District  
District Manager: Howard Konkol  
District Technician: Craig Christensen \_\_\_\_\_ 507/836-6990

Redwood County Soil and Water Conservation District  
District Administrator/Water Plan Coordinator: Marilyn Bernhardson  
  
District Engineering Technician: Eric Anderson \_\_\_\_\_ 507/637-2427

Brown County Water Plan Coordinator  
Paul Davis \_\_\_\_\_ 507/233-6642

Brown County Environmental Officer  
Jane Starz \_\_\_\_\_ 507/233-6640

Cottonwood County Water Plan Coordinator/Environmental Officer  
C. Michael Hanson \_\_\_\_\_ 507/831-2060

Lyon County Water Plan Coordinator/Environmental Officer  
Paul Henricksen \_\_\_\_\_ 507/537-6733

Murray County Water Plan Coordinator/Environmental Officer  
Dean Williams\_\_\_\_\_507/836-6148

Redwood County Environmental Officer  
Jon Mitchell\_\_\_\_\_507/637-4023

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
Clean Water Partnership and Basin Planning  
Project Implementation: Jim Doering\_\_\_\_\_507/537-7136  
Hydrologist: Joe Magner\_\_\_\_\_651/296-9268

Board of Water and Soil Resources  
Board Conservationist: Tabor Hoek\_\_\_\_\_507/537-7260  
  
Board Conservationist: Chris Hughes\_\_\_\_\_507/359-6076

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources  
Hydrologist: Cliff Bentley\_\_\_\_\_507/537-7258

Area II, Minnesota River Basin Projects, Inc.  
Kerry Netzke\_\_\_\_\_507/537-6369

Natural Resources Conservation Service, Area Office  
Area Conservationist: Mike Appel\_\_\_\_\_507/537-0541

## Executive Summary

The purpose of this study was to document factors affecting sediment and nutrient transport to the Cottonwood River, and to determine reductions necessary to meet both main stem and tributary goals. The study defined characteristics of specific pollutants, the processes affecting their transport, and appropriate measures to reduce their delivery to the Cottonwood River. Priority management areas were selected based on relative contributions to the total sediment and nutrient load in the River. Attitudes and opinions of watershed residents were explored as they relate to water quality and measures for its protection.

The Cottonwood River Watershed encompasses 1,310 square miles, and is one of thirteen major watersheds in the Minnesota River Basin. The River originates on the Coteau des Prairies, flowing eastward approximately 150 miles to the Minnesota River, with a drop in elevation of about 750 feet. This topography results in periodic spring and summer flooding in the central portion of the watershed. At times, damages are severe. A related implication is rapid transport of sediment and attached nutrients from inadequately treated cropland during spring snowmelt and spring and summer rainfall events.

Nearly all wetlands have been drained by a highly efficient and interconnected artificial drainage system. This drainage system has allowed agriculture, the primary land use, to flourish. Corn and soybeans are the main crops grown in the watershed.

The study's primary research tool was a water quality monitoring program used to gather data at three main stem locations and six tributary sites. Streambank erosion assessments were made at several locations along the lower reach of the Cottonwood River. A fishery survey was used to assess populations and species diversity. Land use and physical characteristics of the watershed were analyzed through application of Geographic Information System (GIS) data layers. These evaluations were supplemented by field observations using the tailored integrated stream and watershed assessment (TISWA) methodology.

Annual sediment (TSS) loading from the Cottonwood River in 1997 was estimated at over 330,000 tons, or 252 tons per square mile. Total phosphorus (TP) was estimated at 505 tons. These are much higher figures than reported in earlier studies of the Cottonwood River. Highwater and Dutch Charley Creeks exhibited the largest sediment yield of all sampled tributaries, annually delivering approximately 136 tons per square mile, based on data collected in 1997 and 1998. Additionally, highest flow weighted mean concentrations of total suspended solids and total phosphorus of all sampling stations, including those on the main stem, were recorded on these two tributaries. Sleepy Eye Creek contributed a high nitrate nitrogen load during the study period, but a much lower sediment load than expected. Throughout the study period, flow-weighted mean concentrations of sediment and nutrients on the main stem and most tributaries exceeded expected values for minimally impacted ecoregion streams.

Recreational opportunities on the Cottonwood River are limited by degraded water quality, channel obstructions, limited access, and a general lack of awareness by watershed residents. Potentially, the river is a major recreational resource.

Ten-year goals and objectives were established in the areas of water quality, public participation, and recreation. Main stem and tributary water quality goals will require pollutant reductions of twenty-five to thirty percent. These will be accomplished by concentrating best management practices (BMPs) within priority management areas. The public participation goal will emphasize citizen involvement in watershed monitoring and observation activities. Developing means for people to personally experience the river will help achieve the recreational goal.

Project evaluation will be accomplished through continued water quality monitoring at five stations, citizen surveys, fishery and watershed inventories and assessments, and BMP tracking.

The estimated cost to carry out the six-year implementation plan is slightly under \$10 million. About fifty percent of this amount will be used to convert cropland to permanent vegetation and wetlands. These funds will be derived from existing federal and state land retirement programs. Clean Water Partnership low interest loans will be used to upgrade septic systems, increase residue management, and reduce livestock impacts on water quality. State and federal cost-share funds will be used to cover costs related to other best management practices listed in the plan. Additional staff positions will be created to assess needs within priority management areas and work with landowners to select and implement appropriate practices.