|  |
| --- |
| Watershed Assessment and Non-Point Source Management Plan Recommendations for Streams Monitored in 2012 - 2013 |
| Prepared for |
| **Oglala Sioux Tribe**  **Environmental Protection Program**  **P.O. Box**  **Pine Ridge, SD 57770**  **P:\OST\OST flag 6.17.08.JPG** |

Prepared by

**Charles Jason Tinant**

**MS Water Resources Engineering**

**Jordan Cano**

**Oglala Lakota College**

**490 Piya Wiconi Road**

**Kyle, SD 57752**

Table of Contents

List of Tables 3

List of Figures 5

List of Equations 5

1.0 Introduction 6

1.1 Watershed descriptions 7

1.1.1 Communities and Economy 8

1.1.2 Climate and Geology 10

1.1.3 Monitoring Sites 11

1.1.4 Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Standards 11

1.2 Goals and Objectives 11

2.0 Monitoring Strategy and Previous Results 12

3.0 Data Analysis 16

3.1 Goals and Objectives 17

3.2 Water Quality Data 18

3.3 Macroinvertebrate Data 27

4.0 Results 31

4.1 Water Quality Results 31

4.1.1 Upper White River Watershed Results **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

4.1.2 White River / Wounded Knee Creek Subwatershed Results **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

4.1.3 White River / Medicine Root Creek Subwatershed Results **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

4.1.4 White River / Bear in the Lodge Creek Subwatershed Results 34

4.1.5 White River / Pass Creek Subwatershed Results 34

4.2 Nutrient Specific Results **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

4.3 Geochemical Modeling **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.0 Stream Health Results 35

5.1 Upper White River Subwatershed Results **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.2 White River / Wounded Knee Creek Subwatershed Results **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.6 White River / Medicine Root Crek Subwatershed Results **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.6 White River / Pass Creek Subwatershed Results 37

5.6 White River / Little White River Subwatershed Results **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.6 Cheyenne River Subwatershed Results **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.7 Macroinvertebrate Metric Analysis Results **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.8 Stream Flow and Stream Health Results **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.0 Combined Stream Health Results 39

7.0 Discussion 43

8.0 Recommendations 46

8.1 Implementation of Previous Recommendations 46

8.2 Recommendations Based on Recent Findings 48

8.2.1 Parameters of Concern and Monitoring Recommendations 48

8.3 Best Management Practices (BMPs) 56

8.4 Next Steps 58

9.0 Public Participation and Education 58

9.1 Education 58

Works Cited 59

APPENDIX 61

Appendix A Tables Surface Water Quality Standards 61

Appendix B MANOVA Analysis Results 67

# List of Tables

Table 1. Chemical Property Parameters 17

Table 2. Upper White River Stations **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 3. Porcupine Creek/Wounded Knee Stations **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 4. White River / Medicine Root Creek Stations **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 5. White River / Bear-in-the-Lodge Stations 18

Table 6. White River / Pass Creek Stations 23

Table 7. White River / Little White River Stations **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 8. Cheyenne River Stations **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 9. Upper White River Stations **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 10. Wounded Knee/Porcupine Creek Stations **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 11. Medicine Rook Creek Stations 27

Table 12. Pass Creek Stations 29

Table 13. Little White River Stations **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 14. Cheyenne River Stations **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 15: Impairment Status for Pine Ridge Reservation Streams 2008 – 2011. 31

Table 16. Cation Concentrations and Differences by Location and Season **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 17. Anion Concentrations and Differences by Location and Season **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 18. Charge Balances for the Upper and Lower White River **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 19. Selected Saturation Indices for the Upper and Lower White River by Location and Season. Values greater than zero indicate supersaturation. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Table 18 Priority NPS Pollutants 56

Table 19 Environmental Education Activities 58

Table 20 Criteria for Coldwater Marginal Fish Life Propagation Waters 61

Table 21 Criteria for Warmwater Permanent Fish Life Propagation Waters 61

Table 22 Criteria for Warmwater Semipermanent Fish Life Propagation Waters 62

Table 23 Criteria for Immersion Recreation Waters 63

Table 24 Criteria for Fish and Wildlife Propagation, Recreation, and Stock Watering Waters 63

Table 27 Wounded Knee Creek Criteria Comparison 64

# 

# List of Figures

Figure 1: Map of Pine Ridge Indian Reservation (BIA 1997) 6

Figure 2: Subwatersheds and Surface Water Monitoring Sites on the Pine Ridge Reservation 9

Figure 3: Flow Duration Curves for the White River and Little White River Watersheds 11

Figure 3: Fecal Coliform Samples for 2008-2011 18

Figure 4: E-coli Samples for 2008-2011 18

Figure 5: Biochemical Oxygen Demand Samples for 2008-2011 18

Figure 6: Total Suspended Samples for 2008-2011 18

Figure 7: Nitrogen as Ammonia Samples for 2008-2011 18

Figure 8: Nitrogen as Nitrate for 2008-2011 samples 18

Figure 9: Total Phosphorus for 2008-2011 Samples 18

Figure 10: Soluable Reactive Phosphorus for 2008-2011 Samples 18

Figure 11: Macroinvertebrate Taxa Richness for 1993-2011 Samples **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Figure 12: Macroinvertebrate EPT Index for 1993-2011 Samples **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Figure 13: Macroinvertebrate Family Biotic Index for 1993-2011 Samples **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Figure 14: Macroinvertebrate %Dominant Family for 1993-2011 Samples **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Figure 15: Macroinvertebrate %Dipteran and Non-Insect for 1993-2011 Samples **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Figure 16: Macroinvertebrate %Collector Gatherer for 1993-2011 Samples **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Figure 17: Macroinvertebrate Total Health Score for 1993-2011 Samples **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

# List of Equations

[Equation 1 Calculating Load (3) 49](#_Toc297235202)

# 1.0 Introduction

The Oglala Sioux Tribe (OST) Water Pollution Control Program is responsible for developing watershed based plans for water quality restoration, identifying impacts to water quality, implementing the monitoring program and to identify best management practices.

In September 2005 Tetra Tech, Inc. developed an NPS Assessment Report and NPS Management Program Plan for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the OST. The NPS plan complies with guidelines associated with Section 319 of the Clean Water Act. Matrix Consulting reviewed the NPS Assessment Report and NPS Management Plan in 2010 and analyzed water quality data for the Wounded Knee and Porcupine subwatersheds for 2005-2009.

The Oglala Lakota College (OLC) Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Department reviewed the Matrix Consulting report and analyzed water quality for 2008-2011 and macroinvertebrate data for 1993-2011 as a service-learning project. The goal of our report is to provide guidance to the OST Water Pollution Control Program on stream health on the Pine Ridge Reservation (Figure 1). The specific objectives of the report are: 1) analyze water quality data collected by the Oglala Sioux Tribe (OST) Water Quality Program from 2008-2011, 2) integrate macroinvertebrate sampling data collected by the OST from 1993-2008 and by the OST and OLC STEM Department 2010 – 2011, 3) refine recommendations for future monitoring and implementation of best management practices (BMPs).




Figure 1: Map of Pine Ridge Indian Reservation (BIA 1997)

## 1.1 Watershed descriptions

The White River Basin is the most southern of five major drainages in South Dakota that enter the Missouri River from the west (Matrix 2010). The watershed divide with the Cheyenne River is along the northwest corner of the Pine Ridge Reservation (PRR). The upper White River Basin extends south to the southern border of the PRR. Watersheds were subdivided into the following sub watersheds for the NPS Management Program Plan (Figure 2):

* Cheyenne River Tributaries- The Cheyenne River drains the northwestern corner of the reservation with the Cheyenne River itself forming 17.2 miles of the reservation boundary. The Cheyenne River drains to the Missouri River; the confluence is northeast of the reservation boundary (Tetra tech 2005).
* Upper White River- Upper White River watershed drains the southwestern corner of the reservation including the towns of Oglala and Pine Ridge falls. The White River enters the reservation from the south and flows north through the Upper White River watershed. The White River’s confluence with White Clay Creek, which is northwest of the town of Oglala, is the boundary of the Upper White River watershed and the White River/Wounded Knee Creek watershed (Tetra tech 2005).
* White River/Wounded Knee Creek- The White River/Wounded Knee Creek subwatershed drains the western portion of the reservation from the Upper White River subwatershed to the south to the Cheyenne River watershed to the northwest. The southeastern portion of the White River/Wounded Knee Creek subwatershed extends south to the southern border of the reservation. The White River flows into the White River/Wounded Knee Creek subwatershed from the Upper White River watershed and flows approximately 67.3 miles north and northeast to the boundary with the White River/Medicine Root Creek watershed near the White River confluence with Porcupine Creek (Tetra tech 2005).
* White River/Medicine Root Creek-The White River/Medicine Root Creek subwatershed drains the reservation from the northwestern corner of Bennett County to the northern border of the reservation and west to the boundary of the Cheyenne River watershed. The White River flows into the White River/Medicine Root Creek subwatershed from the White River/Wounded Knee Creek subwatershed and flows approximately 37.1 miles northeast to the boundary with the White River/Bear-in-the-Lodge Creek subwatershed near the White River’s confluence with Red Water Creek (Tetra tech 2005).
* White River/Bear-in-the-Lodge Creek- The White River/Bear-in-the Lodge Creek subwatershed encompasses approximately 734 square miles of the reservation from north of Highway 18 in Bennett County north to the White River at the northern border of the reservation. The White River flows into the White River/Bear-in-the-Lodge Creek subwatershed from the White River/Medicine Root Creek subwatershed and flows approximately 44.2 miles east to the boundary with the White River/Pass Creek subwatershed near the White River confluence with Eagle Nest Creek.
* White River/Pass Creek- The White River/Pass Creek subwatershed encompasses approximately 746 square miles of the reservation from just north of Highway 18 in Bennett County north to the White River at the northern border of the reservation and east to the eastern border of the reservation (see Figure 2). The White River flows into the White River/Pass Creek subwatershed from the White River/Bear-in-the-Lodge Creek subwatershed and flows approximately 40.5 miles along the northern border of the reservation east to the reservation boundary.

White River/Little White River- The Little White River watershed encompasses approximately 604 square miles of the reservation from the southern boundaries of the White River/Medicine Root Creek/Bear-in-the-Lodge Creek/Pass Creek subwatersheds south to the northern boundary of the Niobrara River Tributaries watershed and from the southeastern boundary of the White River/Wounded Knee Creek subwatershed east to the eastern reservation border. The Little White River flows through the watershed from west to east. The river’s headwaters are in Shannon County, near U.S. Highway 18. The Little White River flows off the reservation near the southeastern corner. The Little White River flows to the White River; the rivers’ confluence is east of the reservation in Mellette County, just downstream of U.S. Highway 83.

The Little White River watershed, within reservation boundaries, includes LaCreek Migratory Waterfowl Refuge, tribal and non-tribal ranching activities, dryland and irrigated agriculture, and the communities of Martin (population approximately 2,500), Batesland, Tuthill (approximately

10 to 15 houses), and Swett. The communities of Martin, Tuthill, Batesland, and Swett are non-

Indian and do not fall under tribal jurisdiction; however, there are tribal housing developments

near Batesland and Swett. The water table tends to be very shallow in this watershed.

### 1.1.1 Communities and Economy

The major economic land uses in the White River watershed are agriculture-related with rangeland and cropland dominating in the Little White River subwatershed and rangeland and hay farming dominating all other subwatersheds. Community wastewater collection systems with treatment lagoons are used to treat municipal waste in PRR communities (Tetra Tech, Inc. 2005, Matrix 2011).




Figure 2: Subwatersheds and Surface Water Monitoring Sites on the Pine Ridge Reservation

The Upper White River subwatershed, which extends within reservation boundaries from the southern border of the Pine Ridge Reservation to above the confluence with Wounded Knee Creek, includes tribal and nontribal ranching activities and the communities of Oglala (population approximately 2,000) and Pine Ridge (population approximately 4,000). Both Oglala and Pine Ridge are served by community wastewater collection systems; there at least four treatment lagoons between these two communities. The Prairie Wind Casino, near the town of Oglala, is also served by a sewage collection and treatment lagoon system (Tetra tech 2005, Matrix 2011)

The White River/Wounded Knee Creek subwatershed, within reservation boundaries, includes southern portions of the Badlands, tribal and non-tribal ranching activities, hay farming, and the communities of Rockyford, Sharps Corner (population approximately 150), Porcupine (population approximately 1,000), Manderson (population approximately 1,000), and Wounded Knee (population approximately 800). All of these communities are served by community wastewater collection systems with treatment lagoons (Tetra tech 2005, Matrix 2011).

The White River/Medicine Root Creek subwatershed, within reservation boundaries, includes portions of Badlands National Park, including portions of the Badlands Bombing Range, tribal and non-tribal ranching activities, and the community of Kyle (population approximately 2,000). Kyle is one of the fastest-growing communities on the reservation (Tetra tech 2005). Kyle is served by a community wastewater collection system with treatment lagoons (Matrix 2011). An infiltration gallery for the Mni Wiconi Drinking Water project is located along the American Horse Creek alluvium.

The White River/Bear-in-the-Lodge Creek subwatershed, within reservation boundaries, includes portions of Badlands National Park and portions of the Badlands Bombing Range, tribal and non-tribal ranching activities, and the communities of Potato Creek, Allen, and Hisle (population approximately 20) (Matrix 2011).

The Cheyenne River watershed, within reservation boundaries, includes western portions of Badlands National Park, including the Badlands Bombing Range, tribal and non-tribal ranching activities, irrigated crop production, and the community of Red Shirt Village (population approximately 150) (Tetra tech 2005, Matrix 2011).

The White River/Pass Creek subwatershed, within reservation boundaries, includes portions of Badlands National Park, tribal and non-tribal ranching activities, irrigated agriculture including alfalfa and corn production, and the communities of Wanblee (population approximately 1,500), Long Valley (population approximately 100), and Vetal (population approximately 50). The communities of Long Valley and Vetal are non-Indian and do not fall under tribal jurisdiction (Matrix 2011).

### 1.1.2 Climate and Geology

The climate is typical of the Northern Great Plains with a median temperature of 50F in January and 730F in July (SDSU climate website, accessed March 6, 2013). The average annual precipitation between the years 1971 and 2000 at the Manderson 3 NE station is 19.3 inches with January as the driest month (0.39 inches) and June as the wettest month (3.18 inches). The Manderson station is slightly drier than the rest of the south-central region of South Dakota, which has an average precipitation of 21.6 +/-4.5 inches (standard deviation) (SDSU climate website, accessed March 6, 2013). The Keya Paha Tablelands receives a mean annual precipitation of 16-20 inches while the Pine Ridge Escarpment receives 16-17 inches (Bryce et al., 1998). The Great Plains has an historical record of major drought ([Meyer et al., 1999](#_ENREF_20)). The 2012 drought resulted in zero flow conditions in the White River and a majority of White River tributary streams (Tinant personal observation).

The amount and frequency of hydrological exchange between the floodplain, groundwater and the stream depends on geology and alluvial composition.Upper White River tributaries begin in central Nebraska as springs. Middle White River tributaries begin in Arikaree Group sandstones and siltstones, and then flow across White River Group volcaniclastic claystones, before draining into the White River (Bryce et al. 1998, Heakin 1999). Sandier units of the Arikaree group form water table aquifers that sustain base flow in the upper reaches of White River tributaries (Heaken 1999). The hydrologic regime shifts from a mixed flow regime to an event-dominated regime as streams cross the Arikaree Group – White River Group contact as infiltration rates decrease and the volume of overland flow increases (Foreman 2006). Infiltration, percolation and ground water flow dominates Sandhills ecoregion hydrology in the Little White River watershed.

Figure 3: Flow Duration Curves for the White River and Little White River Watersheds

### 1.1.3 Monitoring Sites

The Oglala Sioux Tribe (OST) currently maintains 38 water-quality monitoring stations. The Upper White River subwatershed includes three monitoring stations on White Clay Creek (WCC1 – WCC3), a station on Wolf Creek (WOL1), and a station on the White River (WHR1). The White River/Wounded Knee Creek subwatershed includes four stations on Wounded Knee Creek (WOK1 –WOK4), three stations on Porcupine Creek (POR1 – POR3) and a station on the White River (WHR2). The White River/Medicine Root Creek subwatershed includes three stations on Medicine Root Creek (MER1, MER3, MER4), a station on No Flesh Creek (NFL1), a station on American Horse Creek (AMH1), and a station on Red Water Creek (RED1). The White River/Bear-in-the-Lodge Creek subwatershed includes stations on the Bear Creek and Bear in the Lodge Creek complex (BEA1 – BEA3, BLC1, BLC2), a station on Potato Creek (POT1), a station on Lost Dog Creek (LDC1), a station on Corn Creek (COR1), two stations on Eagle Nest Creek (EAN1, EAN2) and a station on the White River (WHR5). The White River/Pass Creek subwatershed contains a station on Corn Creek (COR1), a station on Craven Creek (CRA1), a station on Long Creek (LON1), a station on Buzzard Creek (BUZ1), three stations on Pass Creek (PAS1 – PAS3), and a station on the White River (WHR4). The Cheyenne River watershed contains two stations on the Cheyenne River (CHR1 and CHR2) (Tetra tech 2005, Matrix 2011).

### 1.1.4 Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Standards

“The purpose of water quality standards is to define the water quality goals of a water body, or portion thereof, by designating the use or uses and identifying criteria necessary to protect the uses. Each state adopts water quality standards to protect public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act, established by Congress in 1972” (The U.S. Government's Printing Office 2011). Water Quality Standards consist of Beneficial Uses, Water Quality Criteria, and Anti-degradation Clauses” (Matrix 2011). The Tetra-tech (2005) and Matrix (2011) reports describe OST and South Dakota administrative rules for beneficial uses, water quality criteria and anti-degradation clauses in effect for the Pine Ridge Reservation.

## 1.2 Goals and Objectives

The overall goals and objectives of the 106 Water Quality Program remain consistent with the NPS Management Program Plan (Tetra Tech 2005, Matrix 2011), which include:

* Restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the waters within the jurisdiction of OST to preserve and enhance the environment within the jurisdiction of the Tribe.
* Conserve waters within the jurisdiction of the Tribe by protecting, maintaining and improving the quality of water for public water supplies, wildlife, fish and aquatic life, recreation, agriculture, industry, cultural and other beneficial uses.
* Identify the BMPs and measures to be undertaken to reduce pollutant loading from each category and subcategory of nonpoint source pollution in each watershed, taking into account the impact of best management practices on groundwater quality.
* Identify programs to achieve BMPs.
* Develop a schedule, with milestones, for the implementation of BMPs in each water within the jurisdiction of the Tribe
* Identify sources of federal funding and other funding available to assist in controlling NPS pollution.
* Describe the involvement in NPS pollution control of local public and private agencies and organizations that have experience in controlling of NPS pollution

This report focuses on the following objectives:

* Report and evaluate water quality data collected from 2008-2011 and incorporate previous assessment results;
* Evaluate and integrate macroinvertebrate sampling data collected between 1993-2011 with water quality results
* Make recommendations on:
  + Current monitoring program
  + Identifying specific BMPs for implementation

# 2.0 Monitoring Strategy and Previous Results

The NPS Management Program Plan (Tetra Tech 2005b) describes the process the OST used for the period 2005-2009 to address NPS pollution on the Pine Ridge Reservation as identified in the NPS Assessment Report. Specific management activities and long-term goals identified in the NPS Management Plan include:

* Conducting the administrative activities, assessments, monitoring, and education activities to support and maintain the practices and programs that will be implemented to address NPS pollution
* Eliminating grazing-related nonpoint source pollutant contributions to surface waters
* Implementing appropriate BMPs to minimize NPS contributions of herbicides and other agricultural chemicals
* Eliminating illegal dumping and minimizing NPS pollutant contributions from the improper disposal of automobiles, appliances, and hazardous waste
* Rehabilitating failing septic systems and relocating poorly sited systems
* Integrating storm water and NPS pollution concerns into road planning and maintenance on the reservation
* Integrating storm water and NPS pollution concerns into construction planning and building activities on the reservation
* Minimizing the NPS pollutant contributions in urban runoff from towns and villages

The OST monitoring strategy is divided into two phases: a) monitoring between 1992-2005 and b) monitoring between 2005-2013 (the latest available data). Phase I activities focused on site identification, physical, chemical, and macroinvertebrate data collection. Monitoring of chemical parameters focused on nutrients, common inorganics and metals including heavy metals (Matrix 2011). Monitoring of physical parameters focused on conductivity, pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and temperature (Matrix 2011).

Tetra Tech (2005) analyzed historical water quality data pre-2005 and found widespread exceedences in several water quality parameters.

* Water quality exceedances for Cheyenne River stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when less than 10 samples were collected (water bodies designated “Threatened”) include: pH (upper limit), dissolved oxygen, turbidity, selenium. Water quality exceedances for Cheyenne River stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when greater than 10 samples (water bodies designated “Impaired”) include: arsenic, cadmium, iron, manganese, mercury, and total phosphorus.
* Water quality exceedances for Upper White River sub watersheds occurring in greater than 10% of cases when less than 10 samples were collected (water bodies designated “Threatened”) include: turbidity, pH (lower limit). Water quality exceedances for Upper White River sub watershed stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when greater than 10 samples (water bodies designated “Impaired”) include: pH (upper limit), dissolved oxygen, arsenic, cadmium, iron, manganese, mercury, and total phosphorus.
* Water quality exceedances for White River/Wounded Knee Creek stations occurring in less than 10% of cases when less than 10 samples were collected (water bodies designated “Threatened”) include: temperature, pH (upper limit), dissolved oxygen, turbidity, selenium. Water quality exceedances for White River/Wounded Knee Creek stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when greater than 10 samples (water bodies designated “Impaired”) include: arsenic, cadmium, iron, manganese, mercury, and total phosphorus.
* Water quality exceedances for White River/Medicine Root Creek stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when less than 10 samples were collected (water bodies designated “Threatened”) include: dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and cadmium. Water quality exceedances for White River/Medicine Root Creek stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when greater than 10 samples (water bodies designated “Impaired”) include: temperature, pH (upper limit), arsenic, cadmium, iron, manganese, mercury, and total phosphorus.
* Water quality exceedances for White River/Bear-in-the-Lodge Creek stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when less than 10 samples were collected (water bodies designated “Threatened”) include: turbidity. Water quality exceedances for White River/ Bear-in-the-Lodge Creek stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when greater than 10 samples (water bodies designated “Impaired”) include: temperature, pH (upper limit), dissolved oxygen, arsenic, cadmium, iron, manganese, mercury, and total phosphorus.
* Water quality exceedances for White River/Pass Creek stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when less than 10 samples were collected (water bodies designated “Threatened”) include: temperature, turbidity, cadmium, selenium and zinc. Water quality exceedances for White River/Pass Creek stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when greater than 10 samples (water bodies designated “Impaired”) include: pH (upper limit), dissolved oxygen, arsenic, iron, lead, manganese, mercury, and total phosphorus.
* Water quality exceedances for White River/Little White River stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when less than 10 samples were collected (water bodies designated “Threatened”) include: pH (upper limit), dissolved oxygen, turbidity, cadmium, selenium, and silver. Water quality exceedances for White River/Little White River stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when greater than 10 samples (water bodies designated “Impaired”) include: arsenic, iron, lead, manganese, mercury, zinc and total phosphorus.

Tetra Tech (2005a) concluded that many of the metals exceeding water quality standards in Pine Ridge reservation surface waters could originate from natural sources and proscribed best management practices aimed at reducing total suspended solids and nutrient loading for the following land uses:

**Agricultural runoff** - EPA determined in March 2004 there were approximately 20 cattle ranching operations across the reservation, with agricultural activities include cattle grazing, crop production, and winter feeding and calving areas (Matrix 2011). Crop agriculture, which consists primarily of dryland and irrigated faming for spring and winter wheat, is conducted primarily in the southeastern portion of the reservation.

**Septic Systems** - Approximately 50 percent of households on tribal land are served by individual septic systems (Tetra tech 2005).

**Storm water Runoff** - Most towns and villages across the reservation lack storm water collection systems. Pine Ridge and Martin have storm water collection systems, however, the Tribe is unaware of any BMPS being implemented to minimize pollutant loads (Tetra tech 2005, Matrix 2011).

**Illegal dumping** - Improper disposal of domestic solid waste, household appliances and automobiles continue to contribute pollutants to surface waters (Tetra tech 2005, Matrix 2011).

**Roads** - Many roads across the reservation are constructed of dirt and gravel, contributing significant sediment loads to surface waters (Tetra tech 2005, Matrix 2011).

**Construction -** Silt fences and other BMPS do not appear to be used for smaller construction projects.BMPs could be used to minimize sediment loads from construction projects into surface waters (Tetra tech 2005, Matrix 2011).

OST phase II monitoring activities included a reduction in sampling stations from 41 stations to 38 stations and a shift in parameters from metals and toxins to bacteria, nutrients, and inorganics (Matrix 2011). The physical parameters sampled include: pH, temperature, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, temperature, and turbidity; the conventional pollutants include: biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), total suspended solids (TSS), fecal coliform bacteria, and E-coli; and non-conventional pollutants include: ammonia-nitrogen, nitrate-nitrogen, hardness, and total phosphorus. Water quality samples are collected during three months with the highest annual precipitation, April, May and June, and four months with low precipitation, July, August, September, and October for water quality parameters reflecting parameters of concern based on criteria for beneficial uses. In 2011, in addition to parameters of concern, Soluble Reactive Phosphorus (SRP) and additional anions and cations were collected in order to better understand phosphorus sources and to develop a more complete understanding of the distribution of common inorganic ions in order to evaluate historical metals data (Table 8). The results of the additional sampling are given in sections 4.2 and 4.3 of this report.

Matrix Consulting (2011) analyzed physical and chemical data collected between 2005-2009 for the White River/Wounded Knee Creek watershed. Water quality exceedances for Wounded Knee Creek stations occurring in greater than 10% of cases when less than 10 samples were collected (water bodies designated “Threatened”) include: Fecal coliform, E. coli, and TSS. Fecal coliform exceed water quality criteria at Wounded Knee Creek Station 1 (WOK1) with a 25% exceedances (1 of 4 samples), Wounded Knee Creek Station 3 (WOK3) with a 33% exceedance (1 of 3 samples), and Wounded Knee Creek Station 4 (WOK4) with a 50% exceedance (2 of 4 samples). Escherichia coli (E. coli) exceed water quality criteria at Wounded Knee Creek 2 (WOK2) with a 25% exceedance (1 of 4 samples), WOK3 with a 60% exceedance (3 of 5 samples), and WOK4 with a 100% exceedance (4 of 4 samples). Total suspended solids (TSS) exceed water quality criteria at WOK4 with a 25% exceedance (1 of 4 samples). No exceedances were found for Porcupine Creek monitoring stations during the sampling period.

Macroinvertebrate were incorporated into a NPS monitoring on the Pine Ridge Reservation in 1999 (Matrix 2011). Stream health monitoring using benthic macroinvertebrate began in 1993. Based on samples collected between 1993-1996, seven metric scoring criteria were chosen: Taxa Richness, EPT Index, % EPT, Family Biotic Index, % Dominant, Family, % Dipterans and Non-Insects, and % Collector-Gatherer. To determine the relationship between habitat quality and biological condition, biosurvey and habitat data collected from April to November 1998 for 38 monitoring stations. The study identified biological conditions for the White River/Porcupine Creek watershed ranging from severely impaired (WOK1), to moderately impaired (WOK2, WOK3, POR1), to unimpaired (POR2, POR3) and overall habitat ratings of sub-optimal. The report concluded nutrient enrichment to be the cause of reduced biological integrity (Matrix 2011).

# 3.0 Data Analysis

This section presents the chemical data analysis for streams monitored between 2008-2011. Physical data including pH, conductivity, temperature, and dissolved oxygen was collected as instantaneous measurements between 2008-2011, however these results will be published as part of individual watershed assessment reports beginning in 2014. Water quality is an indicator of the general condition of the watershed and pollutant source types, locations, and behavior (USEPA 2010). The process of conducting data analyses to characterize the watershed and its pollutant sources began with broad assessments evaluating the averages, minimums, and maximums of measured parameters at the monitoring sites (Matrix 2011).

Water quality data alone does not adequately characterize stream health (Shapiro 2008). Reports commissioned in early 2000 to address questions from the US Congress on the condition of US waters found that the US lacked the data necessary to report the current status of its ecological resources, trends in these conditions, and causes of environmental degradation (Heintz 2002, USEPA 2003, Shapiro 2008). The early 2000 reporting resulted in the development and application of standardized protocols focusing on biological indicators for sampling, processing and interpreting core indicators of biological condition and of key stressors (Barbour 1999, Shapiro 2008). Stream health is defined as “a desirable and sustainable ecosystem structure and function, or ecosystem integrity” (Merritt 1986, Karr 1989). Macroinvertebrate taxa are often used as an indicator of overall ecosystem integrity through a multi-metric approach that measure a wide range of gradients from individual health to landscape dynamics (Planfkin 1999). Metrics incorporate taxa richness, dominance of taxa that are sensitive or insensitive to pollution, balance of functional feeding groups (Rosenberg and Resh 1993, Merritt 1986).

## 3.1 Goals and Objectives

Samples collected by the OST Water Pollution Control Program were tested through Energy Labs in Rapid City, SD for chemical properties, outlined in Table 8. Energy Labs recorded samples with concentrations below the reporting limit as “Non-detect”.

Table 1. Chemical Property Parameters

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Analyses** | **Parameter** | **Units** | **Reporting Limit** |
| Microbiological | Bacteria, Fecal Coliform | CFU 100 ml | 1 |
| Bacteria, E-Coli Coliform | mpn/100 ml | 1 |
| Physical | Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | mg/L | 2 |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | mg/L | 10 |
| Cations | Hardness as CaCO3 | mg/L | 1 |
| Calcium | mg/L | 1 |
| Magnesium | mg/L | 1 |
| Sodium | mg/L | 1 |
| Potassium | mg/L | 1 |
| Anions | Chloride | mg/L | 1 |
| Sulfate | mg/L | 1 |
| Nutrients | Phosphorus, Total as P | mg/L | 0.01 |
| Phosphorus, SRP | mg/L | 0.01 |
| Nitrogen, Ammonia as N | mg/L | 0.05 |
| Nitrogen, Nitrate as N | mg/L | 0.05 |

## 3.2 Water Quality Data

Figure 4: Fecal Coliform Samples for 2008-2011

Figure 5: E-coli Samples for 2008-2011

Figure 6: Biochemical Oxygen Demand Samples for 2008-2011

Figure 7: Total Suspended Samples for 2008-2011

Figure 8: Nitrogen as Ammonia Samples for 2008-2011

Figure 9: Nitrogen as Nitrate for 2008-2011 samples

Figure 10: Total Phosphorus for 2008-2011 Samples

Figure 11: Soluble Reactive Phosphorus for 2008-2011 Samples

Table 2. White River / Bear-in-the-Lodge Stations

| **Name** | **Site #** | **Parameter** | **Criteria exceeded** | **# of Samples** | **Percent exceedance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bear in the Lodge Creek | BEA1  (2012 -2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 3 of 6  No Data | 50%  No Data |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 4 of 6  2 of 3 | 66%  66% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 6  Zero of 5 | 0%  0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | Zero of 6  Zero of 5 | 0%  0% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | No Data  Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  **>0.56 mg/L b** | Zero of 5  **Zero of 5** | 0%  0%  **0%**  **0%** |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  **> 0.09 mg/L d** | 5 of 6  5 of 5  **2 of 6**  **4 of 5** | 80%  100%  **33%**  **80%** |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data  No Data | No Data |
| BEA2  (2012 -2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 3 of 6  No Data | 50% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 4 of 6  6 of 6 | 100%  100% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 5  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | 1 of 6  Zero of 5 | 16%  0% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | No Data  Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | Zero of 6  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  > 0.09 mg/L d | 6 of 6  5 of 5  5 of 6  5 of 5 | 100%  100%  83%  100% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| BEA3  (2012-2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 3 of 6  No Data | 50% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 4 of 6  3 of 3 | 66%  100% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 5  Zero of 3 | 0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | 1 of 6  Zero of 5 | 33%  0% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | No Data  Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | Zero of 3  1 of 3 | 0%  33% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  > 0.09 mg/L d | 6 of 6  5 of 5  5 of 6  5 of 5 | 100%  100%  80%  100% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| Bear in the Lodge | BLC1  (2012-2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 3 of 3  No Data | 100% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 3 of 3  3 of 3 | 100%  100% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 3  Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | 2 of 3  4 of 5 | 66%  80% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | No Data  Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | 1 of 3  Zero of 3 | 33%  0% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  > 0.09 mg/L d | 3 of 3  5 of 5  3 of 3  5 of 5 | 100%  100%  100%  100% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| BLC2  (2012-2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 3 of 4  No Data | 75% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 3 of 4  3 of 3 | 75%  100% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 4  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | 2 of 4  3 of 5 | 20% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | Zero of 4  1 of 3 | 0%  33% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  > 0.09 mg/L d | 4 of 4  5 of 5  3 of 4  5 of 5 | 100%  100%  75%  100% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| Eagle Nest Creek | EAN1  (2012-2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 3 of 3 | 100% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 3 of 3  2 of 3 | 100%  67% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 5  Zero of 3 | 0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | Zero of 3  Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | Zero of 3  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  > 0.09 mg/L d | 5 of 5  3 of 3  5 of 5  2 of 3 | 100%  100%  100%  67% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| EAN2  (2008) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 2 of 2  No Data | 100% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 2 of 3  2 of 2 | 67%  100% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 3  Zero of 3 | 0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | 1 of 2  4 of 5 | 50%  80% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | Zero of 5  No Data | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | 1 of 2  2 of 3 | 50%  67% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  > 0.09 mg/L d | 2 of 2  5 of 5  2 of 2  4 of 5 | 100%  100%  100%  80% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| Other Tributaries | Lost Dog Creek  (2008)  (2010) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | Zero of 1  No Data | 0% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | Zero of 1  No Data | 0% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 1  No Data | 0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | Zero of 1  1 of 1 | 0%  100% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | Zero of 1  No Data | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | Zero of 1  No Data | 0% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  >0.09 mg/L d | 1 of 1  1 of 1  1 of 1  1 of 1 | 100%  100%  100%  100% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| POT1  (2012)  (2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 3 of 6  No Data | 50% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 3 of 6  2 of 3 | 50%  67% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | > 30 mg/L | Zero of 6  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | Zero of 6  Zero of 5 | 0%  0% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | No Data  Zero of 5 | 0%  0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | Zero of 6  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  >0.09 mg/L d | 6 of 6  5 of 5  4 of 6  5 of 5 | 100%  100%  67%  100% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| COR1  (2008) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 2 of 3  No Data | 67% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 3 of 3  2 of 3 | 100%  67% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 3  Zero of 3 | 0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | 1 of 3  4 of 5 | 33%  80% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | No Data  Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | 1 of 3  Zero of 3 | 33%  0% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  >0.09 mg/L d | 3 of 3  5 of 5  2 of 3  4 of 5 | 100%  100%  67%  80% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| White River | WHR5  (2008) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 3 of 3  No Data | 100% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 3 of 3  1 of 3 | 100%  33% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 3  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 4525 mg/L | 2 of 3  1 of 4 | 67%  25% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | Zero of 4 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | 3 of 3  1 of 3 | 100%  33% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  >0.09 mg/L d | 4 of 4  4 of 4  4 of 4  4 of 4 | 100%  100%  100%  100% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No data | No data |

Table 3. White River / Pass Creek Stations

| **Waterbody** | **Site #** | **Parameter** | **Criteria exceeded** | **# of Samples** | **Percent exceedance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pass Creek | PAS1  (2012  2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 6 of 6  Zero of 1 | 100%  0% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 6 of 6  3 of 3 | 100%  100% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 6  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | 1 of 6  Zero of 5 | 13%  0% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | No Data  Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | Zero of 6  Zero of 5 | 0%  0% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  > 0.09 mg/L d | 6 of 6  5 of 5  4 of 6  4 of 5 | 100%  100%  67%  80% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| PAS2  (2012  2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 3 of 4  No Data | 75% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 3 of 4  1 of 3 | 75%  33% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 4  Zero of 3 | 0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | Zero of 4  Zero of 5 | 0%  0% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | No Data  Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | Zero of 4  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  .0.09 mg/L d | 4 of 4  5 of 5  4 of 4  5 of 5 | 100%  100%  100%  100% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| PAS3  (2012  2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 2 of 3  No Data | 67% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 2 of 3  1 of 2 | 67%  50% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 3  Zero of 2 | 0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | 1 of 3  1 of 4 | 33%  25% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | Do Data  Zero of 4 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | Zero of 3  Zero of 2 | 0%  0% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  >0.09 mg/L d | 3 of 3  4 of 4  3 of 3  4 of 4 | 100%  100%  100%  100% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| Other Tributaries | CRA1  (2012  2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | Zero of 6  No Data | 0% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 3 of 6  2 of 3 | 0% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 6  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | Zero of 6  Zero of 5 | 0%  0% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | No Data  Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | 6 of 6  3 of 3 | 100%  100% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  >0.09 mg/L d | 6 of 6  5 of 5  5 of 6  4 of 5 | 100%  100%  83%  80% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| BUZ1  (2012  2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 2 of 2  No Data | 100% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 2 of 2  No Data | 100% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 2  No Data | 0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | Zero of 2  Zero of 2 | 0% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | No Data  Zero of 2 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | Zero of 2  No Data | 0%  0% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  >0.09 mg/L d | 2 of 2  2 of 2  1 of 2  2 of 2 | 100%  100%  50%  100% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No Data | No Data |
| BLP1  (2012  2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 5 of 6  1 of 1 | 100%  100% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 6 of 6  3 of 3 | 100%  100% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 5  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | 3 of 6  Zero of 5 | 50%  0% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | No Data  Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | 6 of 6  3 of 3 | 100%  100% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  >0.09 mg/L d | 6 of 6  5 of 5  3 of 6  3 of 5 | 100%  100%  50%  60% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No data | No data |
|  | LON1  (2012  2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | Zero of 2  No Data | 0% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 2 of 2  3 of 3 | 100%  100% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 2  Zero of 3 | 0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 158 mg/L | Zero of 2  Zero of 5 | 0%  0% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | Zero of 2  2 of 2  Zero of 3  3 of 3 | 0%  100%  0%  100% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c >0.09 mg/L d | 2 of 2  5 of 5  Zero of 2  4 of 5 | 100%  100%  0%  80% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No data | No data |
| White River | WHR4  (2012  2013) | Fecal Coliform | > 400 CFU/100mL | 3 of 3  1 of 1 | 100%  100% |
| Escherichia coli (E-Coli) | > 235 mpn/100 ml | 3 of 3  2 of 3 | 100%  67% |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | 30 mg/L | Zero of 3  Zero of 3 | 0%  0% |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | > 4525 mg/L | 2 of 3  3 of 5 | 67%  60% |
| Total Ammonia (NH3) as N | > 1.8 mg/L a | Zero of 5 | 0% |
| Nitrate (NO3) as N | >88 mg/L  >0.56 mg/L b | 0 of 3  2 of 3 | 0%  67% |
| Total Phosphorus | > 0.037 mg/L c  > 0.09 mg/L d | 3 of 3  5 of 5  3 of 3  5 of 5 | 100%  100%  100%  100% |
| Soluble Reactive Phosphorus | >0.037 mg/L e | No data | No data |

## 3.3 Macroinvertebrate Data

Table 4. Bear in the Lodge Creek Stations

| **Waterbody** | **Site #** | **Parameter** | **Value** | **Prior Mean** | **Prior StDev** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bear in the Lodge Creek | BEA1  (2012-2013)  Chironomidae  n = 5 years  High Plains Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 9 / 17 | 8.33 | 3.9 |
| EPT Index | 3 / 5 | 2.7 | 0.58 |
| % EPT | 18% / 26% | 21% | 18% |
| Family Biotic Index | 5.7 / 5.8 | 6.0 | 0.94 |
| % Dominant Family | 71% / 52% | 56% | 4% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 80% / 70% | 75% | 18% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 85% / 87% | 76% | 19% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 24** | **9 / 24** | **13** | **6.5** |
| BEA2  (2012-2013)  Chironomidae  n = 4 years  High Plains Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 10 / 7 | 10.50 | .71 |
| EPT Index | 1 / 2 | 4.5 | .71 |
| % EPT | 1% / 10% | 43% | 43% |
| Family Biotic Index | 7.08 / 6.43 | 5.77 | 1.53 |
| % Dominant Family | 45% / 64% | 36% | 36% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 96% / 83% | 52% | 52% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 85% / 91% | 59% | 31% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 27** | **6 / 3** | **24** | **24** |
| BEA3  (2012-2013)  Chironomidae  n = 4 samples  Great Plains Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 11 / 9 | 10.50 | 1.5 |
| EPT Index | 5 / 3 | 4.00 | 0.82 |
| % EPT | 36% / 52% | 56% | 17% |
| Family Biotic Index | 5.6 / 4.6 | 4.87 | 0.5 |
| % Dominant Family | 24% / 27% | 43% | 22% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 61% / 41% | 34% | 21% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 70% / 46% | 44% | 22% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 30** | **15 / 18** | **23.25** | **7.89** |
| BEL1  (2012-2013)  Chironomidae  n = 5 years  Great Plains Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 13 / 6 | 12.3 | 3.1 |
| EPT Index | 5 / 3 | 5.3 | 2.1 |
| % EPT | 17% / 29% | 47% | 36% |
| Family Biotic Index | 6.9 / 6.3 | 5.2 | 1.7 |
| % Dominant Family | 43% / 44% | 50% | 22% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 81% / 68% | 41% | 42% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 85% / 72% | 49% | 40% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 39** | **12 / 9** | **27** | **15.9** |
| BEL2  (2012-2013)  Simuliidae  Chironomidae  n = 4 years  Badlands Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 4 /4 | 12 | 5.6 |
| EPT Index | 1 / 0 | 2.8 | 2.6 |
| % EPT | 1% / 0% | 29% | 35% |
| Family Biotic Index | 6.4 / 6.6 | 5.4 | .8 |
| % Dominant Family | 54% / 69% | 37% | 15% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 99% / 99% | 53% | 40% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 46% / 86% | 36% | 10% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 30** | **9 / 0** | **22** | **11** |
| White River and Downstream Tributaries | WHR3  (n = 1 year)  Badlands Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | No Data | 2 | No Data |
| EPT Index | No Data | 1 | No Data |
| % EPT | No Data | 1% | No Data |
| Family Biotic Index | No Data | 6 | No Data |
| % Dominant Family | No Data | 99% | No Data |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | No Data | 99% | No Data |
| % Collector Gatherers | No Data | 1% | No Data |
| **Total Score** | **No Data** | **No Data** | **No Data** |
| EAN1  (2012-2013)  Chironomidae  n = 2 years  Great Plains Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 15 / 6 | No Data | No Data |
| EPT Index | 4 / 0 | No Data | No Data |
| % EPT | 1% / 0% | No Data | No Data |
| Family Biotic Index | 5.5 / 6.7 | No Data | No Data |
| % Dominant Family | 48% / 79% | No Data | No Data |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 91% / 95% | No Data | No Data |
| % Collector Gatherers | 52% / 92% | No Data | No Data |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = No Data** | **18 / 3** | **No Data** | **No Data** |
| EAN2  (2013)  Chironomidae  n = 1 year  Badlands Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 5 | No Data | No Data |
| EPT Index | 1 | No Data | No Data |
| % EPT | 1% | No Data | No Data |
| Family Biotic Index | 7.0 | No Data | No Data |
| % Dominant Family | 43% | No Data | No Data |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 99% | No Data | No Data |
| % Collector Gatherers | 68% | No Data | No Data |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = No Data** | **18** | **No Data** | **No Data** |
| POT1  (2013)  Elmidae  n = 4 years  Great Plains Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 10 | 11.3 | 4.2 |
| EPT Index | 1 | 1.25 | 1.0 |
| % EPT | 2% | 2% | 1% |
| Family Biotic Index | 4.7 | 6.1 | 1.2 |
| % Dominant Family | 65% | 57% | 22% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 14% | 52% | 31% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 65% | 70% | 25% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = No Data** | **15** | **12.8** | **No Data** |
|  | WHR5  (2012-2013)  Similidae  n = 2 years  White River Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 3 /3 | 3 | No Data |
| EPT Index | 1 / 0 | 1.5 | No Data |
| % EPT | 2% / 0 | 1% | No Data |
| Family Biotic Index | 6.0 / 6.0 | 6.0 | No Data |
| % Dominant Family | 68% / 92% | 75% | No Data |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 98% / 99% | 98% | No Data |
| % Collector Gatherers | 32% / 7% | 19% | No Data |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 9** | **6 / 9** | 7.5 | No Data |

Table 5. Pass Creek Stations

| **Waterbody** | **Site #** | **Parameter** | **Value** | **Mean** | **StDev** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pass Creek | PAS1  (2012-2013)  Baetidae  Oligachaeta  n = 5 years  High Plains Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 14 / 12 | 13.2 | 2.28 |
| EPT Index | 7 / 3 | 5.0 | 1.6 |
| % EPT | 49% / 4% | 59% | 25% |
| Family Biotic Index | 3.97 / 7.03 | 4.0 | 1.5 |
| % Dominant Family | 25% / 34% | 41% | 12% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 44% / 93% | 34% | 27% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 61% / 66% | 44% | 14% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 36** | **33 / 12** | **31** | **9.8** |
| PAS2  (2012-2013)  Hydropsychidae  Oligachaeta  n = 6 years  Great Plains  Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 11 / 10 | 10.8 | 1.6 |
| EPT Index | 5 / 3 | 3.5 | 1.5 |
| % EPT | 54% / 14% | 51% | 32% |
| Family Biotic Index | 4.4 / 6.7 | 3.8 | 1.7 |
| % Dominant Family | 26% / 33% | 52% | 14% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 31% / 84% | 26% | 36% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 40% / 45% | 15% | 16% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 36** | **27 / 12** | **27** | **7.7** |
| PAS3  (2013)  Baetidae  Simulidae  n = 5 years  Badlands Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 14 | 6 | 2.2 |
| EPT Index | 3 | 2.25 | 2.1 |
| % EPT | 19% | 55% | 38% |
| Family Biotic Index | 6.1 | 5.24 | 0.88 |
| % Dominant Family | 29% | 60% | 22% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 70% | 31% | 25% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 58% | 65% | 17% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 36** | **30** | **15.75** | **0.17** |
| BUZ1  (2013)  Chironomidae  n = 4 years  Great Plains Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 11 | 10.3 | 3.6 |
| EPT Index | 0 | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| % EPT | 0% | 22% | 18% |
| Family Biotic Index | 6.9 | 6.3 | 1.1 |
| % Dominant Family | 35% | 43% | 18% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 90% | 71% | 23% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 43% | 65% | 29% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 18** | **6** | **10.5** | **6** |
| LON1  (2013)  Chironomidae  n = 1 year  Great Plains Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 14 | No Data | No Data |
| EPT Index | 2 | No Data | No Data |
| % EPT | 13% | No Data | No Data |
| Family Biotic Index | 6.0 | No Data | No Data |
| % Dominant Family | 57% | No Data | No Data |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 81% | No Data | No Data |
| % Collector Gatherers | 84% | No Data | No Data |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = No Data** | **15** | **No Data** | **No Data** |
| BLP1  (2012-2013)  Nonotonecdae  Chironomidae  n = 6 years  Great Plains Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 6 / 10 | 9.8 | 3.0 |
| EPT Index | 0 /3 | 3.8 | 1.8 |
| % EPT | 0% / 10% | 71% | 35% |
| Family Biotic Index | 6.9 / 5.5 | 2.5 | 2.1 |
| % Dominant Family | 89% / 78% | 41% | 34% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 5% / 83% | 19% | 29% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 1% / 83% | 18% | 29% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 33** | **18 / 12** | **29.3** | **8.1** |
|  | CRA1  (2012-2013)  Baetidae  Elmidae  n = 5 years  Great Plains Ecoregion | Taxa Richness | 9 / 12 | 7.7 | 5.1 |
| EPT Index | 3 / 2 | 2 | 1.7 |
| % EPT | 82% / 22% | 33% | 43% |
| Family Biotic Index | 4.25 / 5.71 | 5.9 | 1.8 |
| % Dominant Family | 79% / 28% | 73% | 26% |
| % Dipteran & Non-insects | 10% / 50% | 58% | 44% |
| % Collector Gatherers | 92% / 80% | 91% | 9% |
| **Total Score**  **Max Score = 33** | **24 / 18** | **13** | **12.2** |

# 4.0 Results

## 4.1 Water Quality Results

The Pine Ridge Reservation stream impairment status for the Bear in the Lodge and Pass Creek watersheds between 2012-2013 is listed in Table 15. The criteria contributing to Bear in the Lodge stream impairments are: fecal coliform bacteria (91%; 10 of 11 stations), E-coli bacteria (91%; 10 of 11 stations), total phosphorus (100%; 11 of 11 stations), nitrate (55%; 6 of 11) and total suspended solids (55%; 6 of 11 stations). The criteria contributing to Pass Creek stream impairments are: fecal coliform bacteria (87%; 7 of 8 stations), E-coli bacteria (87%; 7 of 8 stations), total phosphorus (100%; 8 of 8 stations), nitrate (50%; 4 of 8) and total suspended solids (38%; 3 of 8 stations). There were no exceedances of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), ammonia (NH3), or nitrate (NO3) at the 88 mg/L water quality standard.

Table 6: Impairment Status for Pine Ridge Reservation Streams 2012 – 2013.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Watershed Name** | **Station Name** | **Criteria** | **# Exceedances of # Samples** | **Impairment Status** |
| White River / Bear in the Lodge Subwatershed | Bear Creek 1 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 3 of 6 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 8 of 12 | Impaired |
| Total Phosphorus | 6 of 11 | Impaired |
| Bear Creek 2 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 3 of 6 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 10 of 12 | Impaired |
| Total Phosphorus | 11 of 2 | Impaired |
| Bear Creek 3 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 3 of 6 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 7 of 10 | Threatened |
| Nitrate  (>0.56 mg/L) | 1 of 6 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 10 of 11 | Impaired |
| Bear in the Lodge Creek 1 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 3 of 3 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 6 of 6 | Threatened |
| Nitrate | 1 of 6 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 8 of 8 | Threatened |
| Total Suspended Solids | 6 of 8 | Threatened |
| Bear in the Lodge Creek 2 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 3 of 4 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 6 of 7 | Threatened |
| Nitrate | 1 of 7 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 8 of 9 | Threatened |
| Total Suspended Solids | 5 of 9 | Threatened |
| Eagle Nest Creek 1 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 3 of 3 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 5 of 6 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 7 of 8 | Threatened |
| Eagle Nest Creek 2 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 2 of 2 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 4 of 5 | Threatened |
| Nitrate | 3 of 5 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 6 of 7 | Threatened |
| Total Suspended Solids | 5 of 7 | Threatened |
| Lost Dog Creek | Total Suspended Solids | 1 of 2 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 2 of 2 | Threatened |
| Potato Creek | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 3 of 6 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 5 of 8 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 9 of 11 | Impaired |
|  | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 2 of 3 | Threatened |
|  | E-coli Bacteria | 5 of 6 | Threatened |
| Corn Creek | Nitrate | 1 of 6 | Threatened |
|  | Total Suspended Solids | 5 of 8 | Threatened |
|  | Total Phosphorus | 6 of 8 | Threatened |
| White River 5 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 3 of 3 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 4 of 6 | Threatened |
| Nitrate | 4 of 6 | Threatened |
| Total Suspended Solids | 3 of 7 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 8 of 8 | Threatened |
| White River Pass Creek Watershed | Pass Creek 1 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 6 of 7 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 9 of 9 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 8 of 11 | Impaired |
| Pass Creek 2 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 3 of 4 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 4 of 7 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 9 of 9 | Threatened |
| Pass Creek 3 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 2 of 3 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 3 of 5 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 7 of 7 | Threatened |
| Total Suspended Solids | 2 of 7 | Threatened |
| Buzzard Creek | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 2 of 2 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 2 of 2 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 3 of 4 | Threatened |
| Craven Creek | E-coli Bacteria | 5 of 9 | Threatened |
|  | Nitrate | 9 of 9 | Threatened |
|  | Total Phosphorus | 9 of 11 | Impaired |
| Long Creek | Nitrate | 5 of 5 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 4 of 7 | Threatened |
| White River 4 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 4 of 4 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 5 of 6 | Threatened |
| Nitrate | 4 of 6 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 8 of 8 | Threatened |
| Total Suspended Solids | 5 of 8 | Threatened |
| Black Pipe 1 | Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 6 of 7 | Threatened |
| E-coli Bacteria | 9 of 9 | Threatened |
| Nitrate | 9 of 9 | Threatened |
| Total Phosphorus | 6 of 11 | Impaired |
| Total Suspended Solids | 3 of 11 | Impaired |

*\*\* South Dakota Surface Water Quality Standards (74:51:01) Appendix A Total Ammonia Criteria, (Equation 2):*

### 4.1.4 White River / Bear in the Lodge Creek Subwatershed Results

The White River / Bear in the Lodge subwatershed, which includes: Potato Creek, Lost Dog Creek, Bear Creek, Corn Creek, Bear in the Lodge Creek, Eagle Nest Creek watersheds, has 11 stations: POT1, LOD1, BEA1, BEA2, BEA3, COR1, BLC1, BLC2, EAN1, EAN2. Potato Creek and Lost Dog Creek are White River tributaries in the Great Plains ecoregion. The Bear in the Lodge Creek watershed includes headwater stations on Bear Creek east of Allen (BEA1) and (BEA2) in the High Plains ecoregion and Corn Creek (COR1) in the Northern Great Plains ecoregion, mid-order stations, a mid-order station north of Hisle (BEA3) in the Northern Great Plains ecoregion, and downstream stations on Bear in the Lodge Creek below the confluence with Bear Creek in the Northern Great Plains ecoregion (BEL1) and near the confluence with the White River in the White River Badlands ecoregion (BEL2). Eagle Nest watershed, located east of the Bear in the Lodge watershed, has an upstream station (EAN1) in the Great Plains ecoregion and a downstream station (EAN2) in the Badlands ecoregion near the confluence with the White River. The nearest White River station (WHR5) includes flow from the White River / Medicine Root Subwatershed, as well as Potato Creek (POT1), Lost Dog Creek (LOD1).

The degree of Impairments in the Bear in the Lodge watershed depended on the parameter measured. The degree of impairment remained generally steady upstream to downstream in the Bear in the Lodge subwatershed and the degree of impairment increased slightly since the last time samples were collected. In 2008, the overall bacterial water quality exceedances for the Bear in the Lodge subwatershed were 58% (18 of 31) fecal coliform exceedances and 66% (25 of 38) E-coli exceedances. In 2012, the overall bacterial water quality exceedances for the Bear in the Lodge subwatershed were 67% (29 of 43) fecal coliform exceedances and 74% (32 of 43) E-coli exceedances. In 2013, the overall bacterial water quality exceedances for the Bear in the Lodge subwatershed were 77% (23 of 30) E-coli exceedances. The greatest bacterial exceedances occurred during the month of July. Total suspended solids exceedances were highest for White River group streams. Nitrate exceedances were highest in the White River with fewer exceedances in the lower Bear in the Lodge Creek and White River tributaries. All stations in the watershed exceeded the phosphorus concentration at greater than 50%.

### 4.1.2 White River / Pass Creek Subwatershed Results

The White River / Bear in the Lodge subwatershed, which includes: Craven Creek, Long Creek, Pass Creek, and Black Pipe Creek watersheds, has 11 stations: CRA1, LON1, PAS1, PAS2, PAS3, BUZ1, and BLP1. Craven Creek, which is also known as Buckle Creek, and Long Creek are in the Great Plains ecoregion and have one station (CRA1) and (LON1), respectively. The Pass Creek watershed includes: headwater stations in the High Plains ecoregion on Pass Creek, PAS1, and in the Great Plains ecoregion on Buzzard Creek, BUZ1, a mid-order station, PAS2, in the High Plains ecoregion, and PAS3 a station in the Badlands ecoregion near the confluence with the White River. Black Pipe Creek watershed has a station, BLP1, near the Pine Ridge reservation boundary.

The degree of Impairments in the Pass Creek watershed depended on the parameter measured. The degree of bacterial impairment did not show a strong spatial trend in the Pass Creek subwatershed and the degree of impairment increased since the last time samples were collected. In 2009, the overall bacterial water quality exceedances for the Pass Creek subwatershed are 51% (18 of 35) fecal coliform exceedances and 69% (24 of 35) E-coli exceedances. In 2012, the overall bacterial water quality exceedances for the Pass Creek subwatershed are 63% (20 of 32) fecal coliform exceedances and 81% (26 of 32) E-coli exceedances. In 2013, the overall bacterial water quality exceedances for the Pass Creek subwatershed are 75% (15 of 20) E-coli exceedances. Total suspended solids exceedances were highest for White River group streams. Nitrate exceedances were very high in Craven Creek, Long Creek, Black Pipe Creek. All stations in the watershed exceeded the phosphorus concentration at greater than 50%.

# 5.0 Stream Health Results

The Pine Ridge Reservation stream health results for 2012-2013 are shown in Table 20. The general trend for impairments follows the water quality results with 10% (4 of 40) stations scoring less than 29% of the best station in the region being designated severely impaired and 43% (17 of 40) stations scoring less than 79% of the best station in the region being designated moderately impaired. The general trend over time is a decrease in stream health over time with 5% (2 of 37) stations scoring less than 29% of the maximum score for the station designated as being severely degraded and 51% (19 of 37) stations scoring less than 79% of the maximum score for the station designated as being moderately degraded. Major changes in stream health since the 1990s result from increases in abundance of tolerant taxa as designated by the Family Biotic Index and increases in abundance of taxa designated as collector gatherers. Notable exceptions to the general trend are No Flesh Creek and Wolf Creek, which have improved markedly since the 1990s.

Table 20: Generalized Stream Health Results for Pine Ridge Reservation Streams 2008 – 2011 with Highlighted Stations Representing the Reference Stream for the Ecoregion.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Ecoregion** | **Station** | **Impairment Status** | **Status** |
| 2012 | Badlands | Bear in the Lodge 2 | 50%; 9/18  15%; 4.5/30 | Non-Impaired /  Severely Degraded |
| Pass Creek 3 | No data | Non-impaired / No Data |
| Eagle Nest 2 | 17%; 3/18 | Severely Impaired  No Data |
| White River 3 | No data | No Data |
| Great Plains / High Plains | Bear Creek 1 | 27%; 9/33  38%; 9/24 | Severely Impaired / Moderately Degraded |
| Bear Creek 2 | 18%; 6/33  22%; 6/27 | Severely Impaired / Moderately Degraded |
| Bear Creek 3 | 45%; 15/33  50%; 15/30 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Buzzard Creek | 23%; 18/33  30%; 6/18 | Moderately Degraded / Moderately Degraded |
| Bear in the Lodge 1 | 36%; 12/33  31%; 12/39 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Corn Creek | No Data |  |
| Eagle Nest 1 | 55%; 18/30  18/18 | Moderately Impaired /  Non-Degraded |
| Potato Creek | No Data |  |
| Pass Creek 1 | 33/33  33/36 | Non-Impaired /  Non-degraded |
| Pass Creek 2 | 90%; 27  90%; 27/30 | Non-Impaired /  Non-degraded |
| Craven Creek | 80%; 24 of 30  100%; 24 of 24 | Non-Impaired /  Non-degraded |
| Black Pipe Creek | 55%; 18/33  60%; 18/30 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| 2013 | Badlands | Bear in the Lodge 2 | 0%; 0/30  0% /30 | Severely Impaired /  Severely Degraded |
| Pass Creek 3 | 100%; 30/30  83%; 30/36 | Non-Impaired / No Degradation |
| Eagle Nest Creek 2 | 10%; 3/30  No Data | Severely Impaired |
| Great Plains | Bear Creek 1 | 100%; 24/24  100%; 24/24 | Non-Impaired  Significant Improvement |
| Bear Creek 2 | 25%; 6/24  22%; 6/27 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Bear Creek 3 | 75%; 18/24  60%; 18/30 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Buzzard Creek | 25%; 6/24  33%; 6/18 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Bear in the Lodge 1 | 38%; 9/24  23%; 12/39 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Corn Creek | 50%; 12/24  40%; 12/30 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Eagle Nest 1 | 13%; 3/24  33%; 3/18 | Severely Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Potato Creek | 75%; 18/24  85%; 18/21 | Moderately Impaired /  Non-Degraded |
| Pass Creek 1 | 50%; 12/24  33% 12/36 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Pass Creek 2 | 50%; 12/24  40%; 12/30 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Craven Creek | 75%; 18 of 24  75%; 18 of 24 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Black Pipe Creek | 50%; 12 / 24  36%; 12/33 | Moderately Impaired /  Moderately Degraded |
| Long Creek | 50%; 15/30  No Data | Moderately Impaired |
|  |  |  |

## 5.1 White River / Bear in the Lodge Creek Subwatershed Results

Overall watershed health has declined in the Pass Creek subwatershed since the last sampling period in the 1990s. Bear in the Lodge Creek headwaters (Bear Creek 1) has improved from severely impaired in 2012 to become the station with the highest stream health score in 2013. Mid-order stations Bear Creek 2 (BEA2) and Bear Creek 3 (BEA3) are designated as moderately to severely impaired status in 2012-2013, declining from a non-impaired status in the 1990s. Lower order station Bear in the Lodge Creek 1 (BEL1) declined from a stream with one of the highest health scores in the 1990s to moderately impaired. Bear in the Lodge Creek 2 (BEL2), near the White River confluence, declined from non-impaired and non-degraded status in the 1990s to a severely impaired status in 2013. The two stations on Eagle Nest Creek were not sampled in the 1990s. Both stations are designated as severely impaired. Potato Creek has improved from severely impaired in the 1990s to moderately impaired in 2013.

## 5.2 White River / Pass Creek Subwatershed Results

Overall watershed health is moderately impaired, declining in the Pass Creek subwatershed since 2010. Pass Creek headwaters (PAS1) in the High Plains ecoregion health declined to moderate impairment in 2013 and BUZ1 in the Great Plains ecoregion improved to moderate impairment. The mid-order Pass Creek station (PAS2 in the High Plains ecoregion), which was designated non-impaired in 2010 and 2012, declined to moderate impairment. The lower Pass Creek station (PAS3 in the Badlands) remained non-impaired. The Black Pipe tributary of the White River, which was non-impaired in 2010, declined to moderate impairment. Craven Creek and Long Creek, which were not sampled in 2010, are designated moderately impaired.

~~Stream impairments are related to stream macroinvertebrate changes. The Pass Creek 1 community changed from being dominated by the intolerant trichoptera Brachycentridae to moderately tolerant trichoptera Leptceridae dominated in 2010, to moderately tolerant ephemeroptera dominated in 2012, to oligichate dominated in 2013.~~

~~Stream health of the Pass Creek headwaters (PAS1) is designated non-impaired relative to Great Plains streams sampled in 2010 (100%, 33 of 33). PAS1 stream health decreased from 1996 to 2010 from a total score of 36 to a total score of 33, and a long-term average score of 31. The macroinvertebrate community changed from Brachycentridae dominated in 1996 to. From 1996 to 2010, taxa richness increased from 14 to 16, with a long-term average of 13.3, the EPT index increased from five families in 1996 to six families in 2010, with a long-term average of 5.0, the %EPT decreased from 66% to 58% with a long-term average of 59%, Family Biotic Index increased from 2.9 to 4.9 with a long term average of 4.0, %Dominant Family decreased from 52% to 25% with a long-term average of 41%, %Dipterans and Non-insects increased from 20% to 42% with a long-term average of 34%, and %Collector Gatherers increased from 30% to 53% with a long-term average of 44%.~~

~~Stream health of Buzzard Creek (BUZ1) is designated severely impaired relative to Great Plains streams sampled in 2010 (18%, 6 of 33). BUZ1 stream health decreased from 1996 to 2010 from a total score of 15 to a total score of 3, and a long-term average score of 9. The macroinvertebrate community changed from Hydropsychidae dominated in 1996 to Taltridae dominated in 2010. From 1996 to 2010, taxa richness decreased from 12 to 7, with a long-term average of 8.3, the EPT index increased from two families in 1996 to four families in 2010, with a long-term average of 2.3, the %EPT decreased from 38% to 15% with a long-term average of 19%, Family Biotic Index increased from 5.0 to 7.3 with a long term average of 6.2, %Dominant Family decreased from 38% to 65% with a long-term average of 48%, %Dipterans and Non-insects increased from 51% to 69% with a long-term average of 67%, and %Collector Gatherers increased from 29% to 71% with a long-term average of 63%.~~

~~Stream health of middle Pass Creek (PAS2) is designated non-impaired relative to other Great Plains streams sampled in 2010 (100%, 33 of 33). PAS2 stream health increased from 1996 to 2010 from a total score of 18 to a total score of 33, and a long-term average score of 28. The macroinvertebrate community changed from Cecidumyiidae dominated in 1996 to Hydropsychidae dominated in 2010. From 1996 to 2010, taxa richness decreased from 13 to 12, with a long-term average of 10.8, the EPT index increased from two families in 1996 to four families in 2010, with a long-term average of 3.5, the %EPT increased from 3% to 85% with a long-term average of 51%, Family Biotic Index decreased from 5.9 to 4.1 with a long term average of 3.8, %Dominant Family increased from 43% to 59% with a long-term average of 52%, %Dipterans and Non-insects decreased from 79% to 7% with a long-term average of 26%, and %Collector Gatherers increased from 17% to 26% with a long-term average of 15%.~~

~~Stream health of lower Pass Creek (PAS3) is designated non-impaired relative to other Great Plains streams sampled in 2010 (100%, 30 of 30). PAS3 stream health increased from 1996 to 2010 from a total score of 18 to a total score of 30, and a long-term average score of 15.8. The macroinvertebrate community changed from Leptophlebiidae dominated in 1996 to Baetidae dominated in 2010. From 1996 to 2010, taxa richness increased from six to nine, with a long-term average of 6.0, the EPT index increased from two families in 1996 to five families in 2010, with a long-term average of 2.3, the %EPT decreased from 81% to 62% with a long-term average of 55%, Family Biotic Index decreased from 4.9 to 4.6 with a long term average of 5.2, %Dominant Family decreased from 75% to 27% with a long-term average of 60%, %Dipterans and Non-insects increased from 14% to 36% with a long-term average of 31%, and %Collector Gatherers increased from 80% to 41% with a long-term average of 65%.~~

~~Stream health of lower Black Pipe Creek (BLP1) is designated non-impaired relative to other Great Plains streams sampled in 2010 (91%, 30 of 33). BLP1 stream health remained steady from 1996 to 2010 with a total score of 30, and a long-term average score of 29.3. The macroinvertebrate community remained Brachycentridae dominated between 1996 and 2010. From 1996 to 2010, taxa richness increased from 8 to 11, with a long-term average of 9.5, the EPT index increased from three families in 1996 to five families in 2010, with a long-term average of 3.3, the %EPT decreased from 81% to 70% with a long-term average of 71%, Family Biotic Index increased from 1.7 to 3.0 with a long term average of 2.5, %Dominant Family decreased from 79% to 61% with a long-term average of 67%, %Dipterans and Non-insects increased from 4% to 24% with a long-term average of 18%, and %Collector Gatherers increased from 10% to 29% with a long-term average of 18%.~~

## 6.0 Combined Stream Health Results

A crosswalk of stream health and impairment status indicates stream health is broadly correlated with the number of impairments (Table 21). The prioritization metric scores a ‘1’ for each unimpaired water quality metric, a ‘2’ for a threatened state, and a ‘3’ for an impaired state. The metrics are then averaged to provide a total chemical score. Biological condition is treated in the same fashion to provide a total biological score. The two scores are added together to provide a total ranking value. A pristine section of stream would score a ‘2’ by the metric and a totally impaired section of stream would score a ‘6’. These data are quantified in tables 22 to 26 using the watershed prioritization metric developed by Matrix (2010).

The overall change in stream health over the previous period was a 3% overall improvement in combined stream health over the previous period. The improvement was caused by a 22% improvement in the Little White River subwatershed, a 13% improvement in the Pass Creek subwatershed, and an 11% improvement in the Wounded Knee Creek subwatershed. The Upper White River subwatershed declined by 18% and the Cheyenne River subwatershed declined by 10%. The Medicine Root subwatershed combined stream health improved by 1%.

Table 21: Cross-walk of Water Quality and Stream Health Results for Pine Ridge Reservation Streams 2008 – 2011


|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Watershed Name** | **Station Name** | **Stream Health** | **Impairment Status and Percentage** |
| White River / Bear in the Lodge Subwatershed | Bear Creek 1 | No data | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (40%) and E-coli (60%) in 2008 samples |
| Bear Creek 2 | No data | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (100%), E-coli (100%), and TSS (20%) in 2008 samples |
| Bear Creek 3 | No data | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (100%), E-coli (100%) and TSS (20%) in 2008 samples |
| Bear in the Lodge Creek 1 | No data | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (60%), E-coli (80%) and TSS (60%) in 2008 samples |
| Bear in the Lodge Creek 2 | No data | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (100%), E-Coli (100%) and TSS (20%) in 2008 samples |
|  | Eagle Nest Creek 1 | No data | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (20%) and E-coli (40%) in 2008 samples |
| Eagle Nest Creek 2 | No data | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (100%), E-coli (100%) and TSS (100%) in 2008 samples |
| White River 5 | No data | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (75%) and E-coli (75%) in 2008 samples |
| White River Pass Creek Watershed | Pass Creek 1 | Non-impaired (100%) in 2010 | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (75%) and E-coli (100%) in 2009 samples |
| Pass Creek 2 | Non-impaired (100%) in 2010 | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (60%) and E-coli (100%) in 2009 samples |
| Pass Creek 3 | Non-impaired (100%) in 2010 | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (20%), E-coli (60%), and TSS (60%) in 2009 samples |
| Buzzard Creek | Severely Impaired (9%) in 2010 | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (60%) and E-coli (100%) in 2009 samples |
| Long Creek | No data | Threatened in Fecal coliform (20%) and E-coli (40%) in 2008 samples |
| White River 4 | No data | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (100%), E-coli (80%) and TSS (80%) in 2009 samples |
| Black Pipe | Non-impaired (91%) in 2010 | Threatened in Fecal Coliform (100%) and E-Coli (100%) in 2009 samples |

Table 27: Watershed Prioritization of the Pass Creek Subwatershed based on Chemical and Biological Metrics for Streams Sampled from 2008 – 2011

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PAS1** | **Prior Ranking** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | ***3.00*** |
| **PAS1** | **2009** | 80% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2.20 | 1 | ***3.20*** |
| **PAS2** | **Prior Ranking** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No Data | No Data |  |
| **PAS2** | **2009** | 60% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2.00 | 1 | ***3.00*** |
| **PAS3** | **Prior Ranking** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6 | 2 | ***4.60*** |
| **PAS3** | **2009** | 20% | 60% | 20% | 0% | 80% | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1.60 | 1 | ***2.60*** |
| **CRA1** | **Prior Ranking** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.63 | 2 | ***3.63*** |
| **CRA1** | **2008** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 100% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1.80 | No Data | **No Data** |
| **BUZ1** | **Prior Ranking** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No Data | No Data |  |
| **BUZ1** | **2009** | 75% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2.20 | 3 | ***5.20*** |
| **BLP1** | **Prior Ranking** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | ***4.00*** |
| **BLP1** | **2009** | 100% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 80% | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2.60 | 1 | ***3.60*** |
| **LON1** | **Prior Ranking** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | ***4.00*** |
| **LON1** | **2008** | 0% | 25% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1.40 | No Data | **No Data** |
| **WHR4** | **Prior Ranking** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 1 | ***3.50*** |
| **WHR4** | **2009** | 80% | 80% | 80% | 40% | 100% | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2.80 |  |  |

Table 28: Watershed Prioritization of the Pass Creek Subwatershed based on Chemical and Biological Metrics for Streams Sampled from 2008 – 2011

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Year** | **F.**  **Coli** | **E-Coli** | **TSS** | **TN** | **TP** | **F.**  **Coli** | **E-Coli** | **TSS** | **TN** | **TP** | **Total Chem** | **Bio Con.** | **Total Ranking Value** |
|  | **Prior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | ***4*** |
| **BEA1** | **2008** | 25% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.2 | No Data |  |
|  | **12-13** | 50% | 66% | 0% | 0% | 55% | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | **4** |
|  | **Prior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.14 | 2 | ***4.14*** |
| **BEA2** | **2008** | 100% | 100% | 20% | 0% | 0% | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.8 | No Data |  |
|  | **12-13** | 50% | 83% | 0% | 16% | 92% | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | **4** |
|  | **Prior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.8 | 2 | ***4.8*** |
| **BEA3** | **2008** | 75% | 100% | 60% | 0% | 100% | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2.4 | No Data |  |
|  | **12-13** | 50% | 70% | 0% | 16% | 92% | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | **4** |
|  | **Prior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 | 1 | ***3.2*** |
| **BLC1** | **2008** | 50% | 50% | 20% | 0% | 100% | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1.8 | No Data |  |
|  | **12-13** | 100% | 100% | 75% | 13% | 91% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1.8 | 2 | ***3.2*** |
|  | **Prior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.08 | 2 | ***4.08*** |
| **BLC2** | **2008** | 100% | 100% | 20% | 20% | 50% | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | ` |
|  | **12-13** | 75% | 86% | 56% | 14% | 89% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **4** |
|  | **Prior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No Data | No Data |  |
| **EAN1** | **2008** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1.4 | 2.5 |  |
|  | **12-13** | 100% | 83% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1.8 | 2.5 | **4.4** |
|  | **Prior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.25 | 2 | ***4.25*** |
| **EAN2** | **2008** | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | No Data | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | No Data |  |
|  | **12-13** | 100% | 80% | 71% | 60% | 84% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | **5.5** |
|  | **Prior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 | 2 | ***4.2*** |
| **LOD1** | **2008** | 0% | 25% | 20% | 0% | 75% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1.4 | No Data |  |
|  | **2010** | 25% | 25% | 0% | 0% | 80% | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **3** | **1.4** | **No Data** |  |
|  | **12-13** | No Data | No Data | 50% | 0% | 100% |  |  | 2 | 1 | 3 | No Data | No Data |  |
|  | **Prior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.86 | 2 | ***3.86*** |
| **POT1** | **2008** | 33% | 60% | 20% | 0% | 33% | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1.6 | No Data |  |
|  | **2010** | 40% | 60% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1.8 | No Data |  |
|  | **12-13** | 50% | 67% | 0% | 0% | 82% | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | **4** |
|  | **Prior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | ***4*** |
| **COR1** | **2008** | 50% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 66% | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | No Data |  |
|  | **12-13** | 66% | 83% | 63% | 16% | 75% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **4** |
|  | **Prior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No Data | No Data | ***No Data*** |
| **WHR5** | **2008** | 100% | 66% | 43% | 66% | 100% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | No Data |  |
|  | **12-13** | 100% | 66% | 43% | 66% | 100% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | No Data | No Data |



**Figure 25: Combined Stream Health and Water Quality Trends for Streams Sampled from 2008 – 2011**

# 7.0 Discussion

Water quality sampling efforts between 2012-2013 indicate widespread impairments of fecal coliform bacteria (86%; 36 of 42 stations), E-coli bacteria (88%; 37 of 42 stations), total suspended sediments (40%; 17 of 42 stations), nitrate and total phosphorus at the suggested EPA limits of 5.6 mg/L to limit algal growth, total phosphorus (100%; 42 of 42 stations). There were no exceedances of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), ammonia (NH3), or nitrate (NO3) at the water quality standard of greater than 88 mg/L. Agricultural runoff is the most likely primary source of fecal coliform and E. Coli exceedances in the Bear in the Lodge and Pass Creek subwatersheds. Marnach (2013) found event E. coli and fecal coliform loadings at BEL2 and PAS3 were two log orders higher than base flow loadings during events indicating the primary pathogen transport pathway is by surface flow.

Natural erosion and agricultural runoff are the most likely sources of TSS and total phosphorus exceedances in the White River watershed. The draft total phosphorus numeric criterion was exceeded at all stations sampled between 2012-2013. Phosphorus concentrations of samples taken from the Cheyenne River watershed, which is mostly composed of marine sediments, are lower than the phosphorus concentrations of samples taken from the White River watershed samples, which is composed of varying amounts of volcanically derived sediments. Marnach (2013) found event TP and TSS loadings at BEL2 and PAS3 during events were between 2 and 2.5 log orders higher than during base flow indicating the most likely source of phosphorus exceedances across in the Bear in the Lodge, and Pass Creek subwatersheds is from the erosion of natural sources. Several sites with TSS exceedances are in the sparsely vegetated Badlands ecoregion.

Geochemical modeling supports natural erosion of sediments as the main source of phosphorus exceedances in the Wounded Knee, Porcupine Creek, Medicine Root, Bear in the Lodge, and Pass Creek subwatersheds. Increasing concentrations of phosphorus, sodium, and iron concentrations in downstream White River samples are consistent with a shift in geology from Pierre Shale and Arikaree Group sediments to White River Group sediments. Saturation indices indicate the transport of sodium is as a dissolved ion, and iron and phosphorus sorbed to sediments that are transported to the stream as overland flow. Hydroxyapatite (the solid form of phosphorus) is stable in alkaline waters. The 45-degree slope of the plot of soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP) to total phosphorus (TP) in water quality samples from Pine Ridge Reservation streams (Figure 25) indicates an approximately 1:1 relationship between SRP and TP at lower concentrations until an upper-limit is reached. The standard method for TP analysis is to conduct an SRP test after heating the sample for one hour in an acid solution, which increases hydroxyapatite solubility. Thus, the knee in the plot at approximately 0.5 mg/L in Figure 25 may be a function of the maximum sediment surface area available for SRP.




Figure 12: Total vs. Soluble Reactive Phosphorus

In general, nutrient enrichment affects water quality as the bioavailable nitrogen and phosphorus concentration increases algal and aquatic macrophyte density increases. Algae and aquatic macrophytes photosynthesize increasing the daytime dissolved oxygen concentration. However, as algae and aquatic macrophytes also respire at night when photosynthesis is not occurring, an abundance of algae and aquatic macrophytes can significantly reduce dissolved oxygen levels at night. Low nighttime dissolved oxygen concentrations affect macroinvertebrate families differently with populations of taxa sensitive to pollution including mayflies (*Ephemeroptera*), caddis flies *(Trichoptera*) and stone flies (*Plecoptera*) decreasing relative to pollution tolerant families including true flies *(Diptera*), freshwater shrimp (*Isopoda*) and worms *(Oligichaeta*).

The

The frequent flushing in Badlands streams may increase the resilience of Badlands macroinvertebrates communities to disturbance caused by nutrient loading, as well as promoting generalist feeding-strategies in Badlands macroinvertebrate populations. Two metrics for the Badlands ecoregion, %EPT and %Collector Gather, were statistically higher than for stations in other ecoregions with the same land use intensity. %EPT or percentage of *Ephemeroptera*, *Plecoptera*, and *Trichoptera* measures the relative abundance of sensitive organisms. %Collector Gathers is a measurement of trophic dynamics. Trophic measures are surrogates for complex processes such as trophic interaction, production, and food source availability (Barbour 1996). The higher relative abundance of sensitive and generalist species at Badlands ecoregion stations most likely results from a greater frequency of flood disturbance. Badlands watersheds are less vegetated and contain soils with very low infiltration rates. Thus, streams in the Badlands ecoregion are more likely to contain a greater volume of water immediately following a precipitation event than streams in other ecoregions. The greater volume of water most likely flushes organic material from Badlands streams more frequently than may occur in streams in other ecoregions, thereby increasing the nutrient assimilative capacity.

There is a widespread increase in stressed conditions when comparing two stream health metrics: Family Biotic Index (FBI) and %Collector Gatherers 2000s values to 1990s values.. Family Biotic index is a measure of the overall tolerance of a stream macroinvertebrate community to nutrient enrichment (Barbour 1996). %Collector Gathers is an indication of trophic dynamics. An increase in %Collector Gatherer indicates stressed conditions because specialized feeders, which are more sensitive to pollution, are declining relative to generalist feeders which have a broader range of acceptable food materials (Barbour 1996). The statistically significant declines are correlated with widespread fecal coliform and E-coli exceedances. Nutrient enrichment by agricultural runoff is the most likely explanation for the declines in health, as the declines in health are correlated with pathogen exceedances.

# 8.0 Recommendations

## 8.1 Implementation of Previous Recommendations

Three previous watershed assessments and non-point source management plans were developed prior to this report. Previous recommendations by Tetra-tech (2005) for non-point source management include the following action items: 1) minimize NPS pollutants in runoff from agricultural areas with strategies on a) identification of priority areas, b) improved coordination with other agencies, 2) identify and quantify natural sources of nutrients and metals to better distinguish and address nonpoint sources of pollutants with strategies including a) identifying and analyzing existing data sources and b) refining the existing monitoring program to facilitate investigation of natural contributions to surface water pollution, 3) minimize illegal dumping of household waste across the reservation, 4) identify data gaps including: monitoring for pesticides, fecal coliform, and total suspended solids, and 5) integration of water quality and biological assessment data. Previous recommendations by Matrix Consulting (2011) for non-point source management include the following action items: 1) fecal coliform and E-coli should be analyzed at a higher dilution level, 2) total coliform should be analyzed at a higher dilution level, 3) sampling of two watersheds per year for a period of two years including a) establishment of at least one continuous flow monitoring station per watershed that incorporates both flow and automated sampling, b) conduct monthly sampling in addition to c) event sampling of four to six events per year, d) rotation of the automated sampling at two-year intervals, 4) evaluate land use practices within each watershed to specifically identify potential sources of pollution, 5) develop load calculations to evaluate load reductions, 6) prioritization of watersheds for monitoring.

The OST Environmental Protection Program has made progress in the following areas:

**Recommendation 1 (Tetra Tech):** The OST Environmental Protection Program coordinated meetings with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, OST Land Office, South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, and Oglala Lakota College in fall 2012 to coordinate agricultural Best Management Practice (BMP) implementation. The meetings led to an implementation proposal submitted in 2012 that narrowly missed being funded and a resubmission by Respec on behalf of the OST EPP in 2013.

**Recommendation 2 (Tetra-tech):** OST Environmental Protection Program contacted faculty at SDSMT (Dr. Scott Kenner) and Oglala Lakota Collect (Mr. Charles Jason Tinant) to quantify natural sources of nutrients and metals to better distinguish and address non-point sources of pollutants. The result of the faculty contacts include: a) an updated NPS management plan and the establishment of load duration curves for fecal coliform, E-coli, phosphorus, and total suspended solids by Mr. Nicholas Marnach as part of an MS thesis funded in part through an EPA Education Grant, and b) analysis of phosphorus sources by Mr. Tinant (this report).

**Recommendation 3 (Tetra-tech):** The OST EPP is concerned about the risk of solid waste migration into reservation waterways. The volume of solid waste in found in waterways indicates a need for more public education. Solid waste in waterways also indicates the need of a sustainable solid waste management plan for the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation.The most recent version of the solid waste management plan version was collaboratively developed by the IHS, BIA, USEPA, Rapid City Landfill Director, Chadron Landfill operators, and the OST EHTT and approved by the OST Tribal Council. The essence of the plan was to transition service towards individualized service. However, the plan has not been implemented. The solid waste plan is being revisited through the support of Oglala Lakota College. We are planning a comprehensive review of the current operations of the Solid Waste facilities and to review the suggested action in all previous plans as part of guided pre-engineering student projects in summer 2014.

**Recommendation 4 (Tetra-tech):** The OST EPP now routinely samples for fecal coliform, e-coli, and total suspended solids. The OST EPP does not routinely sample sampling for pesticides. However, the USGS did conduct a comprehensive study of shallow ground water for the Pine Ridge reservation (Heaken 2000) that did not detect pesticides in shallow ground water. The Natural Resources Regulatory Agency has a pesticide pollution prevention program monitors pesticide use on the reservation.

**Recommendation 5 (Tetra-tech):** The OST EPP asked Oglala Lakota College to help with stream bioassessment. In 2010, Mr. Charles Jason Tinant began an undergraduate student research program focusing on macroinvertebrate bioassessment. Results of the research program are included in this report.

**Recommendations 1 and 2 (Matrix):** The OST EPP is working with OLC, Energy Labs, and the EPA to improve the reliability of the pathogen sampling program. In 2013, the OST EPP revised the pathogen sampling program in order to improve the reliability of results and to maximize sampling program efficiency.

**Recommendation 3 (Matrix):** The OST EPP worked with SDSMT to sample Pass Creek and Bear in the Lodge Creek watersheds in 2012-2013. Continuous flow monitoring stations coupled with automated sampling were established at Pass Creek 3 and Bear in the Lodge Creek 2. Event sampling was conducted at both stations in 2012-2013. Continuous flow monitoring and automated sampling is planned for Medicine Root Creek. An additional six continuous flow monitoring stations were set up at WOK2, WOK4, POR2, POR3, MER3, and MER4 through a partnership with OLC. In addition to stream flow, the stations are monitoring pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, and temperature at 15-minute intervals.

**Recommendation 4 (Matrix):** Pollution sources within each watershed have not been specifically identified. However, Jason Tinant under the direction of Dr. Scott Kenner is planning a flow-duration based TMDL study that should identify specific pollution sources within the watershed.

**Recommendation 5 (Matrix):** Load calculations for Pass Creek III and Bear in the Lodge Creek II have been developed from event samples (see Marnach 2013). EPP staff have purchased stream flow monitoring equipment, received training to collect stream flow data and have developed a comprehensive stream-flow monitoring program, which is at early implementation.

**Recommendation 6 (Matrix):** The EPP has implemented the watershed prioritization schedule recommended by Matrix.

## 8.2 Recommendations Based on Recent Findings

The following recommendations were given in the 2008-2011 report to the OST EPP. These recommendations remain

### 8.2.1 Parameters of Concern and Monitoring Recommendations

The non-point source parameters of concern include both conventional and non-conventional pollutants including: pathogens, total suspended solids, and nutrients. However, the recent change in the sediment water quality standard for the White River has reduced the number of total suspended solids exceedances for Pine Ridge reservation streams. Physical parameter exceedances, which were not analyzed in this report, will be analyzed as part of an upcoming report.

The following parameters were sampled during 2008 – 2013 for water quality samples collected during three months with the highest annual precipitation, April, May and June, and four months with low precipitation, July, August, September, and October based on beneficial use criteria. Additional parameters were sampled to better understand phosphorus sources and to develop a more complete understanding of the distribution of common inorganic ions in order to evaluate historical metals data as part of Tetra-tech recommendation 1.

Physical Parameters (2008 – 2013):

* stream flow
* pH
* temperature
* conductivity
* dissolved oxygen
* turbidity

Conventional Pollutants (2008 – 2013):

* biochemical oxygen demand (BOD)
* total suspended solids (TSS)
* fecal coliform bacteria
* E-coli

Non-conventional pollutants (2008 – 2013):

* ammonia-nitrogen (NH3)
* nitrate-nitrogen (NO3)
* total phosphorus

Additional parameters sampled one or more years between 2008 and 2013:

* Total coliform bacteria
* soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP)
* hardness
* calcium
* magnesium
* sodium
* potassium
* chloride
* sulfate

Recommendations for physical parameters, conventional and non-conventional pollutants are discussed in detail below.

**Stream flow** is the most important physical parameter measured by EPP staff. Stream flow is necessary to calculate load from concentration data. Load calculations determine the reduction of pollutant load necessary to achieve water quality standards (See equations 1 - 3). Discussion with EPP staff have identified several challenges in collecting and verifying stream flow including: out of date or broken equipment, a lack of training opportunities for staff, inability to field verify stream flow measurements, lack of software to capture/calculate flow data, challenges in maintaining mechanical stream flow measuring equipment.

Equation 1 –Stream Flow Calculation

Equation 2 – Load Calculation

Equation 3 - Unit Conversion (kg/day)

**Recommendation 1b:** Establishment of permanent staff gauges at flow monitoring stations will allow for the establishment of a stage – discharge relationship. The stage – discharge relationship will provide greater quality control of stream flow data and over time can be used to understand fluvial morphological changes in the stream near the monitored segment.

**Recommendation 1a:** The purchase of and training with an acoustic doppler-type flow meter with integrated quality-control software (for example: Flow-tracker, which is used by the USGS, or a similar meter) will alleviate many challenges with maintaining equipment and capturing and calculating high quality flow data.

**pH** is a measurement of hydrogen ion concentration on a logarithmic scale. pH is related to pOH, which is a measurement of hydroxide ion concentration on a logarithmic scale. pH values for Pine Ridge reservation streams are typically about 8.1, which indicates that there is about 100 times as much hydroxide ion as hydrogen ion in stream waters. Thus, pH has implications on the amount of metals in streams, with streams having high pH tending to have low concentrations of most metals with arsenic being a notable exception. pH is often measured along with alkalinity. Alkalinity provides buffering capacity for pH values from about 6.5 to about 8.5. Pine Ridge reservation streams tend to have high alkalinities, thus pH measurements which are either very low (below about 7.5) or very high (above about 8.7) may be indicative of equipment failure, calibration solution contamination, or the need to recalibrate instruments at a higher frequency. pH measurement is a requirement under South Dakota water quality standards (Appendix 1).

**Recommendation 2a:** Calibration logs for pH, conductivity, turbidity and dissolved oxygen should be maintained as part of a Quality Assurance Protection Plan. Anomalous measurements can be checked against the calibration logs in order to identify equipment failures from changes in loadings into stream segments.

**Recommendation 2b:** Alkalinity should be added to the list of parameters to be analyzed in future years. Alkalinity is a Fish and Wildlife Propagation, Recreation, and Stock Watering Waters Criteria. Furthermore, measurement of alkalinity for will provide an early indication of changes to acidic or basic loadings into stream segments.

**Temperature** is a measurement of the amount of heat in a quantity of water. Temperatures tend to be highest during low flows and in unshaded segments of streams. Temperature measurement is a requirement under South Dakota water quality standards (Appendix 1).

**Conductivity** is a measurement of the amount of dissolved solids in a quantity of water. Temperature measurement is a requirement under South Dakota water quality standards (Appendix 1).

**Dissolved oxygen** is a measurement of the amount of oxygen is available for fish or other aquatic life. Thus, dissolved oxygen is a criteria parameter for fish life propagation. Low dissolved oxygen in streams can occur in two ways: 1) BOD loading from the watershed or a point source and 2) stream eutrophication from nutrient loading. Low dissolved oxygen and high BOD concentrations are consistent with streams receiving point source discharges from wastewater treatment plants. Streams experiencing high nutrient loadings (e.g. soluble phosphorus and soluble inorganic nitrogen loadings (e.g. NH3, NO2, NO3)) will typically have high daytime and low nighttime dissolved oxygen concentrations because algal and photosynthesis converts alkalinity to algal biomass and dissolved oxygen. In stream dissolved oxygen concentration decreases during the night as the algal population continues to respire. Streams segments monitored from 2008 to 2011 typically had low BOD concentrations, and high phosphorus and nitrogen loadings. Daytime dissolved oxygen concentrations measured between 2008-2011 were typically above 100% saturation (Tinant unpublished data). Dissolved oxygen measurements for selected Wounded Knee Creek subwatershed stations in the measured in summer 2012 shifted up to 6 mg/L over 24-hours (Tinant unpublished data). The large shifts in dissolved oxygen over 24-hours are correlated with overall macroinvertebrate community trends in the Wounded Knee Creek watershed. Dissolved oxygen measurement is a requirement under South Dakota water quality standards (Appendix 1).

**Recommendation 3:** Twenty-four hour measurement of dissolved oxygen should be implemented as part of a future monitoring strategy. Existing EPP water quality instrumentation has the capacity to collect continuous (e.g. 15-minute interval) dissolved oxygen data. The instrument can be secured using water quality probe shroud, which can be fashioned by a machine shop.

**Turbidity** is a measurement of water clarity. Water becomes cloudy as a result of the suspension of clay-sized particles or as a result of phytoplankton growth. Turbidity measurement is not currently a requirement under South Dakota water quality standards.

**Biochemical oxygen demand (BOD)** is a measurement of labile dissolved carbon compounds. The BOD tests measure labile carbon consumption by bacteria over a five-day interval by measuring the change in dissolved oxygen over the five-day interval. BOD measurement is a requirement under South Dakota water quality standards (Appendix 1).

**Total suspended solids (TSS)** is a measurement of the amount of sediment and organic compounds entrained in the water column. TSS measurement is conducted by filtering a quantity of a water sample and weighing the residue left on the filter conduct the measurement. TSS measurement is a requirement under South Dakota water quality standards (Appendix 1). A recent change in the South Dakota water quality standards increased the water quality standard for White River stations from 158 mg/L to 4525 mg/L. The majority of White River Badlands stations (4 of 6) were designated as threatened or impaired in TSS. However a TMDL may indicate that natural sources may be large component of TSS loading given that the natural erosion from White River group sediments have been identified as the major source of suspended sediments in the White River below Rockyford.

**Recommendation 4:** Identify partners and funding sources for Total Suspended Solids TMDL development for White River Badlands ecoregion stations (see below).

**Fecal coliform bacteria** and **E-coli bacteria** are counts of coliform bacteria commonly occurring in the intestines of mammals and birds. “E-coli bacteria is the major species in the fecal coliform group. Of the five general groups of bacteria that comprise the total coliforms, only E. coli is generally not found growing and reproducing in the environment. Consequently, E. coli is considered to be the species of coliform bacteria that is the best indicator of fecal pollution and the possible presence of pathogens.” (NY Dept. of Health 2013). Increased levels of fecal coliform bacteria and E-coli bacteria are an indication of either the failure of a water treatment system or the presence of livestock using streams as a watering source. Fecal coliform bacteria in water in most cases are not harmful to humans. However, the presence of fecal coliform and E-coli bacteria indicates a higher risk of pathogens in water such as: hepatitis A, hepatitis C, dysentery, typhoid fever, and gastroenteritis, and cholera. Fecal coliform bacteria and E-coli bacteria measurement are requirements under South Dakota water quality standards (Appendix 1). Fecal coliform and E-coli are the major sources of impairment in Pine Ridge reservation waters between 2008-2011.

**Recommendation 5:** Continue the strategy outlined by Matrix for continuous flow monitoring and automated sampling for at least one station per watershed that incorporates both flow and automated sampling. Monthly sampling should be conducted in addition to automated sampling of four to six events for a minimum of a one-year period with two years recommended to fully evaluate the watershed. Two watersheds should be sampled each year for a period of two years (and only those watersheds) and rotated every two years. Event samples should be evaluated for fecal coliform and E-coli, as well as TSS, and nutrients.

**Ammonia-nitrogen** is a measure of total ammonia (NH3 + NH4) concentration. Ammonia is toxic to fish and shellfish life. Ammonia concentration depends on temperature and pH. Ammonia is converted to nitrate (NO3) by bacteria in oxygenated streams. Sampling between 2008-2011 indicated that ammonia is not a significant concern. Ammonia measurement is required under South Dakota water quality standards (Appendix 1).

**Recommendation 6:** Best Management Practice (BMP) implementation over the short-term should focus primarily on fecal coliform, E-coli, and TSS reductions through agricultural best management practice implementation.

**Nitrate-nitrogen (NO3)** monitoring is required under South Dakota water quality standards for fish and wildlife propagation, recreation, and stock watering waters (Appendix 1). However the daily maximum of 88 mg/L and the 30-day average of 50 mg/L are 16,000% and 9,000%, respectively, of the EPA recommendation of 0.56 mg/L for total nitrogen (NDOM + NH3 + NO2 + NO3). Stoichiometric and geochemical analysis of nitrate and phosphorus indicates nitrogen is the limiting nutrient for algal blooms for reservation streams. Stream monitoring in 2011 – 2013 indicates a qualitative increase in algal biomass in the Wounded Knee Creek subwatershed. However, it is not clear from available data if the rapid bioassessment protocols used by the Environmental Protection Program to assess are detecting a quantitative increase in algal biomass.

**Recommendation 7b:** Rapid Bioassessment Protocol Physical Results should be analyzed with chemical data in order to detect changes in algal biomass over time and for Best Management Practice evaluation. Furthermore, riparian cover should be measured at each station in order to better forecast the effects of eutrophication at a site level.

The EPA has provided guidance for the developing nutrient criteria for States and Tribes that reflect local conditions and specific designated uses (EPA 2001). The guidance recommends the following prioritization for the development of nutrient criteria for nitrogen: 1) total nitrogen (TN) reported values in cases where there are a large number of streams in the sample, 2) the calculated median lowest 25th percentile values for subecoregions when there development of nutrient criteria where data are missing or very low, 3) the lowest aggregated values when a similar subecoregion can not be determined. The Pine Ridge reservation contains two subecoregions: subecoregion 43 – northwestern Great Plains and subecoregion 44 – Nebraska Sandhills. Reported median TN values are 0.65 mg/L (n=12) for subecoregion 43 – northwestern Great Plains and 0.80 mg/L (n=17) for subecoregion 44 – Nebraska Sandhills. Calculated median TN values are 0.38 mg/L (n range = 75 - 100) for subecoregion 43 – northwestern Great Plains and 0.35 mg/L (n range = 11 - 19) for subecoregion 44 – Nebraska Sandhills. The aggregate median reported TN values for ecoregion VI streams, which includes regions in South Dakota, Montana, North Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas, are 56 mg/L (n = 65) and 61 mg/L (n range = 212 – 299). The aggregate value of 0.56 mg/L was chosen for this report because 1) it represents a compromise between the lower calculated subecoregion values and the higher reported values for subecoregions 43 and 44, and represents the median aggregate value with the highest sample size.

**Recommendation 7a:** The Environmental Protection Program should adopt a water quality goal of 0.56 mg/L for Total Nitrogen in order to limit eutrophication and degradation of stream health in Pine Ridge reservation streams.

**Total Phosphorus (TP)** monitoring is not currently required under South Dakota numeric water quality standards (Appendix 1). However, total phosphorus monitoring is required by most States and is generally discussed as part of South Dakota law:

*\*74:51:01:09. Nuisance aquatic life. Materials which produce nuisance aquatic life may not be discharged or caused to be discharged into surface waters of the state in concentrations that impair an existing or designated beneficial use or create a human health problem.*

*\*74:51:01:12. Biological integrity of waters. All waters of the state must be free from substances, whether attributable to human-induced point source discharges or nonpoint source activities, in concentrations or combinations which will adversely impact the structure and function of indigenous or intentionally introduced aquatic communities.*

While stoichiometric and geochemical analysis of nitrate and phosphorus indicates nitrogen is the limiting nutrient for algal blooms for reservation streams, continued phosphorus monitoring is important in order to detect changes in land use by shifts in the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus. A numeric goal for total phosphorus or soluble reactive phosphorus (see below) should be adopted by the OST Environmental Protection Program in preparation for the adoption of water quality standards for Oglala Sioux Tribal Waters.

The EPA has provided guidance for the developing nutrient criteria for States and Tribes that reflect local conditions and specific designated uses (EPA 2001). The guidance recommends developing an initial standard and then refining the standard based on weight of evidence including: 1) literature sources, 2) historical data and trends, 3) reference condition, 4) models, 5) expert view and consensus, and downstream effects. Along this framework, the OST Tribe has adopted a draft TP standard of 37 ug/L that is consistent with reported median TP values of 28 ug/L (n = 111, range = 2 - 1,514 ug/L) for subecoregion 43 – northwestern Great Plains and reported aggregate median TP values of 23 ug/L (n = 341, range = 0 - 2,070 ug/L) and below the reported median TP value of 157 ug/L (n = 23 range = 104 - 598) for subecoregion 44 – Nebraska Sandhills. A historical trend for Pine Ridge reservation streams has not been established. However, analysis of historical data (this report) indicates that the 37 ug/L standard is unobtainable. One way to establish a general reference condition is by aggregating all of the stations and using the 25th percentile (EPA 2001). By this method, the TP standard for OST Tribal Waters should be set at 90 ug/L. The 90 ug/L standard should be evaluated at an ecoregion level as the most likely source for total phosphorus is by natural erosion (Tetra tech 2005, Matrix 2011, this report).

**Recommendation 8:** The Environmental Protection Program should adopt a water quality goal of 90 ug/L for Total Phosphorus to limit the potential for eutrophication and degradation of stream health in Pine Ridge reservation streams, with possibly higher limits for particular ecoregions or subwatersheds to account for the high background phosphorus concentrations.

**Total coliform bacteria** is the count of coliform bacteria occurring in soils, contaminated water, and the intestines of mammals and birds. Because total coliform bacteria includes bacteria growing in soils, it is not a good indicator of pathogens. **Total coliform bacteria sampling may be dropped from the monitoring program.**

**Soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP)** is the concentration of bioavailable phosphorus. The advantages to soluble reactive phosphorus measurements are 1) it is not correlated with chlorophyll in the water column as is total phosphorus (Biggs 2000) or with total suspended solids as is the likely case in Pine Ridge Reservation streams (see discussion), 2) analysis does not requires a digestion step as does total phosphorus, 3) because it is less temporarily variable than total phosphorus, which requires weekly monitoring for good estimates of mean concentration (Biggs 2000), good estimates can be obtained by monthly sampling. The main disadvantages are 1) phosphorus bound in organic matter (Biggs 2000) or in sediment (this report) *might*become available to algae and aquatic plants and would not be accounted for in a soluble reactive phosphorus test and 2) results might not be directly transferrable with TP results from other streams in Nebraska and South Dakota.

**Hardness** is a measurement of divalent ion concentration, which is mostly calcium and magnesium. The Environmental Protection Program measured hardness in order to calibrate geochemical models following the Tetra-tech report. Later, other major ions including: **calcium, magnesium, sodium, potassium, chloride, and sulfate** were added in order to better characterize streams for geochemical models as historical trace metals data was available, however major ion data was not available. Our modeling (this report) indicates there is now enough major ion data to address exploratory geochemical modeling questions. Thus, **hardness, calcium, magnesium, sodium, potassium, chloride, and sulfate can be dropped from the current monitoring program.**

**Macroinvertebrate assessment** is a key element of understanding trends in stream ecosystem structure and function, and ecosystem integrity in Pine Ridge reservation streams. Macroinvertebrate health metrics incorporate taxa richness, dominance of taxa that are sensitive or insensitive to pollution, and balance of functional feeding groups. Five of the seven individual stream health indices: EPT Index, %EPT, FBI, %Dipteran and Non-Insect, and %Collector Gatherers detected differences in land use. However, the macroinvertebrate health metrics: Taxa Richness and %Dominance did not detect land use differences. A possible reason these indices did not detect differences in land use is that taxa richness increases under moderate levels of nutrient enrichment and single taxon dominance may not occur until a stream is under high levels of nutrient enrichment.

## 8.3 Best Management Practices (BMPs)

**Recommendation 10:** The Environmental Protection Program should ask for guidance for macroinvertebrate health metrics from EPA Region 8 staff based on the finding that Taxa Richness and %Dominance did not detect differences in land use, thus other metrics might be more reliable indicators of changes from oligotrophic to mesotrophic conditions in Pine Ridge reservation streams.

An evaluation of land management practices needs to be completed to identify specific BMPs for implementation within each watershed. In order to accomplish this, Tinant and Kenner have planned a flow-duration-curve based TMDL for smaller reservation streams that will be conducted as part of Tinant’s proposed PhD dissertation.

This report addresses some changes in approaches to best management practice implementation from previous reports. Best management priorities should be updated to reflect a major finding of the White River Phase II TMDL that the high sediment concentration in streams is from natural sources from White River Group sediments. The finding resulted in an increase in the sediment water quality limit from 148 mg/L to 4525 mg/L for White River streams. At present 14 stream segments are exceeding water quality standards, of which 50% (7 of 14) are in White River Group sediments indicating that both natural sources and human impacts are likely contributing to the sediment exceedances in different watersheds. The highest priorities for best management practice implementation should be for bacteria, followed by nutrients and sediment (see Table .

BMP priorities established in previous NPS management plan are still relevant. However, more recent findings indicate that agricultural BMPs associated with livestock production are the most efficient BMPs in terms of implementation. Furthermore, with the recent changes in allowable sediment levels for White River stream, sediment from natural sources should not be listed for BMP implementation. Table 29 provides a list of BMPs with priorities for implementation listed in BOLD. Suggestions for BMP implementation from Matrix (2011) are still relevant.

Table 29 Priority NPS Pollutants

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Pollutant** | **Contributing NPS Categories** |
| Bacteria | * **Agriculture – Livestock production** * Septic systems |
| Nutrients | * **Agriculture – Livestock production** * Agriculture – Crop production * Septic systems * Urban runoff from towns and villages |
| Sediment | * **Agriculture – Livestock production** * Agriculture – Crop production * Urban runoff from towns and villages |

**Livestock Production**

1. Work with NRCS, BIA, and Tribal Land Office on an ongoing basis to identify producers needing assistance to implement BMPs for grazing lands and calving and winter feeding areas.
2. Identify specific projects and funding sources for target producers.
3. Secure funding and implement projects for target producers.
4. Conduct monitoring to assess BMP effectiveness in reducing NPS pollutant contributions.

**Crop Production**

1. Identify specific BMPs and funding sources for target producers.
2. Secure funding and implement projects for target producers.
3. Conduct monitoring to assess BMP effectiveness in reducing NPS pollutant contributions.
   1. Establish monitoring strategies for priority projects.

**Urban runoff from roads**

1. Track proposed road construction and ongoing maintenance activities within reservation boundaries.
2. Ensure implementation of BMPs to control erosion on road construction and maintenance projects.

**Construction**

1. Track of proposed construction activities within reservations boundaries.
2. Ensure implementation of BMPs to be implemented on construction sites.

**Septic systems**

1. Improve information sharing and coordination with Indian Health Service to share or leverage resources to improve septic services across the reservation.
2. Rehabilitate failing septic systems and relocate poorly sited systems.
3. Ensure proper siting and environmental review for new septic system installation.
4. Address jurisdictional uncertainty for non-tribal lands within the reservation boundaries.

**Urban runoff from towns and villages**

1. Identify significant urban runoff drainages.
   1. Perform a field inspection to identify storm water flow paths and discharge points.
   2. Categorize the urban runoff sources on the basis of the volume of runoff discharged to surface waters.
2. Conduct targeted outreach on BMPs to improve the quality of storm water runoff in significant urban runoff drainages.
3. Implement programs to encourage businesses and homeowners to implement BMPs.

## 8.4 Next Steps

The following items are identified as next steps for the OST Water Pollution Control Program:

* Evaluation of land management practices within each watershed
  + - Implement BMPs with a focus on livestock production
* Complete next Watershed Assessment
* Prepare EPA Grant Applications for BMP Implementation

# 9.0 Public Participation and Education

## 9.1 Education

Education of Tribal members and other reservation residents is critical in the reduction of NPS pollution and in BMP implementation. The educational activities, their frequencies, and funding requirements discussed by Matrix (2011) and listed in Table 30 remain important milestones for public participation and education.

Table 30 Environmental Education Activities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Frequency** |
| Work with owners and land managers of livestock areas and cropland to encourage the use of BMPs. | 2 to 3 times per year |
| Solicit feedback from reservation residents and distribute educational materials to deter illegal dumping | 2 to 3 times during 2005– 2006, with follow-up as needed |
| Distribute educational materials on septic systems to reservation residents. | Once every 5 years, with follow-up as needed |
| Distribute storm water educational materials to business owners and homeowners in the towns of Martin, Oglala, Pine Ridge, and Kyle, and in other towns as needed. | 2 times per year during public meetings |
| Work with Shannon, Jackson, and Bennett counties to discuss NPS pollution issues and BMP implementation. Both Shannon and Bennett counties have developed Hydrologic Unit Plans and have ranked priorities for their watersheds (i.e. soil erosion, weed control, grazing management, Prairie Dog control). | 2 times per year |

# Works Cited

Carter, J., & Heakin, A. (2007). *Generalized Potentiometric Surface of the Arikaree Aquifer, Pine Ridge Indian Reservation and Bennett County, South Dakota.* U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Map 2993, 2 sheets.

Carter, J., Sando, S., & Hayes, T. (1998). *Source, Occurence, and Extent of Arsenic in the Grass Mountain Area of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, South Dakota.* U.S. Geological Survey Investigations Report 97-4286, 90 p.

Environmental Protection Agency (2001). *Ambient Water Quality Criteria Recommendations: Information Supporting the Development of State and Tribal Nutrient Criteria - Rivers and Streams in Nutrient Ecoregion IV.* Office of Water. Washington DC.

Energy Laboratories. (2010). *Oglala Sioux Tribe Environmental Protection Program-Laboratory Analytical Report.* Rapid City.

Heakin, A. (2000). *Water Quality of Selected Springs and Public-Supply Wells, Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, South Dakota, 1992-97.* U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 99-4063, 61 p.

Oglala Sioux Tribe. (2002). *OST Water Quality Management Code.* Pine Ridge: OST Environmental Health Technical Team, Environmental Protection Program.

Oglala Sioux Tribe Water Resources Department. (1999). *Integration of Benthic Macroinvertebrate Rapid Bioassessment Habitat Quality Data and Chemical Water Quality Data for Streams and Rivers on the Pine Ridge Reservation.*

SD Department of Enviroment & Natural Resources, Pirner, Steven M. (2010). *The 2010 South Dakota Integrated Report Surface Water Quality Assessment.* South Dakota Department of Enviroment & Natural Resources.

SD Department of Environment & Natural Resources. (2011, January). *Surface Water Quality Standards*. Retrieved January 2011, from South Dakota, DENR: http://denr.sd.gov/des/sw/swqstandards.aspx

SD Legislature. (2010). *Administrative Rules*. Retrieved August 12, 2010, from Surface Water Quality Standards: http://legis.state.sd.us/rules/DisplayRule.aspx?Rule=74:51:01

South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources. (2005). *Phase 1 Environmental Assessment of the White River Watershed-White River, South Dakota.*

South Dakota Department of Natural Resources. (2011). *Surface Water Quality Standards*. Retrieved February 2011, from SD DENR: http://denr.sd.gov/des/sw/swqstandards.aspx

Tetra Tech, Inc. (2005a). *Nonpoint Source Assessment Report for the Oglala Sioux Tribe.* Denver: United States Environment Protection Agency-Region 8.

Tetra Tech, Inc. (2005b). *NPS Managment Program Plan for the Oglala Sioux Tribe.* Denver: United States Environmental Protection Agency-Region 8.

The U.S. Government's Printing Office. (2011, January 11). *Electronic Code of Federal Regulations.* Retrieved January 2011, from GPO Access: http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=ecfr&rgn=div5&view=text&node=40:21.0.1.1.18&idno=40#40:21.0.1.1.18.1

United States Environmental Protection Agency. (2010). *Handbook for Developing Watershed Plans to Restore and Protect Our Waters.*

New York Department of Health. (2013, October 27). *Coliform bacteria in Drinking Water Supplies.* Retrieved October 2013, from: http://www.health.ny.gov/environmental/water/drinking /coliform\_bacteria.htm

# APPENDIX

# Appendix A Tables Surface Water Quality Standards

Table 7 Criteria for Coldwater Marginal Fish Life Propagation Waters

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 74:51:01:46. Criteria for coldwater marginal fish life propagation waters. | | | |
| Parameter | Criteria | Unit of Measure | Special Conditions |
| Total ammonia nitrogen as N | Equal to or less than the result from Equation 3 in Appendix A | mg/L | 30-day average |
| Equal to or less than the result from Equation 1 in Appendix A | Daily maximum |
| Dissolved oxygen as measured anywhere in the water column of a non-stratified water body, or in the epilimnion and metalimnion of a stratified water body | ≥ 5.0 | mg/L | Daily minimum |
| Undisassociated hydrogen sulfide | ≤ 0.002 | mg/L | Daily maximum |
| pH | ≥ 6.5 - ≤ 9.0 | Units | See § 74:51:01:07 |
| Total Suspended Solids | ≤ 90 | mg/L | 30-day average |
| ≤ 158 | Daily maximum |
| Temperature | ≤ 75 | ͦF | See § 74:51:01:31 |

Table 8 Criteria for Warmwater Permanent Fish Life Propagation Waters

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 74:51:01:47. Criteria for warmwater permanent fish life propagation waters. | | | |
| Parameter | Criteria | Unit of Measure | Special Conditions |
| Total ammonia nitrogen as N | Equal to or less than the result from Equation 3 in Appendix A | mg/L | 30-day average March 1 – October 31 |
| Equal to or less than the result from Equation 4 in Appendix A | 30 day average November 1 – February 29 |
| Equal to or less than the result from Equation 2 in Appendix A | Daily maximum |
| Dissolved oxygen as measured anywhere in the water column of a non-stratified water body, or in the epilimnion and metalimnion of a stratified water body | ≥ 5.0 | mg/L | Daily minimum |
| ≥6.0 | In Big Stone Lake and Lake Traverse during April and May |
| Undisassociated hydrogen sulfide | ≤ 0.002 | mg/L | Daily maximum |
| pH | ≥ 6.5 - ≤ 9.0 | Units | See § 74:51:01:07 |
| Total Suspended Solids | ≤ 90 | mg/L | 30-day average |
| ≤ 158 | Daily maximum |
| Temperature | ≤ 80 | ͦF | See § 74:51:01:31 |

Table 9 Criteria for Warmwater Semipermanent Fish Life Propagation Waters

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 74:51:01:48. Criteria for warmwater semipermanent fish life propagation waters. | | | |
| Parameter | Criteria | Unit of Measure | Special Conditions |
| Total ammonia nitrogen as N | Equal to or less than the result from Equation 3 in Appendix A | mg/L | 30-day average  March 1 – October 31 |
| Equal to or less than the result from Equation 4 in Appendix A | 30-day average November 1 – February 29 |
| Equal to or less than the result from Equation 2 in Appendix A | Daily maximum |
| Dissolved oxygen as measured anywhere in the water column of a non-stratified water body, or in the epilimnion and metalimnion of a stratified water body | ≥ 5.0 | mg/L | Daily minimum |
| Undisassociated hydrogen sulfide | ≤ 0.002 | mg/L | Daily maximum |
| pH | ≥ 6.5 - ≤ 9.0 | Units | See § 74:51:01:07 |
| Total Suspended Solids | ≤ 90 | mg/L | 30-day average |
| ≤ 158 | Daily maximum |
| Temperature | ≤ 90 | ͦF | See § 74:51:01:31 |

Table 10 Criteria for Immersion Recreation Waters

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 74:51:01:50. Criteria for immersion recreation waters. | | | |
| Parameter | Criteria | Unit of Measure | Special Conditions |
| Dissolved oxygen as measured anywhere in the water column of a non-stratified water body, or in the epilimnion and metalimnion of a stratified water body | ≥ 5.0 | mg/L | Daily minimum |
| Fecal coliform | ≤ 200 | /100mL | Geometric mean based on a minimum of 5 samples obtained during separate 24-hour periods for an 30-day period, and they may not exceed this value in more than 20% of the samples examined in this same 30-day period |
| ≤ 400 | In any one sample |
| Escherichia coli | ≤ 126 | /100mL | Geometric mean based on a minimum of 5 samples obtained during separate 24-hour periods for any 30-day period |
| ≤ 235 | In any one sample |

Table 11 Criteria for Fish and Wildlife Propagation, Recreation, and Stock Watering Waters

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 74:51:01:52. Criteria for fish and wildlife propagation, recreation, and stock watering waters. | | | |
| Parameter | Criteria | Unit of Measure | Special Conditions |
| Total alkalinity as calcium carbonate | ≤ 750 | mg/L | 30-day average |
| ≤ 1313 | Daily maximum |
| Total dissolved solids | ≤ 2,500 | mg/L | 30-day average |
| ≤ 4375 | Daily maximum |
| Conductivity at 25 ͦC | ≤ 4,000 | Micromhos/cm | 30-day average |
| ≤ 7,000 | Daily maximum |
| Nitrates as N | ≤ 50 | mg/L | 30-day average |
| ≤ 88 | Daily maximum |
| pH | ≥ 6.5 - ≤ 9.0 | Units | See § 74:51:01:07 |
| Total petroleum hydrocarbon | ≤ 10 | mg/L | See § 74:51:01:10 |
| Oil and grease | ≤ 10 | mg/L | See § 74:51:01:10 |

(Table information is from the website <http://legis.state.sd.us/rules/DisplayRule.aspx?Rule=74:51:01> SD Legislature – Administrative Rules – Chapter 74:51:01 Surface Water Quality Standards)

Table 12 Wounded Knee Creek Criteria Comparison

| **Site #** | **Parameter** | **NPS Assessment Criteria** | **SD DENR Criteria** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| WKI | pH (upper limit) | ≤ 8.8 s.u. | ≤ 9.0 s.u. |
| Dissolved Oxygen | ≥ 5 mg/L | ≥ 5 mg/L |
| Phosphorus, total | ≤ 36.56 µg/L | \*See Narrative Criteria |
| Arsenic | ≤ 0.14 µg/L |  |
| Iron | ≤300 µg/L |  |
| Manganese | ≤ 100 µg/L |  |
| Mercury | ≤ 0.012 µg/L |  |
| Nitrate as N |  | ≤88 mg/L |
| Total Ammonia Nitrogen as N |  | \*\*Based on pH |
| Fecal coliform |  | ≤ 400 /100mL |
| Escherichia coli |  | ≤ 235 /100mL |
| TSS |  | ≤ 158 mg/L |
| Temperature |  | ≤ 75 ͦF\*  ≤ 80 ͦF |
| WKII | pH (upper limit) | ≤ 8.8 s.u. | ≤ 9.0 s.u. |
| Dissolved oxygen | ≥ 5 mg/L | ≥ 5 mg/L |
| Turbidity | ≤ 5.70 NTU |  |
| Phosphorus, total | ≤ 36.56 µg/L | \*See Narrative Criteria |
| Arsenic | ≤ 0.14 µg/L |  |
| Cadmium | ≤0.66 µg/L |  |
| Iron | ≤1,000 µg/L |  |
| Manganese | ≤ 100 µg/L |  |
| Mercury | ≤ 0.012 µg/L |  |
| Nitrate as N |  | ≤88 mg/L |
| Total Ammonia Nitrogen as N |  | \*\*Based on pH |
| Fecal coliform |  | ≤ 400 /100mL |
| Escherichia coli |  | ≤ 235 /100mL |
| TSS |  | ≤ 158 mg/L |
| Temperature |  | ≤ 75 ͦF\*  ≤ 80 ͦF |
| WKIII | pH (upper limit) | ≤ 8.8 s.u. | ≤ 9.0 s.u. |
| Dissolved oxygen | ≥ 5 mg/L | ≥ 5 mg/L |
| Turbidity | ≤ 5.70 NTU |  |
| Phosphorus, total | ≤ 36.56 µg/L | \*See Narrative Criteria |
| Arsenic | ≤ 0.14 µg/L |  |
| Cadmium | ≤0.66 µg/L |  |
| Iron | ≤1,000 µg/L  ≤300 µg/L |  |
| Manganese | ≤ 100 µg/L |  |
| Mercury | ≤ 0.012 µg/L |  |
| Nitrate as N |  | ≤88 mg/L |
| Total Ammonia Nitrogen as N |  | \*\*Based on pH |
| Fecal coliform |  | ≤ 400 /100mL |
| Escherichia coli |  | ≤ 235 /100mL |
| TSS |  | ≤ 158 mg/L |
| Temperature |  | ≤ 80 ͦF |
| WKIV | pH (upper limit) | ≤ 9.0 s.u. | ≤ 9.0 s.u. |
| Dissolved oxygen | ≥ 5 mg/L | ≥ 5 mg/L |
| Turbidity | ≤ 5.70 NTU |  |
| Phosphorus, total | ≤ 36.56 µg/L | \*See Narrative Criteria |
| Arsenic | ≤ 0.14 µg/L |  |
| Cadmium | ≤0.66 µg/L |  |
| Iron | ≤1,000 µg/L  ≤300 µg/L |  |
| Manganese | ≤ 100 µg/L |  |
| Mercury | ≤ 0.012 µg/L |  |
| Nitrate as N |  | ≤88 mg/L |
| Total Ammonia Nitrogen as N |  | \*\*Based on pH |
| Fecal coliform |  | ≤ 400 /100mL |
| Escherichia coli |  | ≤ 235 /100mL |
| TSS |  | ≤ 158 mg/L |
| Temperature |  | ≤ 80 ͦF |

# Appendix B MANOVA Analysis Results

A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of time, ecoregion, and land use intensity on the stream health variables: taxa richness, EPT index, %EPT, FBI, %Dominant Family, Dipteran and Non-Insect, and Collector Gatherer. MANOVA results indicate that ecoregion (Pillai’s Trace = 0.765, F(28, 324) = 2.735, p<0.001, eta-squared = 0.191), land use (Pillai’s Trace =1.067, F(14,158) = 12.910, p<0.001, eta-squared = .534), and ecoregion x landuse (Pillai’s Trace =0.761, F(42,498) = 1.721, p=0.004, eta-squared = .127) significantly affect the combined stream health metrics. MANOVA results indicate that time (Pillai’s Trace =0.138, F(7,78) = 1.779, p=0.103, eta-squared = .138) was not significant in driving changes of the combined stream health metrics.

Univariate ANOVA and Tukey’s post-hoc tests were conducted as follow-up tests. ANOVA results indicate that %EPT, Dipteran and Non-Insect, and Collector Gatherer metrics significantly differ by ecoregion (F(4,84)=8.806, p=<0.001, eta-squared=0.295; F(4,84)=1.886, p=0.039, eta-squared=0.112; F(4,84)=3.347, p=0.014, eta-squared=0.137) ANOVA results indicate that EPT Index, %EPT, FBI, Dipteran and Non-Insect, and Collector Gatherer metrics significantly differ by land use (F(2,84)=5.717, p=0.005, eta-squared=0.120; F(2,84)=71.325, p<0.001, eta-squared=0.629; F(2,84)=25.517, p<0.001, eta-squared=0.378; F(2,84)=65.805, p=<0.001, eta-squared=0.610; F(2,84)=3.346, p=0.04, eta-squared=0.074). ANOVA results indicate that %EPT and Collector Gather metrics differ significantly by ecoregion x land use (F(6,84)=3.306, p=0.006, eta-squared=0.191; F(6,84)=2.699, p=0.019; eta-squared=0.162). Although time was not significant in determining changes in overall stream health, ANOVA results indicate that FBI and Collector Gather metrics significantly differ between 1990 and 2000 samples (F(6,84)=3.306, p=0.006, eta-squared=0.074; F(6,84)=2.699, p=0.019, eta-squared=0.102).

Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference test indicates significant differences between the Badlands and Great Plains, the Badlands and High Plains, and Badlands and Sand Hills ecoregion %EPT scores (MD=0.314, p<0.000; MD=0.248, p=0.002; MD=0.173, p=0.006). Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference test indicates significant differences between the Badlands and Great Plains, the Badlands and High Plains and Badlands, and Sand Hills ecoregion Dipteran and Non-insect scores (MD=-0.207, p<0.001; MD=-0.267, p=0.002; MD=-0.198, p=0.003). Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference test indicates significant differences between the Badlands and High Plains and Badlands and River ecoregion Collector Gatherer scores (MD=0.361, p=0.005; MD=0.337, p=0.005). Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference test indicates significant differences between high and low and high and moderate land use by EPT Index (MD=-1.38, p<0.001; MD=-1.67, p=0.004).

Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference test indicates significant differences between high and low, high and moderate, and moderate and low land use by % EPT (MD=-0.560, p<0.001; MD=-0.173, p<0.001, MD=-0.387, p<0.001). Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference test indicates significant differences between high and low, high and moderate, and moderate and low land use by FBI (MD=2.287, p<0.001; MD=1.264, p<0.001, MD=1.023, p=0.003). Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference test indicates significant differences between high and low, and high and moderate land use by % Dipterans and Non-insects (MD=0.541, p<0.001; MD=0.466, p<0.001). Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference test indicates significant differences between high and low, and moderate and low land use by % Collector Gatherer (MD=0.200, p<0.001; MD=0.209, p=0.008).