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Introduction

The Clearwater River Stream Bank Stabilization and Revitalization Project is part of Phase II (implementation phase) of the Clearwater River Nonpoint Study. Phase I of the Clearwater River Nonpoint Study (1994) identified bank stabilization along the Clearwater River and its tributaries as a method to improve water quality in the Clearwater River watershed. Phase II of the project identified and assessed specific areas of severe erosion in the Clearwater River watershed. The erosion problem on Greenwood 27 was occurring on a much larger scale relative to previously implemented bank stabilization projects.

In April of 1999, the Red Lake Watershed District (RLWD) submitted a grant proposal to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) to help fund a stream stabilization project on the Clearwater River that would include three sites: Section 27 of Greenwood Township in Clearwater County, Section 6 of Gully Township in Polk County, and Section 31 of Equality Township in Red Lake County, Minnesota. In June of 1999, the MPCA granted approval to provide a 319 grant. The grant funding was available in the year 2000. The Red Lake Watershed District was awarded $134,500.00 in matching grant funds by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency for projects totaling $269,000.00 in cost. This funding is provided through the Section 319 Nonpoint Source Implementation Program. The goal of this project is to make improvements to water quality in the Clearwater River Watershed while demonstrating effective methods to use in future stream and stream bank stabilization in the Red Lake Watershed District.

The first project to be completed was the Greenwood 27 project. After the original work was completed, additional work was needed in order to ensure the success of the project. Since the erosion occurring at the Equality 31 site was determined to be part of the natural evolution of the stream, the funds allocated to that site were reallocated for additional work on Greenwood 27, which was completed in the fall of 2003. Construction at the Gully 6 site took place during the fall of 2003 as well.
General Work Plan for Each Site

Data collection

This task involved collecting data for use in designing and implementing erosion control measures. Work included a site survey that included alignment, channel profiles, and cross-sections. Additional field data on soils, vegetation, hydrology and geomorphology was collected to allow determination of stream stability characteristics following the methods of the Rosgen classification system. This item included field measurements of stream flow to supplement available stream flow records and statistical analyses. Photos were taken of each site for use in design and for further use in the information and education components of this project.

Analysis

This task provided a description of the problems occurring at each site. Specific goals and alternative solutions were identified and analyzed for each site. Alternative solutions were reviewed to ensure that selected designs meet site-specific needs as well as broad program goals.

Design

This task involved applying selected alternative solutions to each site. Design measures were implemented to achieve project goals—such as to improving stream stability, fish and wildlife habitat, water quality, and concurrently reducing erosion and non-point source pollution.

Construction Documents

This task involved developing the design and construction documents (plans, specifications, and bid documents) of the selected alternatives for each site. Engineer’s estimates for the costs of implementation were also provided.

Right Of Way

This task included defining the land area necessary for implementing the selected erosion control measures. Easements were secured for short-term access for data collection and construction activities, as well as long-term access for the purpose of monitoring and demonstration tours.

Permits

This task included applying for required federal, state, and local governmental unit permits from the Corps of Engineers, MPCA, MDNR, and MWCA permits, as required.

Selection of contractor

This task involved advertising and receiving bids or contractor quotes as required to complete the planned construction work at each site. Contractors were selected from this process.
Construction management and inspection

This task involved providing all construction management and inspection services. This work included staking, performing construction observation and inspection, and certifying the quantities for pay requests.

Monitoring

This includes implementing a monitoring program to assess the success of the work at each site. A plan was provided utilizing the Standard Operating Procedures manual from the Red Lake Watershed District. Monitoring includes a combination of assessments. Physical assessments include establishing bank pins, cross-section monuments, and benchmarks for reference in the ongoing monitoring of the project. Photo reference points have been established so that successive photo records can be taken from the same reference points. Biologic assessments may be performed and may include monitoring of vegetation and other biotic indices. Monitoring activities are planned to continue once a year into the indefinite future to ensure success and stability of the project and area.

Information & Education

This task includes the preparation of newsletter articles describing the demonstration project. This task included the creation of this report. Tours of the demonstration sites will be given as part of the information and education efforts. This task also includes formation and meeting times of project committees. The committees consist of permit agency and other interested agency workers, landowners, local officials and RLWD-SWCD representatives.

Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood 27 Project (original project design) – Original Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Analysis/ Bid Documents</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Easement</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits/ Advertising</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$70,500.00</td>
<td>$132,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWCD (special projects)</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$31,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/ Information/ Education</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$84,500.00</td>
<td>$84,500.00</td>
<td>$169,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gully 6 and Equality 31 Projects – Original Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Analysis/Bid Documents</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$11,268.00</td>
<td>$10,268.00</td>
<td>$21,536.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Easement</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits/Advertising</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Landowners/SWCD/Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$31,732.00</td>
<td>$39,732.00</td>
<td>$71,464.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/Information/Education</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Equality 31 Funds Allocated to Additional Work at Greenwood 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Analysis/Bid Documents</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Easement</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits/Advertising</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Landowners/SWCD/Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/Information/Education</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,800.00</td>
<td>$13,500.00</td>
<td>$28,300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Funds Remaining for the Gully 6 Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Analysis/Bid Documents</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$7,768.00</td>
<td>$6,768.00</td>
<td>$14,536.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Easement</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits/Advertising</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Landowners/SWCD/Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$21,732.00</td>
<td>$29,732.00</td>
<td>$51,464.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/Information/Education</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,200.00</td>
<td>$36,500.00</td>
<td>$71,700.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Actual Expenditures for the Original Greenwood 27 Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Analysis/ Bid Documents</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way/ Work Easements</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>$17,822.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,822.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits/ Advertising</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$1,544.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,544.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>$18,500.00</td>
<td>$70,500.00</td>
<td>$154,942.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWCD (special projects)</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,942.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/ Information/ Education</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$2,232.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,232.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$116,042.51</td>
<td>$84,500.00</td>
<td>$200,542.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actual expenditures for Additional Greenwood 27 Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Analysis/ Bid Documents</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$3,076.84</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$6,576.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Easement</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits/ Advertising</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$771.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>$771.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Landowners/SWCD/ Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$22,714.93</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$32,714.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/ Information/ Education</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$42.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,605.76</td>
<td>$13,500.00</td>
<td>$40,105.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actual Expenditures for the Gully 6 Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Analysis/ Bid Documents</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$15,364.93</td>
<td>$10,250.00</td>
<td>$25,614.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way/ Work Easement</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits/ Advertising</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$2,004.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,004.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Landowners/SWCD/ Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$6,725.32</td>
<td>$26,250.00</td>
<td>$32,975.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/ Information/ Education</td>
<td>Clearwater Nonpoint Funding</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,494.46</td>
<td>$36,500.00</td>
<td>$60,994.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Milestone schedule

#### Timeline for Greenwood 27 (original design of project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management And Inspect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Timeline for Greenwood 27 (additional work on project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management And Inspect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Timeline for Gully 6 and Equality 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management And Inspect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greenwood 27 Project

Location

The project site is located on the Clearwater River within the Eastern ½ of Section 27 of Greenwood Township in Clearwater County. Most of the land surrounding this location is privately owned.

History

The US Army Corps of Engineers began a channel improvement project on the Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers in 1946, and completed the project in 1956. This work provides the Clearwater River with a channel capacity adequate to handle approximately a 5-year runoff event and included channelization of a reach approximately 38 miles. The work extends upstream from approximately river mile 41 to river mile 78.8. The aim of the stream bank stabilization and revitalization project is to stabilize the Clearwater River in the reach immediately upstream from the Corps channel project. This stream segment is actively eroding and the channel is degrading (downcutting). (Clearwater River Stabilization Project, pg. 1).

Problem Description

The Clearwater River in the project area was actively eroding prior to the project. Headcutting was occurring upstream of the USACE channelization project. Do to this straightening of the stream, the stream grade had increased in this area and channel banks were eroding around meanders. Channel erosion had increased the sediment supply to the river, and sandbars and sediment deposits were reported in the channelized portion downstream.

Mr. John Sandland is a landowner in the project area. He estimated that the river channel bottom had eroded (downcut) up to five feet over the last 30 years. Mr. Sandland was concerned that downcutting could cause failure of an in place (rock dam) grade control structure. Failure of this structure would affect an irrigation water supply channel and allow headcutting to continue up the Clearwater River and its tributaries. (Clearwater River Stabilization Project, pg. 2).
Greenwood 27 Streambank Stabilization Project Monitoring Plan

There are a few different sets of guidelines available for performing physical channel monitoring. For this plan two would be utilized, “Channel Monitoring Methodology” written by Dave Rosgen and presented at the Fifth Federal Interagency Sedimentation Conference (1991); and “Establishing Permanent Photo Points”. Two types of monitoring will be performed, permanently photographed points and physical channel measurements.

Methods

The Greenwood 27 project area involves concerns with both vertical and lateral stability of the channel and the floodplain. Along with the monitoring of vertical and lateral stability, bed composition should be monitored to observe any shifts due to lack of stability or stabilization due to work performed. The work will involve five different aspects of geomorphological monitoring: bank pins, toe pins, monumented cross-sections and photographic points.

Monumented Cross-Sections

Monumented cross-sections will be employed at three locations on the Clearwater River in this area. The first cross section will be located above site D, the second will be located in the straight stretch of channel below site D and the third will be located on site A (Figure 1). Another site may be site B, depending on time and expense. During 1997 Houston Engineering, Inc. surveyed the Greenwood 27 site for the Red Lake Watershed District. This work involved several cross sections at certain points along the stream reach. A couple of these old sites will correspond to the monumented cross-sections proposed here. This information may be used for a background of pre-existing conditions before work was done in this area. The setup of these monumented cross-sections should proceed as follows:

1) Set up benchmarks using the original surveying work. A long rod (longer than 7 feet) will be pounded into the ground at the cross-section benchmarks on each side of the river. These will be surveyed and tied to the old benchmarks.
2) Measure the profile of the stream using the installed benchmarks. Do this by the following steps:
   a) Locate the permanent bench mark on both sides of the stream
   b) Stretch the measuring tape very tight with spring clamp and level tape
   c) Tape at same elevation as reference rod on bench mark
   d) Read distance and elevation reading of rod intercept with tape
   e) Measure major features including: left bench mark, left terrace/floodplain, left bankfull, left bank, left edge of water, differences in bed configurations across bed, thalweg, inner berm features, right edge of water, right bank, right bankfull, right terrace/floodplain, right bench mark.
3) Plot the cross-section and compare to previous measurements, note any high water marks and perform this annually or following storm flow/snowmelt runoff events.
4) Prepare a vicinity map and detailed site map for future location.
Bank Pins

To determine the lateral stability the Greenwood 27 work sites, bank pins will be installed at sites A and B (Figure 1). These two areas are where bank stabilization will be performed and should be located on the monumented cross sections. If time and money are not factors, bank pins should be installed at site C and a couple of straight reaches in this project area. These additional sites would give insight into lateral and vertical stability of the project area on a whole, rather than just monitoring the bank stabilization areas themselves.

The procedures for the bank pin installation are as follows:

1) Pound two or three smooth rods (5-7 feet in length) into the bank horizontally at even increments down the side of the bank.
2) Measure from the end of the rod to the bank at least once annually and more after storm periods or large runoff events.

Toe Pins

To determine the effectiveness of the proposed work at sites F, G, I, J, K, L and M, toe pins will be installed in the small channel ravines. The procedure is as follows:

1) Pound smooth rods (10-15 feet in length) into the thalweg of these small ravines. The rods will be located about 25 to 50 feet upstream of sites F, G, I and J. Two more rods will be pounded just above and below the points of headcutting in these small ravines (three separate ravines in total). About 3 to 4 feet should be left above the thalweg, depending upon the bank height of the ravines.
2) The distance from the end of the rod to the ground level should be measured once annually.
3) The horizontal distance between the rods above and below the points of headcutting should be measured along with the point of headcutting to determine if further headcutting is occurring. This should be done once annually.

Bed Composition

The bed composition should be measured along with the monumented cross sections. This may be accomplished by the River Watch program in Clearbrook-Gonvick, who will come up with a plan for this work.

Photographic Points

Photographs can be used to evaluate trends in riparian vegetation, stream bank stability and cover. In order to accomplish this, permanent photo points will be established at point A, point B, point K and near points G and H (Figure 1). Establishment of photo points at A and B will accomplish the goals listed above on stream bank and grade stabilization sites. The photo points at K and G/H will identify success of the floodplain work in delaying headcutting and establishing deposition along with identifying any vegetative succession. The photo points at points A and B will be established at the rod placed for the monumented cross section. Separate
rods will be placed and marked at points K and G/H. The procedure for establishment and recording data are as follows:

1) Set the camera up at the rod marker for the monumented cross section or pound a 10 foot smooth rod into the ground at point which will not be inundated by water and which illustrates the work done at point K, L and M or at points G and H. The photo point should include a view of the ravine channel and upland floodplain. This may require three shots at one photo point. Ensure that the rod is permanently marked with surveying paint.

2) Acquire a profile board (1/3 meter by 2.5 meter plywood board marked in 0.5 meter intervals of alternating black and white). Using a measuring tape, measure 50 feet from the photo point, at a point about three feet from the waters’ edge. Using another rod, mark where the board is placed. As mentioned above, there should be an upstream and downstream shot at the bank stabilization sites and two to three shots at each point on the floodplain.

3) Include landmarks such as large trees or ridgelines in the shots to assure that each scene can be relocated by different observers. Include a clipboard or chalkboard in the photograph with date, time and station location.

4) The same camera, lens, film type, tripod height and light conditions should be used in each photograph. Record this for future observers. Use Kodachrome™ slide film for the photograph.

5) Record the photo points on the same map as the rest of the monitoring efforts.

Vegetation Monitoring and Control

According to the requirements for vegetation management in Chapter 8420.0530, D of Minnesota Rules, control of noxious and invasive species is necessary for the success of wetland establishment. The RLWD will monitor the vegetation through the first five years of wetland establishment by inspection of the site and use of the photographs taken at the photographic reference points. Should noxious or invasive species be noted the RLWD will address these by use of recommended herbicides and reseeding of these areas at mixes and rates recommended by members of the local technical evaluation panel.

Equipment List for Monitoring Based Upon Rosgen’s Channel Monitoring Methodology

- Measuring tape
- Clip Board
- (10) Smooth Rods (10 feet or longer in length)
- (6) Smooth Rods (about 7 feet in length)
- Shovel or spade
- Post pounder
- Field Notebook, pens and pencils
- Surveying paint
- Surveying staff
- Camera, film and tripod
- Vegetation profile board
- Vicinity map
- Detailed site map
- Waders
Greenwood 27 Project Area

RLWD, January 2004
Completing the project

Before October 1999, the data collection phase of this project was completed. Houston Engineering completed a preliminary survey of the Clearwater River. The data collection included field data (cross-sections and stream profiles), stream flow records, and stream stability characteristics. Starting in the fall of 1999, engineering bids were submitted and Jeff Langan, an engineer from Widseth, Smith and Nolting (WSN), was selected for analysis and project design. Specific goals were set and alternative solutions were reviewed with the assistance of committee members. Some analysis occurred during the permitting process, which included alternative designs of grade control structures recommended by DNR personnel.

In the year 2000, a committee consisted of Red Lake Watershed District staff and a board member (Vernon Johnson), Clearwater County Soil and Water Conservation District staff, county board members, county staff (WCA and Environmental Services), BWSR staff, MPCA staff, area landowners, concerned citizens, Minnesota DNR staff, and Army Corps of Engineers staff. The committee was a success and this type of implementation strategy will be employed during RLWD projects in the future. The project design was completed in May 2000. Additional design recommendations mentioned above were added and a final project design was established in August 2000.

Four major components made up the Clearwater River Bank Stabilization and Revitalization project. They are bank stabilization, grade stabilization, rock-riffle structures, and floodplain restoration. Below is a short paragraph detailing each area.

Bank stabilization was performed on three outside edges, or cutbanks of meanders in the Clearwater River. The reshaping of the stream bank at sites A, B, and C, was designed to protect the stream banks from toe failures due to the curves in the river, headcutting affects, and the appearance of the upper bank sloughing in the three areas. Riprap was anchored into the toe of the slopes, and the top of the riprap was placed at full bank flow. From the upper limit of the riprap to near the top of the bank and at the upstream and downstream points of rip rap, dense Red Willow fascines and live stakes were planted. Grass seed mix and geo-textile fiber blankets were also installed along the banks to stabilize the willows. The bank stabilization sites were designed to protect the bank from further erosion, and also protect the fields and the field access roads.

Grade stabilization (grade control structures or rock riffles) structures were placed in sites D and E. These sites were located in the channel, 400 ft and 1100 ft downstream of an already in-place rock dam. The purpose for these two sites was to stop any additional headcutting that most likely would continue to move upstream from the channelized segment. After straightening of the Clearwater River in the 1950's, the velocity of flow increased from 2 to 3 feet/second to 7 to 8 feet/second at these locations. Site D grade stabilization was placed 400 ft downstream to protect the present rock dam from the effects of headcutting. Each rock riffle structure was constructed by placing riprap along the sides of the river, beginning at the toe of the bank and continuing into the channel of the river at sites D and E. The center of the grade structure was in the center of the thalweg of the river. The rock riffle structures direct water toward the thalweg or center of the river, rather than cutting into the banks of the river.
Examples of Rock Weirs

The third part of the Clearwater River Bank Stabilization and Revitalization project was floodplain restoration using rock grade control structures. During floods, floodwater would cut across meanders in the river, creating eroded channels through the floodplain. This process was threatening the water supply of the nearby commercial wild rice operation. In order to prevent further erosion in the floodplains, rock structures were placed at the inlets and outlets of the floodplain channels in order to slow the velocity of water moving through them during flood events. This part consisted of sites F, G, H, I, and J. Parts of the river bank were rebuilt where the water was obviously leaving the channel. Rocks and geo-textile fiber blankets were placed down into the toe of the bank and worked into the top of the bank and sides to allow for stabilization and a partial block of the continued flow from the main channel of the river into the floodplain. The tops of the rebuilt areas were left lower then the adjacent bank to allow for a 5 or 10-year flood to continue over the top instead of forcing the excess water somewhere else. The cuts in the downstream banks were only minimally re-established to their original shape, which should allow slight high water events to enter into the floodplain. Grade control structures made of rock and clay were also installed along with willow plantings at sites K, L and M.

Red Lake Watershed District staff developed a monitoring plan, which included examination of aerial photographs, physical assessments and establishment of photo reference points. During the fall of 2000, photo reference points were established and pre-project photographs were taken. Videotapes and photographs were also taken of high flow events during the year 2000. These materials will be used for information and education about the project.

The project engineer identified the land area needed for construction and RLWD staff obtained (two) temporary five-year construction easements from the landowners. The landowners provided the easements as in-kind contributions to the project. This task was completed in October 2000.

Project plans, specifications, bid documents, and engineer’s estimates were submitted by the project engineer in August 2000. Applications for permits from the Army Corps of Engineers, Minnesota DNR, and county environmental services were submitted in May and June of 2000. All of the required permits were obtained by August 2000.
Advertisements for construction bids were sent out in August and September 2000. A preliminary construction bid meeting was held on September 13, 2000, at which contractors were invited to view the unique project design. This meeting allowed for better estimations for construction bids and ideas for construction from the project engineer and landowners. Construction bids were accepted until 10:00 a.m. September 28, 2000, and at that time were opened at a meeting of the Red Lake Watershed District Board of Managers.

Wright Construction of Thief River Falls, MN, was selected as the construction contractor in October 2000. The contractor stockpiled needed materials (rip-rap) near the project site. John Sandland, area landowner, also provided in-kind construction work, which includes providing access trails and removal of excavated material. Wright Construction subcontracted the bioengineering portion of the project to Lee Nursery of Fertile, MN. The bioengineering portion includes planting of willow stakes and bundles and other seeding. Doug Thompson, Clearwater County SWCD assisted in this effort. Construction continued through 2001 with a scheduled completion deadline of November 15, 2001. Staff from WSN Engineering provided materials inspection and riprap sizing for the contractor.

Area River Watch schools have been informed of monitoring opportunities and may provide biological and other monitoring of the project area. In addition to the video tape, photographs and River Watch involvement, the Red Lake Watershed District continues to provide project updates in their annual reports and reports to other organizations and agencies. The RLWD will also provide newsletter articles or other information to local news publications.

In Appendix A, willow fascines are further discussed.

Additional Work

In February of 2002, the RLWD submitted an updated work plan and explanation to MPCA. The work plan asked for approval of abandonment of the Equality 31 site and for a transfer of these funds to additional work that will be performed at the Greenwood 27 site. Additional work was based on MPCA and DNR staff recommendations for ensuring success of the project. Additional rock riffle structures were deemed necessary downstream of Site E. The reason for this was that there was too much of a drop in water elevation after Site E. Too much of a drop could create a scour hole and threaten the stability of the structure. Additional rock structures within the floodplain scour channels were also suggested, but there was only enough money available to construct the “in-stream” rock-riffle structures. Sites N, O, and P were constructed with geo-textile fiber blanket and rock structures in the channel. Riprap was placed along the sides beginning at the toe of the bank and continuing into the channel of the river at these sites. The center of the grade structure was in the center of the thalweg of the river. The cross-vane weir structures direct water toward the center of the channel and away from the banks of the river.
Diagrams of a Cross-Vane Weir

Examples of Flow Patterns over Cross-Vane Weirs

In the fall of 2002, recommendations for additional riffle structures in the river and grade control structures in the floodplain were received from Luther Aadland, MNDNR River Ecologist, and presented to Curt Meyer of WSN Engineering. A construction cost estimate was worked up in order to determine how much additional work could be done with the money available.

The RLWD has proceeded with plans for more cross vane weir installations and possible work addressing the floodplain erosion “nick points.” Curt Meyer of Widseth, Smith and Nolting Engineering created plans and specs for three additional cross vane weirs. An extension of the previous permit for the Greenwood 27 project was received. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources permit fees were paid. All the necessary permits were received (DNR and United States Army Corps of Engineers). WSN Engineering submitted a construction cost estimate. The cost was estimated at less than $25,000, so the plans were initially sent out for quotes. If the quotes were higher than $25,000, then the project would need to be advertised for bids. Before advertising the project for bids, quotes were requested and they were all too high. Olson Construction TRF, Inc. was the successful bidder for the project. The final estimate for construction costs was $31,762.50. The contract date for the project was September 8, 2003. Construction was delayed by the permitting process, but was eventually completed on November 3, 2003. Three cross-vane weir structures were designed to increase the downstream elevation at Site E and reduce the amount of drop in water elevation at this structure. These new grade stabilization sites are labeled as sites N, O, and P. All three structures are similar in form. Areas disturbed during the construction were seeded and covered with wood fiber blankets.
Monitoring

In late June and early July of 2002, the area experienced heavy runoff events. In the fall of 2002 visit to the site, RLWD staff feared the worst for this site after the runoff and flooding. However, most of the site was in great condition. There were no major problems with project failure. The furthest downstream site “C,” had some erosion near the top of the bank that resulted from a seven-inch rainfall event. The location of this area is the eastern edge of the bank stabilization work at site C. This problem worsened during the spring of 2004, but was fixed during the summer of 2004.

In late October of 2004, the Clearwater River watershed (and others) received a large amount of rain, resulting in unseasonably high flows. During these high flows, the cross-vane weirs appeared to be working as designed. The most recently installed cross-vane weirs (sites N,O, and P) seem to direct flow toward the center of the stream better than the original rock riffle structures (sites D and E).

In Appendix B are past and current photographs of the Greenwood 27 project.
Gully 6 – Lost River Erosion Control Project

Background

This part of the Clearwater River Stream Bank Stabilization and Revitalization project was initiated to demonstrate the use of innovative techniques for erosion control, stream stabilization, and water quality improvements. The purpose of this project is to alleviate erosion near the bridge and around a river bend at the project site. This report will summarize the findings of the Lost River Design Report that was prepared for the Red Lake Watershed District by Engineering. This report will also cover the permitting and construction process. Copies of the Lost River Design Report are available at the RLWD office.

Location

The project site is located on the Lost River within Sections 5 and 6 of Gully Township in Polk County. The map below shows an aerial view of the project area.

History

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers completed a channel improvement project on the Lost River in 1965. This project included clearing and snagging on the lower 20 miles of the Lost River as well as channel work in a reach of approximately 23 miles. The Corps project area extends from the confluence with the Clearwater River near Brooks to Section 28 of Winsor Township near Gonvick. The channel excavation began about two mile west of Oklee and extended 23 miles upstream, from river mile 20.25 upstream to river mile 43.3. The Lost River Erosion Control Project is located near the midpoint of this channelized section at river mile 32.5.
Survey

The Lost River channel in the erosion control project area was surveyed in November 2001 by Red Lake Watershed District staff. Channel alignment, bottom profile, and cross-sections were measured.

Hydrology

The drainage area of the project site is approximately 159 square miles. Flow frequency was examined using data from the USGS gauging on the Lost River in Oklee. The Army Corps of Engineers’ River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) was used to complete the channel and bridge hydraulic analysis for the project. Channel capacity, channel profile changes over time, channel cross-section changes over time, and channel bank – full capacity were also examined by Houston Engineering as part of the Lost River Design report.

Stream Classification

The channel characteristics of the Lost River at the project site were examined and summarized in order to classify the channel according to Rosgen methodology. E6 and F6 Rosgen classifications were found within the project area.

Problem Description

There were several areas of active erosion within the project reach. A scour hole was forming downstream of the CSAH 28 bridge. Severe bank erosion is occurring downstream of the bridge as well, along with the formation of a sand bar on the opposite bank. Flow appeared to be directed into the eroding bank. The scour hole and bank erosion downstream of the bridge may have been aggravated by the erosive forces and velocities generated by a rock pile and beaver dam upstream. Channel bank erosion was also occurring along the outside of a meander within the project reach. Point bars were also forming on the outside of the eroding bend. Toe erosion was apparent along this eroding bend, which appeared to be a cause of the bank stability problems. Head-cutting did not seem to be a problem in this reach.

Erosion at Gully 6

![Image of the Lost River channel with erosion and scour holes](image-url)
Alternative solutions to the problem were evaluated including structural techniques, non-structural techniques, and doing nothing. The “do nothing” approach in this case would have resulted in continued erosion. Non-structural techniques to reduce the rate of runoff were out of the scope of the project and were not feasible alternatives for reaching the project goals. Structural alternatives were the most desirable method for stabilizing banks, reducing lateral erosion, and grade stabilization.

The recommended alternatives were discussed with and approved by the RLWD Board of Managers. These originally included removing point bars, installing a cross-vane weir just downstream of the bridge to direct flow away from the bank and toward the center of the channel, install bendway weirs (see example below) along the outside of the river bend to direct flow away from the bank, retain rocks and beaver dam under the bridge, and retaining vegetation on outside meander banks rather than reshaping the banks. During the permitting process, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources requested that j-hook rock dams be used instead of bendway weirs. The reasoning for this is that they create a scour hole for fish habitat. Since purposefully creating channel erosion wasn’t a desired outcome of this project, stream barbs were used as a compromise. A stream barb may still create a scour hole in the channel, but it will be smaller than one from a j-hook rock dam. Stream barbs are pointed upstream at a sharper angle than bendway weirs, and also increase upstream sedimentation. Stream barbs, j-hook rock dams, and bendway weirs all work to direct the stream of highest velocity away from the stream bank and toward the center of the channel.

Bendway Weirs in Emardville Township of Red Lake County in 2004 (Installed in 1998)
Permits

Permit applications, plans, and specifications were sent to all agencies with review and permit authority including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MN Department of Natural Resources, MN Wetland Conservation Act, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, and the Polk County Highway Department. In order to receive a MN DNR permit, the bendway weirs were re-engineered to be stream barbs, similar to j-hook dams, in order to provide better fish habitat through the creation of a small scour hole in the thalweg of the channel.

Construction

Most of the construction for this project was completed in December of 2003. Additional work involving seeding and some stream bank re-sloping will be completed in the spring of 2004. A cross-vane weir was constructed immediately downstream of the bridge and the sand bar was removed to prevent the bank from eroding on the north side and depositing sediment on the south side. The cross-vane weir directs flow down the center of the channel and away from the eroding bank. Three stream barbs were installed to direct the flow around the bend in the river toward the thalweg (center of the channel) and away from the eroding stream banks.

Cross-Vane Weir and Sand Bar Removal at Gully 6—Summer 2004
Stream Barbs at Gully 6 – Summer 2004

Stream Barb Directing Flow Toward Mid-Channel During November 2004 High Flow
Near the Peak of High Flow in Late October/Early November of 2004

Cross-Vane Weir and Bridge, Looking Upstream
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Appendix A - Willow Fascines

(from the NRCS Streambank and Shoreline Restoration Handbook)
Live Fascines

Live fascines (fa-sheens) are long bundles of live woody vegetation buried in a streambank in shallow trenches placed parallel to the flow of the stream (Figure 1). The plant bundles sprout and develop a root mass that will hold the soil in place and protect the streambank from erosion. For optimum success in Ohio, fascines are constructed of thin live cuttings of willow or red-osier dogwood. These cuttings are bound together in bundles 6-8 inches in diameter and 4-20 feet in length. The name fascine comes from the Latin for 'bundle of sticks.'

![Diagram of fascine construction](image)

Figure 1. Live fascine construction

**To build a fascine:**

1. Harvest and stockpile an assortment (being different species, ages and lengths) of live, dormant cuttings. Fascines can be built from a wide range of cuttings, but are best built from slim relatively unbranched cuttings (coppice) because they are the easiest to work with and produce the densest fascines. If the cuttings have multiple, hard to bend side branches, prune them, being sure to use the trimmings.

2. Fascines are easier to build in a set of saw horses (figure). Lay the cuttings on the sawhorses, with the growing tips facing in the same direction, and with the cut ends staggered throughout.
3. Tightly tie the fascines together tight with rope or twine. The distance between ties can vary. You should be able to carry, bend, and not be able to pull apart, a properly tied fascine. If your first attempt fails, make sure the cut ends are staggered, and that the ties are tight, and frequent. Fascines can be constructed in varying lengths and diameters, but work best if they are tied so they are dense.

All the butt ends of the cuttings should point towards the same end of the bundle with the bundle ends tapered to form a cigar shape. The ends of the cuttings may be staggered along the length of the bundle to facilitate the construction of a long bundle with a maximum length of 15 feet to 20 feet. Ultimately, the bundle should be 6-8 inches in diameter. The cuttings are then bound together every 12-18 inches with untreated/un-dyed bailing twine (see Figure 3). It is helpful to make a saw-horse type frame to support the bundles at waist height as they are being tied together. The frame can be constructed of lumber or cuttings from the site. Each set of legs should extend beyond the crossbar into a "V" shape so that the cuttings can lay inside the V's while being tied together.
The bundles themselves, as previously noted, are composed of cuttings of willow or red-osier dogwood. The bundles need to contain at least five cuttings, each being a minimum of 1/2 inch in diameter. These bundles can contain some dead cuttings as long as they are in the center of the bundle leaving the live cuttings on the outside in direct contact with the soil. The cuttings must be in a dormant condition cut between mid-November and mid-March. They must be installed into the streambank within 48 hours of being cut. The cuttings must not be allowed to dry out. They must be kept moist or soaked in water before being formed into bundles and installed in the streambank.
To install a fascine:

1. Dig a shallow trench, slightly less wide and deep than the diameter of the fascine. The fascine should be approximately 20% exposed once installed.

2. Place the fascine in the trench, and stake into place. The growing tips should point upstream, or if placed on angles on slopes, pointed uphill. There are several methods of staking. Refer to Figure. Livestakes are recommended as they will grow, providing extra strength in the long run for the structure. In compact soils such as clays and clay/shales, UNTREATED 2”x2” stakes, or 2”x4”s cut on a diagonal work well. Place the stakes every 1-1.5 metres. You should not be able to lift the fascine out of the trench.

3. Care should be taken to make sure the upstream end of the fascine is "returned" to the streambank. This means tucking the upstream end into the bank, and staking it securely so that the current cannot dislodge it. If the upstream end of the fascine is pulled away the entire structure could fail.

4. Bury the fascine by placing soil around and on top of it, tamping gently into place. Make sure you fill in all of the air spaces. Large air spaces around the fascine should be avoided as they will promote dessication of the live material.

Materials

- rope or twine, strong enough to tie the fascines together, and resilient enough to last 1 year. Hemp rope, heavy bailer twine, or plastic utility cord are good examples.
- ample quantities of live cuttings, for example a 4 m long fascine 25 cm in diameter will use approximately 5 bundles of cuttings (bundles being 20-30 cm in diameter, and 2 m long). Fascines should be constructed with a minimum of 2 different species. This will optimize the chances of successful growth. Recommended species:

Small streams - Heartleaf willow, Sandbar willow, Shining willow, Pussy willow, all of the dogwoods.
Large streams - Black willow, Peachleaf willow, Pussy willow, Sandbar willow, Heartleaf willow, Carolina poplar, Balsam poplar, all of the dogwoods.

- shovels, rakes, deadblow and sledge hammers, pruning shears, utility knife, sawhorses.
- stakes, depending upon the application, from live stakes, to untreated 2"x2"s, to 2"x4"s cut into wedges.
- straw (for mulching on slopes), or an erosion control blanket (jute, coir, or a straw mix).
Materials & Equipment

The type of equipment required to install a live fascine streambank stabilization project will vary depending on the size and scope of the project, the labor available and the condition of the streambank itself (see Table 2). The tall, steep banks requiring excavation will probably need a backhoe. A backhoe may also be handy to dig the trenches for the live fascines on projects that exhibit longer stretches of streambank. If plenty of hand labor is available and the site permits, hand tools may be all that is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank excavation, if needed</th>
<th>Backhoe. Alternately: hand tools (shovels, mattock) &amp; wheel barrow.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavate trenches</td>
<td>Hand tools (shovels, mattock), wheel barrow, &amp; measuring tape. Alternately: backhoe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct live fascine bundle</td>
<td>willow (Salix spp.) or red-osier dogwood (Cornus stolonifera) cuttings, bailing twine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saws, loppers, knives, &amp; saw-horse type frame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install fascine</td>
<td>Live willow stakes, dead stakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sledge hammers &amp; hand tools (shovels, mattock).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Installation

- Prepare the live fascine bundle and live stakes immediately before installation.
- Beginning at the base of the slope, dig a trench on the contour approximately 10 inches wide and deep.
- Excavate trenches up the slope at intervals specified in Table 16-1. Where possible, place one or two rows over the top of the slope.
- Place long straw and annual grasses between rows.
- Install jute mesh, coconut netting, or other acceptable erosion control fabric. Secure the fabric.
- Place the live fascine into the trench (Fig. 16-9a).
- Drive the dead stout stakes directly through the live fascine. Extra stakes should be used at connections or bundle overlaps. Leave the top of the dead stout stakes flush with the installed bundle.
- Live stakes are generally installed on the downslope side of the bundle. Tamp the live stakes below and against the bundle between the previously installed dead stout stakes, leaving 3 inches to protrude above the top of the ground (Fig. 16-9b). Place moist soil along the sides of the bundles. The top of the live fascine should be slightly visible when the installation is completed. Figure 16-9c shows an established live fascine system 2 years after installation is completed.

Installation

The installation methods are similar to those discussed for live fascines, with the following variations:
- Excavate a trench approximately 10 inches wide and deep, beginning at one end of and parallel to the shoreline section to be repaired and extending to the other end.
- Spread jute mesh or geotextile fabric across the excavated trench and temporarily leave the remainder on the slope immediately above the trench.
- Place a live fascine bundle in the trench on top of the fabric and anchor with live and dead stout stakes.
- Spread long straw on the slope above the trench to the approximate location of the next trench to be constructed upslope.
- Pull the fabric upslope over the long straw and spread in the next excavated trench. Trenches should be spaced 3 to 5 feet apart and parallel to each other.
- Repeat the process until the system is in place over the treatment area.
Construction Guidelines

Make sure the toe is stable when using fascines on slopes. If the toe is not stable, erosion can move up the slope, undermining the fascines and causing failure. Should the toe be experiencing erosion, you will need to remedy the situation by using one of the other appropriate methods in this manual. Once this has been addressed, you can then place the fascines on the slope. The following steps should be followed when placing fascines on slopes:

- install the first fascine at the bottom of the slope.
- move upslope, placing fascines using the recommended spacing of 1 metre for 1:1 slopes (height:vertical), 1.5 metre for 2:1, 2 metres for 3:1, and 3 metres for 4:1 slopes.
- on dry slopes fascines can be placed level or on contour.
- on wet slopes fascines can be placed on slight angles to facilitate drainage of runoff.
- place long straw on the slope between fascines (on slopes 1.5:1 or flatter), steeper slopes would require the use of an erosion control fabric. This fabric would be anchored in place by tucking the leading edge into the trench, and staking the fascine on top.

Excavate the bank to the appropriate slope, if needed, according to design specifications (see Table 1). Starting at the toe of the slope, dig or excavate trenches into the exposed slope at the designatec spacing, parallel to the stream course. The trenches should be 10-15 inches wide and deep to accommodate the live fascines. Lay the fascines into the trench and backfill soil loosely, leaving the top of the fascine partially exposed (Figure 4). When more than one fascine bundle is used to fill the length of a trench, a slight overlap (6-12 inches) of the ends of the bundles should be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stabilize bank if necessary</td>
<td>Period of low flow prior to live fascine installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank excavation to 1:2 or 1:3 slope</td>
<td>Late Sept. to early April (but just prior to fascine installation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut willows for fascines, keep moist at project site</td>
<td>October 1 to April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct fascine at project site, keep moist at project site</td>
<td>October 1 to April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrench and install fascines</td>
<td>October 1 to April 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Timing of Construction and Resource
Cost and Maintenance Needs

Fascines cost very little, especially if the live materials are cut for free. Costs can be reduced even further if livestakes are used to anchor the fascine. The main expense is the time required to harvest live cuttings, transport them, and construct the fascines. Time required to install varies from 0.5 - 1 hour per linear metre. Fascines should be inspected periodically in the first year. Once the fascine is growing, they require little maintenance.

Preparation of a dead stunt stake

Installing live stakes in live fascine system

Placing live fascines in trench

Established fascines after 2 years growth
Local Plants that could be used for making fascines:

Excellent to Very Good
Sandbar Willow (*Salix exigua*) Large shrub, very long, narrow leaves
Peach-leaved Willow (*Salix amygdaloides*) Large shrub to small tree, fat leaves
Shining Willow (*Salix lucida*) Medium to tall shrub
Pussy Willow (*Salix discolor*) Large shrub
Balsam Poplar (*Populus balsamifera*) Tall tree, long sticky, sweet-smelling buds
Black Willow (*Salix nigra*) Small to large tree
Eastern Cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*)

**note:** Bebb's Willow (*Salix bebbiana*) is a very common medium to large shrub with a beaked and coarse textured leaf. Try to avoid this willow since it sprouts poorly.

Good
Red-osier Dogwood (*Cornus stolonifera*) Medium shrub, red stems

Fair
Roundleaf Dogwood (*Cornus rugosa*) Medium to small shrub
Nannyberry (*Viburnum lentago*) Large Shrub
Gray Dogwood (*Cornus racemosa*) Medium to small shrub

If you have questions please contact Doug Thompson at the Clearwater SWCD (694-6845) for identification of these local plants. Local nurseries may also be able to find this plant material for you.
Live Stakes

(i) Live stakes—Live staking involves the insertion and tamping of live, rootable vegetative cuttings into the ground (figs. 16–4 and 16–5). If correctly prepared, handled, and placed, the live stake will root and grow (fig. 16–6).

A system of stakes creates a living root mat that stabilizes the soil by reinforcing and binding soil particles together and by extracting excess soil moisture. Most willow species root rapidly and begin to dry out a bank soon after installation.

Construction guidelines
Live material sizes—The stakes generally are 0.5 to 1.5 inches in diameter and 2 to 3 feet long. The specific site requirements and available cutting source determine sizes.

Live material preparation
- The materials must have side branches cleanly removed with the bark intact.
- The basal ends should be cut at an angle or point for easy insertion into the soil. The top should be cut square.
- Materials should be installed the same day that they are prepared.

Installation
- Erosion control fabric should be placed on slopes subject to erosive inundation.
- Tamp the live stake into the ground at right angles to the slope and diverted downstream. The installation may be started at any point on the slope face.
- The live stakes should be installed 2 to 3 feet apart using triangular spacing. The density of the installation will range from 2 to 4 stakes per square yard. Site variations may require slightly different spacing.

Applications and effectiveness
- Effective streambank protection technique where site conditions are uncomplicated, construction time is limited, and an inexpensive method is needed.
- Appropriate technique for repair of small earth slips and slumps that frequently are wet.
- Can be used to peg down and enhance the performance of surface erosion control materials.
- Enhance conditions for natural colonization of vegetation from the surrounding plant community.
- Stabilize intervening areas between other soil bioengineering techniques, such as live fascines.
- Produce streamside habitat.

- Placement may vary by species. For example, along many western streams, tree-type willow species are placed on the inside curves of point bars where more inundation occurs, while shrub willow species are planted on outside curves where the inundation period is minimal.
- The buds should be oriented up.
- Four-fifths of the length of the live stake should be installed into the ground, and soil should be firmly packed around it after installation.
- Do not split the stakes during installation. Stakes that split should be removed and replaced.
- An iron bar can be used to make a pilot hole in firm soil.
- Tamp the stake into the ground with a dead blow hammer (hammer head filled with shot or sand).
Prepared Live Stake

Growing Live Stake

Prepared Live Stake (note angled basal end and flat-topped end)
Appendix B
Greenwood 27
Monitoring Photos
Pictures of Greenwood 27
Bank Stabilization Sites Before, During, and After Construction

Site A Before Construction, Bank Slumping

Bank Stabilization
Site A
During Construction
In 2001
Bank Stabilization
Site A Willows Shortly After Construction

Bank Stabilization
Site A Willows and Riprap Along Bend

Bank Stabilization
Site B During Construction
Site C Bank Stabilization with Willows and Riprap

Site C Bank Stabilization - Willows Shortly After Construction

Bank Stabilization Site B Willows, Fiber Blanket, and Riprap Around Bend

Bank Stabilization Site B Willows Shortly After Construction
Fall of 2002 Photographic Monitoring
One Year after Construction

Site A
Bank Stabilization

Bank Stabilization
Site B
Site C
Bank Slumping Near Upstream
End of the Site

Bank slumping at Bank
Stabilization
Site C
1 year after construction
Malfunctioning Drain Tile?

Bank Slumping at Bank
Stabilization
Site C
Pooling of water that is the Apparent
Cause of the Slumping
Bank Stabilization
Site A Looking Downstream

Bank Stabilization
Site A Looking Upstream
2 years after construction
Cross-Vane Weirs (Grade Stabilization) at Sites N, O, and P after Construction 2002-2003

Grade Stabilization
Site D

Grade Stabilization
Site E
Additional Cross-Vane Weirs
Site P
Newly Constructed, Fall 2003

Additional Cross-Vane Weirs
Site O
Newly Constructed Fall 2003

Additional Cross-Vane Weirs
Site N
Newly Constructed Fall 2003
Floodplain Improvements after Construction

Floodplain Restoration
Site G
1 year after Construction
(Fall 2002)

Floodplain Restoration
Site H
1 year after Construction
Floodplain Side of Rock Dam, Facing Toward Old Scour Channel in Floodplain
(Fall 2002)

Floodplain Restoration
Site K
(Fall 2002)
Erosion at Site C.
This was apparently caused by a drainage tile, the end of which was buried during the construction. Drainage from the tile caused the sloughing and erosion of the bank. This site was repaired in the summer of 2004.
Grade Stabilization Site E

Pool Behind Site H Structure

Floodplain Restoration Site G

Floodplain Restoration Site K

Floodplain Restoration Site H
Lots of Vegetation on Rock Structure

Grade Stabilization Site N
Appendix C
Greenwood 27 Construction Plans and Specifications

(Scanned and Reduced from 11” X 17” to 8.5” X 11”)
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RED LAKE WATERSHED DISTRICT
CONSTRUCTION PLANS
FOR
STREAMBANK AND GRADE STABILIZATION
2000
LOCATED WITHIN A REACH OF THE CLEARWATER RIVER
WITHIN SECTION 27 OF GREENWOOD TOWNSHIP

PROJECT AREA
## Statement of Quantities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>SPEC NO.</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SITE PREP WORK - SITE A (1)</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SITE PREP WORK - SITE B (1)</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SITE PREP WORK - SITE C (1)</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SITE PREP WORK - SITE D (1)</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SITE PREP WORK - SITE E (1)</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SITE PREP WORK - SITE F (1)</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SITE PREP WORK - SITE G (1)</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SITE PREP WORK - SITE H (1)</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SITE PREP WORK - SITE I (1)</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SITE PREP WORK - SITE J (1)</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SITE PREP WORK - SITE K (1)</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>MAXIMUM REPAP, CLASS S MODIFIED</td>
<td>CUI FT</td>
<td>12880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>MAXIMUM REPAP, CLASS II MODIFIED</td>
<td>CUI FT</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>GRASSCUT FILTER</td>
<td>CUI FT</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>DEBENTILE FILTER, TYPE IV</td>
<td>SQ FT</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>SURF ESTABLISHMENT (2)</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>WOOL FIBER BLANKET, TYPE REGULAR</td>
<td>SQ FT</td>
<td>37000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>SALT WITH FUSER</td>
<td>LIN FT</td>
<td>19920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>URETHANE SEASON</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>19989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Notes

1. NO FIRM SHALL BE USED TO RE-SHAPE THE RIVER BANK AND TO PERFORM MINOR CLEARING PRIOR TO PLACEMENT OF REPAP AND FILTER BLANKET.

2. SURF ESTABLISHMENT SHALL INCLUDE: UNDOCK NO. 400, ADD. 800 SEED MIXTURE APPLIED AT 75 LB/ACRE COMMERCIAL FERTILIZER ANALYSIS 46-0-10 APPLIED AT 100 LB/ACRE WOOL FIBER BLANKET TO BE PLACED OVER ALL AREAS EXCEPT FERTILIZER SHALL BE APPLIED TO ALL AREAS AFFECTED.

3. COMPACTED CLAY BORROW MATERIAL SHALL BE CONSIDERED INCIDENTAL TO THE SITE PREP WORK - SITE I PAY PER.

4. NO DIRECT COMPENSATION WILL BE MADE THEREFOR.

5. SITE A, B, C AND D SHALL BE CONSIDERED INCIDENTAL TO SITE PREP WORK - SITE I, AND NO DIRECT COMPENSATION WILL BE MADE THEREFOR. THIS IS DUE TO RIVER FLOWING PROXIMITY (ADJ FT).

6. SITES A, B, C AND D ARE ACCESSIBLE TO CONSTRUCTION FROM THE FIELD ROAD ADJACENT TO THE RIVER.

7. SITES I, J, K, L, M ARE ACCESSIBLE FOR CONSTRUCTION THROUGH A WOODED AREA WITH HIS ACCESS ROAD.

8. ACCESS TO THESE AREAS, UP TO THE RIVER, WILL BE PROVIDED BY THE ERIK AT NO EXPENSE TO THE CONTRACTOR (SEE PROPOSED ACCESS ISSUES ON SHEET 3). THE CONTRACTOR WILL BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE HIS OWN ACCESS ACROSS THE RIVER TO THE RESPECTIVE SITES.

9. DEBENTILE FILTER CLAY SHALL BE A TYPE NO. 10005.

10. ORGANIC MATERIAL SHALL BE RECYCLED ALONG THE RIVER BANK IN A MANNER APPROVED BY THE ENGINEER.

The ERIK WILL REMOVE THE MATERIAL AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE PROJECT. THE FILE SHALL NOT BE PLACED WITHIN 20 FT. FROM THE TOP OF THE NEW SLOPE.
RED LAKE WATERSHED DISTRICT
CONSTRUCTION PLANS
FOR
STREAMBANK AND GRADE STABILIZATION
2003
LOCATED WITHIN A REACH OF THE CLEARWATER RIVER
WITHIN SECTION 27 OF GREENWOOD TOWNSHIP
# Statement of Quantities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Article I</th>
<th>Article II</th>
<th>Article III</th>
<th>Article IV</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STEEL-OUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LIVELINE - TRENCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LIVELINE - TRENCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LIVELINE - TRENCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EARTH WORK - TRENCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>STEEL-OUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## General Notes

1. The client reserves the right to make minor revisions to the plans to fit conditions encountered during construction.

2. The location of underground utilities shown on the plan sheets are approximate. The contractor shall verify the utility locations and coordinates as required by contract terms. Excavation to locate underground utilities shall be executed.

3. The statement of quantities is not intended to be an invoice, but merely to provide guidance to the contractor for purchasing purposes. Quantities may vary.

4. The contractor shall notify utility companies and owners of obstructions at least 48 hours prior to commencing work.

For more information call 1-800-282-4562.
CONSTRUCTION PLANS FOR
LOST RIVER EROSION CONTROL PROJECT
RED LAKE WATERSHED DISTRICT
THIEF RIVER FALLS, MINNESOTA
JUNE 23, 2003

PREPARED BY: HOUSTON ENGINEERING, INC.
FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA MAPLE GROVE, MINNESOTA BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA
BENDWAY WEIR LAYOUT DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERCEPT</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13+85.26’</td>
<td>87° 44’ 02”</td>
<td>16’</td>
<td>24’</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14+42.82’</td>
<td>89° 57’ 55”</td>
<td>14’</td>
<td>24’</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+46.80’</td>
<td>79° 16’ 19”</td>
<td>7’</td>
<td>33’</td>
<td>140.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
- LOCATIONS, LENGTHS, AND ESTIMATED QUANTITIES FOR BENDWAY WEIRS ARE ESTIMATED BASED ON AVAILABLE CROSS SECTION DATA. FINAL LOCATIONS AND QUANTITIES MAY VARY BASED ON EXISTING CONDITIONS AT TIME OF CONSTRUCTION.
- ESTIMATED RIPRAP QUANTITIES FOR BENDWAY WEIRS:
  STA. 13+85.26’ = 45 CU. YD.
  STA. 14+42.82’ = 52 CU. YD.
  STA. 15+46.80’ = 64 CU. YD.
- ALL EXCAVATION REQUIRED TO CONSTRUCT THE BENDWAY WEIRS AS DETAILED IN THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SHALL BE CONSIDERED INCIDENTAL AND NO DIRECT COMPENSATION SHALL BE MADE.

TYPICAL BENDWAY WEIR

SECTION A-A

SECTION B-B

CONSTRUCTION DETAIL - BENDWAY WEIRS

HOUSTON ENGINEERING, INC.

PROPRIETARY MATERIAL - DO NOT COPY.

67