

Lower Klamath River Nutrient, Periphyton, Phytoplankton and Algal Toxin Sampling Analysis Plan (SAP)



THE YUROK TRIBE

Yurok Tribal Environmental Program

Klamath Office ~ Administration

190 Klamath Blvd

Klamath, CA 95548

(707) 482-1618

Prepared with assistance from:

Kier Associates

Arcata and Blue Lake, California

June 2008

**Yurok Tribe Environmental Program
Lower Klamath River Nutrient, Periphyton, Phytoplankton, and Algal Toxin
Sampling Analysis Plan**

Yurok Tribal Environmental Program
Klamath Office ~ Administration
190 Klamath Blvd
Klamath, CA 95548

June 2008

YTEP Project Manager _____

YTEP QA Officer _____

For EPA use:

Expedited Review? Yes No

Received by QA Office: _____ Date: _____

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Approved: _____ Date: _____

Region 9 Quality Assurance Manager

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Site Names	2
1.2 Sampling Locations.....	3
1.3 Responsible Agency.....	3
1.4 Project Organization	3
1.5 Statement of the Specific Problem.....	4
2.0 BACKGROUND	5
2.1 Site or Sampling Area Description	8
2.2 Operational History.....	10
2.3 Previous Investigations/Regulatory Involvement	10
2.5 Environmental and/or Human Impact.....	12
3.0 PROJECT DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVES	13
3.1 Project Task and Problem Definition.....	13
3.2 Data Quality Objectives (DQOs)	14
3.3 Data Quality Indicators (DQIs)	15
3.4 Data Review and Validation	17
3.5 Data Management	18
3.6 Assessment Oversight.....	19
4.0 SAMPLING RATIONALE.....	20
4.3 Water Sampling	20
5.0 REQUEST FOR ANALYSES	24
5.1 Analysis Narrative.....	24
5.2 Analytical Laboratories Other Than U.S. EPA.....	25
6.0 FIELD METHODS AND PROCEDURES	26
6.1 Field Equipment.....	26
6.1.1 Field Equipment List.....	26
6.1.2 Calibration of Field Equipment	28
6.2 Field Screening	28
6.5 Water Sampling	28
6.5.1 Surface Water Sampling	28
6.6 Biological Sampling.....	31
6.6.1 Biological Sampling for Chemical Analysis.....	34
7.0 SAMPLE CONTAINERS, PRESERVATION AND STORAGE.....	34
8.0 DISPOSAL OF RESIDUAL MATERIALS	34
9.0 SAMPLE DOCUMENTATION AND SHIPMENT	35
9.1 Field Notes and Logbooks	355
9.1.2 Photographs.....	35
9.2 Labeling	35
9.3 Chain of Custody	366
9.4 Packaging and Shipment.....	366
10.0 QUALITY CONTROL	36
10.1 Field Quality Control Samples.....	377
10.1.1 Assessment of Field Contamination (Blanks).....	377

10.1.2 Assessment of Sample Variability (Field Duplicate or Co-located Samples) .	37
10.3 Field Screening, Confirmation, and Split Samples	38
10.3.3 Split Samples	38
10.4 Laboratory Quality Control Samples	38
11.0 FIELD VARIANCES.....	399
12.0 FIELD HEALTH AND SAFETY PROCEDURES.....	39
13.0 REFERENCES	40

APPENDICES

YTEP Churn Splitter Field Sampling & Cleaning SOPs.....	A-1
YTEP Nutrient, Phytoplankton, Periphyton and Algal Toxin Sampling Data Sheet.....	B-1
YTEP Nutrient, Phytoplankton, Periphyton and Algal Toxin Chain of Custody Form.....	C-1
YTEP Periphyton Grid Datasheet.....	D-1
YSI Datasonde Instructions and Calibration SOPs.....	E-1
Aquatic Analysts Algae Analytical and Quality Assurance Procedures.....	F-1
Aquatic Research Incorporated Quality Assurance/Quality Control Plan.....	G-1
California Department of Fish and Game Laboratory QAPP.....	H-1
California Department of Fish and Game Laboratory LC/MS/MS Analysis SOP.....	I-1

Note: The section numbering system used herein corresponds to U.S. EPA’s 2000 *SAP Guidance and Template* version 1. Sections that do not apply are generally not included here, resulting in some gaps in the numbering system.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Yurok Tribe is the largest in California with more than 5,000 members. Its Reservation borders the Lower Klamath River from the convergence of the Klamath and Trinity rivers approximately 44 miles downstream to the ocean (Figure 1). The Yurok Tribe Environmental Program (YTEP) monitors and assesses the conditions and trends of surface water, groundwater and coastal waters of the Yurok Indian Reservation (YIR) and those of watersheds draining on to the Reservation. YTEP uses the *YIR Water Quality Control Plan (WQCP)* (YTEP, 2004c) to:

“restore, maintain and protect the chemical, physical, biological, and cultural integrity of the surface waters of the YIR; to promote the health, social welfare, and economic well-being of the YIR, its people, and all the residents of the YIR; to achieve a level of water quality that provides for all potential uses; and to provide for full protection of state and federally threatened and endangered species.”

The Klamath River in California is listed as an impaired water body on the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 303(d) list for temperature, nutrients and dissolved oxygen (CSWRCB, 2005). A major beneficial use that concerns all Klamath River Tribes is the salmon that have sustained them for thousands of years and that can be profoundly impacted by water pollution. Klamath River pollution from toxic algae species has now also been recognized in Klamath Hydroelectric Project reservoirs (Kann and Corum, 2006) and downstream to the estuary (YTEP, 2005). This Sampling Analysis Plan (SAP) applies to collection of data on nutrients, phytoplankton, periphyton and algal toxins on the YIR. Understanding the range and patterns in data will inform the Yurok Tribe so that appropriate standards can be set to prevent water pollution and protect beneficial uses. Data may ultimately be used for nutrient budgets, nutrient cycling and spiraling analysis, and tracking the abundance of toxic algae and associated algal toxins.

Although this SAP covers only covers 5 YIR sampling sites, it is part of a basin-wide effort. YTEP will be coordinating sampling with the Karuk Tribe, which will collect data at 3 additional Klamath River locations upstream in their ancestral territory nearer to Iron Gate Dam and 3 from tributaries for a total of 11 sites combined. The Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources (DNR) will follow identical protocols and methods as detailed below, but will file a separate SAP for its sampling because of the separate chain of custody.

1.1 Site Names

The Klamath River will be sampled above (WE) and below (TC) the Trinity River at Weitchpec, downstream at the USGS gage at Terwer Creek (TG) and surface waters of the lower Klamath River estuary (LES). The Trinity River (TR) will also be sampled just above where it joins the Klamath.



Figure 1. Map of Yurok Indian Reservation location, including village sites, counties and where it is relative to the State of California. Map from YTEP (2004c).

1.2 Sampling Locations

The YTEP sampling sites for grab sampling of nutrients, phytoplankton and algal toxins are on the Klamath River as it enters the YIR at Weitchpec (WE) (RM 43.5), below the confluence of the Trinity River (TC) (RM 38.5), near the lower extent of the YIR at the U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) gage at Terwer Creek (TG) (RM 5.8) and in the lower Klamath River Estuary (LES), just upstream of where the Klamath empties into the Pacific Ocean. Samples will also be taken in the lowest portion of the Trinity River (TR) to understand conditions in this major, more nutrient-limited tributary (Hoopa TEPA, 2008).

Periphyton sample sites are at three of the five YIR locations, 1) Klamath River above the Trinity River at Weitchpec (WE), 2) Trinity River (TR), and at 3) Terwer Creek USGS gage (TG). As described below, these samples are taken by defined areas of stream substrate, usually cobble sized rocks. Periphyton samples are not possible or appropriate in the deep open water of the Klamath River Estuary (LES) or at the Klamath River sampling location below the convergence of the Trinity River (TC). The latter site has deep, swift water with bedrock or large submerged boulders that cannot be sampled appropriately.

1.3 Responsible Agency

The Yurok Tribe Environmental Program will be responsible for collecting all YIR samples and insuring that sampling and handling protocols are followed. YTEP will properly pack samples and expedite shipping to appropriate water quality laboratories for analysis.

1.4 Project Organization

Table 1 lists key players and contractors, including those collecting samples, contractors that will process samples and YTEP staff that will oversee quality control (QC) procedures. The YTEP Director will have ultimate oversight capacity and will fully discuss quality assurance (QA) issues with the Project Manager, but have no direct involvement in data collection, analysis, interpretation or reporting. Laboratories that will process samples are 1) Aquatic Research Inc. in Seattle, Washington, 2) Aquatic Analysts Inc. in White Salmon, Washington, 3) the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX Laboratory in Richmond, California, and 4) the California Department of Fish and Game's Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory in Rancho Cordova.

Table 1. All parties participating in collection, shipping and handling, analysis of Klamath River nutrient, phytoplankton and algae generated toxics data on the YIR and those responsible for implementation of QA/QC procedures.

Title/Responsibility	Staff/Contractor	Phone Number
EPA Project Manager	Loretta Vanegas	(415) 972-3433
Project Manager	Ken Fetcho	(707) 482-1618
YTEP Staff	Laura Mayo	(707) 482-1618
YTEP Staff	Micah Gibson	(707) 482-1618
YTEP Staff	Cody Watt	(707) 482-1618
Quality Assurance Officer	YTEP Director	(707) 482-1350
Contractor, Aquatic Research Inc.	Steve Lazoff	(206) 632-2715
Contractor, Aquatic Analysts	Jim Sweet	(509) 493-8222
USEPA Region 9 Lab	Andy Lincoff	(510) 412-2330
CA Fish and Game Lab	Dave Crane	(916) 358-4395

1.5 Statement of the Specific Problem

The Klamath River is listed as an impaired water body under Clean Water Act (CWA) section 303(d) in both California and Oregon (CSWRCB, 2005; ODEQ, 2006). Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) studies related to pollution abatement are complete for Upper Klamath Lake and its tributaries in Oregon (ODEQ, 2002) but in progress for the Lower Klamath (Link River and Keno Reservoir to the ocean) (St. John, 2005). Nutrient pollution in the Lower Klamath River can be traced to several sources: agricultural activities, the nitrogen fixing blue-green algae species *Aphanizomenon flos-aquae* that flourishes in Upper Klamath Lake and Klamath Hydroelectric Project reservoirs, and from the Lost River and Lower Klamath Lake basin via direct winter pumping and the Straits Drain (Kier Associates, 2007).

Nutrient pollution in the Lower Klamath River causes elevated pH and dissolved ammonia and depressed dissolved oxygen. Recent studies related to Klamath Hydroelectric Project (KHP) relicensing have brought to light linkages between nutrient pollution in the Lower Klamath River and fish health (YTEP, 2006a). Algae beds and deposits of benthic organic matter in the

Klamath River just below Iron Gate Dam provide ideal habitat for a polychaete worm that plays host to one of the Klamath River's most deadly fish diseases, the protozoan *Ceratomyxa shasta* (Stocking and Bartholomew, 2004; Stocking, 2006). The combination of direct stress to fish from water pollution in combination with increased abundance of pathogens has led to more than 40% of downstream migrant juvenile Chinook salmon dying before they reach the ocean in some years (Foott et al., 2003; Nichols and Foott, 2005).

The recent discovery of toxic algae species, such as *Microcystis aeruginosa* (MSAE), in KHP reservoirs (Kann and Corum, 2006; Kann and Corum, 2007; Kann, 2007) and the Klamath River (YTEP, 2005), now pose risks to human health in late summer and fall from recreational or cultural-use contact. Data collected under this SAP will help better understand the complex nature of Klamath River nutrient pollution and the prevalence of algal toxins on the YIR.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Klamath River system drains much of northwestern California and south-central Oregon (Figure 2). The KHP and diversion projects have altered natural flow regimes (Hardy and Addley, 2001) and algal and nutrient dynamics (Kann and Asarian, 2005; Kann and Asarian, 2006; Kann and Asarian, 2007). Copco and Iron Gate reservoirs, the lowest in the KHP, are often dominated by the nitrogen fixing blue-green algal species such as *Aphanizomenon flos-aquae* (Kann and Asarian, 2006; Kann and Asarian, 2007). The Klamath River is more often limited by nitrogen than phosphorus (NRC, 2004; Hoopa TEPA 2008). Nutrient concentrations in reservoir outflows are periodically substantially higher than in reservoir inflows, making nutrients available for downstream growth of algae and macrophytes (Kann and Asarian, 2005), although patterns vary by year (Kann and Asarian, 2007).

Photosynthetic activity in algae beds and by periphyton in downstream locations elevates pH during daylight hours and plant respiration at night contributes to depressed dissolved oxygen (D.O). High pH in combination with water temperatures of 25° C, which are common on the Klamath River in summer, cause a conversion of ammonium ions to dissolved ammonia (Goldman and Horne, 1983) that is toxic to salmonids at low levels (Heisler, 1990). Nutrient concentrations generally decline with increasing distance downstream of Iron Gate Dam due to dilution and natural river nutrient retention processes (assimilation into periphyton, denitrification, and/or settling)(Asarian and Kann 2006); however, there are still water quality problems on the YIR and other downstream reaches.




Figure 2.1 Klamath River Basin in California and Oregon, including the Trinity River sub-basin showing the Yurok and Hoopa Reservations and the location of KHP dams and reservoirs.

Severe nutrient-related water quality problems are apparent just upstream of the YIR boundary (RM 43.5); consequently, concern over impacts on the YIR require further study. For example, the average daily maximum pH at Orleans (RM 66) in August 2004 was 8.5, which exceeds NCRWQCB (2005) *Basin Plan* standards, and created stressful conditions for salmonids (Wilkie and Wood, 1995). NCRWQCB samples for dissolved ammonia at Ikes Falls (RM 70) in June 1996 were as high as 0.050 mg/l, which is recognized as lethal for salmonids (Heisler, 1990). In August of 1997, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Arcata Field Office (Halstead, 1997) measured D.O. as low as 3.4 mg/l at Big Bar (RM 50), which was causing mortality of hearty, warmwater-adapted fish species such as suckers and dace, as well as salmonids.

A preliminary nutrient budget by reach for the Klamath River (Asarian and Kann, 2006) found insufficient quantity and quality of data to fully understand nutrient dynamics in the Klamath River. Problems included laboratory detection limits for nitrogen forms that were too high, insufficient temporal and spatial resolution of samples, and lack of periphyton/macrophyte data. Due to lower nutrient concentrations, detection limit issues were particularly important in the lower reaches of the Klamath River such as on the YIR.

Kann (2005) detected high concentrations of a toxic blue-green algae species MSAE in a fall 2004 reconnaissance sample. The Karuk Tribe followed up with more sampling of Iron Gate and Copco reservoirs and found the widespread presence of high concentrations of *Microcystis* in both Copco and Iron Gate Reservoirs in 2005-2007 (Kann and Corum, 2006; Kann and Corum, 2007; Kann 2007). A *Microcystis* bloom was documented in the Klamath River within the YIR boundaries in August and September 2005 (YTEP, 2006b). The timing is significant because of the presence of adult salmon and steelhead migrating upstream during this time period. This is also a time of increased cultural and recreational use of the Klamath River by both Tribal members and sport fisherman.

Coordination between the Karuk and Yurok Tribe will allow YTEP to anticipate when MSAE levels may be high so that samples can be analyzed for microcystin by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) Region 9 Laboratory in Richmond, California. Samples in 2007 found toxic blue-green algae species other than MSAE and tests for these and related toxins will also be conducted in 2008 (YTEP, 2008) at the California Department of Fish and Game's Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory in Rancho Cordova.

The Yurok and Karuk Tribes have been collecting water quality samples throughout the Klamath River Basin for nutrient and algae analysis since 2001 (YTEP, 2004a; 2004b; 2005). Both Tribes initially cooperated with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) between 2001-2005 and collected samples according to USFWS' previously formulated SAP. Current development of this SAP is necessary because the Tribes no longer coordinate with USFWS for sample collection and analysis. The Karuk DNR samples upstream reaches of the Klamath River and major tributaries in Karuk ancestral territories and has already submitted SAPs to the U.S. EPA for previous projects. They will be filing a separate but similar SAP for nutrient, phytoplankton, periphyton and algal toxins because they have a separate chain of custody and quality assurance chain of command.

2.1 Site or Sampling Area Description

Table 2 lists the YTEP sampling sites for nutrients, phytoplankton, periphyton and algal toxins, including site codes, spatial coordinates, general location and a specific description of access. The sampling area includes the lower 44 river miles of the mainstem Klamath River on the YIR and the Trinity River above its convergence with the Klamath near the southern boundary of the YIR. Although the Klamath River is bordered mostly by forests and wildlands, nutrient pollution and now toxic algae are creating water quality problems on the YIR. A map of specific locations of the sampling sites is shown in Figure 2.2. While grab samples for nutrients, phytoplankton and algal toxins will be collected at all five YIR sampling sites, periphyton samples are only possible at three (WE, TR, TG).

Table 2. Site codes and locations of YTEP sampling stations for nutrients, phytoplankton, periphyton and algal toxins.

Code	Latitude	Longitude	Grab	Periphyton	Location
WE	41°11'09"	123°42'20"	X	X	Klamath River upstream of Weitchpec
TR	41°11'04"	123°42'19"	X	X	Trinity River upstream of Klamath River confluence at Weitchpec
TC	41°13'36"	123°46'19"	X		Klamath River above Tully Creek
TG	41°30'58"	123°59'57"	X	X	Klamath River at Terwer USGS Gage
LES	41°32'45"	124°04'21"	X		Lower Klamath River Estuary (Surface)




Figure 2.2: Location of periphyton and grab sample monitoring sites on the YIR.

2.2 Operational History

Klamath River nutrient pollution has been widely recognized since the 1950's (Phinney and Peak, 1962; CH2M Hill, 1985; Kier Associates, 1991). The adult salmon kill in the September 2002 (CDFG, 2003; Guillen, 2003), chronic high mortality of juvenile salmon (Nichols and Foott, 2005) and discovery of problems with toxic algae in KHP reservoirs (Kann and Corum, 2006) all point to a water quality crisis. As noted above, sources of pollution include upstream agricultural operations and nitrogen fixing algae in Upper Klamath Lake, Lost River, Lower Klamath Lake and KHP reservoirs. The lowest two KHP reservoirs are also recognized as fostering toxic algae species as well. The extent of nutrient pollution and problems with algal toxins on the YIR are not well studied and create a need for more information and the sampling regime discussed herein.

2.3 Previous Investigations/Regulatory Involvement

The Klamath River Water Quality Monitoring Coordination Workgroup that includes Tribes and State and federal agencies was formed after the September 2002 adult salmon kill and coordinated water quality sampling subsequently increased. Asarian and Kann (2006) used existing nutrient data to construct a nutrient budget by reach for the Klamath River and their study lists all nutrient related water quality samples collected between 1996-2004. They pointed out data gaps for nutrient sampling using adequate laboratory detection limits and the need for more periphyton samples. The Hoopa Tribal Environmental Protection Agency (TEPA) (2008) used existing data to characterize Klamath River nutrient pollution and to set limits on their Reservation waters just upstream of Weitchpec. Figure 2.3 is adapted from Hoopa TEPA (2008) and shows all sampling sites in the years 2000-2004 by type for the lower Klamath River (note: no site was sampled for every parameter in every year).

The USFWS Arcata Field Office in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs assisted the Yurok Tribe with fisheries investigations on the Lower Klamath River, including water quality monitoring, until the Tribe became formally organized. USFWS increased water quality monitoring since 1995 as linkages between water pollution and fish health became more apparent. Data have included hand held samples for nutrients and those derived from continuous recording data probes that capture parameters such as pH, D.O., temperature and conductivity. Although the Klamath and Trinity rivers near their convergence have often been monitored by USFWS, they did not collect data at the other three sampling locations below the Trinity, at

Terwer Creek and in the Klamath River Estuary. In 2004, the Yurok Tribe, NCRWQCB, and PacifiCorp conducted




Figure 2.3. This map is taken from Hoopa TEPA (2008) (Figure 9) and shows all sites where nutrient related data were collected on the lower Klamath River by sample type from 2000-2004.

a Klamath River periphyton study that included monthly sampling at four sites on the YIR, with results summarized by Eilers (2005) and Hoopa TEPA (2008).

The Yurok Tribe began cooperative water quality sampling, including nutrients, with USFWS in 2001. YTEP has operated continuous water quality datasondes at four YIR locations since that time for temperature, D.O., pH, and conductivity. Monitoring for toxic algae species began in 2005 and continued through 2007 and periphyton occurred in 2004, 2006 and 2007. Since 2006 YTEP has been responsible for all YIR sample collection, transportation to applicable laboratories, data storage, and data analysis related to nutrient, phytoplankton and toxic algae. Nutrient data collected from 2001-2006 by YTEP underwent extensive QA/QC examination. Data from 2006 and 2007 are currently being integrated into the Yurok Environmental Data Storage System (YEDSS). This innovative database is able to update the U.S. EPA's STORET system. Data will also be added to the comprehensive TMDL database, which is shared and augmented by the Klamath River Water Quality Monitoring Coordination Workgroup and used by the U.S. EPA and NCRWQCB for the Klamath River TMDL.

2.5 Environmental and/or Human Impact

Nutrient and toxic algae pollution in the Klamath River is causing stressful conditions for Pacific salmon species and their juveniles and providing an environment that fosters an increase in disease organisms (YTEP, 2006c). Reduced salmon production and loss of access to salmon as a food resource has had major health consequences on the health of Native Americans in the Klamath River basin (Norgaard, 2005).

Although MSAE may also be contributing to fish health problems, it also has the capacity to directly affect human health. As MSAE cells die and decay the hepatotoxin microcystin is released, which can cause a range of reactions in humans and/or animals: rash, irritation, conjunctivitis, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, liver damage, tingling, numbness, paralysis, and death (Chorus and Bartram 1999; Chorus 2001). Once ingested, microcystin is not excreted and instead bioaccumulates and can cause liver damage, decreased liver function and eventually mortality (WHO, 1998). Mortality in fish, domestic animals, and humans has been recorded following from both single-dose events and long-term exposure to microcystin (Carmichael 1994).

Trace amounts of microcystin were measured in the liver of a half-pounder steelhead from the Lower Klamath River (YTEP, 2006b), giving rise to concern for fish health and for the health of those who consume the fish. Phytoplankton samples in 2007 also detected other toxin producing

blue-green algae species and toxins other than those produced by MSAE have been detected in KHP reservoirs (YTEP, 2008). The presence, prevalence and effects on people and fish of these other toxins needs further exploration both on the YIR and upstream reaches.

3.0 PROJECT DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Task and Problem Definition

The study area is the Klamath River within the boundaries of the YIR, although the Karuk DNR will be conducting identical sampling in upstream reaches and tributaries. This project will help understand the extent of nutrient pollution and the prevalence of algal toxins and the risk both pose to fish and human health. While the YIR benefits from addition of relatively high quality water from the Trinity River at its upper boundary, nutrient pollution on the YIR may be occurring and needs further study.

Specific questions this study should answer include:

- 1) Are there nutrient levels indicative of pollution in the Klamath River, including reaches within the YIR?
- 2) Do periphyton samples show a density of chlorophyll *a* indicative of nutrient pollution?
- 3) Are there dangerous levels of MSAE and microcystin toxin in the Klamath River, including reaches within the YIR?
- 4) Are there other potentially toxic blue-green species present in the Klamath River and algal toxins other than the most common microcystin variant?

Although YTEP investigations are restricted to the YIR, the Karuk DNR will provide data to answer the same questions for upstream reaches. In the longer term, these samples will show pollution variation between water years and provide a basis to judge effectiveness of short-term and long-term management and regulatory actions taken to abate pollution throughout the Klamath River Basin. This will also allow participation of Tribes as resource co-managers and as full partners in adaptive management. Within the YIR specifically, the data may be used as justification for improvement of standards needed to protect Tribal members, the public and other beneficial uses.

Evidence gathered may also help the Yurok Tribe and other Lower Klamath Basin Tribes to prevail in actions to have polluting KHP reservoirs removed and to prompt further action on non-point source pollution from agriculture through mechanisms such as the Klamath River and Lost River TMDL implementation. In the short term, action will be taken immediately to inform appropriate agencies and the public in the event that potentially dangerous levels of blue-green algae cell counts or toxins are discovered.

3.2 Data Quality Objectives (DQOs)

Data quality objectives (DQOs) are quantitative and qualitative criteria that establish the level of uncertainty associated with a set of data. DQO protocols (U.S. EPA, 2006) must be followed in water quality studies funded by or in partnership with the U.S. EPA. Meeting DQOs assures that data produced accurately reflects concentrations of contaminants and can be used to judge compliance or non-compliance with water quality standards. In order to minimize uncertainty and provide information suitable for decision support, sampling methods will follow standard protocols defined below known to produce trustable results, and strict QA/QC procedures will be implemented. The QA Officer will work with the Project Manager to examine all aspects of sampling, shipping and chain of custody and laboratory results and correct any problems immediately.

YTEP is cooperating with other agencies and Tribes to help understand patterns of pollution generated by nutrients and algal toxins in the Klamath River. Previous studies, such as Asarian and Kann (2006), prescribed the level of accuracy of nutrient data, such as nitrogen, needed for a fuller understanding of Klamath River nutrient pollution. Nutrient grab samples will be collected bi-weekly (every two weeks) between May and October at YIR sampling locations analyzed for the following parameters:

- Total Phosphorus
- Ortho-Phosphorus
- Total Nitrogen
- Nitrate and Nitrite
- Ammonia
- Chlorophyll *a*/Phaeophytin *a*
- Total Organic Carbon
- Total Suspended Solids
- Total Dissolved Solids
- Alkalinity

- Calcium
- Magnesium

Additional analytes may be added or omitted from the sample matrix based on funding or input from the Klamath River Water Quality Monitoring Coordination Workgroup. YTEP is using the one of the most well recognized laboratories in the West for nutrient analysis, Aquatic Research, Inc. in Seattle, Washington.

Periphyton data collection will follow protocols of previous studies (Eilers, 2005) that are consistent with widely recognized standards (Porter et al., 1995; U.S. EPA, 2002). Samples will be packed on ice and shipped for next day delivery to Aquatic Analysts in White Salmon, Washington which will determine species composition and the levels of chlorophyll *a*.

Phytoplankton sample analysis will include species composition and cell counts determined by Aquatic Analysts. Very low detection levels are being set for microcystin and other toxins because of the risk posed to human health; therefore, only laboratories specializing in detection of these substances are being used. The analysis for microcystin toxin using the enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) method will be performed by the U.S. EPA Region IX Laboratory in Richmond, California, similar to cooperative efforts of 2007.

The California Department of Fish and Game's Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory in Rancho Cordova will perform the analysis of microcystin variants and anatoxin-a using liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS). MSAE cell counts may not directly relate to toxin levels and high counts may lead to low levels of toxin or vice versa. YIR 2007 sampling results reported that toxicogenic cyanobacteria species other than MSAE were present, including *Aphanizomenon*, *Anabaena* and *Oscillatoria* (YTEP, 2008). Samples destined for the U.S. EPA lab and ELISA testing will be split and a duplicate sent to the California Department of Fish and Game's Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory in Rancho Cordova for LC-MS/MS testing. This will allow YTEP and cooperators to answer questions as to whether toxic algae pollution is restricted to microcystin-LR or if other forms (LA, YR, RR, LF, LW) or other toxins such anatoxin-a are also present.

3.3 Data Quality Indicators (DQIs)

Data quality indicators (DQI) relate to accuracy, precision, representativeness, comparability, completeness and methods detection limits. The quality control criteria established by YTEP for

data gathering, sampling, and analysis activities assures that important data gaps regarding Klamath River nutrient and toxic algae pollution can be filled with scientifically accurate data.

Hoopa TEPA (2008) found that nitrogen in the Klamath River is correlated with maximum pH, diel pH fluctuation, and minimum D.O.; therefore, nitrogen is an important index of nutrient pollution. YTEP will adopt reference levels for key nutrients nitrogen, phosphorous and total inorganic nitrogen similar and MSAE and microcystin (Table 3.3) to those chosen as standards for the Klamath River on the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation (Hoopa TEPA, 2008), which intersects with the river just above Weitchpec. An indication of high quality data will be sufficient resolution and accuracy to support comparison with these objectives. Similarly, Hoopa TEPA (2008) recognize that periphyton chlorophyll *a* levels can be used as an index of pollution, and recommended a maximum annual peak biomass limit of 150 mg/m² to protect water quality and fisheries.

Table 3.3 Limits of pollution for various nutrient parameters, MSAE and microcystin toxins.

Water Quality Parameter	Recognized Pollution Level
Total Nitrogen (TN) (mg/L)	0.2 mg/l
Total Phosphorus (TP) (mg/L)	0.035 mg/l
Periphyton Chlorophyll <i>a</i> (mg/m ²)	150 mg/m ²
<i>Microcystis aeruginosa</i> cell count	40,000 cells/ml
Microcystin Toxin	1 µg/l

Microcystin is a relatively new problem in California, but a consortium of State agencies has set provisional standards for hazardous conditions for recreational water bodies (CSWRCB, CDPH, and OEHHA, 2007). The standards for public health protection and limits of pollution levels are 40,000 cells of MSAE to trigger posting of a water body and 1 µg/l of microcystin for complete closure. This is consistent with World Health Organization (1998) limits for microcystin and YTEP and the Karuk DNR will issue warnings and communicate with all appropriate agencies should Klamath River samples exceed these thresholds.

The primary DQI specific to this project is whether uncertainty associated with each measurement is low enough to provide sufficient resolution to determine values relative to the above references.

Accuracy: The degree of agreement between a measurement and the true or expected value is the definition of accuracy. Nutrient data accuracy will be checked through the use of spikes, samples with known concentrations of analytes that are prepared by a certified provider to test laboratory results for accuracy. Spiked samples should have a percent recovery of + or - 20%.

Precision: Precision of results will be tested using duplicate samples, usually taken as field splits, with a target of less than 20% relative percent difference (RPD).

Comparability: Samples will be taken with comparable methods across the universe of samples in 2008 on the Klamath River and its tributaries so will be comparable within the year. Methods are also consistent with previous samples that make up baseline and trend data for nutrients, phytoplankton, periphyton and algal toxins.

Completeness: Given the high quality of past samples taken by YTEP, completeness on this project is expected to be over 90%, which is highly desirable because samples will only be taken bi-weekly (every two weeks) in 2008.

Representativeness: This is the expression of the degree to which data accurately and precisely represent a characteristic of an environmental condition or a population. Field crews collecting samples will ensure representativeness of samples by selecting free-flowing water from established sampling locations and using a churn splitter to mix sample water once collected (Lurry and Kolbe, 2000) and by following protocols (Eilers, 2005; U.S. EPA, 2002) for periphyton.

See Table 3.31 for comparability measures and detection limits for nutrient samples, including U.S. EPA or American Public Health Association (APHA) (Eaton et al., 1995) approved sampling methods.

3.4 Data Review and Validation

All YTEP field personnel have been thoroughly trained in the protocols of data collection for nutrients, phytoplankton, periphyton and algal toxins. Results they have collected over the last several years have been of high quality. Each field visit requires that staff fill out field data sheets, a field notebook with standard entries and label samples appropriately in the field (Appendix B). Sampling is always conducted by at least two staff for safety reasons and to maintain consistency. YTEP is the primary organization

responsible for data review, although the professional laboratories analyzing water quality samples will also note potential problems with outliers or other anomalies in sample results. Information regarding QA/QC procedures for the laboratories, other than U.S. EPA Region IX, are attached as Appendices F, G and H. One hundred percent of laboratory-generated data will be checked on receipt by the Project Manager for consistency, including whether blanks, spikes and duplicates are within specified targets

Table 3.31 Nutrient grab sample analytical methods and reporting limits (Aquatic Research Inc. 2007).

Parameter	Method	Reporting Limit (mg/L)	MDL (mg/L)
Total Phosphorus	EPA 365.1	0.002	0.002
Ortho Phosphorus	EPA 365.1	0.001	0.001
Total Nitrogen	SM204500N	0.100	0.045
Nitrate + Nitrite	EPA 353.2	0.010	0.005
Ammonia	EPA 350.1	0.010	0.006
Chlorophyll <i>a</i> / Phaeophytin <i>a</i>	SM1810200	0.0001	0.0001
Total Organic Carbon	EPA 415.2	0.250	0.095
Total Suspended Solids	EPA 160.2	0.050	0.10
Total Dissolved Solids	EPA 160.1	5.00	1.00
Alkalinity	EPA 310.1	1.00	0.20
Calcium	EPA 200.7	0.100	0.008
Magnesium	EPA 200.7	0.100	0.011

and meet DQOs. Once data are merged or entered into a database, charting tools will be used to further check for data anomalies or errors. Outliers will be defined as in U.S. BOR (2005). Any unusual values outside the range of norm will be flagged and all aspects of field data sheets, shipping handling and laboratory handling and testing will be reviewed. Water temperature, conductivity, pH and dissolved oxygen are measured in the field when samples are collected and values of these hand-held measurements can be used to check field conditions at the time of sampling.

3.5 Data Management

The Project Manager will use the following information to evaluate data quality:

- Sample chain of custody documentation is complete and correct
- Sample preparation information is complete and correct
- Sample integrity has been maintained

- Instrument performance criteria have been met
- Calibration criteria have been met
- Holding times, sample preservation, and sample storage criteria have been met
- Analyte identification and quantification are correct
- QC samples and method blanks are within control limits
- Documentation (including the case narrative) is complete and correct

The data manager will visually inspect all entered data sets to check for inconsistencies with original field or laboratory data sheets. Where inconsistencies are encountered, data will be re-entered and re-inspected until the entered data is found to be satisfactory or results will be discarded. The Project Manager will maintain field datasheets and notebooks in the event that the QA Officer needs to review any aspect of sampling for QA/QC purposes.

The Yurok Tribe received a grant under the Environmental Information Exchange Network Program and used it to develop the Yurok Tribe Environmental Data Storage System (YEDSS). Nutrient data covered by this SAP will be captured in YEDSS, which has automatic QA/QC screening so that data entries that fall outside expected ranges are automatically flagged. Raw data and data that have under-gone further QA/QC are automatically archived separately and metadata associated with each data type are also stored within the system and can be easily accessed when questions arise. Phytoplankton, periphyton and algal toxin data will be entered into Excel spreadsheets that are checked for accuracy by the Project Manager and backed up onto the YTEP network and an external hard drive system that is maintained offsite.

3.6 Assessment Oversight

The Project Manager will check field forms, equipment calibration reports, and results of laboratory analysis every two weeks. Any discovery of problems with logistics of sampling or data will be documented and corrected as soon as discovered. The Project Manager will be encouraged to bring problems to the attention of the QA Officer before routine monthly meetings when problems with QA/QC procedures are suspected. The QA Officer is also the YTEP Executive Director and has the authority to make any necessary changes to maintain or improve quality of field sampling or laboratory results and will take immediate action as decided through meetings with the Project Manager and in consultation with the U.S. EPA.

Data quality will be assessed by looking at how samples compare to the existing universe of Klamath River data and recognized ranges of expected values from the literature. If data that do not fall within expected ranges cannot be corrected or validated through cross-checking, it will

not be used in any analysis, but maintained with an associated metadata file describing why those data did not meet QA/QC standards.

4.0 SAMPLING RATIONALE

Background information above showed the need for samples of nutrients, periphyton, phytoplankton and algal toxins on the YIR.

4.3 Water Sampling

Nutrient pollution and toxic blue-green algae blooms have been detected in the mainstem Klamath River on the YIR posing a risk to fish health and human health. YTEP has been monitoring water quality in the mainstem Klamath River since 2001.

Monitoring Locations: Sampling sites (Figure 2.2) were selected based on the following criteria:

- WE (Klamath River upstream of Trinity River at Weitchpec) – Conditions of the Klamath River as it enters the YIR.
- TR (Trinity River upstream of Weitchpec) – Conditions of the Trinity River, an important tributary that enters the Klamath River near the border of the YIR. Water temperatures in the Trinity River are generally cooler than the Klamath River during summer months and less nutrient rich.
- TC (Klamath River above Tully Creek) – This site is downstream of the confluence of the Klamath/Trinity Rivers and is in a well-mixed region. YTEP has conducted studies to ensure that water quality conditions at this location are homogeneous across the river channel, ensuring that samples are not biased and influenced more heavily by either the Klamath or Trinity rivers. Samples from this site capture the effect that Trinity River water quality has on flows from the mainstem Klamath.
- TG (Klamath River at Terwer Creek USGS Gage) – This site is near the lowermost USGS streamflow gauging station on the Klamath River near the town of Klamath. It is of interest how nutrients are assimilated as they travel down the mainstem Klamath at this site is approximately 31 miles downstream of TC.
- LES (Lower Klamath River Estuary) – This location was selected to monitor water quality in the estuarine environment and also as the last point before water from the Klamath River enters the Pacific Ocean. During periods of low flow, the mouth periodically partially closes, which inundates the estuary and creates a

lagoon-like habitat. Sampling at this location would enable YTEP to determine if water quality differs when the estuary becomes inundated.

Periphyton sampling only takes place at three locations because the estuary sampling station (LES) and the Klamath River above Tully Creek (TC) sampling station are not suitable due to depth and substrate conditions.

Decisions regarding adding or removing sites for sampling will consider the following criteria:

- Are the substantial differences in observed water quality between two adjacent sampling sites? If there are differences, adding a site between the two may be necessary to understand what is occurring (e.g. the presence of some nutrient sink/source).
- Identification of new threat/issues. For example, when the Yurok Tribe became aware several years ago that the toxic algal species MSAE is present in the Klamath River, YTEP began a phytoplankton and algal toxin monitoring program in the Klamath River Estuary because of its unique habitat compared to the river sampling sites.
- Trade-offs between spatial and temporal sampling intensity. Would dropping unnecessary sites free up resources to allow for more frequent sampling at other more important sites?

Timing of Samples: YTEP will collect bi-weekly (every other week) samples between May and October. This time period was selected because it is when nutrients impair water quality in the mainstem Klamath River and when toxic algae blooms may occur. Monthly samples have proved insufficient for fully understanding nutrient dynamics of the Klamath River (Asarian and Kann, 2006; Kann and Asarian, 2007) and would have greater potential to miss dangerous levels of algal toxins.

Late spring through fall are important times for juvenile salmonid (chinook, coho, steelhead) emigration, adult spring and fall chinook migration into the Klamath basin, and migration of lamprey and green sturgeon, which are all of great importance to the Yurok People. Water quality conditions may impact these species of importance and may also impact the use of the river for recreation and subsistence fishing. MSAE blooms and those of other toxic algae species occur in late summer and early fall, when fishing is in progress. Detection of nutrient pollution and toxic algae in the Klamath River on the YIR have caused YTEP to create a long-term monitoring dataset.

Justification for Analytes

Grab Samples: The following parameters from grab samples were selected based on the following criteria or concerns:

- Total Phosphorus – This parameter is an indicator of runoff from agriculture and is typically found at very low concentrations in unpolluted waters. This parameter is of interest since the availability of phosphorus is key in stimulating algae blooms. The Upper Klamath Basin has extensive agricultural land use and algae blooms occur regularly throughout the summer and early fall months in the Upper Basin and persist downriver as well.
- Ortho-Phosphorus – This parameter is the dissolved form of phosphorus that is readily available for utilization by plants and algae. YTEP is interested in this parameter since algae blooms occur regularly in the Klamath Basin and may be affected by Ortho-Phosphorus levels.
- Total Nitrogen – Total Nitrogen is a common indicator of water quality and the relative supply of both nitrogen and phosphorus and their concentrations can be indicative of human impacts on a water body. This parameter was chosen because the Klamath River is listed as impaired for nutrients.
- Nitrate + Nitrite – Nitrate and Nitrite are both highly soluble in water and are commonly used as indicators of water quality. Nitrate is a component of fertilizers, sewage, and manure. This parameter was chosen because the Klamath River is listed as impaired for nutrients and agricultural land use in the Upper Basin, Scott River and Shasta River contribute to nutrient pollution.
- Ammonia – Ammonia is highly soluble in water and is commonly used as an indicator of water quality. Ammonia is a component of fertilizers, sewage, and manure and; therefore, an index of nutrient loading from agricultural activities upstream. High pH in combination with high water temperature converts ammonium ions to dissolved ammonia, which is highly toxic to fish at relatively low levels. Having pH, water temperature and ammonia levels will allow calculation of dissolved ammonia.
- Chlorophyll *a* / Phaeophytin *a* – Chlorophyll *a* and Phaeophytin *a* (a breakdown product of chlorophyll *a*) are indirect measurements of algal biomass. This parameter was chosen because it is a well recognized index of nutrient pollution (U.S. EPA, 2000). This is a concentration (mass per unit volume) measurement based on water grab samples, as opposed to mass/unit area for periphyton samples (see below).

- Total Organic Carbon – Elevated levels of total organic carbon can cause an increase in biological oxygen demand, decreasing D.O. in the water column resulting in unfavorable conditions for aquatic life. Total organic carbon is affected by climate, flow, and the amount of vegetation within or contributing to detritus in the water column. YTEP chose this parameter because flows in the Klamath River drop substantially during summer months and there is a high accumulation of algae and aquatic vegetation, which could result in high total organic carbon levels.
- Total Suspended Solids – Total Suspended Solids in the water column can impact aquatic life by clogging fish gills, decreasing foraging success, and ultimately can result in decreasing growth rates of fish inhabiting water with high levels of suspended solids. High concentrations of suspended solids can also decrease light penetration through the water column, which indirectly affects other parameters such as temperature and dissolved oxygen concentrations (by decreasing photosynthesis). YTEP chose this parameter because it will allow tracking of the concentration of organic and inorganic particles in the water throughout the sampling season.
- Total Dissolved Solids – Total Dissolved Solids is a measure of inorganic salts and dissolved organic matter. YTEP chose this parameter because it will allow tracking of the concentration of organic and inorganic salts in the water throughout the sampling season.
- Alkalinity – Alkalinity is the total measure of substances in water that have an ‘acid neutralizing’ ability. Results from alkalinity analyses will indicate the Klamath River’s ability to react with acidity and ‘buffer’ pH levels. YTEP chose this parameter because pH levels in the Klamath River are elevated, which may cause stressful conditions for aquatic life.
- Calcium and Magnesium – Calcium and magnesium both contribute to water hardness and may provide a buffer that moderates pH fluctuation. The ratio of these two minerals may provide insight into what is driving harmfully high alkalinity in the Klamath River.
- MSAE and Toxic Blue-Green Algae Cell Counts: Health warnings by the WHO (1998) and the State of California (CSWRCB, CDPH, and OEHHA, 2007) for potentially toxic blue-green algae species are based on cell counts.
- Microcystin and Other Algal Toxins: Microcystin-LR is the most common toxin generated by blue-green algae species, but the potential for other forms of

microcystin (LF, LW, LA, YR, RR) or other types of toxins like anatoxin-a are also being explored to understand all potential human health risks.

Periphyton Samples: Periphyton sample analytes are justified as follows:

- Chlorophyll *a*: This is a standard parameter for understanding nutrient pollution and is measured in units of mass per unit area based on rock scrapings (see below).
- Algae Species Enumeration and Composition: Species collected in periphyton samples also are useful in understanding whether the community structure reflects nutrient polluted conditions.

Decisions regarding adding or removing sites for sampling will consider the following criteria:

- Water quality models may require collection of data regarding new parameters. For example, models may require measuring sediment oxygen demand in the Klamath River Estuary.
- Specific research questions. For example, bettering understanding of how changes in nutrient loading would affect the Klamath River Estuary may require collected detailed information on the quantities and types of organic matter entering the estuary from the River (e.g. ratio of particulate vs. dissolved organic matter, and particle-size distribution of particulate organic matter).

5.0 REQUEST FOR ANALYSES

5.1 Analysis Narrative

The U.S. EPA worked cooperatively with YTEP in 2007 and ran ELISA tests for the blue-green algae generated toxin microcystin LR at their Region IX Laboratory in Richmond, California. This SAP anticipates the same working relationship and same analytes in 2008 and into the future as long as the agency desires. U.S. EPA has been concerned about potential health effects of microcystin and partnership with the Yurok Tribe is the most cost-effective way to acquire data needed to manage risk. Because the U.S. EPA Region 9 Lab will only be processing microcystin-LR using the ELISA method and samples do not require fixing with chemicals; therefore, there is no need for a Request for Analytical Service Matrix table here.

Detailed shipping and handling of samples and QA/QC requirements will be met by using YTEP Chain of Custody form (Appendix C). Samples from all five YIR sampling stations (Table 2.1) will be shipped bi-weekly (every two weeks) from May through October. In addition, a complete

set of duplicates will be collected from one sampling location during each sampling event to evaluate the field crew's and lab's performance.

YTEP (2008) noted that 2007 phytoplankton data showed the highest levels of *MSAE* since 2005, but there were very low microcystin-LR toxin levels. Also, in addition to *MSAE* other toxic blue-green algae species were discovered. YTEP needs to test the hypothesis that toxins other than microcystin-LR may be present. Consequently, a split sample will be sent to the California Department of Fish and Game's Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory in Rancho Cordova to use LC-MS/MS to look for microcystin variants (LF, LW, LR, LA, YR, RR) and other algal toxins (i.e. anatoxin-a).

Field water quality samples taken contemporaneously with nutrient grabs, phytoplankton, periphyton and toxic algae surveys are collected using a YSI datasonde. Calibration methods of the YSI datasonde are attached as Appendix E. Parameters measured include water temperature, dissolved oxygen, conductivity, and pH. Data will be recorded onto the grab sample datasheet (Appendix B). The Project Manager will check calibration logs to ensure that QA/QC procedures are followed increasing chances that spot data collected during sampling accurately reflect ambient water quality conditions. As discussed above, these data can be used to resolve questions that may arise with regard to sampling anomalies or outliers.

5.2 Analytical Laboratories Other Than U.S. EPA

Table 5 lists all parameters that will be measured and to which laboratory each will be shipped for processing. The other laboratories participating in sampling analysis under this plan are Aquatic Research, Inc. (AR), Aquatic Analysts, Inc. (AA) and California Department of Fish and Game's Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory in Rancho Cordova.

Aquatic Research Inc. (AR) has processed Karuk Tribe samples for the reservoir studies from 2005-2007 (Kann and Corum, 2006) and provided reliable services for the Klamath Tribes in Oregon since 1990. AR has some of the lowest reporting limits for nitrogen related parameters on the West coast and has certified lab status from the states of Washington and California.

Aquatic Analysts Inc. (AA) has been identifying Klamath River algae samples since 2004. Jim Sweet is the owner and expert taxonomist and has assisted with Upper Klamath algae studies for the Klamath Tribes of Oregon.

The California Department of Fish and Game's Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory in Rancho Cordova will process algal toxin sample splits from two Klamath River sampling sites for microcystin variants (LF, LW, LR, LA, YR, and RR) and anatoxin-a using the LC-MS/MS method. The California Department of Fish and Game's Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory in Rancho Cordova has highly trained staff and state-of-the-art equipment. Further information regarding laboratory QA/QC procedures is included as Appendices F, G and H.

6.0 FIELD METHODS AND PROCEDURES

YTEP follows standard water quality grab sample procedures for nutrients, phytoplankton, and algal toxins using a churn to mix samples and following an appropriate regimen of blanks, duplicates and other steps to assure quality. Periphyton samples follow procedures as defined by the U.S. EPA (2002) and USGS (Porter et al., 1995) as previously used on the Klamath River by Eilers (2005).

6.1 Field Equipment

Standard methods will be used for collecting nutrient, phytoplankton, periphyton and algal generated toxics with specific equipment and steps for use described below. All samples are shipped to the laboratory on ice the same day samples are collected (see Section 7.0).

6.1.1 Field Equipment List

Field equipment for nutrient, phytoplankton and toxic samples, include a churn splitter and jars provided by laboratories. A YSI datasonde is used to capture ambient water quality (temperature, pH, D.O. and conductivity). The churn splitter requires cleaning with deionized water in the field. Churn cleaning before or after use at YTEP headquarters is with hydrochloric acid, which is not transported into the field (see Churn Cleaning SOP, Appendix A).

The following are the items on the YTEP grab sampling check list that staff refer to before going into the field to collect nutrient, phytoplankton or algal toxin data:

1. Portable Water Quality instrument = YSI instrument
2. Ice (in bottles or packs)
3. Sample Jars (from laboratory)
4. Coolers
5. Splitter/churn
6. Clip board

- a. Data sheet
 - b. Pencils
 - c. Chain of Custody forms
 - d. Protocol Instructions
- 7. Nitrile Gloves
 - 8. Watch
 - 9. Waders and boots
 - 10. Distilled Water- 5+ gallons

Table 5. Nutrient, phytoplankton, periphyton and algal toxin parameters and the laboratory to which each will be shipped for analysis.

Parameter	Laboratory	Method	Reporting Limit (mg/L)	MDL (mg/L)
Total Phosphorus	AR	EPA 365.1	0.002	0.002
Ortho Phosphorus	AR	EPA 365.1	0.001	0.001
Total Nitrogen	AR	EPA 351.1	0.100	0.045
Nitrate + Nitrite	AR	EPA 353.2	0.010	0.005
Ammonia	AR	EPA 350.1	0.010	0.006
Chlorophyll <i>a</i> / Phaeophytin <i>a</i>	AR	APHA Standards (10200H)	0.0001	0.0001
Phytoplankton speciation and enumeration	AA	APHA Standards	NA	
Total Organic Carbon	AR	EPA 415.2	0.250	0.095
TSS	AR	EPA 160.2	0.050	0.10
TDS	AR	EPA 160.1	5.00	1.00
Alkalinity	AR	EPA 310.1	1.00	0.20
Calcium	AR	EPA 200.7	0.100	0.008
Magnesium	AR	EPA 200.7	0.100	0.011
Microcystin-LR	US EPA	ELISA	1.8 µg/l	1.8 µg/l
Microcystin (LR,LA,YR,RR,LF,LW) Anatoxin-a	CA Fish and Game	LC-MS/MS	1.0 µg/l	1.0 µg/l
Periphyton Chlorophyll- <i>a</i>	AA	APHA Standards (10200.H.3)	1 mg/m ²	1 mg/m ²

Periphyton speciation and enumeration	AA	APHA Standards	NA	NA
---------------------------------------	----	----------------	----	----

The following equipment is needed to follow the methods of Eilers (2005), U.S. EPA (2002) and USGS (Porter et al., 1995) for collection of periphyton samples:

- 1) Flow meter
- 2) Measuring tape
- 3) Measuring staff/yard stick for water depth
- 4) Grid (1.5 square feet) used to determine algae cover at sample sites
- 5) Tub for keeping rocks selected for sampling submerged to carry to sampling site.
- 6) Microscope slides (1 “ by 3”) to judge sampling area and for sample application
- 7) Scraping tools such toothbrushes, scrapers, razor blades and spatulas
- 8) Tray or pan used for working surface
- 9) Jars for capturing sample scrapings
- 10) Coolers with ice for shipping samples to labs
- 11) Sample jars with Lugol’s solution for periphyton speciation and enumeration (from Aquatic Analysts)
- 12) Sample jars with chemical preservative (MgCO₃) for fixing chlorophyll *a* (from Aquatic Analysts)

The Yurok Tribe has multiple YSI datasondes and flow meters to provide replacement equipment, in the event of any equipment malfunction.

6.1.2 Calibration of Field Equipment

The YTEP YSI multi-channel datasondes are very reliable, if properly calibrated. YTEP staff calibrate the YSI datasonde before use in the field daily following YSI instructions and other standard procedures for calibration (U.S. EPA, 2001) that are attached as Appendix E. Every winter the YSI recorders are sent back to the factory and any defective sensors replaced.

6.2 Field Screening

Field screening is not appropriate for the sampling regime proposed under this SAP.

6.5 Water Sampling

6.5.1 Surface Water Sampling

Grab samples will be collected on the same day for all five YIR locations using standard techniques from USGS (Lurry and Kolb, 2000). Timing of samples will be bi-weekly (every two weeks) between May and October. General water quality parameters (temperature, dissolved oxygen, conductivity, and pH) will also be measured simultaneously with a YSI datasonde that has been calibrated (using procedures in Appendix E) and data recorded onto the grab sample datasheet.

At 5 YIR locations previously selected (Section 1.1), water samples will be collected with a churn splitter to ensure that the sample is homogeneously mixed before the sample bottles are filled (Figure 6.5.1). The churn is fully submerged into the stream and filled to the lid with flowing water, not stagnant water. Prior to filling for nutrient, phytoplankton and algal toxin sampling, the churn will be rinsed three times with deionized water. The goal of rinsing is to remove substances adhering to equipment from previous exposure to environmental and other media (Lurry and Kolb, 2000). After rinsing with deionized water, the churn is rinsed three times with stream water. Samples are collected from uniformly mixed water by wading out into the water channel from the bank and the churn is fully submerged into the stream and filled to the lid with sample water. Completely filling the churn allows for all sample bottles to be filled from one churn; thereby minimizing differences in water properties and quality between samples.



Figure 6.5.1. YTEP staff collects Klamath River water in churn to ensure representativeness of sample. Photo taken in 2007 at Weitchpec location just upstream of the convergence with the Trinity River.

Proper use of the churn guarantees that the water is well mixed before the sample is collected. The churn should be stirred at a uniform rate by raising and lowering the splitter at approximately 9 inches per second while bottles are being filled (Bel-Art Products, 1993). If filling is stopped for some reason, the stirring rate must be resumed before the next sample is drawn from the churn. As the volume of water in the churn decreases, the round trip frequency increases as the velocity of the churn splitter remains the same. Care must be taken to avoid breaking the surface of the water as the splitter rises toward the top of the water in the churn.

Sample bottles and chemical preservatives used will be provided by the associated laboratories and are considered sterile prior to field usage. Sample bottles without chemical preservatives will be rinsed with stream water from the churn three times before filling with sample water. In the case of bottles that contain chemical preservatives, bottles are not rinsed before sample collection and care is taken to avoid over-spillage that would result in chemical preservative loss.

Collected samples are placed in coolers on ice for transport to contracted laboratories for analysis.

For quality assurance/ quality control (QA/QC) purposes duplicate, blank, and spiked bottle sets are prepared and collected for one site each sampling period. These additional bottle sets are handled, prepared and filled following the same protocol used for regular bottle sets and samples.

6.6 Biological Sampling

Periphyton samples will be collected at three of five YIR sampling sites contemporaneously with water quality grab samples. The lower Klamath River Estuary (LES) and the Klamath River sampling site above Tully Creek (TC) are not suitable for periphyton sampling because of depth and substrate types. Periphyton sampling techniques employed are those recommended by U.S. EPA (2002) and USGS (Porter et al., 1995) and previously applied on the Klamath River by Eilers (2005). This section discusses samples of periphyton that will be analyzed for species diversity, while parallel samples are also collected at the same time for chemical analysis (chlorophyll *a*) (see section 6.6.1 below), which is a measure of weight per unit area (mg/m^2) of streambed. Site selection is not random, but rather chosen to represent periphyton communities in exposed sites that are probably most prevalent because of the Klamath Rivers width, as opposed to very-near shore or deep water assemblages, which are less extensive and less likely to affect water quality.

1. Select five representative cobbles from the stream bed at each YIR sampling location. Rocks selected should not include extremes of algal cover. The specific stream bottom area sampled should meet the following criteria:
 - Depth: 1 to 2 feet (use current meter staff)
 - Velocity: 1 to 2 feet per second (current meter)
 - Exposure: Clear solar path (i.e., no serious topographic or riparian shading)
2. Record the stream velocity, water depth, distance from the shore and the stream width for the location in which rocks will be removed for sampling on the datasheet.
3. Place 1.5 square foot grid on stream bed where cobbles are to be collected and make note of percent cover of algae within the total grid area (Figure 6.6.1).

4. Record any general observations that may be useful such as weather conditions and/or any drastic change in stream flow that could influence the periphyton community (i.e., recent rain event that caused increase in flow or scheduled flow releases or reductions).
5. Place cobbles selected for sampling in a tub containing water of sufficient depth to keep them submerged and transport to a convenient sample-processing area.
6. Select an area the size of a 1 inch by 3 inch microscope slide on an area of the clast that is representative and can be easily scraped (Figure 6.6.2). Two samples per location are collected for species identification and enumeration and also for chemical samples.
7. Scrape area of selected cobbles into sample jars (Figure 6.2) that contain Lugol's solution for cell preservation to aid species identification. The tray over which the sample has been processed is then carefully poured into the sample jar.
8. Label sample jars.
9. Pack labeled jars in cooler and complete field datasheets.

Although biological samples for species diversity do not require rush shipping, they are shipped the same day as collected along with chlorophyll *a* samples that do require 48 hour delivery.

Grid estimation of periphyton cover helps to gauge changes from month to month. Grid data are recorded on a separate datasheet (Appendix D). Effort is made to select an area that has not been disturbed by the sampling crew but still meets the same depths and velocities of location where the rock samples were taken. Use view finder of camera used for field documentation to visually inspect the amount of periphyton or macrophyte in each quadrant and record. Two samples should be taken, if one is not sufficiently representative.



Figure 6.6.1 This photo shows the 1.5 ft² grid for field estimation of periphyton cover in the vicinity of sample collection.




Figure 6.6.2 Sample area equivalent to a 1" X 3" microscope slide is selected prior to scraping.

6.6.1 Biological Sampling for Chemical Analysis

Periphyton collection for chlorophyll *a* is identical to steps described above for species diversity sampling with the following noted exceptions. Distilled water may be used in washing contents of trays over which samples have been processed. These samples also require immediate refrigeration and so are placed in coolers with ice that have been brought into the field and which will be used for shipping samples to the laboratory. Samples are shipped via overnight carrier in a sealed cooler packed with wet ice so that lab analysis is conducted within 48 hours. The wet ice will be double bagged to prevent leakage. Double bagging the wet ice will also prevent water from melted ice having direct contact with the sample containers and packaging. Grab samples for phytoplankton are also analyzed by Aquatic Research for chlorophyll-*a* and phaeophytin-*a* using a spectrophotometer, but sampling protocols do not vary from standard collection methods for nutrients, algal toxins or phytoplankton cell counts.

7.0 SAMPLE CONTAINERS, PRESERVATION AND STORAGE

As described above (Section 5.2), all samples collected are destined for one of four laboratories with which YTEP is working. These laboratories provide containers for each sample type, including appropriate preservatives. For example, the periphyton chlorophyll *a* sample jars have a preservative of saturated solution of MgCO₃ prepared by Aquatic Analysts, Inc. Lugol's is added to periphyton and phytoplankton grab samples to preserve cell structure. Nutrient samples do not require fixing. If there are no agents for fixing samples in sampling jars, they are rinsed three times with river water prior to being filled with sample. Labs also supply coolers suitable for secure shipping and YTEP packs sufficient ice in them to maintain cold conditions conducive to sample preservation.

As mentioned above, special care will be taken in the cleaning of the sampling churn that is used to ensure the representativeness of nutrient, phytoplankton and algal toxic samples. It will be rinsed with distilled water three times, then river water three times, before being submerged in the river for sampling. HCl is used to clean the churn at YTEP headquarters. Churn cleaning SOPs are attached as Appendix A.

8.0 DISPOSAL OF RESIDUAL MATERIALS

This section does not apply to the type of sampling conducted under this SAP.

9.0 SAMPLE DOCUMENTATION AND SHIPMENT

All samples will be fully documented and complete notes will accompany every sampling event, including photo monitoring.

9.1 Field Notes and Logbooks

Sampling from each day of data collection will be recorded on the YTEP Nutrient, Phytoplankton, Periphyton and Algal Toxin Sampling Data Sheet (Appendix B), which includes:

1. Survey crew identification
2. Date and time
3. Ambient water quality measurements (temperature, pH, D.O., conductivity)
4. Number of bottles collected of each sample type (nutrients, phytoplankton, periphyton, and toxins)
5. Note fields for recording site conditions

As noted above, grid information on the percent cover of the stream bottom by periphyton is also recorded on the Grid Data Sheet (Appendix D). All water quality information is recorded with a YSI datasonde that is calibrated before going into the field every day samples are collected.

Since this is the only source of field-recorded water quality data, YSI instrument calibration is not noted on sampling data sheets.

9.1.2 Photographs

Photographs will be taken at each sampling location during each sampling event. They will serve to verify information entered in the field logbook. For each photograph taken, the following information will be written in the logbook or recorded in a separate field photography log:

- Time, date, location, and weather conditions
- Description of the subject photographed
- Name of person taking the photograph

9.2 Labeling

All samples collected will be labeled in a clear and precise way for proper identification in the field and for tracking in the laboratory. At a minimum, the sample labels will contain the following information: station location, date of collection, analytical parameter(s), and method of preservation. Every sample, including samples collected from a single location but going to separate laboratories, will be assigned a unique sample number. Labels will be taped to all

sample bottles with packing tape and label also serving as a security seal while samples are in transit.

9.3 Chain of Custody

All sample shipments for analyses will be accompanied by a YTEP Nutrient, Phytoplankton, Periphyton and Algal Toxin Chain of Custody Form (Appendix C). These forms will be completed and sent with each sample for each laboratory and each shipment (i.e., each day). If multiple coolers are sent to a single laboratory on a single day, duplicate forms will be completed and sent in each cooler.

Until the samples are shipped, the custody of the samples will be the responsibility of YTEP staff assigned to collection and shipment of samples and the Project Manager. The chain of custody form includes date and time of transfer to carrier and carrier shipping number. Each laboratory listed above will be responsible for chain of custody once they have received from the shipping company. As noted above, seals on sample bottles help maintain security during shipment.

9.4 Packaging and Shipment

Sturdy coolers suitable for secure sample transit are provided by the laboratories and YTEP staff makes sure that packing materials and ice are supplemented to protect samples in transit. The YTEP Nutrient, Phytoplankton, Periphyton and Algal Toxin Chain of Custody Form supplies U.S. EPA staff at the Region 9 Richmond Laboratory with a Regional Analytical Program (RAP) number. Shipment of samples will not include a copy of the YTEP Nutrient, Phytoplankton, Periphyton and Algal Toxin Sampling Data Sheet (Appendix B), so that labs cannot introduce bias because locations are unknown to them.

10.0 QUALITY CONTROL

YTEP will implement a fully coordinated QA/QC program including field QC samples, confirmation samples, background samples, laboratory QC samples, and split samples. Locations of QA/QC samples will vary between the universe of 11 sampling sites on the Klamath River, including the five on the YIR covered under this SAP. YTEP and the Karuk DNR will share all QA/QC sample information as it comes back from the lab so that QA/QC is constantly analyzed by both staffs. Most QA/QC samples will be sent to the laboratory blind, while laboratory QC samples will be identified and additional sample collected, if necessary (e.g., a double volume). One blank, duplicate and spike sample will be collected every sampling event.

10.1 Field Quality Control Samples

Field quality control samples will be taken for assessment of field contamination and assessment of sampling variability. Duplicate, spike and blank samples are disguised with unique sample site IDs and times so the lab does not know the difference between QA/QC samples and the primary samples that have been submitted for analysis. For QA/QC purposes duplicate, blank, and spiked bottle sets are prepared and collected for one site each sampling period with coordination between the Karuk DNR and YTEP. These additional bottle sets are handled, prepared and filled following the same protocol used for regular bottle sets and samples.

10.1.1 Assessment of Field Contamination (Blanks)

Blank samples are utilized to assess accuracy of the analysis and to verify that the handling, transportation or laboratory sample handling do not introduce error. Some blanks for nutrient samples may be filled in the YTEP lab, while others may be filled in the field (see below). Distilled water is used for all blanks.

10.1.1.1 Equipment Blanks

Sometimes blanks will be drawn from the churn with water from the third rinse with distilled water in the field. This will check the effectiveness of previous churn cleanings as per Churn SOPs (Appendix A).

10.1.1.2 Field Blanks

Field blank samples will be obtained by pouring distilled water into a sampling container at the sampling point instead of river water. This will allow assessment of environmental contamination from the field and laboratories. The target for field blanks is less than or equal to 2 times the reporting limit of a measureable amount of the analyte being evaluated. Targets for some analytes that have extremely low reporting limits will be equal to or 5 times the reporting limit of a measureable amount of the analyte being evaluated.

10.1.2 Assessment of Sample Variability (Field Duplicate or Co-located Samples)

Duplicate samples are obtained using the same process as regular samples. These are used to ensure the laboratory analytical precision. Standard levels of duplicate sampling are 10% and the program of QA/QC offered for this SAP would be for one location of the 11 being cooperatively sampled per sampling event, except for algal toxins which the QA procedure calls for 10% duplicate samples.

The site numbers for locations will proceed upstream from the Pacific Ocean at the western extent of the YIR. Thus, locations covered under this SAP are as follows for QA/QC testing purposes:

1. Lower Klamath River Estuary Surface (LES)
2. Terwer USGS Gauge (TG)
3. Above Tully Creek (TC)
4. Trinity River (TR)
5. Klamath Above Trinity (WE)

Other QA/QC sampling site numbers will proceed in an upstream will be given numbers 6-11 accordingly by the Karuk DNR.

The target is that duplicates will have less than 20% RPD for most parameters (U.S. BOR, 2005). The exception is cell counts for *MSAE* and other blue-green algae species, which are recognized as highly variable. Consequently, a 50% overlap between sample splits would be acceptable (Appendix F).

10.3 Field Screening, Confirmation, and Split Samples

Field screening and confirmation samples do not apply to the type of sampling conducted under this SAP; split samples are discussed on Section 10.3.3.

10.3.3 Split Samples

As noted above, samples destined for the U.S. EPA lab and ELISA testing will be split and duplicates sent to the California Department of Fish and Game's Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory for LC-MS/MS testing. This will allow YTEP and cooperators to answer questions as to whether toxic algae pollution is restricted to microcystin-LR or if there are combinations of blue-green algae generated toxins, such as microcystin LF, LW, LA, YR and RR or anatoxin-a. California Department of Fish and Game's Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory in Rancho Cordova measurement of microcystin-LR, will also be used for cross confirming the U.S. EPA R 9 Lab ELISA results.

10.4 Laboratory Quality Control Samples

To determine accuracy blind samples with known concentrations of different analytes known as "spikes" will be submitted to Aquatic Research, Inc., which will be analyzing nutrient samples. Data forms containing the known spike concentrations are kept to verify that the lab is attaining

accurate results. The spike concentrations that are used are determined based on past findings for each analyte. The spike concentrations will be between 5 and 50 times the minimum detection limit or between 1 and 10 times the ambient level, whichever is greater (Eaton et. al., 1995). Specific analytes that will be used for spikes are ammonia, nitrate/nitrite, total nitrogen, orthophosphate, and total phosphorous. Known concentrations of these analytes will be transported into the field on wet ice and poured directly from the bottle they were shipped in into the empty sampling containers provided by the laboratory. No matrix spikes will occur to reduce any problems with accurately measuring volumes of water or spike standards. Sample results from spikes need to be in a range of plus or minus 20% (80-120%) (U.S. BOR, 2005). If spike values depart from this range, the QA Officer and Program Manager will consult with the laboratory and take appropriate steps to reduce sampling error. If a suitable explanation for why the sample results did not meet QA acceptance criteria cannot be found, reanalysis by the laboratory will be requested.

Laboratories with which YTEP is contracting have long records of high quality data provision and information regarding their procedures are attached as Appendices F, G, H.

11.0 FIELD VARIANCES

As conditions in the field may vary, it may become necessary to implement minor modifications to sampling as presented in this plan. When appropriate, the QA Office will be notified and a verbal approval will be obtained before implementing the changes. Modifications to the approved plan will be documented in the sampling project report. Sample periodicity and QA/QC sampling levels may vary in future years depending on the level of funding and commitment to cooperative sampling with the U.S. EPA.

12.0 FIELD HEALTH AND SAFETY PROCEDURES

Water samples may be hazardous when MSAE or other toxic blue-green algae species are present, otherwise field hazards are low. YTEP staff conducting phytoplankton and toxic samples will be advised to minimize contact with the water in that season and be careful not to ingest any and to wash thoroughly after returning from the field.

Some sampling sites are in remote locations and steep hillsides adjacent pose risks to staff. Sampling will always be done at least in pairs for safety reasons and YTEP staff will be advised to use caution when working on slippery substrate characteristic of the Klamath River margin.

Poison oak is a common occupational hazard and washing after return from the field is also encouraged for that reason.

13.0 REFERENCES

Asarian, E. and J. Kann. 2006. Klamath River Nitrogen Loading and Retention Dynamics, 1996-2004. Kier Associates Final Technical Report to the Yurok Tribe Environmental Program, Klamath, California. 56pp + appendices.

Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (ANHMRC). 2005. Managing Risks in Recreational Waters. Australian Government ISBN Online: 1864962720: www.nhmrc.gov.au

Bel-Art Products. 1993. Churn Sample Splitter Instructions, 37805 Series. Pequannock, NJ.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 2003. September 2002 Klamath River Fish Kill: Preliminary analysis of contributing factors. CDFG, Redding, CA.

California State Water Resources Control Board. 2005. Revision of the Clean Water Act Section 303 (d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments (Vol I). CA SWRCB Water Quality Division, Sacramento, CA. 322 p.

California State Water Resources Control Board, Department of Public Health and Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment. 2007. Cyanobacteria in California Recreational Water Bodies: Providing Voluntary Guidance about Harmful Algal Blooms, Their Monitoring and Public Notification. State-wide Blue-Green Algae Work Group. Sacramento, CA. 38 p.

Carmichael W.W. 1994. The toxins of cyanobacteria. *Scientific American* 270: 78-86.

CH2M Hill. 1985. Klamath River Basin Fisheries Resource Plan. Prepared for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Dept of the Interior.

Chorus I (Ed.). 2001. Cyanotoxins: occurrence, causes, consequences. World Health Organization Report. Springer-Verlag: Berlin.

Chorus I, Bartram, J, editors. 1999. Toxic cyanobacteria in water. World Health Organization Report. E & FN Spon, London and New York.

Eaton, Andrew D., Lenore S. Clesceri, and Arnold E. Greenberg. (eds.). 1995. Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater. American Public Health Association (APHA) 19th Edition. Washington D.C.

Eilers, J.M. 2005. Periphyton in Selected Sites of the Klamath River, California. Prepared for Tetra Tech, Inc. Fairfax, VA by J.M. Eilers MaxDepth Aquatics, Inc. Bend, OR. 20 p.

Foott, J.S, R. Harmon, and R. Stone. 2003. Ceratomyxosis resistance in juvenile Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout from the Klamath River, 2002 Investigational Report. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, California – Nevada Fish Health Center, Anderson, CA. 25 p.

Goldman, C.R. and A.J. Horne. 1983. *Limnology*. McGraw-Hill, Inc. New York. 464 pp.

Guillen, G. 2003. Klamath River fish die-off, September 2002: Causative factors of mortality. Report number AFWO-F-02-03 . U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office. Arcata, CA. 128 pp.

Hardy, T.B., and R.C. Addley. 2001. Evaluation of Interim Instream Flow Needs in the Klamath River: Phase 2. Final Report. Institute for Natural Systems Engineering, Utah Water Research Laboratory, Utah State University, Logan, UT.

Heisler, N. 1990. Mechanisms of Ammonia Elimination in Fishes. In J.P. Truchot and B. Lahlou (eds) Animal Nutrition and Transport Processes (Chapter 2) in Comparative Physiology (Vol. 6), pp 137-151.

Hoop Valley Tribe Environmental Protection Agency (Hoop TEPA). 2008. Water Quality Control Plan Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation. Adopted by the HVTC on February 14, 2008. Hoopa TEPA, Hoopa, CA. 100 pp. plus appendices.

Kann, J. 2005. Copco/Irongate Reservoir Toxic Cyanobacteria Results, Aug-Sep. Technical Memoranda to Karuk Tribe, NCWQCB and SWQCB.

Kann, J. 2007. Toxic Cyanobacteria Results for Copco/Iron Gate Reservoirs: October 29-30, 2007. Technical Memorandum prepared for Karuk Tribe, Orleans, CA.

Kann, J. and E. Asarian. 2005. 2002 Nutrient and Hydrologic Loading to Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs, California. Kier Associates Final Technical Report to the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California. 59pp + appendices.

Kann, J and E. Asarian. 2006. Technical Memorandum: Longitudinal Analysis of Klamath River Phytoplankton Data 2001-2004. Prepared by Kier Associates and Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences for the Yurok Tribe Environmental Program, Klamath, California. 36 pp.

Kann, J and E. Asarian. 2007. Nutrient Budgets and Phytoplankton Trends in Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs, California, May 2005 - May 2006. Final Technical Report to the State Water Resources Control Board, Sacramento, California.

Kann, J. and S. Corum. 2006. Summary of 2005 Toxic *Microcystis aeruginosa* Trends in Copco and Iron Gate Reservoirs on the Klamath River, CA. Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, Ashland Oregon and the Karuk Tribe DNR, Orleans, CA. 35 p.

Kann, J. and S. Corum. 2007. Summary of 2006 Toxic microcystin *aeruginosa* trends in Copco and Iron Gate Reservoirs, CA. Technical Memorandum Prepared for the Karuk Tribe of California, Orleans, CA.

Kier Associates. 1991. Long Range Plan for the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Fishery Restoration Program. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Klamath River Fishery Resource Office. Yreka, CA. 403 pp.

Kier Associates. 2007. Comments on Klamath River Nutrient, Dissolved Oxygen, and Temperature TMDL Implementation Plan Workplan Outline for CA. Performed under contract to the Klamath Basin Tribal Water Quality Work Group with funding from the U.S. EPA. Kier Associates, Arcata, CA. 16 p.

Lurry, D.L. and C.M. Kolbe. 2000. Interagency field manual for the collection of Water Quality Data. USGS Publication, Open File Report 00-213. 85 p.

Nichols, K. and J.S. Foott. 2005. Health Monitoring of Juvenile Klamath River Chinook Salmon, FY 2004 Investigational Report. USFWS California-Nevada Fish Health Center, Red Bluff, CA.

Norgaard, K.M. 2004. The Effects of Altered Diet on the Health of the Karuk People: A Preliminary Report. Written under contract to the Karuk Tribe of California: Department of Natural Resources Water Quality Program, Orleans, CA. 75 p.

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2003. Clean Water Act Section 303d List of Water Quality Limited Segments. Approved by U.S. EPA in July 2003. NCRWQCB, Santa Rosa, CA. 30 p.

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2005. Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region. Staff report adopted by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board on July 7, 2005. Santa Rosa, CA. 201 p.

Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR). 2000. Water Quality Program Rules, 340-041-0150, Nuisance Phytoplankton Growth. State of Oregon, Portland, OR.

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. 2002. Upper Klamath Lake Drainage Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). ODEQ, Portland. OR. 204 p.

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. 2006. 2004/2006 Integrated Report and Section 303(d) list. Submitted to U.S. EPA for review on May 23, 2006. ODEQ, Portland, OR.

Phinney, H. and C.H. Peek. 1960. Klamath Lake, an instance of natural enrichment. Transactions of the Seminar on Algae and Metropolitan Wastes, April 27-29, 1960. U.S. Public Health Service, Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Cincinnati, OH. 6 p.

Porter, S.D., T.F. Cuffney, M.E. Gurtz, and M.R. Meador. 1995. Methods for collecting algal samples as part of the National Water Quality Assessment Program. U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) Open-File Report 93-409. 29 P.

St. John, M. 2005. Status of Lost River and Klamath River TMDLs, Fact Sheet. North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Rosa, CA.

Stocking, R.W. and J.L. Bartholomew. 2004. Assessing links between water quality, river health and Ceratomyxosis of salmonids in the Klamath River system. Oregon State University. Corvallis, Oregon. 5 pp.

Stocking, R.W. 2006. Distribution of *Ceratomyxa shasta* (Myxozoa) and Habitat Preference of the Polychaete Host, *Manayunkia speciosa* in the Klamath River. A thesis submitted to Oregon State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science. Oregon State University: Corvallis, OR. 116 pages.

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. 2005. Standard Operating Procedures for Quality Assurance. Revision 2005-01. U.S. DOI, U.S. BOR, Denver, CO. 86 p.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2000. Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual: Rivers and Streams. Office of Water and Office of Science and Technology , Washington D.C. EPA-822-B-00-002.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2001. National Coastal Assessment Quality Assurance Project Plan 2001-2004. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program, U.S. EPA, Washington D.C. EPA/620/R-01/002

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2002. Surface Waters Western Pilot Study: Field Operations Manual for Non-Wadeable Rivers and Streams (Draft). Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program, Office of Research and Development, U.S. EPA, Washington D.C. 227 p.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2006. Guidance on Systematic Planning Using the Data Quality Objectives Process (EPA QA/G-4). EPA/240/B-06/001. U.S. EPA, Washington D.C.

Wilkie, M.P and C.M. Wood. 1995. The adaptation of fish to extremely alkaline environments. Comparative Biochemical Physiology. Vol 113B, No. 4, p 665-673.

World Health Organization (WHO). 1998. Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality. Second Ed. Addendum to Vol. 2, Health Criteria and Other Supporting Information. World Health Organization, Geneva.

Yurok Tribe Environmental Program. 2004a. Water Year 2002 (WY 2002) Water Quality Report. January 2004. YTEP, Klamath, CA. 168 p.

Yurok Tribe Environmental Program. 2004b. Water Year 2003 (WY 2003) Water Quality Report. March 2004. YTEP, Klamath, CA. 538 p

Yurok Tribe Environmental Program. 2004c. Water Quality Control Plan for the Yurok Indian Reservation. August 2004. YTEP, Klamath, CA. 37 p.

Yurok Tribe Environmental Program. 2005. Water Year 2004 (WY 2004) Water Quality Report. December 2005. YTEP, Klamath, CA. 207 p

Yurok Tribe. 2006a. Comments and Recommended Terms and Conditions for Klamath Hydroelectric Project (FERC #2082). Letter from Tribal Howard McConnell to Magalie R. Salas of FERC. Yurok Tribe, Klamath, CA. 140 p.

Yurok Tribe Environmental Program. 2006b. Klamath River Blue-Green Algae Bloom Report. By Ken Fetcho, YTEP, Klamath, CA. 19 p.

Yurok Tribe Environmental Program. 2007. 2006 Klamath River Blue-Green Algae Summary Report. By Ken Fetcho, YTEP, Klamath, CA. 34 p.

Yurok Tribe Environmental Program. 2008. Klamath River and Major Tributaries Water Sampling Proposal 2008. Submitted to U.S. EPA. YTEP, Klamath, CA. 4 p.

APPENDICES

YTEP Churn Splitter Field Sampling & Cleaning SOPs.....	A-1
YTEP Nutrient, Phytoplankton, Periphyton and Algal Toxin Sampling Data Sheet.....	B-1
YTEP Nutrient, Phytoplankton, Periphyton and Algal Toxin Chain of Custody Form.....	C-1
YTEP Periphyton Grid Datasheet.....	D-1
YSI Datasonde Instructions and Calibration SOPs.....	E-1
Aquatic Analysts Algae Analytical and Quality Assurance Procedures.....	F-1
Aquatic Research Incorporated Quality Assurance/Quality Control Plan.....	G-1
California Department of Fish and Game Laboratory QAPP.....	H-1
California Department of Fish and Game Laboratory LC/MS/MS Analysis SOP.....	I-1