

Big Black Creek at Jefferson County Road 10 near Whites Chapel (33.595861/-86.531639)

BACKGROUND

Big Black Creek was placed on Alabama's Clean Water Act (CWA) <u>1998</u> <u>\$303(d) list</u> of impaired waters for not meeting its <u>Fish and Wildlife</u> (F&W) water use classification. It was listed for siltation and other habitat alteration due to abandoned surface mining. Based on monitoring conducted in 1999, Big Black Creek was delisted in 2000.

The Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM) monitored Big Black Creek at BLCC-1 in 2007 to further investigate impairment resulting from abandoned surface mining. Macroinvertebrate and habitat assessments were conducted to verify impairment to aquatic communities. Monthly water chemistry samples were collected to identify the cause of impairment. Results from these data may also be used in the determination of Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) needs and priorities.



Figure 1. Landuse in Big Black Creek watershed at BLCC-1.

WATERSHED CHARACTERISTICS

Big Black Creek at BLCC-1 is located within the Southern Sandstone Ridges ecoregion (*Griffith et al. 2001*) in Jefferson County. Based on the 2000 National Landcover Dataset (NLCD), landuse within the watershed was composed primarily of forested areas (70%), with some agriculture (10%) (Table 1, Figure 1). Development activities accounted for approximately 6% of the watershed. As of February 23, 2011, the ADEM has issued 100 NPDES permits, 91 of which are related to construction stormwater activities.

REACH CHARACTERISTICS

<u>General observations</u> (Table 2) and a <u>habitat assessment</u> (Table 3) were completed during the macroinvertebrate assessment. In comparison with reference reaches in the same ecoregion, they give an indication of the physical condition of the site and the quality and availability of habitat. Big Black Creek at BLCC-1 is a small, mostly-open stream reach. This high gradient stream was characterized by a predominantly sand substrate with cobble and gravel present. Pools, which are deeper areas with lower velocities, comprised 80 percent of the stream reach. Overall habitat quality was categorized as *marginal* due to excessive sedimentation and poor riparian vegetative protection resulting in limited instream habitat quality.

Table 1. Summary of watershed characteristics.

Waters	hed Characteristics	
Basin Drainage Area (mi ²)		Cahaba River 39
Ecoregion ^a		67h
% Landuse		0/11
		<1
Open water	TT 7 1	
Wetland Forest	Woody Deciduous	1 44
rorest		
	Evergreen	19
	Mixed	7
Shrub/scrub		4
Grassland/herbaceous	6	9
Pasture/hay		8
Cultivated crops		2
Development	Open space	4
	Low intensity	1
	Moderate intensity	<1
Barren	-	1
Population/km ^{2b}		12
# NPDES Permits ^c	TOTAL	100
401 Water Quality Ce	ertification	2
Construction Stormwa	ater	91
Industrial General		2
Municipal Individual		1
Underground Injection Control		4

a.Southern Sandstone Ri

b.2000 US Census

c.#NPDES permits downloaded from ADEM's NPDES Management System database, February 23, 2011

Table 2. Physical characteristics of Big BlackCreek at BLCC-1, May 29, 2007.

Physical Cha	racteristics		
Canopy Cover	Mostly Open		
Depth (Ft)			
Riffle	0.3		
Run	1.5		
Pool	3.0		
% of Reach			
Riffle	5		
Run	15		
Pool	80		
% Substrate			
Boulder	2		
Cobble	20		
Gravel	20		
Sand	42		
Silt	10		
Organic Matter	6		

TM Graphics provided by Florida Dept. of Environmental Protection (FDEP); used with permission

Table 3. Results of the habitat assessment conducted on Big Black

 Creek at BLCC-1, May 29, 2007.

Habitat Assessment	%Maximum Score	Rating		
Instream Habitat Quality	y 51	Marginal (41-58)		
Sediment Deposition	n 49	Marginal (41-58)		
Sinuosit	y 70	Sub-optimal (65-84)		
Bank and Vegetative Stability	y 65	Sub-optimal (60-74)		
Riparian Buffe	r 65	Marginal (50-69)		
Habitat Assessment Score	139			
% Maximum Score	58	Marginal (41-58)		

 Table 4. Results of the macroinvertebrate bioassessment conducted in

 BLCC-1, May 29, 2007.

Macroinvertebrate Assessment					
	Results	Scores	Rating		
Taxa richness measures		(0-100)			
# Ephemeroptera (mayfly) genera	3	25	Poor (23-46)		
# Plecoptera (stonefly) genera	1	17	Poor (16-31)		
# Trichoptera (caddisfly) genera	6	50	Fair (45-66)		
Taxonomic composition measures					
% Non-insect taxa	14	44	Poor (24.7-49.4)		
% Non-insect organisms	5	86	Fair (62.8-93.9)		
% Plecoptera	0	0	Very Poor (<6.56)		
Tolerance measures					
Beck's community tolerance index	5	18	Very Poor (<20.2)		
WMB-I Assessment Score		34	Poor (24-48)		

Table 5. Summary of water quality data collected March-October, 2007. Minimum (Min) and maximum (Max) values calculated using minimum detection limits (MDL) when results were less than this value. Median, average (Avg), and standard deviations (SD) values were calculated by multiplying the MDL by 0.5 when results were less than this value.

			Med	Avg	SD		
Physical							
6	18.0	23.6	21.8	21.5	1.9		
6	6.8	10.2	8.5	8.7	1.2		
5	170.0	288.0	241.0 ^M	244.2	48.4		
5	<1.0	7.0	1.0	2.3	2.7		
6	331.9	525.0	415.0 ^G	422.3	63.2		
5	105.5	170.2	115.9 ^M	126.7	26.3		
5	0.4	2.1	1.1	1.3	0.8		
6	6.3	7.5	7.0	7.0	0.4		
6	7.4	8.0	7.7	7.7	0.3		
5	< 0.015	0.101	0.008	0.032	0.041		
5	0.089	0.209	0.168 ^M	0.155	0.055		
5	<0.150	0.374	0.169	0.195	0.132		
5	<0.182	0.542	0.372	0.351	0.134		
5	0.004	0.016	0.009	0.010	0.004		
5	0.017	0.024	0.021	0.021	0.002		
5	<1.0	2.2	0.5	0.8	0.8		
5	2.9	3.4	3.2	3.1	0.3		
Biological							
5	10	180	26	73	77		
	6 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	6 6.8 5 170.0 5 <1.0	6 6.8 10.2 5 170.0 288.0 5 <1.0	6 6.8 10.2 8.5 5 170.0 288.0 241.0 ^M 5 <10.0	6 6.8 10.2 8.5 8.7 5 170.0 288.0 241.04 244.2 5 170.0 288.0 241.04 244.2 5 170.0 7.0 1.0 2.3 6 331.9 525.0 415.06 422.3 5 105.5 170.2 115.94 126.7 5 0.4 2.1 1.1 1.3 6 6.3 7.5 7.0 7.0 6 7.4 8.0 7.7 7.7 5 0.015 0.101 0.008 0.032 5 0.089 0.209 0.168M 0.155 5 0.182 0.542 0.372 0.351 5 0.017 0.024 0.021 0.021 5 0.107 0.24 0.25 0.8 5 2.9 3.4 3.2 3.1		

G=value higher than median concentration of all verified ecoregional reference reach data collected in the ecoregion 67h; J=estimate; M=value >90% of all verified ecoregional reference reach data collected in the ecoregion 67h; N=# samples.

BIOASSESSMENT RESULTS

Benthic macroinvertebrate communities were sampled using ADEM's <u>Intensive Multi-habitat Bioassessment methodology</u> (<u>WMB-I</u>). The WMB-I uses measures of taxonomic richness, community composition, and community tolerance to assess the overall health of the macroinvertebrate community. Each metric is scored on a 100 point scale. The final score is the average of all individual metric scores. Metric results indicated the macroinvertebrate community to be in *poor* condition (Table 4). Very few pollution-intolerant taxa were collected at the site.

WATER CHEMISTRY

In situ measurements and water samples were collected monthly, during March through October of 2007 to help identify any stressors to the biological communities. Water chemistry results are summarized in Table 5. Median nitrate+nitritenitrogen concentrations, total dissolved solids, and alkalinity were higher than the 90th percentile of data collected at reference reaches in ecoregion 67h. Specific conductance was higher than the median value of data collected at reference reaches in this ecoregion.

SUMMARY

As part of the <u>assessment process</u>, ADEM will review the monitoring information presented in this report, along with all other available data.

Big Black Creek was placed on Alabama's Clean Water Act (CWA) <u>1998 §303(d) list</u> of impaired waters for not meeting its <u>Fish and Wildlife (F&W)</u> water use classification. It was listed for siltation and other habitat alteration due to abandoned surface mining. Results of the 2007 bioassessment indicated the macroinvertebrate community in Big Black Creek at BLCC-1 to be in *poor* condition, indicating impairment to biological communities potentially caused by nutrient (nitrogen) loading.

FOR MONITORING INFORMATION, CONTACT: Brien Diggs ADEM/FOD Environmental Indicators Section 1350 Coliseum Boulevard Montgomery, AL 36110 (334) 260-2750 lod@adem.state.al.us