

2008 Monitoring Summary



303(d) TMDL Monitoring Site

Harrand Creek at Coffee County Road 702 (31.34535/-85.81470)

BACKGROUND

A 9.7 mile segment of Harrand Creek from its source downstream to its confluence with Claybank Creek has been on Alabama's Clean Water Act (CWA) 303(d) list of impaired waters since 2006. The impairment is caused by siltation/habitat alteration from urban runoff and storm sewers. In 2008, the Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM) monitored Harrand Creek at HDC-2. Macroinvertebrate and habitat assessments were conducted to evaluate habitat and biological conditions. Monthly water chemistry samples were collected to identify the cause of any impairments. Results from these data may be used in the development of the siltation/habitat alteration Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).



Figure 1. Harrand Creek at HDC-2, March 20, 2014.

WATERSHED CHARACTERISTICS

Watershed characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Harrand Creek at HDC-2 is a *Fish & Wildlife (F&W)* stream located in Enterprise. Based on the 2006 National Land Cover Dataset, landuse within the watershed is mostly forest (35%) and development (32%). As of September 1, 2012, there are 29 active NPDES discharges in this watershed.

REACH CHARACTERISTICS

General observations (Table 2) and a habitat assessment (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. Harrand Creek at HDC-2 is a glide-pool stream with a substrate dominated by sand (Figure 1). Overall habitat quality was categorized as *marginal* for supporting diverse aquatic macroinvertebrate communities.

BIOASSESSMENT RESULTS

The benthic macroinvertebrate community was sampled using ADEM's Intensive Multi-habitat Bioassessment methodology (WMB-I). Measures of taxonomic richness, community composition, and community tolerance are used to assess the overall health of the macroinvertebrate community in comparison to conditions expected in south Alabama streams and rivers. Each score is based on a six-point scale, ranging from 1, or *natural*, to 6, or *highly altered*. The macroinvertebrate survey conducted at HDC-2 rated the site as *poor-fair*. Relative abundance of pollution-sensitive taxa were lower than expected, and the community was dominated by a few pollution-tolerant taxa (Table 4).

Table 1. Summary of watershed characteristics.

| Watershed Characteristics | | Choctawhatchee River |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Basin | | |
| Drainage Area (mi²) | | 7 |
| Ecoregion^a | | 65d |
| % Landuse | | |
| Open water | | 1 |
| Wetland | Woody | <1 |
| | Emergent herbaceous | <1 |
| Forest | Deciduous | 6 |
| | Evergreen | 17 |
| | Mixed | 12 |
| Shrub/scrub | | 8 |
| Pasture/hay | | 10 |
| Cultivated crops | | 13 |
| Development | Open space | 19 |
| | Low intensity | 10 |
| | Moderate intensity | 2 |
| | High intensity | 1 |
| Population/km^{2b} | | 209 |
| # NPDES Permits^c | TOTAL | 29 |
| | Construction Stormwater | 27 |
| | Industrial General | 2 |

a. Southern Hilly Gulf Coastal Plain

b. 2000 US Census

c. #NPDES permits downloaded from ADEM's NPDES Management System database, September 1, 2012.

Table 2. Physical characteristics of Harrand Creek at HDC-2, July 17, 2008.

| Physical Characteristics | |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Width (ft) | 25 |
| Canopy Cover | Mostly Shaded |
| Depth (ft) | |
| Run | 2.0 |
| Pool | 4.0 |
| % of Reach | |
| Run | 30 |
| Pool | 70 |
| % Substrate | |
| Clay | 1 |
| Mud/Muck | 10 |
| Gravel | 1 |
| Sand | 70 |
| Silt | 8 |
| Organic Matter | 10 |

Table 4. Results of the macroinvertebrate bioassessment conducted in Har-rand Creek at HDC-2, July 17, 2008.

| Habitat Assessment | % Maximum Score | Rating |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Instream Habitat Quality | 52 | Marginal (40-<53) |
| Sediment Deposition | 51 | Marginal (40-<53) |
| Sinuosity | 40 | Poor (<45) |
| Bank Vegetative Stability | 44 | Marginal (35-<59) |
| Riparian Buffer | 50 | Marginal (50-<70) |
| Habitat Assessment Score | 97 | |
| % Maximum Score | 48 | Marginal (40-<53) |

Table 4. Results of the macroinvertebrate bioassessment conducted in Har-rand Creek at HDC-2, July 17, 2008.

| Macroinvertebrate Assessment | | Results |
|---|--|------------------|
| Taxa richness and diversity measures | | |
| Total # Taxa | | 33 |
| # EPT taxa | | 5 |
| # Highly-sensitive and Specialized Taxa | | 0 |
| Taxonomic composition measures | | |
| % EPC taxa | | 14 |
| % EPT minus Baetidae and Hydropsychidae | | 2 |
| % Chironomidae Individuals | | 43 |
| % Dominant Taxon | | 21 |
| % Individuals in Dominant 5 Taxa | | 63 |
| Functional feeding group | | |
| # Collector Taxa | | 7 |
| % Tolerant Filterer Taxa | | 15 |
| Community tolerance | | |
| # Sensitive EPT | | 1 |
| % Sensitive taxa | | 6 |
| % Nutrient Tolerant individuals | | 32 |
| WMB-I Assessment Score | | 5+ |
| WMB-I Assessment Rating | | Poor-Fair |

WATER CHEMISTRY

Results of water chemistry analysis are presented in Table 5. In situ measurements and water samples were collected monthly, April through November of 2008 to help identify any stressors to the biological communities. Samples for metals analyses were collected in July, September, and November. Organics (pesticides, semi-volatile organics, and atrazine) samples were collected in July and September.

Organics and atrazine were sampled in July and September. All results were below minimum detection limits. Median conductivity, ammonia nitrogen concentrations, and chlorides were higher than expected, based on reference reach data collected in the Southern Hilly Gulf Coastal Plains ecoregion.

SUMMARY

Bioassessment results indicated the macroinvertebrate community in Har-rand Creek at HDC-2 to be in *poor-fair* condition. Habitat assessment results were scored as *marginal* for supporting diverse aquatic macroinvertebrate communities. Median conductivity, ammonia nitrogen concentrations, and chlorides were higher than expected based on ecoregional reference reach data collected in ecoregion 65d.

Table 5. Summary of water quality data collected April-November, 2008. Minimum (Min) and maximum (Max) values calculated using minimum detection limits (MDL). Median, average (Avg), and standard deviations (SD) values were calculated by multiplying the MDL by 0.5 when results were less than this value.

| Parameter | N | Min | Max | Med | Avg | SD | Q |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------|--------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|---|
| Physical | | | | | | | |
| Temperature (°C) | 9 | 13.9 | 25.1 | 24.1 | 22.2 | 3.7 | |
| Turbidity (NTU) | 9 | 8.8 | 24.8 | 11.1 | 14.0 | 5.4 | |
| Total Dissolved Solids (mg/L) | 8 | 8.0 | 62.0 | 29.0 | 31.5 | 17.5 | |
| Total Suspended Solids (mg/L) | 8 | < 10 | 90 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 3.0 | |
| Specific Conductance (µmhos) | 9 | 70.2 | 83.8 | 78.8 ^G | 76.1 | 4.1 | |
| Hardness (mg/L) | 3 | 13.7 | 24.8 | 20.6 | 19.7 | 5.6 | |
| Alkalinity (mg/L) | 8 | 17.3 | 24.1 | 21.4 | 21.2 | 2.0 | |
| Stream Flow (cfs) | 8 | 2.8 | 12.7 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 3.5 | |
| Chemical | | | | | | | |
| Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | 9 | 5.5 | 8.4 | 8.0 | 6.5 | 0.9 | |
| pH (su) | 9 | 6.4 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 0.1 | |
| Ammonia Nitrogen (mg/L) | 8 | 0.021 | 0.136 | 0.068 ^M | 0.060 | 0.035 | |
| ↓ Nitrate+Nitrite Nitrogen (mg/L) | 8 | 0.180 | 0.418 | 0.274 | 0.273 | 0.080 | |
| Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (mg/L) | 8 | < 0.150 | 0.754 | 0.360 | 0.353 | 0.193 | |
| ↓ Total Nitrogen (mg/L) | 8 | < 0.271 | 1.087 | 0.608 | 0.626 | 0.239 | |
| Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus (mg/L) | 8 | 0.006 | 0.012 | 0.008 | 0.008 | 0.002 | |
| ↓ Total Phosphorus (mg/L) | 8 | 0.021 | 0.039 | 0.028 | 0.027 | 0.006 | |
| CBOU-5 (mg/L) | 8 | < 1.0 | 2.2 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.7 | |
| Chlorides (mg/L) | 8 | 6.2 | 9.1 | 7.5 ^M | 7.4 | 1.0 | |
| Atrazine (µg/L) | 2 | < 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | |
| Total Metals | | | | | | | |
| ↓ Aluminum (mg/L) | 3 | 0.026 | 0.075 | 0.049 | 0.050 | 0.024 | |
| Iron (mg/L) | 3 | 1.360 | 2.940 | 2.200 | 2.167 | 0.790 | |
| Manganese (mg/L) | 3 | 0.080 | 0.115 | 0.114 | 0.103 | 0.020 | |
| Dissolved Metals | | | | | | | |
| Aluminum (mg/L) | 3 | < 0.015 | < 0.019 | 0.010 | 0.009 | 0.001 | |
| Antimony (µg/L) | 3 | < 2.0 | < 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | |
| Arsenic (µg/L) | 3 | < 1.6 | < 2.2 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.2 | |
| Cadmium (µg/L) | 3 | < 3.000 | < 5.000 | 2.500 | 2.167 | 0.577 | |
| Chromium (µg/L) | 3 | < 4.000 | < 13.000 | 2.000 | 3.500 | 2.598 | |
| Copper (mg/L) | 3 | < 0.005 | < 0.013 | 0.002 | 0.004 | 0.002 | |
| Iron (mg/L) | 3 | 0.222 | 0.489 | 0.355 | 0.355 | 0.134 | |
| Lead (µg/L) | 3 | < 0.8 | < 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.3 | |
| Manganese (mg/L) | 3 | 0.074 | 0.112 | 0.102 | 0.098 | 0.020 | |
| Mercury (µg/L) | 3 | < 0.030 | < 0.080 | 0.015 | 0.023 | 0.014 | |
| ↓ Nickel (mg/L) | 3 | < 0.008 | 0.015 ^S | 0.003 | 0.007 | 0.007 | 1 |
| Selenium (µg/L) | 3 | < 1.5 | < 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.0 | |
| Silver (µg/L) | 3 | < 2.000 | < 3.000 | 1.500 | 1.333 | 0.289 | |
| Thallium (µg/L) | 3 | < 0.5 | < 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | |
| ↓ Zinc (mg/L) | 3 | < 0.006 | 0.008 | 0.003 | 0.005 | 0.003 | |
| Biological | | | | | | | |
| Chlorophyll a (µg/L) | 3 | < 0.10 | 5.34 | 2.29 | 2.56 | 2.86 | |
| ↓ Fecal Coliform (col/100 mL) | 3 | 21 | 100 | 58 | 60 | 40 | |

G=value higher than median concentration of all verified ecoregional reference reach data collected in the ecoregion 65d; J=estimate; M=value >90% of all verified ecoregional reference reach data collected in the ecoregion 65d; N=# samples; Q=# of uncertain exceedances; S=F&W hardness-adjusted aquatic life use

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Aaron Goar, ADEM Aquatic Assessment Unit
1350 Coliseum Boulevard Montgomery, AL 36110
(334) 260-2755 agoar@adem.state.al.us