

2009 Monitoring Summary



Big Shoal Creek at Lawrence County Road 61 (34.48650/-87.14684)

BACKGROUND

Big Shoal Creek was placed on Alabama's 2002 Clean Water Act (CWA) §303(d) list of impaired waters for only partially meeting its *Fish & Wildlife (F&W)* water use classification. It was listed for organic enrichment and dissolved oxygen (OE/DO) impairment from pasture grazing.

The Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM) monitored Big Shoal Creek in 2009 to document conditions prior to implementation of best management practices (BMPs). A watershed management plan is in development, and will include agricultural BMPs such as livestock fencing, alternative water sources, heavy use area protection, filter strips, and conservation tillage.



Figure 1. Big Shoal Creek at BSCL-1, May 25, 2009.

WATERSHED CHARACTERISTICS

Watershed characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Big Shoal Creek is located north of the city of Five Points in Lawrence County, located in the Little Mountain sub-ecoregion of the Interior Plateau. Based on the 2006 National Land Cover Dataset, landuse within the watershed is primarily pasture/hay and forest (26%). The ADEM has issued seven NPDES discharge permits 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. Big Shoal Creek at BSCL-1 is a riffle-run stream with a diversity of substrate types. The riparian buffer was limited within the reach (Figure 1). Overall habitat quality was categorized as *sub-optimal* for supporting diverse aquatic macroinvertebrate communities.

Table 1. Summary of watershed characteristics.

| Watershed Characteristics | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Basin | | Tennessee R |
| Drainage Area (mi ²) | | 17 |
| Ecoregion ^a | | 71j |
| % Landuse | | |
| Open water | | <1 |
| Wetland | Woody | 4 |
| | Emergent herbaceous | <1 |
| Forest | Deciduous | 18 |
| | Evergreen | 4 |
| | Mixed | 4 |
| Shrub/scrub | | 7 |
| Grassland/herbaceous | | 1 |
| Pasture/hay | | 49 |
| Cultivated crops | | 3 |
| Development | Open space | 7 |
| | Low intensity | 2 |
| | Moderate intensity | ,1 |
| | High intensity | <1 |
| Barren | | <1 |
| Population/km ^{2b} | | 62 |
| # NPDES Permits ^c | TOTAL | 7 |
| | Construction Stormwater | 4 |
| | Municipal Individual | 2 |
| | Underground Injection Control | 1 |

a. Little Mountain

b. 2000 US Census

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

Table 2. Physical characteristics of Big Shoal Creek at BSCL-1, June 30, 2009.

| Physical Characteristics | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Width (ft) | | 25 |
| Canopy Cover | | Estimate 50/50 |
| Depth (ft) | | |
| | Riffle | 0.8 |
| | Run | 3.5 |
| | Pool | 4 |
| % of Reach | | |
| | Riffle | 25 |
| | Run | 45 |
| | Pool | 30 |
| % Substrate | | |
| | Bedrock | 15 |
| | Boulder | 15 |
| | Clay | 15 |
| | Cobble | 10 |
| | Gravel | 8 |
| | Sand | 30 |
| | Silt | 1 |
| | Organic Matter | 6 |

Table 3. Results of the habitat assessment conducted on Big Shoal Creek at BSCL-1, June 30, 2009.

| Habitat Assessment | % Maximum Score | Rating |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Instream Habitat Quality | 68 | Sub-optimal (59-70) |
| Sediment Deposition | 72 | Optimal >70 |
| Sinuosity | 80 | Sub-optimal (65-84) |
| Bank and Vegetative Stability | 61 | Sub-optimal (60-74) |
| Riparian Buffer | 40 | Poor <50 |
| Habitat Assessment Score | 155 | |
| % Maximum Score | 65 | Sub-optimal (59-70) |

Table 4. Results of the macroinvertebrate bioassessment conducted on Big Shoal Creek at BSCL-1, June 30, 2009.

| Macroinvertebrate Assessment | | |
|---|---------|---------------------|
| | Results | Scores |
| Taxa richness and diversity measures | | (0-100) |
| # EPT taxa | 15 | 48 |
| Shannon Diversity | 3.03 | 15 |
| Taxonomic composition measures | | |
| % EPT minus Baetidae and Hydropsychidae | 39 | 86 |
| % Non-insect taxa | 17 | 29 |
| Functional feeding group | | |
| % Predator Individuals | 2 | 0 |
| Community tolerance | | |
| % Tolerant taxa | 40 | 26 |
| WMB-I Assessment Score | --- | 31 |
| WMB-I Assessment Rating | | Fair (29-43) |

BIOASSESSMENT RESULTS

Benthic macroinvertebrate communities were sampled using ADEM's Intensive Multi-habitat Bioassessment methodology (WMB-I). 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 in comparison to least-impaired reference reaches in each ecoregion. The final score is the average of all individual metric scores. Metric results indicated the macroinvertebrate community to be in *fair* condition (Table 4).

WATER CHEMISTRY

Results of water chemistry analyses are presented in Table 5. When possible, in situ measurements and water samples were collected monthly, semi-monthly (metals), or quarterly (pesticides, herbicides, and semi-volatile organics) from March through October of 2009 to identify any stressors to the biological community.

The maximum stream flow (90.0 cfs) was measured in April. Stream flow was higher in May, and could not be measured. Stream flows were <2.0 cfs in June, July, and September. Dissolved oxygen concentrations did not meet the *F&W* use classification criterion during these three sampling events. Median concentrations of specific conductivity, hardness, chlorides, nutrients (total Kjeldahl nitrogen, dissolved reactive phosphorus and total phosphorus), and metals (total and dissolved aluminum, iron, and manganese) were higher than expected based on comparison with least-impaired reference reach data collected in Ecoregion 71. Dissolved arsenic concentrations exceeded the human health criterion applicable to its *F&W* use classification during one out of four sampling events.

Table 5. Summary of water quality data collected March-October, 2009. Minimum (Min) and maximum (Max) values calculated using minimum detection limits (MDL) when results were less than this value for non-metals parameters. 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 | E |
|---|---|------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|---|
| Physical | | | | | | | |
| Temperature (°C) | 9 | 12.5 | 24.0 | 20.7 | 19.8 | 4.3 | |
| Turbidity (NTU) | 9 | 4.2 | 33.0 | 12.7 | 16.5 | 10.8 | |
| ^J Total Dissolved Solids (mg/L) | 8 | 92.0 | 164.0 | 109.5 | 113.4 | 22.1 | |
| ^J Total Suspended Solids (mg/L) | 8 | 1.0 | 121.0 | 7.0 | 22.4 | 40.4 | |
| Specific Conductance (µmhos) | 9 | 129.4 | 255.6 | 169.0 ^G | 174.5 | 42.1 | |
| Hardness (mg/L) | 4 | 60.0 | 119.0 | 79.0 ^G | 84.3 | 25.1 | |
| Alkalinity (mg/L) | 8 | 53.4 | 123.0 | 66.6 | 74.0 | 22.0 | |
| Stream Flow (cfs) | 8 | 1.1 | 90.0 | 13.6 | 21.9 | 29.7 | |
| Chemical | | | | | | | |
| Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | 9 | 3.8 ^C | 10.1 | 7.0 | 6.8 | 2.2 | 3 |
| pH (su) | 9 | 7.0 | 8.0 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 0.3 | |
| ^B Ammonia Nitrogen (mg/L) | 7 | <0.006 | 0.060 | 0.023 | 0.022 | 0.021 | |
| ^J Nitrate+Nitrite Nitrogen (mg/L) | 8 | <0.003 | 0.385 | 0.174 | 0.158 | 0.120 | |
| ^B Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (mg/L) | 7 | 0.226 | 1.240 | 0.624 ^M | 0.595 | 0.351 | |
| ^J ^B Total Nitrogen (mg/L) | 7 | 0.002 | 1.434 | 0.814 | 0.775 | 0.373 | |
| ^J Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus (mg/L) | 8 | 0.017 | 0.075 | 0.033 ^M | 0.037 | 0.018 | |
| ^B Total Phosphorus (mg/L) | 7 | 0.053 | 0.130 | 0.066 ^M | 0.078 | 0.031 | |
| CBOD-5 (mg/L) | 8 | <1 | <2.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.2 | |
| Chlorides (mg/L) | 8 | 2.4 | 4.5 | 3.5 ^M | 3.5 | 0.6 | |
| Atrazine (µg/L) | 2 | <0.06 | <0.06 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.00 | |
| Total Metals | | | | | | | |
| ^J Aluminum (mg/L) | 4 | 0.172 | 0.981 | 0.344 ^M | 0.460 | 0.359 | |
| Iron (mg/L) | 4 | 0.396 | 1.150 | 0.582 ^M | 0.678 | 0.339 | |
| Manganese (mg/L) | 4 | 0.051 | 0.302 | 0.074 ^M | 0.125 | 0.119 | |
| Dissolved Metals | | | | | | | |
| ^J Aluminum (mg/L) | 4 | <0.033 | 0.115 | 0.072 ^M | 0.069 | 0.046 | |
| Antimony (µg/L) | 4 | <0.7 | 6.0 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 1.3 | |
| ^J Arsenic (µg/L) | 4 | <0.4 | 0.6 ^H | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1 |
| Cadmium (mg/L) | 4 | <0.002 | <0.003 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.000 | |
| Chromium (mg/L) | 4 | <0.007 | <0.013 | 0.006 | 0.006 | 0.002 | |
| Copper (mg/L) | 4 | <0.013 | <0.200 | 0.006 | 0.030 | 0.047 | |
| ^J Iron (mg/L) | 4 | <0.026 | 0.304 | 0.224 ^M | 0.192 | 0.128 | |
| Lead (µg/L) | 4 | <1 | <1.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.1 | |
| ^J Manganese (mg/L) | 4 | 0.030 | 0.058 | 0.045 ^M | 0.044 | 0.012 | |
| ^B Mercury (µg/L) | 3 | <0.1 | <0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| ^J Nickel (mg/L) | 4 | <0.004 | <0.019 | 0.004 | 0.005 | 0.003 | |
| Selenium (µg/L) | 4 | <0.4 | <0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | |
| Silver (mg/L) | 4 | <0.001 | <0.002 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.000 | |
| Thallium (µg/L) | 4 | <0.4 | <0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | |
| ^J Zinc (mg/L) | 4 | <0.003 | 0.060 | 0.008 | 0.012 | 0.013 | |
| Biological | | | | | | | |
| Chlorophyll a (ug/L) | 8 | <0.10 | 4.27 | 1.47 | 1.67 | 1.41 | |
| ^J Fecal Coliform (col/100 mL) | 8 | 56 | 1500 | 330 | 475 | 482 | |

B= samples excluded due to laboratory QC concerns; C=*F&W* criterion exceeded; E=# samples that exceed criterion; G=value > median of all ecoregional reference reach data collected in ecoregion 71; H= *F&W* human health criterion exceeded; J=estimate; N=# samples; M=value > 90th percentile of all data collected within eco-region 71.

SUMMARY

Results of the 2009 bioassessment indicated the macroinvertebrate community in Big Shoal Creek at BSCL-1 to be in *fair* condition. However, conductivity, nutrients, and metals were higher than expected based on comparison with least impaired reference reaches in ecoregion 71. Biological and water quality conditions may have been affected by the extreme flows experienced in 2009. Monitoring should continue to ensure that water quality and biological conditions remain stable. Additional low-level arsenic sampling may also be necessary to determine if the criterion exceedance is due to natural conditions or anthropogenic sources.

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