

2010 Monitoring Summary



Swift Creek at Chilton County Road 24 near Billingsley (32.72144/-86.69159)

BACKGROUND

The Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM) monitors Swift Creek as a “best attainable condition” reference watershed for comparison with streams throughout the Fall Line Hills ecoregion. Swift Creek at SWFC-1 is among the least-disturbed watersheds in the Alabama, Coosa, Tallapoosa (ACT) basin group based on landuse, road density, and population density. The objective of the study is to collect data to develop water quality criteria and TMDLs.

Swift Creek was also selected for biological and water quality monitoring as part of the 2010 Alabama, Coosa, and Tallapoosa (ACT) Basin Assessment Monitoring. The objective of the study was to assess the biological integrity of each monitoring location and to estimate overall water quality within the basin.



Figure 1. Swift Creek at SWFC-1, December 1, 2010.

WATERSHED CHARACTERISTICS

Watershed characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Swift Creek from Alabama River to its source is designated as a *Swimming/Fish & Wildlife (S/F&W)* stream, located in the Fall Line Hills ecoregion (65i). Based on the 2006 National Land Cover Dataset, land cover within the watershed is mainly forest (55%), followed by shrubs/scrub, and pasture/hay. Swift Creek watershed has a low population density. As of May 13, 2013, there are no NPDES outfalls active 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, this information can give an indication of physical condition and the availability and quality of habitat. Swift Creek at SWFC-1 (Figure 1) is sand bottomed stream with small gravel riffles, leaf packs and snags that provide moderately stable habitat for biological communities. Overall habitat quality was categorized as *sub-optimal* for supporting macroinvertebrate communities.

BIOASSESSMENTS

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 the same ecoregion. The final score is the average of all individual metric scores. The final score indicated the biological community to be in *good* condition (Table 4).

Table 1. Summary of watershed characteristics.

| Watershed Characteristics | | Alabama River |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Basin | | Alabama River |
| Drainage Area (mi²) | | 24 |
| Ecoregion^a | | 65i |
| % Landuse | | |
| Open water | | <1 |
| Wetland | Woody | 2 |
| | Emergent herbaceous | <1 |
| Forest | Deciduous | 27 |
| | Evergreen | 13 |
| | Mixed | 15 |
| Shrub/scrub | | 19 |
| Grassland/herbaceous | | <1 |
| Pasture/hay | | 16 |
| Cultivated crops | | 4 |
| Development | Open space | 3 |
| | Low intensity | 1 |
| | Moderate intensity | <1 |
| Population/km² b | | 17 |

a.Fall Line Hills
b.2000 US Census

Table 2. Physical characteristics of Swift Creek at SWFC-1, May 12, 2010.

| Physical Characteristics | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Canopy Cover | Mostly Shaded |
| Width (ft) | 33 |
| Depth (ft) | |
| | Riffle 0.6 |
| | Run 1.0 |
| | Pool 1.5 |
| % of Reach | |
| | Riffle 10 |
| | Run 85 |
| | Pool 5 |
| % Substrate | |
| | Cobble 5 |
| | Gravel 21 |
| | Sand 60 |
| | Silt 2 |
| | Organic Matter 12 |

Table 3. Results of the habitat assessment conducted at Swift Creek at SWFC-1, May 12, 2010.

| Habitat Assessment | %Maximum Score | Rating |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Instream Habitat Quality | 56 | Sub-optimal (53-65) |
| Sediment Deposition | 50 | Marginal (40-52) |
| Sinuosity | 63 | Marginal (45-64) |
| Bank and Vegetative Stability | 65 | Sub-optimal (60-74) |
| Riparian Buffer | 90 | Optimal >89 |
| Habitat Assessment Score | 153 | |
| % Maximum Score | 64 | Sub-optimal (53-65) |

Table 4. Results of the macroinvertebrate bioassessment conducted in Swift Creek at SWFC-1, May 12, 2010.

| Macroinvertebrate Assessment | | |
|---|---------|---------------------|
| | Results | Scores (0-100) |
| Taxa richness and diversity measures | | |
| % EPC taxa | 28 | 47 |
| % Dominant Taxon | 16 | 89 |
| Taxonomic composition measures | | |
| % EPT minus Baetidae and Hydropsychidae | 38 | 69 |
| Functional feeding group | | |
| # Collector Taxa | 20 | 65 |
| Community tolerance | | |
| % Nutrient Tolerant individuals | 12 | 92 |
| WMB-I Assessment Score | --- | 72 |
| WMB-I Assessment Rating | | Good (48-74) |

WATER CHEMISTRY

Results of water chemistry analyses are presented in Table 5. *In situ* measurements and water samples were collected in July, August, October, and December, 2010 to help identify any stressors to the biological communities. *In situ* parameters were also collected during macroinvertebrate assessment. *In situ* measurements, dissolved solids, chlorides, metals, and most nutrients were within the expected range of reference reaches in the Fall Line Hills ecoregion. Samples were analyzed in April and August for pesticides, semi-volatile organics and atrazine and were below detection limits. However, specific conductance, hardness, and nitrite+nitrate nitrogen were higher than expected for streams located in ecoregion 65i.

SUMMARY

Bioassessment data indicated the macroinvertebrate community in Swift Creek at SWFC-1 to be in *good* condition. Overall habitat assessment was rated as *sub-optimal*. Results of intensive water quality sampling suggest specific conductivity, hardness, and nitrate+nitrite were of concern in Swift Creek at SWFC-1.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
 Sreeletha Prem Kumar ADEM Environmental Indicators Section
 1350 Coliseum Boulevard Montgomery, AL 36110
 (334) 260-2782 skumar@adem.state.al.us

Table 5. Summary of water quality data collected April-December, 2010. 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.

| Parameter | N | Min | Max | Med | Avg | SD | Q |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------|---------|--------------------|-------|-------|---|
| Physical | | | | | | | |
| Temperature (°C) | 6 | 9.9 | 24.8 | 18.3 | 17.8 | 4.9 | |
| Turbidity (NTU) | 7 | 4.3 | 22.3 | 10.3 | 10.5 | 6.0 | |
| Total Dissolved Solids (mg/L) | 4 | 10.0 | 40.0 | 17.0 | 21.0 | 13.7 | J |
| Total Suspended Solids (mg/L) | 4 | < 1.0 | 24.0 | 7.0 | 9.6 | 10.2 | |
| Specific Conductance (µmhos) | 6 | 31.4 | 38.8 | 34.1 ^G | 34.7 | 3.5 | |
| Hardness (mg/L) | 4 | 9.4 | 13.9 | 10.6 ^G | 11.1 | 2.0 | |
| Alkalinity (mg/L) | 4 | 3.6 | 8.8 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 2.2 | |
| Stream Flow (cfs) | 6 | 3.4 | 30.9 | 19.0 | 17.4 | 12.7 | |
| Chemical | | | | | | | |
| Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | 6 | 7.7 | 10.4 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 1.0 | |
| pH (su) | 6 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 0.2 | |
| Ammonia Nitrogen (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.021 | < 0.021 | 0.010 | 0.010 | 0.000 | |
| Nitrate+Nitrite Nitrogen (mg/L) | 4 | 0.052 | 0.500 | 0.388 ^M | 0.332 | 0.209 | |
| Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.080 | 0.322 | 0.148 | 0.164 | 0.146 | |
| Total Nitrogen (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.092 | 0.822 | 0.536 | 0.496 | 0.302 | |
| Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus (mg/L) | 4 | 0.005 | 0.009 | 0.005 | 0.006 | 0.002 | J |
| Total Phosphorus (mg/L) | 4 | 0.013 | 0.038 | 0.021 | 0.023 | 0.012 | |
| CBOD-5 (mg/L) | 4 | < 2.0 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 0.6 | |
| COD (mg/L) | 4 | < 1.8 | 17.3 | 7.7 | 8.4 | 8.7 | |
| TOC (mg/L) | 2 | 1.7 | 4.4 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 1.9 | |
| Chlorides (mg/L) | 4 | 3.2 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 0.8 | |
| Atrazine (µg/L) | 2 | < 0.02 | < 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | |
| Total Metals | | | | | | | |
| Aluminum (mg/L) | 4 | 0.062 | 0.499 | 0.326 | 0.304 | 0.182 | J |
| Iron (mg/L) | 4 | 0.413 | 0.951 | 0.766 | 0.724 | 0.227 | |
| Manganese (mg/L) | 4 | 0.034 | 0.152 | 0.076 | 0.084 | 0.049 | J |
| Dissolved Metals | | | | | | | |
| Aluminum (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.033 | 0.078 | 0.019 | 0.033 | 0.030 | J |
| Antimony (µg/L) | 4 | < 1.9 | < 1.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.0 | |
| Arsenic (µg/L) | 4 | < 2.1 | < 2.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | |
| Cadmium (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.000 | 0.014 | 0.004 | 0.004 | 0.004 | |
| Chromium (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.009 | 0.013 | 0.006 | 0.006 | 0.001 | |
| Copper (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.013 | 0.020 | 0.008 | 0.008 | 0.002 | |
| Iron (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.026 | 0.188 | 0.070 | 0.086 | 0.087 | J |
| Lead (µg/L) | 4 | < 1.7 | < 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.0 | |
| Manganese (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.001 | 0.116 | 0.012 | 0.035 | 0.055 | J |
| Mercury (µg/L) | 4 | < 0.1 | < 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Nickel (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.019 | 0.042 | 0.015 | 0.015 | 0.007 | |
| Selenium (µg/L) | 4 | < 1.7 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.7 | J |
| Silver (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.000 | |
| Thallium (µg/L) | 4 | < 0.6 | < 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | |
| Zinc (mg/L) | 4 | < 0.012 | 0.030 | 0.010 | 0.010 | 0.005 | |
| Biological | | | | | | | |
| Chlorophyll a (ug/L) | 4 | < 0.10 | 0.53 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.24 | |
| E. coli (col/100mL) | 4 | 225 | 2420 | 390 | 856 | 1046 | J |

G=value higher than median concentration of all verified ecoregional reference reach data collected in the ecoregion 65i; J=estimate; M= value >90% all verified ecoregional reference reach data collected in the ecoregion 65i; N= # samples; Q=qualifier.