



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2029

APR 27 2001

Mr. Larry Lawson
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
629 Main Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Re: Maggodee Creek and Lower Blackwater River TMDL, Franklin County

Dear Mr. Lawson:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III is pleased to approve the Lower Blackwater River and Maggodee Creek TMDLs. These TMDLs were submitted for EPA review on March 27, 2001 in accordance with section 303 (d)(1)(c) and (2) of the Clean Water Act. These TMDLs were established to address an impairment of water quality as identified in Virginia's 1998 Section 303 (d) list. Virginia identified the impairment for these water quality-limited segments within the Roanoke watershed based on exceedances of the fecal coliform water quality standard.

In accordance with Federal Regulations in 40 CFR §130.7, a TMDL must be designed to meet water quality standards, and (1) include, as appropriate, wasteload allocations (WLAs) for point sources and load allocations (LAs) for nonpoint sources, (2) consider the impacts of background pollutant contributions, (3) take critical stream conditions into account (the conditions when water quality is most likely to be violated), (4) consider seasonal variations, (5) include a margin of safety (which accounts for uncertainties in the relationship between pollutant loads and instream water quality), and (6) be subject to public participation. The enclosures to this letter describe how the TMDLs for Maggodee Creek and the Lower Blackwater River satisfy each of these requirements.

Following the approval, Virginia shall incorporate these TMDLs into the Water Quality Management Plan pursuant to 40 CFR § 130.7(d)(2). As you know, any new or revised National Pollutant Discharge Eliminations Systems (NPDES) permit must be consistent with the WLAs pursuant to 40 CFR §122.44 (d)(1)(vii)(B). Please submit all such permits to EPA for review as per EPA's letter dated October 1, 1998. Please feel free to contact Thomas Henry at 215-814-5752, if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Hammer

Rebecca Hanmer, Director
Water Protection Division

Enclosures



Decision Rationale
Total Maximum Daily Load of
Fecal Coliform for Maggodee Creek¹

I. Introduction

This document will set forth the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) rationale for approving the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) of Fecal Coliform for Maggodee Creek submitted for final Agency review on March 27, 2001. Our rationale is based on the TMDL submittal document to determine if the TMDL meets the following eight regulatory conditions pursuant to 40 CFR §130.

1. The TMDLs are designed to implement applicable water quality standards.
2. The TMDLs include a total allowable load as well as individual waste load allocations and load allocations.
3. The TMDLs consider the impacts of background pollutant contributions.
4. The TMDLs consider critical environmental conditions.
5. The TMDLs consider seasonal environmental variations.
6. The TMDLs include a margin of safety.
7. The TMDLs have been subject to public participation.
8. There is reasonable assurance that the TMDLs can be met.

II. Background

The impaired segment of Maggodee Creek is 21.13 miles in length with a 29,187-acre watershed. The impaired reach begins at the confluence of the North and South Fork of Maggodee Creek culminating at its confluence with the Blackwater River. Forest is the major land use and makes up roughly 62% of the 29,187 acre watershed.

In response to Section 303 (d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VADEQ) listed 21.13 miles of Maggodee Creek as being impaired by elevated levels of fecal coliform on Virginia's 1998 Section 303 (d) list. Maggodee Creek was listed for violations of Virginia's fecal coliform bacteria standard for primary contact. Fecal coliform is a bacterium which can be found within the intestinal tract of all warm-blooded animals. Therefore, fecal coliform can be found in the fecal wastes of these animals. Fecal coliform in itself is not a pathogenic organism. However, fecal coliform indicates the presence of fecal wastes and the potential for the existence of other pathogenic bacteria. The higher concentrations of fecal coliform indicate the elevated likelihood of increased pathogenic organisms.

Maggodee Creek, identified as watershed VAW-L09R, was given a high priority for

¹This typewritten version of the decision rationale was created after the close of the administrative record on April 27, 2001. It contains a transcription of hand written grammatical changes that were made to the document prior to the close of the record on April 27, 2001. The original document, with the hand written modifications, will be filed within the administrative record.

TMDL development. Section 303 (d) of the Clean Water Act and its implementing regulations require a TMDL to be developed for those waterbodies identified as impaired by the State where technology-based and other controls will not provide for the attainment of Water Quality Standards. The TMDL submitted by Virginia is designed to determine the acceptable load of fecal coliform which can be delivered to Maggodee Creek, as demonstrated by the Hydrologic Simulation Program Fortran (HSPF)², in order to ensure that the water quality standard is attained and maintained. HSPF is considered an appropriate model to analyze this watershed because of its dynamic ability to simulate both watershed loading and receiving water quality over a wide range of conditions.

EPA has been encouraging the States to use e-coli and enterococci as the indicator species instead of fecal coliform. A better correlation has been drawn between the concentrations of e-coli (and enterococci) and the incidence of gastrointestinal illness. The Commonwealth is pursuing changing the standard from fecal coliform to e-coli.

Virginia designates all of its waters for primary contact, therefore all waters must meet the current fecal coliform standard for primary contact. Virginia's standard applies to all flows. Through the development of this and other similar TMDLs, it was discovered that natural conditions (wildlife contributions to the streams) were causing or contributing to violations of the standard during low flows. Based on the model, fecal coliform loading from wildlife alone caused violations of the standard. Thus many of Virginia's TMDLs have called for some reduction in the amount of wildlife contributions to the stream. EPA believes that a significant reduction in wildlife is not practical or desirable and will not be necessary due to the implementation discussion below.

A phased implementation plan will be developed for all streams in which the TMDL calls for reductions in wildlife. The first phase of the implementation will reduce all sources of fecal coliform to the stream other than wildlife. In phase 2, which can occur concurrently to phase 1, the Commonwealth will consider addressing its standards to accommodate this natural loading condition. During phase 2, the Commonwealth has indicated that it will evaluate the following items in relation to the standard: 1) The possibility of placing a minimum flow requirement on the bacteriological standard will be considered. As a result, the standard may not apply to flows below the minimum (possibly 7Q10). This application of the standard is applied in many States. 2) The Commonwealth may develop a Use Attainability Analysis (UAA) for streams with wildlife reductions which are not used for frequent bathing. Depending upon the result of that UAA, it is possible that these streams could be designated primary contact infrequent bathing. 3) The Commonwealth will also investigate incorporating a natural background condition for the bacteriological indicator.

After the completion of phase 1 of the implementation plan the Commonwealth will conduct monitoring to determine if the wildlife reductions are actually necessary, as the violation rate associated with the wildlife loading may be smaller than the percent error of the model. In phase 3, the Commonwealth will investigate the sampling data to determine if further

²Bicknell, B.R., J.C. Imhoff, J.L. Little, and R.C. Johanson. 1993. Hydrologic Simulation Program-FORTRAN (HSPF): User's Manual for release 10.0. EPA 600/3-84-066. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Research Laboratory, Athens, GA.

load reductions are needed in order for these waters to attain standards. If the load reductions and/or the new application of standards allow the stream to attain standards, then no additional work is warranted. However, if standards are still not being attained after the implementation of phases 1 and 2 further work and reductions will be warranted.

During the development of this TMDL, it was discovered that the model consistently under-represented the concentration of fecal coliform in these river segments. The model used for this TMDL duplicated the assumptions and loadings that were used for TMDL development in the four Upper Blackwater River segments (North Fork of the Blackwater, South Fork of the Blackwater, the Upper Blackwater, and the Middle Fork of the Blackwater). As the assumptions made in the previous TMDLs resulted in a model that accurately reflected the concentrations of fecal coliform in the upper watershed, it was felt that a change in the loadings would question the integrity of both studies. An unknown mechanism may be contributing to the elevated fecal coliform concentrations detected in this segment.

One possible mechanism for this discrepancy would be the resuspension of sediments. As documented in the report, fecal coliform concentrations in the sediment often far exceed the concentrations detected in the water column. An agent (cattle in-stream or other mechanism) causing a resuspension of these sediments may cause an elevation in fecal coliform concentrations. The model developed for this TMDL used a factor value based on the likelihood that cattle in-stream were causing the resuspension of fecal coliform in the sediment. The factor value was determined by dividing the stream access area by the sum of the pasture area and the stream width³.

The HSPF model is a comprehensive modeling system for simulation of watershed hydrology, point and nonpoint source loadings, and receiving water quality for conventional pollutants and toxicants⁴. More specifically HSPF uses precipitation data for continuous and storm event simulation to determine total fecal loading to Maggodee Creek from urban areas, forest, good pasture, poor pasture, cropland, farmstead, loafing areas, and livestock access areas. The total land loading of fecal coliform is the result of the application of manure, direct deposition from cattle and wildlife (geese, deer, etc.) to the land, fecal coliform production from pets, fecal coliform from septic systems, and the application of biosolids.

The TMDL analysis allocates the application/deposition of fecal coliform to land-based and in-stream sources. For land-based sources, the HSPF model accounts for the buildup and washoff of pollutants from these areas. Buildup (accumulation) refers to the complex spectrum of dry-weather processes that deposit or remove pollutants between storms⁵. Washoff is the removal of fecal coliform which occurs as a result of runoff associated with storm events. These two processes allow the HSPF model to determine the amount of fecal coliform from land based sources which is reaching the stream. Point sources and wastes deposited directly to the stream were treated as direct deposits. These wastes do not need a transport mechanism to allow them

³MapTech, 2001. Fecal Coliform TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) Development for Maggodee Creek, Virginia. Addendum B.

⁴ CH2MHILL, 2000. Fecal Coliform TMDL Development for Cedar, Hall, Byers, and Hutton Creeks Virginia.

⁵Supra, footnote #4.

to reach the stream. The allocation plan calls for the reduction in fecal coliform wastes delivered by cattle in-stream, wildlife in-stream, and straight pipes.

Table #1 summarizes the specific elements of the TMDL at the watershed outlet.

Segment	Parameter	TMDL	WLA (cfu/yr)	LA (cfu/yr)	MOS(cfu/yr) ¹
Maggodee Creek	Fecal Coliform	1.86E+15	8.28E+10	1.86E+15	4.39E+12

¹ Virginia includes an explicit MOS by identifying the TMDL target as achieving the total fecal coliform water quality concentration of 190 cfu/100ml as opposed to the WQS of 200 cfu/ml. This can be viewed explicitly as a 5% MOS.

EPA believes it is important to recognize the conceptual difference between waste load allocation (WLA) values, load allocation (LA) values for sources modeled as being directly deposited to the stream segment, and LA values for flux sources of fecal coliform to land use categories. WLA values and LA values for direct sources represent the amount of fecal coliform which is actually deposited into the stream segment. However, LA values for flux sources represent the amount of fecal coliform deposited to the land. The actual amount of fecal coliform which reaches the stream segment will be significantly less than the amount of fecal coliform deposited to the land. The HSPF model, which considers landscape processes which affect fecal coliform runoff from land uses, determines the amount of fecal coliform which reaches the stream segment. The LA in Table #1 is the amount of colony forming units reaching the stream outlet from nonpoint sources annually.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has been provided with a copy of this TMDL. A formal response from the USFWS has not been received.

III. Discussion of Regulatory Conditions

EPA finds that Virginia has provided sufficient information to meet all eight basic requirements for establishing a fecal coliform TMDL for Maggodee Creek. EPA is therefore approving this TMDL. Our approval is outlined according to the regulatory requirements listed below.

1) The TMDL is designed to meet the applicable water quality standards.

Virginia has indicated that excessive levels of fecal coliform due to nonpoint sources (directly deposited to the Creek) have caused violations of the water quality standards and designated uses on Maggodee Creek. The water quality criterion for fecal coliform is a geometric mean 200 cfu (colony forming units)/100ml or an instantaneous standard of no more than 1,000 cfu/100ml. Two or more samples over a 30 day period are required for the geometric mean standard. Therefore, most violations of the State’s water quality standard are due to violations of the instantaneous standard.

The HSPF model is being used to determine the fecal coliform deposition rates to the land as well as loadings to the stream from point and other direct deposit sources necessary to

support the fecal coliform water quality criterion and primary contact use. The following discussion is intended to describe how controls on the loading of fecal coliform to Maggodee Creek will ensure that the criterion is attained.

Fecal coliform production rates within the watershed are attained from a wide array of sources on the farm practices in the area (land application rates of manure), the amount and concentration of farm animals, point sources in the watershed, animal access to the stream, wildlife in the watershed, wildlife fecal production rates, land uses, weather, stream geometry, etc. This information is used in the development of the model.

The hydrology component of the model for all the Blackwater TMDLs was developed on United States Geologic Survey (USGS) gage #02056900 on the Blackwater River. The percent error of the simulated flow versus observed flow was within the acceptable limit of 10% and the calibration was deemed acceptable. The model was calibrated to USGS gage #02056900 data from October 01, 1994 through September 30, 1998. The model was then validated, applied to a different time period to determine if it still accurately reflected observed conditions, to USGS gage #02056900 data from January 01, 1991 to September 30, 1994 and October 01, 1980 to September 30, 1981. The validation run was also deemed acceptable with an error of 12.6%.

A regression analysis was performed on instantaneous flow measurements at the USGS gage to flow measurements made at the watershed outlet by VADEQ. This was done to transform the USGS flow to the outlet of the impaired water, thus creating a continuous flow record. Water quality sampling was used to determine an average ratio of flow at the VADEQ monitoring stations to the watershed outlet. This process was then conducted for the simulated flow measurements. These ratios were then evaluated to determine the accuracy of the model on a finer (subwatershed) scale.

The water quality calibration was conducted using data from January 1, 1993 to December 31, 1995.⁶ Parameters such as the fecal coliform concentration in interflow, the intensity of rainfall that will cause 90% of the pollutant to be washed off, decay rate, and the maximum accumulation of a pollutant on the land surface were changed to create a better correspondence between observed and simulated conditions. The decay rate is used to simulate how settlement and die-off affect the in-stream loading. The first order decay rate influences the land-based and in-stream loading.

EPA believes that using HSPF to model and allocate fecal coliform will ensure that the designated uses and water quality standards will be attained and maintained for Maggodee Creek.

2) The TMDL includes a total allowable load as well as individual waste load allocations and load allocations.

⁶MapTech, 2001. Fecal Coliform TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) Development for Maggodee Creek, Virginia.

Total Allowable Loads

Virginia indicates that the total allowable loading of fecal coliform is the sum of the loads allocated to land based, precipitation driven nonpoint source areas (good pasture, poor pasture, cropland, forest, urban, farmstead, loafing lots, and livestock access), directly deposited nonpoint sources of fecal coliform (cattle in-stream, wildlife in-stream, straight pipes, and lateral flow), and point sources. Activities such as the application of manure, fertilizer, and the direct deposition of wastes from grazing animals are considered fluxes to the land use categories. The actual value for the total fecal load can be found in Table #1 of this document. The total allowable load is calculated on an annual basis due to the nature of HSPF model.

Waste Load Allocations

Boones Mill Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is the only point source discharging to the impaired segment of Maggodee Creek. Boones Mill WWTP has an effluent limit of 200cfu/100 ml. The treatment plant is required to chlorinate its effluent. Therefore, the actual end of pipe concentrations are much lower than the permitted concentrations. The plant was modeled in the allocation scenario as discharging its permitted concentration (200 cfu/100 ml) at its design flow capacity (0.3 million gallons per day).

EPA regulations require that an approvable TMDL include individual Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) for each point source. According to 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B), “Effluent limits developed to protect a narrative water quality criterion, a numeric water quality criterion, or both, are consistent with assumptions and requirements of any available WLA for the discharge prepared by the State and approved by EPA pursuant to 40 CFR 130.7.” Furthermore, EPA has authority to object to the issuance of any NPDES permit that is inconsistent with the WLAs established for that point source.

Table #2 - Waste Load Allocations for the Impaired Segment of Maggodee Creek

Facility	Permit Number	Existing Load	Allocated Load
Boones Mill WWTP	VA0067245	8.27E+10	8.27E+10

Load Allocations

According to federal regulations at 40 CFR 130.2 (g), load allocations are best estimates of the loading, which may range from reasonably accurate estimates to gross allotments, depending on the availability of data and appropriate techniques for predicting loading. Wherever possible, natural and nonpoint source loads should be distinguished.

VADEQ recognizes the significant loading of fecal coliform from cattle in-stream, straight pipes, wildlife in-stream, and failed septic systems (lateral flow). These sources are not dependent on a transport mechanism to reach a surface waterbody and therefore can impact water quality during low and high flow events. As stated above a factor value was incorporated into the loading. This factor value was an attempt to address an unknown mechanism that

increased the observed fecal coliform concentrations. The model developed for this TMDL used a factor value based on the likelihood that cattle in-stream were causing the resuspension of fecal coliform in the sediment. Table #3 illustrates the load allocation for the land application of fecal coliform, the loading to each land use. The load that reaches the stream from each land use will be significantly smaller than the amount of fecal coliform deposited to the land (quantities listed in the table).

Table #3 - Load allocation for the land application of fecal coliform

Source	Existing Load(cfu/yr)	Allocated Load(cfu/yr)	Percent Reduction
Good Pasture	1.69E+15	1.69E+15	0%
Poor Pasture	5.89E+15	5.89E+15	0%
Cropland	1.92E+16	1.92E+16	0%
Forest	1.20E+15	1.20E+15	0%
Urban	1.09E+15	1.09E+15	0%
Farmstead	4.47+E13	4.47+E13	0%
Livestock Access ¹	1.31E+14	4.36E+14	-233%
Loafing Lot	1.86E+15	1.86E+15	0%
Straight Pipes	6.44E+13	0.00	100%
Lateral Flow	3.09E+09	3.09E+09	0%
Wildlife In-Stream	2.54E+13	3.80E+12	85%
Cattle In-Stream	1.28E+15	0.00	100%

¹ Livestock access areas are areas where cattle currently have access to the stream. After the implementation of this TMDL, these areas will no longer provide the cattle with access to the stream. The increase in loading to this area is a result of the Cattle In-Stream load being applied to this land segment.

This table documents the allowable loading to each land use, significantly smaller amount of fecal coliform will actually be reaching the stream.

3) The TMDL considers the impacts of background pollution.

A background concentration was set for all land segments by adding 10% of the total wildlife load to each land segment.

4) The TMDL considers critical environmental conditions.

EPA regulations at 40 CFR 130.7 (c)(1) require TMDLs to take into account critical conditions for stream flow, loading, and water quality parameters. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that the water quality of Maggodee Creek is protected during times when it is most vulnerable.

Critical conditions are important because they describe the factors that combine to cause a violation of water quality standards and will help in identifying the actions that may have to be

undertaken to meet water quality standards⁷. Critical conditions are a combination of environmental factors (e.g., flow, temperature, etc.), which have an acceptably low frequency of occurrence but when modeled to insure that water quality standards will be met for the remainder of conditions. In specifying critical conditions in the waterbody, an attempt is made to use a reasonable “worst-case” scenario condition. For example, stream analysis often uses a low-flow (7Q10) design condition because the ability of the waterbody to assimilate pollutants without exhibiting adverse impacts is at a minimum.

The sources of bacteria for these stream segments were a mixture of dry and wet weather driven sources. Therefore, the critical condition for Maggodee Creek was represented as a typical hydrologic year. However, the most stringent reductions were needed to insure that water quality standards were met during extreme low flows. It should be noted that low flow events occurred more often than wet weather events and therefore it was essential that the standard be maintained during these periods. Runoff events occurred less than 8% of the time, based on rainfall analysis from 1994-1999. Therefore, if the geometric mean of fecal coliform concentrations during non-runoff event periods is 100 cfu/100 ml, then the geometric mean of fecal coliform concentrations during runoff events could be as much as 4 orders of magnitude greater and the Commonwealth’s water quality standard (30-day, geometric mean < 200 cfu/100ml) would still be met⁸.

5) The TMDLs consider seasonal environmental variations.

Seasonal variations involve changes in stream flow as a result of hydrologic and climatological patterns. In the continental United States, seasonally high flow normally occurs during the early spring from snow melt and spring rain, while seasonally low flows typically occur during the warmer summer and early fall drought periods. Consistent with our discussion regarding critical conditions, the HSPF model and TMDL analysis will effectively consider seasonal environmental variations.

The model also accounted for seasonal variations in fecal coliform loading. Fecal coliform loads changed for many of the sources depending on the time of the year. For example, cattle spent more time in the stream in the summer and animals were confined for longer periods of time in the winter. Therefore, the loading from cattle in-stream was greatest in the summer when there were more cattle in the stream for longer periods of time. This loading was further enhanced by the low flows encountered during the summer months.

6) The TMDLs include a margin of safety.

This requirement is intended to add a level of safety to the modeling process to account for any uncertainty. Margins of safety may be implicit, built into the modeling process by using conservative modeling assumptions, or explicit, taken as a percentage of the wasteload allocation, load allocation, or TMDL.

⁷EPA memorandum regarding EPA Actions to Support High Quality TMDLs from Robert H. Wayland III, Director, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds to the Regional Management Division Directors, August 9, 1999.

⁸Supra, footnote #3.

Virginia includes an explicit margin of safety by establishing the TMDL target water quality concentration for fecal coliform at 190 cfu/ 100mL, which is more stringent than Virginia's water quality standard of 200 cfu/100 ml. This would be considered an explicit 5% margin of safety.

7) The TMDLs have been subject to public participation.

Seven meetings were held to discuss the TMDL and TMDL process. There was one semi-public meeting, three public meetings associated with TMDL development on the upper four Blackwater segments, two public meetings on the Lower Blackwater and Maggodee Creek, and a public meeting for a select group of farmers. Two one-hour programs and the February 16, 2000 meeting were televised for additional outreach. All of the public meetings were advertised in the *Virginia Register*.

8) There is a reasonable assurance that the TMDL can be met.

EPA requires that there be a reasonable assurance that the TMDL can be implemented. WLAs will be implemented through the NPDES permit process. According to 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B), the effluent limitations for an NPDES permit must be consistent with the assumptions and requirements of any available WLA for the discharge prepared by the state and approved by EPA. Furthermore, EPA has authority to object to issuance of an NPDES permit that is inconsistent with WLAs established for that point source.

Nonpoint source controls to achieve LAs can be implemented through a number of existing programs such as Section 319 of the Clean Water Act, commonly referred to as the Nonpoint Source Program. Additionally, Virginia's Unified Watershed Assessment, an element of the Clean Water Action Plan, could provide assistance in implementing this TMDL.

Fecal Coliform TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) Development for Maggodee Creek, Virginia

Prepared By

MapTech Inc., Blacksburg, VA

for

Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, and
Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation

February 2, 2001

CONTENTS

Contents ii

Tables vi

Figures viii

Executive Summary xi

 Fecal Coliform Impairment xi

 Sources of Fecal Coliform xi

 Water Quality Modeling xi

 Existing Loadings and Water Quality Conditions xii

 Load Allocation Scenarios xii

 Margin of Safety xiii

 Recommendations for TMDL Implementation xiii

 Public Participation xiv

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS xv

1. INTRODUCTION 1-1

 1.1 Background 1-1

 1.2 Applicable Water Quality Standards 1-3

2. TMDL ENDPOINT AND WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT 2-1

 2.1 Selection of a TMDL Endpoint and Critical Condition 2-1

 2.2 Discussion of In-stream Water Quality 2-2

 2.2.1 Inventory of Water Quality Monitoring Data 2-2

 2.2.1.1 Water Quality Monitoring Conducted by VADEQ 2-3

 2.2.1.2 Water Quality Monitoring Conducted by MapTech 2-4

 2.2.1.3 Ferrum College Study 2-5

 2.2.1.4 Summary of In-stream Water Quality Monitoring Data 2-5

- 2.2.2 Analysis of Water Quality Monitoring Data2-6
 - 2.2.2.1 Summary of Frequency of Violations at the Monitoring Stations.....2-6
 - 2.2.2.2 Bacteria Source Tracking2-6
 - 2.2.2.3 Trend and Seasonal Analyses2-7
 - 2.2.2.3.1 Precipitation.....2-8
 - 2.2.2.3.2 Discharge.....2-8
 - 2.2.2.3.3 Fecal Coliform Concentrations2-9
- 3. SOURCE ASSESSMENT3-1
 - 3.1 Assessment of Point Sources.....3-1
 - 3.2 Assessment of Nonpoint Sources3-2
 - 3.2.1 Private Residential Sewage Treatment.....3-3
 - 3.2.2 Livestock.....3-4
 - 3.2.3 Biosolids.....3-8
 - 3.2.4 Wildlife3-8
 - 3.2.5 Pets3-11
- 4. MODELING PROCEDURE: LINKING THE SOURCES TO THE ENDPOINT.....4-1
 - 4.1 Modeling Framework Selection.....4-1
 - 4.2 Model Setup.....4-1
 - 4.3 Source Representation4-3
 - 4.3.1 Point Sources.....4-4
 - 4.3.2 Private Residential Sewage Treatment.....4-4
 - 4.3.2.1 Functional Septic Systems4-5
 - 4.3.2.2 Failing Septic Systems4-5
 - 4.3.2.3 Uncontrolled Discharges.....4-5

- 4.3.3 Livestock.....4-6
 - 4.3.3.1 Land Application of Collected Manure4-6
 - 4.3.3.2 Deposition on Land.....4-6
 - 4.3.3.3 Direct Deposition to Streams4-7
- 4.3.4 Biosolids.....4-7
- 4.3.5 Wildlife4-8
- 4.3.6 Pets4-9
- 4.4 Stream Characteristics.....4-9
- 4.5 Selection of Representative Modeling Period4-11
- 4.6 Model Calibration and Validation Processes4-12
 - 4.6.1 Hydrologic Calibration and Validation.....4-13
 - 4.6.2 Water Quality Calibration and Validation.....4-21
- 4.7 Existing Loadings4-41
- 5. ALLOCATION5-1
 - 5.1 Sensitivity Analysis5-1
 - 5.2 Incorporation of a Margin of Safety.....5-3
 - 5.3 Scenario Development5-4
 - 5.3.1 Wasteload Allocations.....5-4
 - 5.3.2 Load Allocations.....5-4
- 6. IMPLEMENTATION.....6-1
 - 6.1 Follow-Up Monitoring6-1
 - 6.2 TMDL Implementation Process.....6-1
 - 6.3 Stage I Implementation Goal.....6-2
 - 6.4 Wildlife Contribution.....6-3

6.4.1 Designated Uses6-4

6.4.2 TMDL Allocations6-4

6.4.3 Options for Resolution of Wildlife Issue6-5

6.5 Public Participation.....6-6

Appendix: A A-1

Appendix: B..... B-1

Appendix: C C-1

Glossary G-1

REFERENCES R-1

TABLES

Table 2.1 Summary of water quality sampling conducted by VADEQ.....2-3

Table 2.2 Summary of water quality sampling conducted by MapTech. Fecal coliform concentrations (cfu/100 ml).....2-5

Table 2.3 Summary of water quality sampling conducted as part of the *Preliminary Fecal Coliform Assessment in the Blackwater River Watershed* (Yagow et al., 1999).....2-5

Table 2.4 Summary of moods median test on mean monthly discharge at USGS Station #02056900.....2-8

Table 2.5 Summary of moods median test on mean monthly fecal coliform concentrations measured in the Blackwater River watershed.2-9

Table 3.1 Partial listing of information contained in livestock inventory of Blackwater Riparian NPS Pollution Control Project.....3-5

Table 3.2 Livestock populations in the Maggodee Creek Watershed.....3-5

Table 3.3 Average fecal coliform densities and waste loads associated with livestock.....3-5

Table 3.4 Average time dairy cows spend in different areas per day. Based on farmer survey, 11/22/99.....3-6

Table 3.5 Average percentage of collected waste applied throughout year.3-7

Table 3.6 Average time beef cows spend in different areas per day.....3-8

Table 3.7 Wildlife population density.....3-9

Table 3.8 Wildlife populations in the Maggodee Creek Watershed.3-9

Table 3.9 Wildlife fecal production rates and habitat.....3-10

Table 3.10 Average fecal coliform densities and percentage of time spent in stream access areas for wildlife.....3-11

Table 3.11 Pet population density, waste load, and fecal coliform density.....3-11

Table 4.1 Spatial distribution of land use types in the Maggodee Creek drainage area.....4-3

Table 4.2 Example of an “F-table” calculated for the HSPF Model.4-11

Table 4.3 Comparison of modeled time period to historical records.....4-12

Table 4.4 Hydrology calibration criteria and model performance for period 10/1/94 through 9/30/98.....4-14

Table 4.5 Hydrology validation criteria and model performance for validation period 1/1/91 through 9/30/94 and 10/1/80 through 9/30/81.....4-17

Table 4.6 Sub-watershed calibration results in the Maggodee Creek Watershed for the period 10/1/94 through 9/30/98.....4-21

Table 4.7 Results of analyses on calibration runs.....4-27

Table 4.8 Results of analyses on validation runs.....4-28

Table 5.1 Percentage of 30-day geometric mean values exceeding 190 cfu/100 ml fecal coliform in the Maggodee Creek impairment.....5-6

Table 5.2 Land-based nonpoint source load reductions in the Maggodee Creek impairment for final allocation.5-8

Table 5.3 Load reductions to direct nonpoint sources in the Maggodee Creek impairment for final allocation.5-8

Table 6.1 Nonpoint source allocations in the Maggodee Creek impairment for Stage I implementation.6-2

Table 6.2 Load reductions to direct nonpoint sources in the Maggodee Creek impairment for Stage I implementation.6-3

Table 6.3 Public participation in the TMDL development for the Maggodee Creek Watershed.6-8

Table B.1 Current conditions (1999) of land applied fecal coliform load for Maggodee Creek impairment..... B-2

Table B.2 Monthly, directly-deposited, fecal coliform loads in the Maggodee Creek impairment. B-3

Table B.2 Monthly, directly-deposited, fecal coliform loads in the Maggodee Creek impairment. (Continued) B-4

Table B.3 Existing annual loads from land-based sources for Maggodee Creek impairment..... B-5

Table B.4 Existing annual loads from direct-deposition sources for Maggodee Creek impairment. B-6

FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Location of the Maggodee Creek Watershed.	1-2
Figure 1.2	Land uses in the Blackwater River Watershed	1-3
Figure 2.1	Relationship between fecal coliform concentrations and discharge from the Blackwater River (USGS Gaging Station #02056900).	2-2
Figure 2.2	Location of water quality monitoring stations in the Maggodee Creek and Lower Blackwater River Watersheds.....	2-4
Figure 2.3	Results of MapTech’s in-stream monitoring for fecal coliform concentrations and fecal sources.....	2-7
Figure 3.1	Location of VPDES permitted point sources in the Blackwater River watershed.....	3-2
Figure 4.1	Subwatersheds delineated for modeling and location of water quality monitoring stations in the Maggodee Creek (1-10) and the Lower Blackwater River (11-17) Watershed.....	4-2
Figure 4.2	Example of habitat layer developed by MapTech (Raccoon Habitat in the Blackwater River watershed).....	4-8
Figure 4.3	Stream profile representation in HSPF.....	4-10
Figure 4.4	Location of monitoring stations used to transform continuous flow data from USGS Station #02056900 to DEQ Station #4ABWR019.75.....	4-14
Figure 4.5	Calibration results for period 10/1/94 through 9/30/98.....	4-15
Figure 4.6	Calibration results for period 10/1/97 through 9/30/98.....	4-16
Figure 4.7	Validation results for period 1/1/91 through 9/30/94.	4-18
Figure 4.8	Validation results for period 10/1/92 through 9/30/93.	4-19
Figure 4.9	Validation results for period 10/1/80 through 9/30/81.	4-20
Figure 4.10	Quality calibrations for subwatershed 1 of Maggodee Creek impairment.....	4-23
Figure 4.11	Quality calibration for subwatershed 6 of Maggodee Creek Impairment	4-24
Figure 4.12	Quality calibration for subwatershed 7 of Maggodee Creek Impairment	4-25
Figure 4.13	Quality calibration for subwatershed 10 of Maggodee Creek Impairment.	4-26
Figure 4.14	Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window centered on a single observed value. Calibration period for watershed 1 in Maggodee Creek impairment.	4-29

Figure 4.15 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Calibration period for subwatershed 6 in Maggodee Creek impairment.....4-30

Figure 4.16 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Calibration period for subwatershed 7 in Maggodee Creek impairment.....4-31

Figure 4.17 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Calibration period for subwatershed 10 in Maggodee Creek impairment.....4-32

Figure 4.18 Quality validation for subwatershed 1 of Maggodee Creek impairment.4-33

Figure 4.19 Quality validation for subwatershed 6 of Maggodee Creek impairment.4-34

Figure 4.20 Quality validation for subwatershed 7 of Maggodee Creek impairment.4-35

Figure 4.21 Quality validation for subwatershed 10 of Maggodee Creek impairment.....4-36

Figure 4.22 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Validation period for subwatershed 1 Maggodee Creek impairment4-37

Figure 4.23 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Validation period for subwatershed 6 Maggodee Creek Impairment.....4-38

Figure 4.24 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Validation period for subwatershed 7 Maggodee Creek impairment4-39

Figure 4.25 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Validation period for subwatershed 10 Maggodee Creek impairment4-40

Figure 4.26 Existing conditions in subwatersheds 1-5 of Maggodee Creek impairment.....4-42

Figure 4.27 Existing conditions in subwatersheds 6-10 of Maggodee Creek impairment.....4-43

Figure 5.1 Results of total loading sensitivity analysis for the Maggodee Creek Watershed.....5-2

Figure 5.2 Results of sensitivity analysis on 30-day, geometric-mean, concentrations in the Maggodee Creek Watershed, as affected by changes in land-based loadings.....5-2

Figure 5.3 Results of sensitivity analysis on 30-day, geometric-mean, concentrations in the Maggodee Creek Watershed, as affected by changes in loadings from direct nonpoint sources.....5-3

Figure 5.4 Allocation and existing scenarios for Maggodee Creek impairment.5-7

Figure A.1 Frequency analysis of fecal coliform concentrations at station 4AMEE002.38 in the Maggodee Creek impairment. A-2

Figure A.2 Frequency analysis of fecal coliform concentrations at station 4AMEE007.85 in the Maggodee Creek impairment. A-3

Figure A.3 Frequency analysis of fecal coliform concentrations at station 4AMEE0021.13 in the Maggodee Creek impairment. A-4

Figure A.4 Frequency analysis of fecal coliform concentrations at station 4AMHA001.59 in the Maggodee Creek impairment. A-5

Figure A.5 Frequency analysis of fecal coliform concentrations at station 4AMHA001.79 in the Maggodee Creek impairment. A-6

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Fecal Coliform Impairment

Maggodee Creek was placed on the Commonwealth of Virginia's 1996 303(d) List of Impaired Waters because of violations of the fecal coliform bacteria water quality standard, and remains on the 1998 303(d) list. Based on exceedances of this standard recorded at Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VADEQ) monitoring stations, the stream does not support primary contact recreation (e.g. swimming, wading, and fishing). The applicable state standard specifies that the number of fecal coliform bacteria shall not exceed a maximum allowable level of 1,000 colony forming units (cfu)/ 100 milliliters (ml) (Virginia State Law 9VAC25-260-170). Alternatively, if data are available, the geometric mean of two or more observations taken in a thirty-day period should not exceed 200 cfu/100 ml. A review of available monitoring data for the study area indicated that fecal coliform bacteria were consistently elevated above the 1,000 cfu/100 ml standard. In TMDL development, the geometric mean standard of 200 cfu/100 ml was used, since continuous simulated data was available.

Sources of Fecal Coliform

Potential sources of fecal coliform include both point source and nonpoint source contributions. Nonpoint sources include wildlife; grazing livestock; land application of manure; land application of biosolids; urban/suburban runoff; failed, malfunctioning, and operational septic systems, and uncontrolled discharges (straight pipes, dairy parlor waste, etc.). To account for un-quantifiable loads from known wildlife species, a background load was applied to all land segments equal to 10% of the total wildlife load quantified. Boones Mill Sanitary Treatment Plant is the only permitted point discharge in the Maggodee Creek drainage area.

Water Quality Modeling

The US Geological Survey (USGS) Hydrologic Simulation Program - Fortran (HSPF) water quality model was selected as the modeling framework to simulate existing conditions and perform TMDL allocations. In establishing the existing and allocation conditions, seasonal variations in hydrology, climatic conditions, and watershed activities were explicitly accounted for in the model.

Thirty-minute flows from the USGS station (#02056900) on the Blackwater River were transformed using regression analysis of flows at the USGS station and flows at the outlet of the Blackwater River Watershed upstream of Smith Mountain Lake. The transformed flows represent flows at the outlet of the watershed and were used to calibrate hydrologic flows for the Blackwater River watershed in the HSPF model, thereby improving confidence in computed discharges generated by the model. The representative hydrologic period used for calibration ran from October 1, 1994 through September 30, 1998. The model was validated using daily

flows recorded at the same gaging station from October 1, 1980 through September 30, 1981 and from January 1, 1991 through September 30, 1994. The time periods covered by calibration and validation represent a broad range of hydrologic and climatic conditions and are representative of the 20-year precipitation and discharge record. (For purposes of modeling watershed inputs to in-stream water quality, the Maggodee Creek drainage area was divided into ten subwatersheds.) The model was calibrated for water quality predictions using data collected at VADEQ monitoring stations between January 1993 and December 1995, and validated using data collected between January 1991 and December 1992. All allocation model runs were conducted using precipitation data from January 1991 through December 1995.

Existing Loadings and Water Quality Conditions

Wildlife populations and ranges; biosolids application rates and practices; rate of failure, location, and number of septic systems; pet populations; number of cattle and other livestock; and information on livestock and manure management practices for the Maggodee Creek Watershed were used to calculate fecal coliform loadings from land-based nonpoint sources in the watershed. The estimated fecal coliform production and accumulation rates due to these sources were calculated for the watershed and incorporated into the model. To accommodate the structure of the model, calculation of the fecal coliform accumulation and source contributions on a monthly basis accounted for seasonal variation in watershed activities such as wildlife feeding patterns and land application of manure. Also represented in the model were direct nonpoint sources of properly functioning septic systems located within 50 feet of a stream, uncontrolled discharges, direct deposition by wildlife, and direct deposition by livestock.

Contributions from all of these sources were represented in the model to establish existing conditions for the watershed over the representative hydrologic period (1991-1995). The HSPF model provided a comparable match to the VADEQ monitoring data, with output from the model indicating violations of both the instantaneous and geometric mean standards throughout the watershed.

Load Allocation Scenarios

The next step in the TMDL process was to adjust loadings to existing conditions (1999), and determine how to proceed to reduce the various source loads to levels that would result in attainment of the water quality standards. Because Virginia's fecal coliform standard does not permit any exceedances of the standard, modeling was conducted based on 0% exceedance of the 200 cfu/100 ml geometric mean standard and a 5% margin of safety (MOS), resulting in a target concentration of 190 cfu/100 ml. Modeling of scenarios provided predictions of whether the reductions would achieve the target of 0% exceedance. Periods of low flow were critical in terms of water quality. The set of scenarios explored pointed to the importance of reducing direct deposition loadings to the stream. The final load allocation scenario required a 100% reduction in uncontrolled discharges, a 100% reduction in direct deposition to the stream by livestock, and an 85% reduction in direct deposition by wildlife.

Margin of Safety

In order to account for uncertainty in modeled output, a margin of safety (MOS) was incorporated into the TMDL development process. A margin of safety can be incorporated implicitly in the model through the use of conservative estimates of model parameters, or explicitly as an additional load reduction requirement. Individual errors in model inputs, such as data used for developing model parameters or data used for calibration, may affect the load allocations in a positive or a negative way. The purpose of the MOS is to avoid an overall bias toward load allocations that are too large for meeting the water quality target. An explicit MOS equal to 5% of the targeted geometric mean concentration of 200 cfu/100 ml was used in the development of this TMDL. As a result, allocations were made based on a modeled 30-day geometric mean not exceeding 190 cfu/100 ml.

Recommendations for TMDL Implementation

The goal of this TMDL was to develop an allocation plan that can be met during the implementation phase. Virginia's 1997 Water Quality Monitoring, Information and Restoration Act states in Section 62.1-44.19.7 that the "Board shall develop and implement a plan to achieve fully supporting status for impaired waters". To this end, funds will be sought to follow this TMDL development with establishment of a monitoring scheme and development of strategies for a staged implementation plan for restoring the water quality of the Maggodee Creek impairment to levels identified in this TMDL.

The TMDL developed for the Maggodee Creek impairment provides allocation scenarios that will be a starting point for developing implementation strategies. Modeling shows that periods of low flow are the most critical for water quality. This result points out the need to reduce direct deposition of fecal coliform bacteria to the stream. Additional monitoring aimed at targeting these reductions is critical to implementation development. Bacteria source tracking to identify sources of contamination in the impairment area will contribute greatly to the implementation effort. Once established, continued monitoring will aid in tracking success toward meeting water quality milestones.

A staged implementation plan is essential to the process of restoring water quality. The goal of the first stage is to foster local support for the implementation plan. The model scenario developed for the first stage included a 100% reduction in uncontrolled discharges, and a 90% reduction in direct deposition to the stream by livestock. The first stage of the implementation represents preliminary steps in achieving the final allocation. A staged implementation plan is necessarily an iterative process. There is a measure of uncertainty associated with the final allocation development process. Continued monitoring can provide insight into the effectiveness of implementation strategies, the need for amending the plan, and/or progress toward the eventual removal of the impairment from the 303(d) list.

Also critical to the implementation process is public participation. Permitted point sources provide a limited contribution to the overall water quality problem. Nonpoint direct deposition

to streams appears to be the critical factor in addressing the problem. These sources cannot be addressed without public understanding of and support for the implementation process. Stakeholder input will be critical from the onset of the implementation process in order to develop an implementation plan that is truly implementable.

Public Participation

During development of the TMDLs for the Blackwater River Watershed, public involvement was encouraged through public and semi-public meetings. The first, semi-public meeting included members of each stakeholders group and outlined the development process and subsequent meetings. In developing the TMDLs for the upper four impairments of the Blackwater River watershed, three public meetings were held, involving citizens from all areas of the Blackwater River watershed. Two additional meetings were held for the public at large, and focused on the lower two impairments of the Blackwater River. A basic description of the TMDL process, agencies involved, details of the hydrologic calibration, and pollutant sources were presented at the first of the two public meetings. The final model simulations and the TMDL load allocations were presented during the final public meeting. Public understanding of and involvement in the TMDL process was encouraged. Input from these meetings was utilized in the development of the TMDL and improved confidence in the allocation scenarios developed.

In addition to the open public meetings, MapTech, Inc. conducted a meeting on November 22, 1999 with twelve local farmers, identified and assembled by the Franklin County Farm Bureau. Through this meeting, insight into local farming practices that impact the delivery of fecal coliform to the streams was gained through conversation and a written survey of agricultural practices. The survey results formed much of the basis of the modeling efforts.

Supplementing the more direct public presentations described above, two special one-hour programs and the second public meeting held on February 16, 2000 were video-taped and televised. These programs were available to 8,500 county households with cable television access, as well as local institutions such as Ferrum College.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Mark Bennett, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (VADCR)

Mike Shelor, VADCR

Clint Boschen, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VADEQ)

Michael Scanlan, VADEQ

Charles Martin, VADEQ

Dave Johnson, Ferrum College

Roger Seale, Ferrum College

Charles Hagedorn, Virginia Tech

Raymond Reneau, Virginia Tech

Leland Mitchell, Franklin County Farm Bureau

The Franklin County agricultural community

Land owners who provided access through their property.

MapTech, Inc. of Blacksburg, Virginia, supported this study through funding provided by the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (Contract C199:99-592).

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

EPA's document, *Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions: The TMDL Process* (USEPA, 1999) states:

According to Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and EPA water quality planning and management regulations, States are required to identify waters that do not meet or are not expected to meet water quality standards even after technology-based or other required controls are in place. The waterbodies are considered water quality-limited and require TMDLs .

. . . A TMDL, or total maximum daily load, is a tool for implementing State water quality standards and is based on the relationship between pollution sources and in-stream water quality conditions. The TMDL establishes the allowable loadings or other quantifiable parameters for a waterbody and thereby provides the basis for States to establish water quality-based controls. These controls should provide the pollution reduction necessary for a waterbody to meet water quality standards.

Maggodee Creek was initially listed as impaired on the 1996 303(d) *Total Maximum Daily Load Priority List and Report*. According to the 1998 303(d) *Total Maximum Daily Load Priority List and Report* (VADEQ, 1998), Maggodee Creek is on the list for TMDL development and carries an agency watershed ID of VAW-L09R. VADEQ has identified fecal coliform bacteria as the source of the impairment. The impaired stream segment has a length of 21.13 miles, beginning at the Rt. 613 bridge, where the North and South Fork of Maggodee Creek join, and ending where Magadee Creek enters the Blackwater River.

Maggodee Creek is part of the Blackwater River watershed, located in Franklin County, Virginia, just north of Rocky Mount and approximately 15 miles to the south of Roanoke, Virginia (Figure 1.1). The Blackwater River watershed empties into Smith Mountain Lake, a reservoir on the Roanoke River. The Roanoke River flows southeast through a series of two additional reservoirs (John H. Kerr Reservoir and Gaston Lake), eventually emptying into the Albermarle Sound. The Blackwater River watershed is located within the Upper Roanoke hydrologic unit (USGS No. 03010101), and the Virginia hydrologic planning unit L09. The land area of the Blackwater River watershed is approximately 108,000 acres, with forest and agriculture as the primary land uses (Figure 1.2). Of this, the Maggodee Creek Watershed is approximately 29,187 acres comprised of approximately 62% forest, 33% agricultural, 4.5% urban, with the balance being water bodies. The estimated population within the Maggodee Creek drainage area in 1999 was 3,320. Franklin County ranks 2nd, among Virginia counties, for the number of dairy cows, 6th for the number of all cattle and calves, 19th for beef cattle, and 3rd for corn silage. (VASS, 1999). The Blackwater River Watershed received average annual

precipitation of approximately 47 inches, and produced an average annual runoff volume of approximately 17 inches between 1977 and 1998.




Figure 1.1 Location of the Maggodee Creek Watershed.




Figure 1.2 Land uses in the Blackwater River Watershed

1.2 Applicable Water Quality Standards

Virginia state law 9VAC25-260-10 (Designation of uses.) indicates:

- A. *All state waters, including wetlands, are designated for the following uses: recreational uses, e.g., swimming and boating; the propagation and growth of a balanced, indigenous population of aquatic life, including game fish, which might reasonably be expected to inhabit them; wildlife; and the production of edible and marketable natural resources, e.g., fish and shellfish.*
- ..
- D. *At a minimum, uses are deemed attainable if they can be achieved by the imposition of effluent limits required under §§301(b) and 306 of the Clean Water Act and cost-effective and reasonable best management practices for nonpoint source control.*
- ..
- G. *The [State Water Quality Control] board may remove a designated use which is not an existing use, or establish subcategories of a use, if the board can demonstrate that attaining the designated use is not feasible because:*
1. *Naturally occurring pollutant concentrations prevent the attainment of the use;*

2. *Natural, ephemeral, intermittent or low flow conditions or water levels prevent the attainment of the use unless these conditions may be compensated for by the discharge of sufficient volume of effluent discharges without violating state water conservation requirements to enable uses to be met;*
..
6. *Controls more stringent than those required by §§301(b) and 306 of the Clean Water Act would result in substantial and widespread economic and social impact.*

Additionally, Virginia state law 9VAC25-260-170 (Fecal coliform bacteria; other waters.) indicates:

- A. *General requirements. In all surface waters, except shellfish waters and certain waters addressed in subsection B of this section, the fecal coliform bacteria shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 ml of water for two or more samples over a 30-day period, or a fecal coliform bacteria level of 1,000 per 100 ml at any time.*

Sufficient fecal coliform bacteria standard violations were recorded at VADEQ water quality monitoring stations to indicate that the recreational use designations are not being supported (VADEQ 1998). Most of the VADEQ ambient water quality monitoring is done on a monthly or quarterly basis. This sampling frequency does not provide the two or more samples within 30 days needed for use of the geometric mean part of the standard. Therefore, VADEQ used the 1,000 cfu/100 ml standard in the 1996 and 1998 303(d) assessments of the fecal coliform bacteria monitoring data. A five-year time span was used for the assessment period.

2. TMDL ENDPOINT AND WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT

2.1 Selection of a TMDL Endpoint and Critical Condition

Maggodee Creek was initially placed on the Virginia 1996 303(d) list of impaired waters based on monitoring performed between 1991 and 1995, and remained on the list for the 1998 assessment. Elevated levels of fecal coliform bacteria recorded at VADEQ ambient water quality monitoring stations showed that this stream segment does not support the primary contact recreation use.

The first step in developing a TMDL is the establishment of in-stream numeric endpoints, which are used to evaluate the attainment of acceptable water quality. In-stream numeric endpoints, therefore, represent the water quality goals that are to be achieved by implementing the load reductions specified in the TMDL. For the Maggodee Creek TMDL, the applicable endpoints and associated target values can be determined directly from the Virginia water quality regulations (Section 1.2). In order to remove a water body from a state's list of impaired waters; the Clean Water Act requires compliance with that state's water quality standard. Since modeling provided simulated output of fecal coliform concentrations at 15-minute intervals, assessment of TMDLs was made using the geometric mean standard of 200 cfu/100 ml. Therefore, the in-stream fecal coliform target for this TMDL was a geometric mean not exceeding 200 cfu/100 ml.

Fecal coliform sources within the Maggodee Creek Watershed are attributed to both point and nonpoint sources. Critical conditions for waters impacted by land-based nonpoint sources generally occur during periods of wet weather and high surface runoff. In contrast, critical conditions for point source-dominated systems generally occur during low flow and low dilution conditions. Point sources, in this context, include nonpoint sources that are not precipitation driven (e.g. fecal deposition to stream).

A graphical analysis of fecal coliform concentrations and discharge showed that there was no obvious critical flow level (Figure 2.1). That is, the analysis showed no obvious dominance of either nonpoint sources or point sources. High concentrations were recorded in all flow regimes. Based on this analysis, a time period for calibration and validation of the model was chosen based on the overall distribution of wet and dry seasons (Section 4.5). The resulting time period for hydrologic calibration was October 1994 thru September 1998. For validation, the time period selected was October 1980 thru September 1981 and January 1991 thru September 1994.




Figure 2.1 Relationship between fecal coliform concentrations from Maggodee Creek and discharge from the Blackwater River (USGS Gaging Station #02056900).

2.2 Discussion of In-stream Water Quality

This section provides an inventory and analysis of available observed in-stream fecal coliform monitoring data throughout the Blackwater River watershed. Since water quality data are limited, an examination of all data available for the entire Blackwater River watershed, including those collected on Maggodee Creek, were analyzed. Sources of data and pertinent results are discussed.

2.2.1 Inventory of Water Quality Monitoring Data

The primary sources of available water quality information are:

- six VADEQ in-stream monitoring stations located in Maggodee Creek;
- water quality monitoring conducted by MapTech, Inc. as part of the services contracted for this TMDL; and

- a study conducted by Ferrum College in cooperation with MapTech Inc., *Preliminary Fecal Coliform Assessment in the Blackwater River Watershed* (Yagow et al., 1999).

2.2.1.1 Water Quality Monitoring Conducted by VADEQ

Data from in-stream fecal coliform samples, collected by VADEQ, for Maggodee Creek from May 1991 to December 1998 are included in the analysis. Samples were taken for the expressed purpose of determining compliance with the state standard limiting concentrations to less than 1,000 cfu/100 ml. Therefore, as a matter of economy, samples showing fecal coliform concentrations below 100 cfu/100 ml or in excess of 8,000 cfu/100 ml were not further analyzed to determine the precise concentration of fecal coliform bacteria (i.e. censored). The result is that reported concentrations of 100 cfu/100 ml most likely represent concentrations below 100 cfu/100 ml, and reported concentrations of 8,000 cfu/100 ml most likely represent concentrations in excess of 8,000 cfu/100 ml. Table 2.1 summarizes the fecal coliform samples collected at the six VADEQ in-stream monitoring stations in the Maggodee Creek, as well as, stations located in the Middle Blackwater and Lower Blackwater. Monitoring site locations are shown in Figure 2.2.

Table 2.1 Summary of water quality sampling conducted by VADEQ

Impairment and Station Number	Count (#)	Minimum (cfu/100 ml)	Maximum (cfu/100 ml)	Mean (cfu/100 ml)	Median (cfu/100 ml)	Violations (%)
<i>Middle Blackwater</i>						
4ABWR045.80	151	100	8,000	2,392	1,300	58%
4ALLE005.22	121	100	8,000	4,277	3,500	94%
4ATEL001.02	122	100	8,000	3,000	2,200	79%
4AXKF000.20	24	4,800	8,000	7,775	8,000	100%
4AXKF000.40	23	100	8,000	4,370	3,800	91%
<i>Maggodee Creek</i>						
4AMEE002.38	152	100	8,000	1,953	1000	49%
4AMEE007.85	125	100	8,000	2,076	1200	55%
4AMEE0021.13	118	100	8,000	979	600	30%
4AMHA000.01	119	100	8,000	4,412	4200	87%
4AMHA001.59	121	100	8,000	2,061	1000	49%
4AMHA001.79	116	100	8,000	1,029	500	27%
<i>Lower Blackwater</i>						
4ABWR019.75	443	100	8,000	1,483	300	26%
4ABWR032.32	216	100	8,000	1,614	400	31%




Figure 2.2 Location of water quality monitoring stations in the Maggodee Creek and Lower Blackwater River Watersheds.

2.2.1.2 Water Quality Monitoring Conducted by MapTech.

As a part of the services provided by MapTech to VADCR, water quality monitoring was performed on three days (10/20/99, 4/11/00, and 6/13/00) during the contracted period. Specifically, water quality samples were taken at 5 sites in the Maggodee Creek impairment. Two additional samples were collected at station 4AMEE002.38 during sampling sweeps conducted as part of the TMDL development for the upper four impairments of the Blackwater River watershed. All samples were analyzed for fecal coliform concentrations and for bacteria source by the Laboratory for Soil Microbiology in the Crop and Soil Environmental Science Department at Virginia Tech. Table 2.2 summarizes the fecal coliform concentration data collected by MapTech. Bacteria source tracking is discussed in greater detail in Section 2.2.2.2. Four of the five stations showed violations of the 1,000 cfu/100 ml instantaneous

standard. Considering the data collected by VADEQ and Ferrum College, the observance of 0% violations reported in Table 2.2 would appear to reflect the seasonal nature of the problem.

Table 2.2 Summary of water quality sampling conducted by MapTech. Fecal coliform concentrations (cfu/100 ml).

Impairment and Station Number	Count (#)	Minimum (cfu/100 ml)	Maximum (cfu/100 ml)	Mean (cfu/100 ml)	Median (cfu/100 ml)	Violations (%)
<i>Maggodee Creek</i>						
MapTech 7*	3	660	3,400	1,613	780	33%
4AMEE002.38	5	150	550	320	280	0%
MapTech 9*	3	0	22,000	7,640	9,300	33%
MapTech 10*	3	4,430	1,400	1,057	1,340	66%
MapTech 11*	3	100	1,720	753	440	33%

*MapTech sampling sites that do not correspond to VADEQ stations.

2.2.1.3 Ferrum College Study

Data collected as part of the *Blackwater River Riparian NPS Pollution Control Project* (MapTech, 1999a) were considered in examining the distribution of fecal coliform concentrations in the watershed. Table 2.3 summarizes the water quality data collected during the study. Results of this study were consistent with the results of VADEQ monitoring.

Table 2.3 Summary of water quality sampling conducted as part of the Preliminary Fecal Coliform Assessment in the Blackwater River Watershed (Yagow et al., 1999).

Impairment	Count	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Violations
North Fork Blackwater	52	5	51,000	2,293	450	19%
Middle Blackwater	52	17	69,000	6,961	490	35%
Maggodee Creek	48	25	60,000	3,940	1,228	52%

2.2.1.4 Summary of In-stream Water Quality Monitoring Data

Because the data collected by MapTech and Ferrum College were not censored at 8,000 cfu/100 ml, the maximum values provide insight into the potential concentrations of samples reported as 8,000 cfu/100 ml in the VADEQ data. Collins et al. (1996) reported a peak value of 160,000 cfu/100 ml for fecal coliform concentrations in uncensored samples taken within the Maggodee Creek Watershed, further indicating the potential for extreme values throughout the Blackwater River Watershed. Additionally, the mean values reported throughout tend to be higher than the median values indicating the existence of extreme high values.

2.2.2 Analysis of Water Quality Monitoring Data

The data collected were analyzed for frequency of violations, patterns in fecal source identification, and seasonal impacts. Results of the analyses are presented in the following sections.

2.2.2.1 Summary of Frequency of Violations at the Monitoring Stations

All water quality data were collected at a time-step of at least one month. The state standard of 1,000 cfu/100 ml was used to test for violations. Of the samples collected in Maggodee Creek, 49% were in violation of the state standard. A distribution of fecal coliform concentrations at each sampling station in the watershed can be found in Appendix A.

2.2.2.2 Bacteria Source Tracking

MapTech Inc. was contracted to do in-stream sampling and analysis of fecal coliform concentrations as well as bacteria source tracking. Bacteria source tracking is intended to aid in identifying sources (i.e. human, livestock, or wildlife) of fecal contamination in water bodies. While the short time-frame available, and the subsequent small number of observations taken in this case makes drawing conclusions difficult, the data collected will be useful in setting a standard for the use of this technology in developing and implementing TMDLs. The information gained also provides insight into the likely sources of fecal contamination, and will improve the chances for success in implementing solutions.

Several procedures are currently under study for use in bacteria source tracking. The two being developed in Virginia that have shown promise include DNA fingerprinting and biochemical profiling using fecal streptococci. Both procedures are still very much experimental and no studies have yet been completed that compare the methods against each other. For this project, the biochemical profiling method was used to confirm the sources of fecal contamination in streams. This method was selected because it has been demonstrated to be a reliable procedure for confirming the presence or absence of human, livestock and wildlife sources in watersheds in Virginia. Compared to the DNA procedure, biochemical profiling is much quicker, typically analyzes many more isolates (e.g. 48 vs. 10 for DNA analysis), is generally less expensive, has survived limited court testing, and has undergone rigorous peer review from the academic community. The results of sampling were reported as the percentage of isolates acquired from the sample that were identified as originating from human, livestock, or wildlife sources.

Figure 2.3 shows the relationship between fecal coliform concentration at the time of sampling and the percentage of fecal streptococci isolates from each source. Results of monitoring done in both Maggodee Creek and the Lower Blackwater River impairments are shown for comparative purposes. Each sample is represented by three symbols, one each representing the proportion of human isolates, livestock isolates and wildlife isolates within that sample. For example, the sample depicted on the far right of the graph indicates a fecal coliform concentration of 22,000 cfu/100 ml with the predominate source of fecal contamination being

wildlife (54%), followed by livestock (42%), and then human (4%), while the next sample to the left indicates a fecal coliform concentration of 3,400 cfu/100 ml with the predominate source being livestock (85%), followed by human (8%), and then wildlife (7%). Due to the time constraints of the contract, an assessment of seasonal impacts could not be performed on these data.




Figure 2.3 Results of MapTech’s in-stream monitoring for fecal coliform concentrations and fecal sources.

2.2.2.3 Trend and Seasonal Analyses

In order to improve TMDL allocation scenarios and, therefore, the success of implementation strategies, trend and seasonal analyses were performed on precipitation, discharge, and fecal coliform concentrations. A Seasonal Kendall Test was used to examine long-term trends. The Seasonal Kendall Test ignores seasonal cycles when looking for long-term trends. This improves the chances of finding existing trends in data that are likely to have seasonal patterns. Additionally, trends for specific seasons can be analyzed. For instance, the Seasonal Kendall Test could identify a trend (over many years) in discharge levels during a particular season or month.

A seasonal analysis of precipitation, discharge, and fecal coliform concentration data were conducted using the Mood Median Test. This test was used to compare median values of precipitation, discharge, and fecal coliform concentrations in each month. Significant differences between months were reported.

2.2.2.3.1 Precipitation

Total Monthly precipitation measured at Rocky Mt., Virginia from 10/78 to 9/99, was analyzed, and no overall, long-term trend was found. However, for the month of January, a slight upward trend was detected from year to year. The slope of the increase in monthly precipitation for January was estimated at 0.16 in/year. The p-value calculated for this test was 0.08, indicating a high level of significance. No significant difference in monthly precipitation within years was detected.

2.2.2.3.2 Discharge

Mean monthly discharge measured at USGS Gaging Station #02056900 from 10/1/76 to 9/30/98, was analyzed, and an overall, long-term increase in discharge was observed. The slope of the increase in mean monthly discharge was estimated at 0.727 cfs/year. The p-value calculated for this test was 0.011, indicating a high level of significance. Much of this overall trend is likely due to an increasing trend for the months of January and February. The slope of the increase in mean monthly discharge for January and February was estimated at 3.69 and 4.21 cfs/year, respectively. The p-values calculated for both of these tests were 0.02, indicating a high level of significance. Differences in mean monthly discharge are indicated in Table 2.4. Discharges in months with the same median group letter are not significantly different from each other at the 95% significance level. For example, January, May, June, November, and December are all in median group "C" and are not significantly different from each other. In general, discharges in the summer-fall months tend to be lower than discharges in the winter-spring months, with September and October tending to have the lowest flows and March having the highest.

Table 2.4 Summary of mood's median test on mean monthly discharge at USGS Station #02056900

Month	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median Groups ¹				
January	118.4	46.0	185.0		C		E	
February	140.5	53.0	326.5			D	E	
March	173.3	57.0	418.0				E	
April	168.8	64.5	432.0			D	E	
May	127.6	42.0	320.0		C	D	E	
June	98.6	29.5	243.0		B	C	D	
July	66.1	20.0	156.0	A	B			
August	51.0	10.0	91.0	A	B			
September	56.9	18.0	151.0	A				
October	72.3	19.0	260.0	A				
November	84.7	27.5	204.5	A	B	C	D	
December	98.4	46.0	192.0		B	C	D	E

¹ Discharges in months with the same median group letter are not significantly different from each other at the 95% level of significance.

2.2.2.3.3 Fecal Coliform Concentrations

Water quality monitoring data collected by VADEQ were described in an earlier section (Section 2.2.1.1). The trend analysis was conducted on data collected at each station in the Maggodee Creek drainage area. No significant trends were observed at any of the stations in the Maggodee Creek Watershed.

The analysis of seasonality was conducted using all data collected in the Blackwater River watershed. Mean monthly fecal coliform concentrations are indicated in Table 2.5. In general, concentrations in the winter months tend to be lower than concentrations in the summer months, with February and March tending to have the lowest concentrations and July having the highest. Considering these results in combination with the seasonal analysis of discharge, it appears that the highest concentrations are not associated with either the highest or the lowest mean discharges. Specifically, the highest concentrations tend to lead the lowest mean discharges by one to two months. This relationship suggests that the sources of fecal contamination are a combination of direct deposition to the stream and loadings transported to the stream by runoff. Additionally, the effect of die-off and regrowth in the land and stream environment has not been quantified and further complicates any analysis.

Table 2.5 Summary of moods median test on me an monthly fecal coliform concentrations measured in the Blackwater River watershed.

Month	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median Groups ¹						
January	1,176	100	8,000	A	B					
February	1,251	100	8,000	A						
March	1,660	100	8,000	A						
April	1,371	100	8,000		B	C				
May	2,403	100	8,000			C	D			
June	2,620	100	8,000					E	F	
July	2,925	100	8,000							F
August	2,144	100	8,000					D	E	
September	1,758	100	8,000			C	D			
October	1,358	100	8,000	A	B					
November	1,587	100	8,000	A	B	C	D			
December	1,638	100	8,000	A	B					

¹ Concentrations in months with the same median group letter are not significantly different from each other at the 95% level of significance.

3. SOURCE ASSESSMENT

The TMDL development described in this report included examination of all potential sources of fecal coliform in the Maggodee Creek Watershed. The source assessment was used as the basis of model development and ultimate analysis of TMDL allocation options. In evaluation of the sources, loads were characterized by the best available information, landowner input, literature values, and local management agencies. This section documents the available information and interpretation for the analysis. The source assessment chapter is organized into point and nonpoint sections. The representation of the following sources in the model is discussed in Section 4.

3.1 Assessment of Point Sources

Six point sources are permitted to discharge in the Blackwater River watershed through the Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES). Figure 3.1 shows their discharge locations. Permitted point discharges that may contain pathogens associated with fecal matter are required to maintain a fecal coliform concentration below 200 cfu/100 ml. One method for achieving this goal is chlorination. Chlorine is added to the discharge stream at levels intended to kill off any pathogens. The monitoring method for ensuring the goal is to measure the concentration of total residual chlorine (TRC) in the effluent. If the concentration is high enough, pathogen concentrations, including fecal coliform concentrations, are considered reduced to acceptable levels. Typically, if minimum TRC levels are met, fecal coliform concentrations are reduced to levels well below the 200 cfu/100 ml limit.

Boones Mill Sanitary Treatment Plant (STP) is the only permitted point discharge in the Maggodee Creek drainage area (Figure 3.1). According to the current VPDES permit (#VA0067245), Boones Mill STP has a design discharge of 0.03 MGD, and is required to maintain a TRC level between 1 and 2 mg/l. Discharge and TRC levels are recorded from January 1980 to present.




Figure 3.1 Location of VPDES permitted point sources in the Maggodee Creek and Lower Blackwater River Watersheds.

3.2 Assessment of Nonpoint Sources

In the Maggodee Creek Watershed, both urban and rural nonpoint sources of fecal coliform bacteria were considered. Sources include private residential sewage treatment systems, land application of waste (livestock and biosolids), livestock, wildlife, and pets. Sources were identified and enumerated. MapTech collected samples of fecal coliform sources (i.e. wildlife, livestock, and human waste) and enumerated the density of fecal coliform bacteria to support the modeling process, and expand the database of known fecal coliform sources for purposes of bacteria source tracking (Section 2.2.2.2). Where appropriate, spatial distribution of sources was also determined.

3.2.1 Private Residential Sewage Treatment

According to 1990 Census data for Franklin County, there were 14,267 septic systems in operation in the county (FCBS, 1995). Typical private residential sewage treatment systems (septic systems) consist of a septic tank, distribution box, and a drainage field. Waste from the household flows first to the septic tank, where solids settle out and are periodically removed by a septic tank pump-out. The liquid portion of the waste (effluent) flows to the distribution box, where it is distributed among several buried, perforated pipes that comprise the drainage field. Once in the soil, the effluent flows downward to groundwater, laterally to surface water, and/or upward to the soil surface. Removal of fecal coliform is accomplished primarily by die-off during the time between introduction to the septic system and eventual introduction to naturally occurring waters. Properly designed, installed, and functioning septic systems from a stream contribute virtually no fecal coliform to surface waters. Reneau (2000) reported that a very small portion of fecal coliform can survive in the soil system for over 50 days. This number might be higher or lower depending on soil moisture and temperature. An analysis of soil system hydrology for soils typical of the area revealed that lateral movement of 50 feet in 50 days would not be unusual. Weiskel et al. (1996) reported less than 0.01% delivery of fecal coliform from sub-standard septic systems (i.e. drain field extending below water table) to a point 6.5 feet down gradient from the system. Based on these analyses, it was estimated that properly functioning septic systems within 50 feet of a stream contribute, on average, 0.001% of fecal coliform production.

A septic failure occurs when a drain field has inadequate drainage or a "break", such that effluent flows directly to the soil surface, bypassing travel through the soil profile. In this situation the effluent is either available to be washed into waterways during runoff events or is directly deposited in stream due to proximity. A permit from the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) is required for installing or repairing a septic system. During development of the TMDLs for the upper four Blackwater impairments, VDH reported 186 permits issued in the first 9 months of 1999 for repairs to septic systems. Based on this report, 248 total permits were projected for 1999. Baker (2000) reported that this number could be increased by 0.5% to account for unreported failures. In September 2000, VDH reported the total number of permits issued for repair of septic systems in 1999, in Franklin County, was 54, which is less than the original estimate for the first 9 months of 1999. Based on a survey of the major septic pump-out contractors in Franklin County, the average annual number of septic failures, where the failure is evident on the landscape, is 232. The survey also showed that failures were more likely to occur in the winter-spring months than in the summer-fall months, and that a higher percentage of system failures were reported because of a back-up to the household than because of a failure noticed in the yard. The percentage of failures based on the total number of septic systems in Franklin County and the number of failures in the original VDH report, the revised VDH report, and the survey of pump-out contractors, was 1.3%, 0.3%, and 1.2%, respectively. Septic system failure rates used in TMDL development in rural areas of Virginia range from 2.5 %, reported by VADEQ (1999), to a range of failure rates based on system age with 40% failure in the oldest homes and 5% failure in the newest (VADEQ, 2000). While it is clear that failure rates based on permit numbers and surveys of pump-out contractors do not

take into account septic failures that go unreported and un-repaired, there was no evidence available to support the failure rates used in similar TMDL development across the state.

The 1990 Census (USCB, 1990) reports three categories of sewage treatment; public sewage treatment systems, private sewage treatment systems, and "other." "Other" includes portable toilets, latrines, and direct discharge of waste. The "other" category accounted for approximately 4% of the households in Franklin County. Additionally, the 1995 *Comprehensive Plan* for Franklin County (FCBS, 1995) reports that approximately 2.5% of households lack complete plumbing (i.e. hot and cold water, flush toilet, and bathtub/shower). Baker (1999) reported that 0.5% of the number of private sewage systems was a good estimate for the number of households directly depositing sewage to streams.

MapTech (1999) sampled waste from septic tank pump-outs in the watershed and found an average fecal coliform density of 1,040,000 cfu/100 ml. Geldreich (1978) reported an average fecal coliform density for human waste of 13,000,000 cfu/100 ml and a total waste load of 75 gal/day/person.

3.2.2 Livestock

The predominant types of livestock in the Blackwater River Watershed are dairy and beef cattle, although all types of livestock identified were considered in modeling the watershed. Animal populations were based on a 1998 livestock inventory performed in the *Blackwater River Riparian NPS Pollution Control Project* (MapTech, 1999a) by Ferrum College, watershed visits, and verbal communication with farmers. In the inventory, each farm was assigned an index number with the breakdown of animals associated with that farm. The inventory was updated to 1999 conditions by accounting for such things as farms going out of business, herd size differences, animal type changes, and new farms and animals. Table 3.1 depicts a partial listing of information contained in the livestock inventory. The inventory also included information regarding the management of livestock (e.g. time in loafing lot, percentage of waste collected, etc.).

Table 3.2 gives a summary of livestock populations in the Maggodee Creek Watershed. Values of fecal coliform density of livestock sources were based on sampling done in the watershed by MapTech. Reported manure production rates for livestock were taken from ASAE, 1998. A summary of fecal coliform density values and manure production rates is presented in Table 3.3.

Table 3.1 Partial listing of information contained in livestock inventory of Blackwater Riparian NPS Pollution Control Project.

Livestock Site Map Index Code	Number of Animals	Average Weight (lb)	Time in Loafing Lot (hrs)	Waste Collected (%)	Stream Access (hrs)	Collected Waste Spread (%)	Time on Farm (months)	Loafing Area (ac)	Animal Type
1	75	1,350	24	75	0	100	12	8	dairy
2	76	1,350	24	50	12	100	12	6	dairy
3	78	1,350	24	33	0	100	12	12	dairy
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
216	7	1,050	0	0	1.2	0	12	0	beef
217	6	250	0	0	1.2	0	9	0	beef
218	100	1,350	0	0	1.2	0	12	0	dairy
219	100	500	0	0	1.2	0	12	0	dairy

Table 3.2 Livestock populations in the Maggodee Creek Watershed.

Animal Type	Number of Animals
Dairy	1,778
Beef	961
Horse	5
Sheep	79
Goat	0

Table 3.3 Average fecal coliform densities and waste loads associated with livestock.

Type	Waste Load (lb/d/an)	FC Density (FC/g)
Dairy (1,400 lb)	120.4	427,667
Beef (800 lb)	46.4	45,500
Horse (1,000 lb)	51.0	185,000
Donkey	51.0	185,000 ¹
Sheep (60 lb)	2.4	15,000
Goat	5.7	15,000 ²
Dairy Separator	N/A	32,000
Dairy Storage Pit	N/A	1,200 ³

¹ Fecal coliform density for donkey feces was assumed to be equal to that of horse.² Fecal coliform density for goat feces was assumed to be equal to that of sheep.³ Units are CFU/100ml.

Fecal coliform produced by livestock can enter surface waters through four pathways. First, waste produced by animals in confinement is typically collected, stored, and applied to the landscape (e.g. pasture and cropland), where it is available for wash-off during a runoff-producing rainfall event. Second, grazing livestock deposit manure directly on the land, where it is available for wash-off during a runoff-producing rainfall event. Third, livestock with access to streams occasionally deposit manure directly in streams. And fourth, some animal confinement facilities have drainage systems that divert wash-water and waste directly to drainage ways or streams.

Dairy production is the primary source of land-applied livestock waste in the Blackwater River Watershed. Only one beef producer was identified as collecting and applying a portion of the beef cattle waste produced on the farm. This producer also operated a dairy and the collected beef cattle waste was stored in a common pit with the dairy cattle waste. The additional waste collected was considered. However, all land-applied livestock waste was treated as dairy cattle waste in terms of the amount of fecal coliform bacteria expected. Time in confinement was taken from data reported in the *Blackwater River Riparian NPS Pollution Control Project* (Table 3.1). Average values from a farmer survey conducted by MapTech on 11-22-99 were used where numbers were not available for individual farms (Table 3.4). This survey also provided estimates of the timing of applications throughout the year (Table 3.5).

Table 3.4 Average time dairy cows spend in different areas per day. Based on farmer survey, 11/22/99.

Month	Pasture (hr)	Stream Access (hr)	Loafing Lot - Confinement (hr)
January	7.2	0.5	16.3
February	7.2	0.5	16.3
March	7.6	1.0	15.4
April	8.6	1.5	13.9
May	9.3	1.5	13.2
June	9.3	2.0	12.7
July	9.8	2.0	12.2
August	9.8	2.0	12.2
September	10.3	1.5	12.2
October	10.5	1.0	12.5
November	9.8	1.0	13.2
December	8.9	0.5	14.6

Table 3.5 Average percentage of collected waste applied throughout year.

Month	Pasture (%)	Cropland (%)
January	0.00	1.50
February	0.00	1.75
March	0.00	17.00
April	0.00	17.00
May	0.00	17.00
June	1.75	0.00
July	1.75	0.00
August	1.75	0.00
September	0.00	5.00
October	0.00	17.00
November	0.00	17.00
December	0.00	1.50

All livestock were expected to deposit some portion of waste on land areas. The average time per day spent on pasture for dairy and beef cattle was reported by the *Blackwater River Riparian NPS Pollution Control Project* (Table 3.1). Average values from a farmer survey conducted on 11-22-99 were used where numbers were not available for individual farms. The average time per day spent in pasture by dairy cattle is reported in Table 3.4. The percentage of time spent in pasture by beef cattle is reported in Table 3.6. Horses, sheep, donkeys, and goats were assumed to be in pasture 100% of the time.

Only dairy and beef cattle were expected to make a significant contribution through direct deposition to streams. The average amount of time spent by dairy and beef cattle in close proximity to streams for each month is given in Table 3.4 and Table 3.6, respectively.

Table 3.6 Average time beef cows spend in different areas per day.

Month	Pasture (hr)	Stream Access (hr)	Loafing Lot (hr)
January	23.0	1.0	0
February	23.0	1.0	0
March	22.5	1.5	0
April	22.0	2.0	0
May	22.0	2.0	0
June	21.5	2.5	0
July	21.5	2.5	0
August	21.5	2.5	0
September	22.0	2.0	0
October	22.5	1.5	0
November	22.5	1.5	0
December	23.0	1.0	0

3.2.3 Biosolids

Biosolids produced at the Roanoke Waste Water Treatment Plant (RWWTP) and the Upper Smith River Waste Water Treatment Plant (USRWWTP) are applied to agricultural lands in Franklin County. In 1995, 549 dry tons of RWWTP biosolids, containing approximately 5.03×10^{10} cfu of fecal coliform, were applied in the Maggodee Creek drainage area. In 1996, 1,090 dry tons of RWWTP biosolids, containing approximately 9.99×10^{10} cfu of fecal coliform, were applied in the Maggodee Creek drainage area (VADEQ, 2000). The application of biosolids to agricultural lands is strictly regulated in Virginia (VDH, 1997). Biosolids are required to be spread according to sound agronomic requirements, and consideration for topography and hydrology. Class B biosolids may not have a fecal coliform density greater than 1,995,262 cfu/g (total solids). And, application rates must be limited to a maximum of 15 dry tons/ac per three-year period. Average fecal coliform densities measured were 101 cfu/g (MapTech, 1999b) and 68,467 cfu/g (VADEQ, 2000) for RWWTP and USRWWTP, respectively.

3.2.4 Wildlife

The predominant wildlife species in the watershed were determined through consultation with wildlife biologists from the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (VDGIF), citizens from the watershed, faculty at Ferrum College, source sampling, and site visits. Population densities were provided by VDGIF and are listed in Table 3.7 (Farrar, 2000; Keeling, 2000; Knox, 1999; Norman and Lafon, 1998; and Rose and Cranford, 1987). The numbers of animals estimated to be in the Maggodee Creek Watershed are reported in Table 3.8. Habitat

and seasonal food preferences were determined based on information obtained from The Fire Effects Information System (1999) and VDGIF (Costanzo, 2000; Norman, 1999; Rose and Cranford, 1987; and VDGIF, 1999). Waste loads were comprised from literature values and discussion with VDGIF personnel (ASAE, 1998; Costanzo, 2000; Weiskel et al., 1998, and Yagow, 1999). Table 3.9 summarizes the habitat and fecal production information that was obtained. Where available, fecal coliform densities were based on sampling of wildlife waste done in the watershed by MapTech. The only value that was not obtained from sampling in the watershed was for beaver. The fecal coliform density of beaver waste was taken from sampling done for the Mountain Run TMDL development (Yagow, 1999). Percentage of waste directly deposited to streams was based on habitat information that was collected and location of feces during source sampling. Fecal coliform densities and estimated percentages of time spent in stream access areas are reported in Table 3.10.

Table 3.7 Wildlife population density.

Animal	Density	Density Unit
Raccoon	0.070	an/ac of habitat
Muskrat	2.750	an/ac of habitat
Beaver	4.800	an/mi of stream
Deer	0.047	an/ac of habitat
Turkey	0.010	an/ac of forest
Goose	0.004	an/ac
Mallard	0.002	an/ac

Table 3.8 Wildlife populations in the Maggodee Creek Watershed.

Species	Number of Animals
Raccoon	335
Muskrat	902
Beaver	51
Deer	1,362
Turkey	268
Goose	117
Mallard	58

Table 3.9 Wildlife fecal production rates and habitat.

Animal	Waste Load (g/an-day)	Habitat
Raccoon	450	Primary = region within 600 ft of stream and ponds Less frequent = region between 601 and 7,920 ft
Muskrat	100	Continuous flowing stream below 1300 ft elevation; Primary = region within 66 ft of stream and ponds Less frequent = region between 67 and 300 ft
Beaver ¹	200	Continuous flowing stream below 1300 ft elevation; Primary = region within 300 ft of stream and ponds Less frequent = region between 301 and 656 ft
Deer	772	All area of the watershed
Turkey ²	320	All area of watershed excluding farmsteads and urban land uses
Goose ³	225	Continuous flowing stream below 1300 ft elevation; Primary = region within 66 ft of stream and ponds Less frequent = region between 67 and 300 ft
Mallard	150	Continuous flowing stream below 1300 ft elevation; Primary = region within 66 ft of stream and ponds Less frequent = region between 67 and 300 ft

1 Beaver waste load was calculated as twice that of muskrat, based on field observations.

2 Waste load for domestic turkey (ASAE, 1998).

3 Goose waste load was calculated as 50% greater than that of duck, based on field observations and conversation with Gary Costanzo (Costanzo, 2000).

Table 3.10 Average fecal coliform densities and percentage of time spent in stream access areas for wildlife.

Type	Fecal Coliform Density (FC/g)	Portion of Day in Stream Access (%)
Raccoon	13,100,000	5
Muskrat	1,900,000	90
Beaver	1,000	100
Deer	3,300,000	5
Turkey	1,332	5
Goose	320	50
Duck	490	75

3.2.5 Pets

Among pets, cats and dogs are the predominant contributors of fecal coliform in the watershed and were the only pets considered in this analysis. Cat and dog populations were derived from Lehigh Valley Animal Rights Coalition for United States averages in 1996. Dog waste load was reported by Weiskel et al. (1996), while cat waste load was measured. Fecal coliform density for dogs and cats was measured from samples collected in the watershed by MapTech. A summary of the data collected is given in Table 3.11.

Table 3.11 Pet population density, waste load, and fecal coliform density.

Type	Population Density (an/house)	Waste load (g/an-day)	FC Density (FC/g)
Dog	1.7	450	2,200,000
Cat	2.2	19.4	26

4. MODELING PROCEDURE: LINKING THE SOURCES TO THE ENDPOINT

Establishing the relationship between in-stream water quality and the source loadings is a critical component of TMDL development. It allows for the evaluation of management options that will achieve the desired water quality endpoint. In the development of a TMDL for the Maggodee Creek Watershed, the relationship was defined through computer modeling based on data collected throughout the watershed. Monitored flow and water quality data were then used to verify that the relationships developed through modeling were accurate. In this section, the selection of modeling tools, parameter development, calibration/validation, and model application are discussed.

4.1 Modeling Framework Selection

The USGS Hydrologic Simulation Program - Fortran (HSPF) water quality model was selected as the modeling framework to simulate existing conditions and to perform TMDL allocations. The HSPF model is a continuous simulation model that can account for NPS pollutants in runoff, as well as pollutants entering the flow channel from point sources. In establishing the existing and allocation conditions, seasonal variations in hydrology, climatic conditions, and watershed activities were explicitly accounted for in the model. The use of HSPF allowed consideration of seasonal aspects of precipitation patterns within the watershed.

The stream segment within each subwatershed is simulated as a single reach of open channel, referred to as a RCHRES. Water and pollutants from pervious and impervious land segments (i.e. PERLNDs and IMPLNDs) are transported to the RCHRES using mass links. Mass links are also used to connect the modeled RCHRES segments in the same configuration the real stream segments are found in the physical world. The same mass link principal is applied when water and pollutants are conveyed to a RCHRES via a point discharge, or water is withdrawn from a particular RCHRES. On a larger scale, impaired stream segments are also linked to one another by mass links. Therefore, activities simulated in one impaired stream segment affect the water quality downstream in the model.

4.2 Model Setup

To adequately represent the spatial variation in the watershed, the Maggodee Creek drainage area was divided into ten subwatersheds (Figure 4.1). The rationale for choosing these subwatersheds was based on the availability of water quality data and the limitations of the HSPF model. Water quality data (i.e. fecal coliform concentrations) are available at specific locations throughout the watershed. Subwatershed outlets were chosen to coincide with these monitoring stations, since output from the model can only be obtained at the modeled subwatershed outlets (Figure 4.1). The HSPF model requires that the time of concentration in any subwatershed be greater than the time-step being used for the model. Given this modeling constraint and the desire to maintain a spatial distribution of watershed characteristics and associated parameters, a 15-minute modeling time-step was determined to be required. The

spatial division of the watershed allowed for a more refined representation of pollutant sources, and a more realistic description of hydrologic factors in the watershed.




Figure 4.1 Subwatersheds delineated for modeling and location of water quality monitoring stations in the Maggodee Creek (1-10) and the Lower Blackwater River (11-17) Watershed.

Within each subwatershed, up to eight land use types were represented. Each land use had parameters associated with it that described the hydrology of the area (e.g. average slope length) and the behavior of pollutants (e.g. fecal coliform accumulation rate). Table 4.1 shows the different land use types and the area existing in each subwatershed. These land use types are represented in HSPF as pervious land segments (PERLNDs) and impervious land segments (IMPLNDs). All of the impervious areas in the watershed are represented in one IMPLND type, while there are eight PERLND types, each with parameters describing a particular land use. Some IMPLND and PERLND parameters (e.g. slope length) vary with the particular subwatershed in which they are located. Others vary with season (e.g. upper zone storage) to account for management and biological changes.

Table 4.1 Spatial distribution of land use types in the Maggodee Creek drainage area.

Land Use	Acreage
Good Pasture	1,489
Poor Pasture	1,510
Cropland	6,231
Forest	18,076
Urban	1,351
Farmsteads	88
Livestock Access to Streams	125
Loafing Area	183
Water	134

Die-off of fecal coliform can be handled implicitly or explicitly. For land-applied fecal matter, (mechanically applied and deposited directly) die-off was addressed implicitly through monitoring and modeling. Samples of collected waste (i.e. dairy waste from loafing areas) were locally collected and analyzed prior to land application. Therefore, die-off is implicitly accounted for through the sample analysis. Die-off occurring in the field was represented implicitly through model parameters such as the maximum accumulation and the 90% wash off rate, which were adjusted during the calibration of the model. These parameters were assumed to represent not only the delivery mechanisms but the bacteria die-off as well. Once the fecal coliform entered the stream, the general decay module of HSPF was incorporated, thereby explicitly addressing the die-off rate. The general decay module uses a first order decay function to simulate die-off.

4.3 Source Representation

Both point and nonpoint sources can be represented in the model. In general, point sources are added to the model as a time-series of pollutant and flow inputs to the stream. Land-based nonpoint sources are represented as an accumulation of pollutants on land, where some portion is available for transport in runoff. The amount of accumulation and availability for transport vary with land use type and season. The model allows for a maximum accumulation to be specified. The maximum accumulation was adjusted seasonally to account for changes in die-off rates, which are dependent on temperature and moisture conditions. Some nonpoint sources, rather than being land-based, are represented as being deposited directly to the stream (e.g. animal defecation in stream). These sources are modeled similarly to point sources, as they do not require a runoff event for delivery to the stream. These sources are primarily due to animal activity, which varies with the time of day. Direct depositions by nocturnal animals were modeled as being deposited from 6:00 PM to 6:00 AM, and direct depositions by diurnal animals were modeled as being deposited from 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM. Once in stream, die-off is represented by the first-order exponential equation, described above.

Much of the data used to develop the model inputs for modeling water quality is time-dependent (e.g. population). Depending on the timeframe of the simulation being run, different numbers should be used. Data representing 1994 were used for the water quality calibration and validation period (1991-1995). Data representing 1999 were used for the allocation runs in order to represent current conditions. Additionally, data projected to 2004 were analyzed to assess the impact of changing populations.

4.3.1 Point Sources

Boones Mill Sanitary Treatment Plant (STP) is the only permitted point discharge in the Maggodee Creek drainage area. Flow and TRC data were available for the entire calibration and validation periods (10/1/80 - 9/30/81, 1/1/91 - 9/30/98). Boones Mill STP is required to maintain TRC between 1.0 mg/l and 2.0 mg/l. A regression analysis relating TRC and fecal coliform concentrations was performed. The relationship was used to predict fecal coliform concentrations based on TRC records. During allocation runs, the design flow capacity (0.03 MGD) was used. This flow rate was combined with a fecal coliform concentration of 200 cfu/100-ml to ensure that compliance with state water quality standards could be met even if permitted loads were at maximum levels. Additionally, once load allocations were determined, the model was run with the fecal coliform concentration reduced to 9 cfu/100-ml, based on the minimum recorded level of TRC (0.6 mg/l). This final run gives insight into the impact of using the 200 cfu/100-ml value for allocation purposes.

Nonpoint sources of pollution that were not driven by runoff (e.g. direct deposition of fecal matter to the stream by wildlife) were modeled similarly to point sources. These sources as well as land-based sources are identified in the following sections.

4.3.2 Private Residential Sewage Treatment

The number of septic systems in the ten subwatersheds modeled for the Maggodee Creek Watershed were calculated by overlaying 1990 Census group-block and block data (USCB, 1990) with the watershed to enumerate households. These numbers were projected to 1994, 1999, and 2004 using the growth rate for Franklin County (FCBS, 1995). Households were then distributed among farmstead and urban land-use types. The total number of households, reported by the 1990 Census, included farmsteads, which were assumed to have septic systems. Ferrum College (MapTech, 1999a) reported the number and location of farmsteads in the watershed. Each farmstead land-use area was assigned a number of septic systems based on this data. Of the remaining households, only a percentage was reported to be on private sewage (septic) systems (FCBS, 1995). These households were assigned to the urban land-use type. A total of 1,403 septic systems was estimated in the Maggodee Creek Watershed in 1994. During allocation runs, the number of households was projected to 1999, based on current, Franklin County growth rates (FCBS, 1995) resulting in 1,645 septic systems. The number of septic systems is projected to increase to 1,886 by 2004.

4.3.2.1 Functional Septic Systems

Using a procedure developed by MapTech, 1990 Census data (USCB, 1990), overlaid with urban land use and hydrography maps of the watershed, were analyzed to determine the percentage of households with septic systems that were located within 50 feet of a stream. This number was then projected to 1994, 1999, and 2004. The resulting numbers of septic systems within 50 feet of a stream were 90, 94, and 96, respectively. It was estimated for these homes that 0.001% of the fecal coliform produced in the household would reach the stream through lateral flow. The average number of people per household in each of the ten subwatersheds was used to determine the waste load from each house, and the values reported in Section 3.2.1 for human waste load and fecal coliform density were used to determine the fecal coliform load.

4.3.2.2 Failing Septic Systems

Failing septic systems were assumed to deliver all effluent to the soil surface where it was available for wash-off during a runoff event. A septic system failure rate of 1.3% was used in development of the TMDLs for the upper four impairments of the Blackwater watershed, based on the number of septic-repair permits reported by VDH for the first 9 months of 1999. The failure rate calculated based on a survey of septic pump-out contractors was 1.2% and in agreement with the estimate based on permits. VDH subsequently reported permit levels that would indicate a 0.3% failure rate for 1999. VDH also reported that an additional 0.5% of failures might go unreported. In order to be consistent with modeling performed for the four upstream impairments, because it is in general agreement with the survey of septic pump-out contractors, and because it takes into account some un-repaired septic failures, the septic system failure rate of 1.3% was used in modeling this impairment. The survey of septic pump-out contractors also indicated that the majority of failures occurred at homes that were over 20 years old. The total number of failing septic systems in the watershed was therefore distributed among subwatersheds based on the number of homes over 20 years old. The fecal coliform density for septic system effluent was multiplied by the average design load for the septic systems in the subwatershed to determine the total load from each failing system. Additionally, the loads were distributed seasonally based on the survey of septic pump-out contractors to account for more frequent failures during wet months.

4.3.2.3 Uncontrolled Discharges

The number of uncontrolled discharges was estimated to be equal to 0.5% of the number of septic systems in the Maggodee Creek Watershed (Section 3.2.1). Since older homes are more likely to have uncontrolled discharges, the number of uncontrolled discharges was distributed among subwatersheds based on the number of homes in each subwatershed that were built more than 30-years prior. Fecal coliform loads for each discharge were calculated based on the fecal density of human waste and the waste load for the average size household in the subwatershed. The loadings from uncontrolled discharges were applied directly to the stream in the same manner that point sources are handled in the model.

4.3.3 Livestock

Fecal coliform produced by livestock can enter surface waters through four pathways; land application of stored waste, deposition on land, direct deposition to streams, and diversion of wash-water and waste directly to streams. Each of these pathways is accounted for in the model. The number of fecal coliform directed through each pathway was calculated by multiplying the fecal coliform density with the amount of waste expected through that pathway. Livestock numbers determined for 1999 were used for the allocation runs, while these numbers were projected back to 1994 for the calibration and validation runs, based on Franklin County growth rates determined from data reported by the Virginia Agricultural Statistics Service (VASS, 1995; VASS 1999). Similarly, when growth was analyzed, livestock numbers were projected to 2004. For land-applied waste, the fecal coliform density measured from waste storage pit effluent during land application was used, while the density in as-excreted manure was used to calculate the load for deposition on land and to streams (Table 3.3). The use of fecal coliform densities measured in pit-stored manure accounts for any die-off that occurs in storage. The modeling of fecal coliform entering the stream through diversion of wash-water was accounted for by the direct deposition of fecal matter to streams by cattle.

4.3.3.1 Land Application of Collected Manure

The only significant collection of livestock manure occurs on dairy farms. For each dairy farm in the drainage area, the average daily waste production per month was calculated using the number of cows, weight of animal, and waste production rate as reported in Section 3.2.2. The amount of waste collected was first based on proportion of milking cows, as the milking herd represented the only cows subject to confinement and therefore waste collection. Second, the total amount of waste produced in confinement was calculated based on the proportion of time spent in confinement. If beef cattle were reported as being confined for some percentage of time, the waste produced while in confinement was added to this total. Finally, values for the percentage of loafing lot waste collected, taken from the livestock inventory conducted by Ferrum College and reported by MapTech (1999a), were used to calculate the amount of waste available to be spread on pasture and cropland (Table 3.1). Average percentage of waste applied throughout the year for each land use reported in the farmer survey was used to distribute land-applied waste. It was assumed that 100% of land-applied waste is available for transport in surface runoff transport unless the waste is incorporated in the soil by plowing during seedbed preparation. Percentage of cropland plowed and amount of waste incorporated was adjusted using calibration for the months of planting.

4.3.3.2 Deposition on Land

For cattle, the amount of waste deposited on land per day was a proportion of the total waste produced per day. The proportion was calculated based on the livestock inventory conducted by Ferrum College and reported by MapTech (1999a). Where data availability was lacking, average values based on the farmer survey conducted on 11-22-99 were used. The proportion

was based on the amount of time spent in pasture, but not in close proximity to accessible streams, and was calculated as follows:

$$\text{Proportion} = [(24 \text{ hr}) - (\text{time in confinement}) - (\text{time in stream access areas})]/(24 \text{ hr})$$

All other livestock (horse, sheep, donkey, and goat) were assumed to deposit all feces on pasture. Pasture land-use types were divided into good and poor pasture. The total amount of fecal matter deposited on each of these land-use types was area-weighted on a farm-by-farm basis.

4.3.3.3 Direct Deposition to Streams

Dairy and beef cattle are the primary sources of direct deposition by livestock in the Blackwater River watershed. The amount of waste deposited in streams each day was a proportion of the total waste produced per day by cattle. First, the proportion of manure deposited in “stream access” areas was calculated based on the livestock inventory conducted by Ferrum College and reported by MapTech (1999). Where data availability was lacking, average values based on the farmer survey conducted on 11-22-99 were used. The proportion was calculated as follows:

$$\text{Proportion} = (\text{time in stream access areas})/(24 \text{ hr})$$

For the waste produced on the “stream access” land use, 70% of the waste was modeled as being directly deposited in the stream and 30% remained on the land segment adjacent to the stream. The 30% remaining was treated as manure deposited on land. However, applying it in a separate land-use area (stream access) allows the model to consider the proximity of the deposition to the stream. The 70% that was directly deposited to the stream was modeled in the same way that point sources are handled in the model.

4.3.4 Biosolids

In 1995, 549 dry tons of biosolids from the Roanoke Waste Water Treatment Plant (RWWTP), containing approximately 5.03×10^{10} cfu of fecal coliform, were applied in the Maggodee Creek drainage area (VADEQ, 2000). This application was accounted for during water quality calibration of the model. Investigation of VADEQ, VDH, and Wheelabrator data indicated that accurate and consistent records of biosolids applications are difficult to obtain due to the lack of centralized records and standard record keeping procedures (VADEQ, 2000; MapTech, 2000; Wheelabrator, 2000). With urban populations growing, the disposal of biosolids will take on increasing importance. Class B biosolids have been measured with 68,467 cfu/g-dry and are permitted to contain up to 1,995,262 cfu/g-dry, as compared with approximately 240 cfu/g-dry for dairy waste. During modeling of current conditions, no biosolids applications were modeled, however, the sensitivity analysis provided insight into the effects that increased applications of biosolids could have on water quality.

4.3.5 Wildlife

For each species, a GIS habitat layer was developed based on the habitat descriptions that were obtained (Section 3.2.4). An example of one of these layers is shown in Figure 4.2. This layer was overlaid with the land use layer and the resulting area was calculated for each land use in each subwatershed. The number of animals per land segment was determined by multiplying the area times the population density. Fecal coliform loads for each land segment were calculated by multiplying the waste load, fecal coliform densities, and number of animals for each species.




Figure 4.2 Example of habitat layer developed by MapTech (Raccoon Habitat in the Maggodee Creek and Lower Blackwater River Watersheds).

Seasonal distribution of waste was determined using seasonal food preferences for deer and turkey. Goose and duck populations were varied based on migration patterns. No seasonal variation was assumed for the remaining species. For each species, a portion of the total waste load was considered to be land-based, with the remaining portion being directly deposited to streams. The portion being deposited to streams was based on the amount of time spent in stream access areas (Table 3.10). It was estimated that for all animals other than beaver that 5% of fecal matter produced while in stream access areas was directly deposited to the stream. For beaver, it was estimated that 100% of fecal matter would be directly deposited to streams. To account for unquantifiable fecal coliform loads from known wildlife species, a background load was applied to all land segments at 10% of the total land-based wildlife load, and the total

direct-deposition wildlife load was increased by 10%. No long-term (1994 – 2004) adjustments were made to wildlife populations, as there was no available data to support such adjustments.

4.3.6 Pets

Cats and dogs were the only pets considered in this analysis. Population density (animals/house), waste load, and fecal coliform density are reported in Section 3.2.5. Waste from pets was distributed in the urban and farmstead land uses. The location of households was taken from the 1990 Census (USCB, 1990). The land use and household layers were overlaid which resulted in number of households per land use. The number of animals per land use was determined by multiplying the number of households by the population density. The amount of fecal coliform deposited daily by pets in each land use segment was calculated by multiplying the waste load, fecal coliform density, and number of animals for both cats and dogs. The waste load from pets was assumed not to vary seasonally. The populations of cats and dogs were projected from 1990 data to 1994, 1999, and 2004 based on human population growth rates.

4.4 Stream Characteristics

HSPF requires that each stream reach be represented by constant characteristics (e.g. stream geometry and resistance to flow). In order to determine a representative stream profile for each stream reach, cross-sections were surveyed at the subwatershed outlets. One outlet was considered the beginning of the next reach, when appropriate. In the case of a confluence, sections were surveyed above the confluence for each tributary and below the confluence on the main stream.

Most of the sections exhibited distinct flood plains with pitch and resistance to flow significantly different from that of the main channel slopes. The streambed, channel banks, and flood plains were identified. Once identified, the streambed width and slopes of channel banks and flood plains were calculated using the survey data. A representative stream profile for each surveyed cross-section was developed and consisted of a trapezoidal channel with pitch breaks at the beginning of the flood plain (Figure 4.3). With this approach, the flood plain can be represented differently from the streambed. To represent the entire reach, profile data collected at each end of the reach were averaged.




Figure 4.3 Stream profile representation in HSPF.

Conveyance was used to facilitate the calculation of discharge in the reach with different values for resistance to flow (i.e. Manning's n) assigned to the flood plains and streambeds. The conveyance was calculated for each of the two flood plains and the main channel, then added together to obtain a total conveyance. Calculation of conveyance was performed following the procedure described by Chow (1959). The total conveyance was then multiplied by the square root of the average reach slope to obtain the discharge (in ft^3/s) at a given depth.

A key parameter used in the calculation of conveyance is the Manning's roughness coefficient, n . There are many ways to estimate this parameter for a section. The method first introduced by Cowan (1956) and adopted by the Soil Conservation Service (1963) was used to estimate Manning's n . This procedure involves a 6-step process of evaluating the properties of the reach, which is explained in more detail by Chow (1959). Field data describing the channel bed, bank stability, vegetation, obstructions, and other pertinent parameters was collected. Photographs were also taken of the sections while in the field. Once the field data were collected, they were used to estimate the Manning's roughness for the section observed. The pictures were compared to pictures contained in Chow (1959) for validation of the estimates of the Manning's n for each section.

The result of the field inspections of the reach sections was a set of characteristic slopes (channel sides and field plains), bed widths, heights to flood plain, and Manning's roughness coefficients. Average reach slope and reach length were obtained from GIS layers of the watershed, which included elevation from Digital Elevation Models (DEMs) and a stream-flow network digitized from USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle maps (scale 1:24,000). These data were used to derive the Hydraulic Function Tables (F-tables) used by the HSPF model (Table 4.2). The F-tables developed consist of four columns; depth (ft), area (ac), volume (ac-ft), and outflow (ft^3/s). The depth represents the possible range of flow, with a maximum value beyond what would be expected for the reach. A maximum depth of 50 ft was used in the F-tables. The area listed is the surface area of the flow in acres. The volume corresponds to the total

volume of the flow in the reach, and is reported in acre-feet. The outflow is simply the stream discharge, in cubic feet per second.

Table 4.2 Example of an “F-table” calculated for the HSPF Model.

Depth (ft)	Area (ac)	Volume (ac-ft)	Outflow (ft ³ /s)
0.0	21.75	0.00	0.00
0.2	21.96	4.37	10.87
0.4	22.16	8.78	34.54
0.6	22.36	13.23	67.92
0.8	22.56	17.73	109.75
1.0	22.77	22.26	159.29
1.3	23.07	29.14	246.88
1.7	23.48	38.44	386.59
2.0	23.78	45.53	507.43
2.3	24.08	52.71	641.30
2.7	24.49	62.43	839.20
3.0	24.79	69.82	1001.68
6.0	29.42	149.62	3222.35
9.0	37.08	249.37	6254.60
12.0	44.73	372.08	10078.05
15.0	52.38	517.75	14818.37
25.0	77.32	1163.48	38629.43
50.0	92.02	2796.19	103246.75

4.5 Selection of Representative Modeling Period

Selection of the modeling period was based on two factors; availability of data (discharge and water quality) and the need to represent critical hydrological conditions. Mean daily discharge data at USGS Gaging Station #02056900 were available from October 1976 to September 1998. Mean 30-minute discharge data (based on 15-minute instantaneous measurements) was available from October 1994 to June 1999. The most comprehensive time period for reported fecal coliform concentrations is during the assessment period from May 1991 to September 1995. The fecal coliform concentration data were evaluated for use during calibration and validation of the model. Calibration is the process of comparing modeled data to observed data and making appropriate adjustments to model parameters to minimize the error between observed and simulated events. Using observed data that is reported at a shorter time-step improves this process and subsequently the performance of a time-dependent model. Validation is the process of comparing modeled data to observed data during a period of time other than that used for calibration. During validation, no adjustments are made to model parameters. The goal of validation is to assess the capability of the model in hydrologic conditions other than those used during calibration.

As reported in Section 2.1, high concentrations of fecal coliform were recorded in all flow regimes, and a time period for calibration and validation was chosen based on the overall distribution of wet and dry seasons. The mean daily flow and precipitation for each season were calculated for the period October 1977 through September 1998. This resulted in 21 observations of flow and precipitation for each season. The mean and variance of these observations were calculated. Next, a representative period for modeling was chosen and compared to the historical data. The initial period was chosen based on the availability of mean 30-minute discharge data (10/1/94 – 9/30/98). Additional years, beginning with the fecal coliform assessment period (5/91 – 9/95), were added until the mean and variance of each season in the modeled time period was not significantly different from the historical data (Table 4.3). Therefore, the period was selected as representing the hydrologic regime of the study area, accounting for critical conditions associated with all potential sources within the watershed. The resulting time period for hydrologic calibration was October 1994 thru September 1998. For hydrologic validation the time period selected was October 1980 thru September 1981 and January 1991 thru September 1994.

Table 4.3 Comparison of modeled time period to historical records.

	Mean Flow (cfs)				Precipitation (in/day)			
	Fall	Winter	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter	Spring	Summer
	Historical Record (1978 - 1998)							
Mean	101	155	211	99	0.1223	0.1151	0.1365	0.1422
Variance	4,948	2,621	12,214	1,964	0.0023	0.0017	0.0018	0.0027
	Calibration & Validation Period (10/80 - 9/81, 1/91 - 9/98)							
Mean	77	172	194	101	0.1082	0.1285	0.1341	0.1375
Variance	3,320	3,749	7,442	2,611	0.0023	0.0016	0.0015	0.0032
	P-Values							
Mean	0.178	0.228	0.322	0.453	0.241	0.203	0.440	0.416
Variance	0.289	0.762	0.224	0.719	0.536	0.495	0.396	0.648

4.6 Model Calibration and Validation Processes

Calibration and validation are performed in order to ensure that the model accurately represents the hydrologic and water quality processes in the watershed. The model's hydrologic parameters were set based on available soils, land use, and topographic data. Qualities of fecal coliform sources were modeled as described in chapters 3 and 4. Through calibration these parameters were adjusted within appropriate ranges until the model performance was deemed acceptable. The modeled design included the Maggodee Creek impairment and the Lower Blackwater River impairment, with the upper Blackwater River

impairments being represented as a point source at the headwater of the Lower Blackwater impairment. Model simulations were run for both impairments simultaneously.

4.6.1 Hydrologic Calibration and Validation

Parameters that were adjusted during the hydrologic calibration represented the amount of evapotranspiration from the root zone (LZETP), the recession rates for groundwater (AGWRC) and interflow (IRC), the length of overland flow (LSUR), the amount of soil moisture storage in the upper zone (UZSN) and lower zone (LZSN), the amount of interception storage (CEPSC), the infiltration capacity (INFILT), and the amount of soil water contributing to interflow (INTFW). Additionally, state variables in the PERLND water (PWAT) section of the User's Control Input (UCI) file were adjusted to reflect initial conditions.

Continuously monitored flow data was not available downstream of the impairment and above the point where the Blackwater enters Smith Mountain Lake. In order to relate flow values measured at USGS Station # 02056900 (i.e. the nearest continuous flow record) to flows at the outlet of the Lower Blackwater impairment (VADEQ Station #4ABWR019.75), a regression analysis was performed on instantaneous measurements of flow at both locations. These measurements were recorded as part of a special study conducted by VADEQ. The resulting relationship was:

$$Q_{Outlet} = 2.3692 * (Q_{USGS\ Gage})^{0.9242}$$

This relationship was used to transform continuously recorded flows from USGS Station # 02056900 to the outlet of the Lower Blackwater impairment (Figure 4.4) and create a continuous flow record for use during calibration and validation.




Figure 4.4 Location of monitoring stations used to transform continuous flow data from USGS Station #02056900 to DEQ Station #4ABWR019.75

The model was calibrated for hydrologic accuracy using the 30-minute flow data transformed from USGS Station #02056900 for the period October 1994 through September 1998 (Table 4.4). Results for the entire calibration period are plotted in Figure 4.5. Water year 1998 is represented in Figure 4.6 to portray the model performance on an annual scale. Positive values for "% Error" indicated the model is over estimating the flow conditions and conversely negative values indicate under estimates of observe data.

Table 4.4 Hydrology calibration criteria and model performance for period 10/1/94 through 9/30/98.

Criterion	Simulated	Observed	% Error
Total annual runoff, in.	198.8	183.3	8.4
Total of highest 10% of flows, in	65.42	63.85	2.4
Total of lowest 50% of flows, in.	37.89	40.09	-5.5
Summer flow vol., in.	35.28	36.27	-2.7
Winter flow vol., in.	65.02	64.13	1.4
Summer storm vol., in.	3.98	3.73	6.7




Figure 4.5 Calibration results for period 10/1/94 through 9/30/98.




Figure 4.6 Calibration results for period 10/1/97 through 9/30/98.

The model was validated for the period January 1991 through September 1994 and October 1980 through September 1981 (Table 4.5). Only mean daily flows were available for this period. Validation results are included in Figure 4.7 through Figure 4.9.

Table 4.5 Hydrology validation criteria and model performance for validation period 1/1/91 through 9/30/94 and 10/1/80 through 9/30/81.

Criterion	Simulated	Observed	% Error
Total annual runoff, in.	168.23	192.58	-12.6
Total of highest 10% of flows, in	55.1	64.88	-15.1
Total of lowest 50% of flows, in.	35.51	44.73	-20.6
Summer flow vol., in.	33.52	38.71	-13.4
Winter flow vol., in.	44.11	50.71	-13.0
Summer storm vol., in.	1.73	1.88	-7.9




Figure 4.7 Validation results for period 1/1/91 through 9/30/94.




Figure 4.8 Validation results for period 10/1/92 through 9/30/93.




Figure 4.9 Validation results for period 10/1/80 through 9/30/81.

In addition, instantaneous flow measurements taken by VADEQ during water quality sampling were used to calculate the average ratio of flow at the water quality sampling sites to flow at the outlet of the Blackwater River watershed (VADEQ station #4ABWR019.75). These ratios were compared to ratios based on model output to determine if HSPF was adequately representing flow at the subwatershed scale (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6 Sub-watershed calibration results in the Maggodee Creek Watershed for the period 10/1/94 through 9/30/98.

DEQ Station Number	Modeled Data % of #4ABWR019.75	Monitored Data % of #4ABWR019.75
4AMEE002.38	25%	27%
4AMEE007.85	17%	23%
4AMEE0021.13	3%	4%
4AMHA000.01	2%	9%

4.6.2 Water Quality Calibration and Validation

Water quality calibration is complicated by a number of factors, some of which are described here. First, water quality concentrations (e.g. fecal coliform concentrations) are highly dependent on flow conditions. Any variability associated with the modeling of stream flow compounds variability in modeling water quality parameters such as fecal coliform concentration. Second, the concentration of fecal coliform is particularly variable. Variability in location and timing of fecal deposition, variability in the density of fecal coliform bacteria in feces (among species and for an individual animal), environmental impacts on regrowth and die-off, and variability in delivery to the stream all lead to difficulty in measuring and modeling fecal coliform concentrations. Grab samples are collected at a specific point in time and space, while the model predicts concentrations averaged over the entire stream reach and the duration of the time-step, in this case 15 minutes. Additionally, the limited amount of measured data for use in calibration and the practice of censoring both high (over 8,000 cfu/100 ml) and low (under 100 cfu/100 ml) concentrations impede the calibration process.

The water quality calibration was conducted from 1/1/93 through 12/31/95. Only four parameters were available for adjustment in the model; in-stream first-order decay rate (FSTDEC), maximum accumulation on land (SQOLIM), rate of surface runoff that will remove 90% of stored fecal coliform per hour (WSQOP), and concentration of fecal coliform in interflow (IOQC). All these parameters were initially set at expected levels for the watershed conditions and adjusted within reasonable limits in an effort to establish an acceptable match between measured and modeled fecal coliform concentrations. With the exception of the first-order decay rate, all of the parameters listed above influence only land-based loadings. During the calibration process, it was observed that, within some watersheds, the model in low-flow

conditions was underestimating fecal coliform concentrations. The land-based calibration parameters had no effect on these model outputs. Additionally, the first-order decay rate had only a minor impact on these situations. It was also noted that the degree of underestimation was similar among subwatersheds with similar land use, topography, and stream order. While it is not known what the source of the additional direct load is, possible sources include: unaccounted-for straight pipes, re-suspension of bacteria, and unaccounted-for direct deposition by wildlife. In order to account for this additional load, a factor was developed based on subwatershed characteristics and applied to the original direct load prior to running the model. The factor for each subwatershed was adjusted, keeping the relative values among subwatersheds equal, until an acceptable match between measured and modeled fecal coliform concentrations was established. Figures 4.10 through 4.13 show the results of calibration. Short-period fluctuations in the modeled data denotes the effective modeling of the variability within daily concentrations that was achieved through distributing direct depositions from wildlife, livestock, and uncontrolled discharges across each day (Section 4.3). In these figures as well as corresponding validation figures, a 2-day moving average of simulated values is plotted as an aid to the viewer in recognizing trends, but was not used in this analysis.




Figure 4.10 Quality calibration for subwatershed 1 of Maggoodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.11 Quality calibration for subwatershed 6 of Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.12 Quality calibration for subwatershed 7 of Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.13 Quality calibration for subwatershed 10 of Maggodee Creek impairment.

Careful visual inspection of graphical comparisons between continuous simulation results and limited observed points was the primary tool used to guide the calibration process. To provide a quantitative measure of the agreement between modeled and measured data while taking the inherent variability of fecal coliform concentrations into account, each observed value was compared with modeled concentrations in a 2-day window surrounding the observed data point. First, the minimum and maximum modeled values in each modeled window was determined. Figures 4.14 through 4.17 show the relationship between these extreme values and observed data. In addition, standard error in each observation window was calculated as follows:

$$Standard\ Error = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (observed - modeled_i)^2}{(n-1)}}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

where

observed = an observed value of fecal coliform

modeled_i = a modeled value in the 2 - day window surrounding the observation

n = the number of modeled observations in the 2 - day window

This is a non-traditional use of standard error, applied here to offer a quantitative measure of model accuracy. In this context, standard error measures the variability of the sample mean of the modeled values about an instantaneous observed value. The use of limited instantaneous observed values to evaluate continuous data introduces error and therefore increases standard error. The mean of all standard errors for each station analyzed was calculated. Additionally, the maximum concentration values observed in the simulated data were compared with maximum values obtained from uncensored data (Section 2) and found to be at reasonable levels (Table 4.7).

Table 4.7 Results of analyses on calibration runs.

WQ Monitoring Station	Subwatershed	Mean Standard Error (cfu/100 ml)	Max. Simulated Value (cfu/100 ml)
AMEE0021.13	1	92.95	18,835
4AMEE007.85	6	158.13	130,140
4AMHA000.01	7	290.42	120,190
4AMEE002.38	10	117.18	172,740

The water quality validation was conducted for the time period from 1/1/91 to 12/31/92. The relationship between observed values and modeled values can be seen in Figures 4.18 through 4.25. The results of standard error and maximum value analyses are reported in Table 4.8. Standard errors calculated from validation runs were comparable to standard errors calculated from calibration runs. Maximum simulated values were comparable to observed maximum values in the area (Section 2).

Table 4.8 Results of analyses on validation runs.

WQ Monitoring Station	Subwatershed	Mean Standard Error (cfu/100 ml)	Max. Simulated Value (cfu/100 ml)
AMEE0021.13	1	69.43	23,999
4AMEE007.85	6	153.18	177,420
4AMHA000.01	7	311.95	141,800
4AMEE002.38	10	113.34	221,920




Figure 4.14 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window centered on a single observed value. Calibration period for subwatershed 1 in Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.15 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Calibration period for subwatershed 6 in Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.16 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Calibration period for subwatershed 7 in Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.17 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Calibration period for subwatershed 10 in Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.18 Quality validation for subwatershed 1 of Maggoodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.19 Quality validation for subwatershed 6 of Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.20 Quality validation for subwatershed 7 of Maggoodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.21 Quality validation for subwatershed 10 of Maggoodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.22 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Validation period for subwatershed 1 of Maggodee Creek impairment




Figure 4.23 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Validation period for subwatershed 6 of Maggodee Creek Impairment.




Figure 4.24 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Validation period for subwatershed 7 of Maggoodee Creek impairment




Figure 4.25 Comparison of minimum and maximum modeled values in a 2-day window, centered on a single observed value. Validation period for subwatershed 10 of Maggodee Creek impairment

4.7 Existing Loadings

All appropriate inputs were updated to 1999 conditions, as described in Section 4. All remaining model runs were conducted using precipitation data for the representative time period used for water quality calibration and validation (1/1/91 through 12/31/95). Figures 4.26 and 4.27 show the 30-day geometric mean of fecal coliform concentrations in relation to the 200 cfu/100 ml standard.




Figure 4.26 Existing conditions in subwatersheds 1-5 of Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure 4.27 Existing conditions in subwatersheds 6-10 of Maggodee Creek impairment.

5. ALLOCATION

Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) consist of waste load allocations (WLAs, i.e. point sources) and load allocations (LAs, i.e. nonpoint sources) including natural background levels. Additionally, the TMDL must include a margin of safety (MOS) that either implicitly or explicitly accounts for the uncertainties in the process (e.g. accuracy of wildlife populations). The definition is typically denoted by the expression:

$$TMDL = WLAs + LAs + MOS$$

The TMDL becomes the amount of a pollutant that can be assimilated by the receiving water body and still achieve water quality standards. For fecal coliform bacteria, TMDL is expressed in terms of counts (or resulting concentration). A sensitivity analysis was performed to determine the impact of uncertainties in input parameters.

5.1 Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity analyses were conducted to assess the impact of unknown variability in source allocation (e.g., seasonal and spatial variability of waste production rates for wildlife, livestock and septic system failures, uncontrolled discharges, background loads, and point source loads). Additional analyses were performed to define the sensitivity of the modeled system to growth or technology changes that impact waste production rates.

An initial base run was performed using precipitation data from water year 1995 and model parameters established for 1999 conditions. Two sources of fecal coliform were considered in the sensitivity analyses; land-based loadings, and direct deposition to the stream from nonpoint sources. Each of these sources was adjusted by four percentages ($\pm 10\%$, $\pm 100\%$). The resulting percent change in total fecal coliform bacteria leaving the impairment area was recorded, and are presented in Figure 5.1.

Since the water quality standard for fecal coliform bacteria is based on concentrations rather than loadings, it was considered necessary to analyze the effect of source changes on the 30-day geometric-mean fecal coliform concentration. A running, 30-day, geometric mean was calculated at each 15-minute time-step, and the maximum value for each month was recorded. Deviations from the base run are plotted by month in Figures 5.2 and 5.3.




Figure 5.1 Results of total loading sensitivity analysis for the Maggodee Creek Watershed.




Figure 5.2 Results of sensitivity analysis on 30-day, geometric-mean, concentrations in the Maggodee Creek Watershed, as affected by changes in land-based loadings.




Figure 5.3 Results of sensitivity analysis on 30-day, geometric-mean, concentrations in the Maggodee Creek Watershed, as affected by changes in loadings from direct nonpoint sources.

Additionally, the effects of the Boones Mill STP and potential biosolids applications were analyzed. The impact of allocating the full 200 cfu/100-ml concentration permitted to the point source at Boones Mill STP was compared with considerably lower concentrations expected at this site. Reducing the allocation to the highest expected value (9 cfu/100-ml), based on the chlorination process employed at the site (Section 4.3.1), had no appreciable effect on in-stream water quality during water year 1995. As was noted earlier (Section 3.2.3), 549 dry tons of biosolids from the Roanoke Waste Water Treatment Plant (RWWTTP), containing approximately 5.03×10^{10} cfu of fecal coliform, were applied in the Maggodee Creek drainage area during 1995. This represents a load increase of 0.0002% in land-applied loads. This increase, based on a fecal coliform density of 101 cfu/g, would not have much effect on water quality as can be seen from Figure 5.2. If the full permissible fecal coliform density of 1,995,262 cfu/g was applied to this load, the application would represent an increase of approximately 3%, and a small increase in the maximum, 30-day, geometric mean may be expected.

5.2 Incorporation of a Margin of Safety

A margin of safety (MOS) was incorporated into the TMDL in an effort to account for scientific errors inherent to the TMDL development process, measurement uncertainty in model parameters, and to account for trends which might prevent the water quality goal, as targeted by the TMDL, from being achieved. Scientific errors arise from our inability to fully describe mathematically the processes and mechanisms by which pollutants are delivered to the stream. Model calibration is an attempt to address these errors through adjusting model parameters until a suitable fit to observed data is achieved. Measurement uncertainty also introduces errors in the model calibration, because model parameters that are adjusted to non-representative

conditions result in model simulations being biased either low or high. For example, observed data used for model calibration were collected for the purpose of detecting violations of the state's water quality standards. As a result, sample analyses are arbitrarily censored at a level above the state standard. This introduces modeling uncertainty during events that produce high pollutant concentrations. To ensure a pollutant reduction, long-term trends in pollutant sources must be considered in load allocations. For instance, if livestock populations within the targeted watershed are increasing, then a larger MOS might be appropriate to account for the expected increase in loads.

The MOS is a subjective value, representing a balance between complete certainty of reaching the in-stream standard and not meeting the standard. The MOS was entered explicitly as 5% of the maximum 30-day geometric mean standard (200 cfu/100-ml). The result was that allocation scenarios were developed with the goal of maintaining the modeled 30-day geometric mean below 190 cfu/100-ml.

5.3 Scenario Development

Allocation scenarios were modeled using HSPF. Existing conditions were adjusted until the water quality standard was attained (Table 5.1). The standard included the geometric mean of 200 cfu/100mL along with the MOS described in Section 5.2. The development of the allocation scenario was an iterative process that required numerous runs with each followed by an assessment of source reduction against the water quality target. Additional reductions were made until the target was achieved.

5.3.1 Wasteload Allocations

There is only one permitted point source located within the Maggodee Creek impairment. This source, Boones Mill Sanitary Treatment Plant, has no limit on discharge but is designed to process 0.03 mgd. The impact on in-stream fecal coliform levels from this source was considered negligible. The allocation of the point source, Boones Mill Sanitary Treatment Plant, is equivalent to its current permit levels (0.03 mgd and 200 cfu/100-ml).

5.3.2 Load Allocations

Load allocations to nonpoint sources are divided into land-based loadings from land uses and direct applied loads in the stream (e.g. livestock, septic systems within 50 feet of a stream, and wildlife). Source reductions include those that are affected by both high and low flow conditions. Within this framework, however, initial criteria that influenced developing load allocations included how sources were linked for representing existing conditions, and results from bacteria source tracking in the area. Direct deposition nonpoint sources were modeled with consistent loadings to the stream regardless of flow regime and had a significant impact on low flow concentrations. Bacteria source tracking during three 1999/2000 sampling periods confirmed the presence of human, livestock and wildlife contamination.

With the impact of in-stream deposition very large, and the presence of human, livestock, and wildlife fecal material, an initial scenario was 100% reduction of uncontrolled residential discharges and 90% reduction in livestock stream access. All land-based allocations remained at existing conditions, that is, zero reduction.

This resulted in significant exceedances of the geometric mean standard (Table 5.1, Scenario A). The exceedances all occurred in historically low flow periods (Table 2.4). With the exception of this period, all geometric means were less than the target of 190 cfu/100ml. A review of discharge data reveals that the discharge for the period is nearly equal to the twenty year low. These periods are nearly totally dominated by in-stream deposition limiting the scenarios to achieve the target to a reduction of livestock to 100% (i.e. total exclusion from streams), reduction of wildlife, and/or reduction of lateral flow from septic systems within 50 feet of streams. However, 100% reduction of livestock direct deposition did not meet the standard (Table 5.1, Scenario B). Additional scenarios were explored incorporating a reduction in land-based loads (e.g. Table 5.1, Scenario C) resulting in minimal reduction in the percent of exceedances.

As required by our contract, the TMDL allocations were to be developed using the State's thirty-day geometric mean standard for fecal coliform. The geometric mean is designed to diminish the effect of a small number of extremely large observations, if the majority of observations are within acceptable limits. Because of this, it becomes important to understand the proportions of runoff events and low flow conditions within a thirty-day window. Rudimentary analysis of 1994-1999 rainfall data indicate no more than seven percent of the time within any thirty day window was there a potential runoff event. Conversely, 93 percent of the time water quality was not directly impacted by surface runoff. So, the impact of the runoff events was relatively small, and the effect of reducing land-based loads was similarly small, as was observed in the TMDL analysis (Table 5.1, Scenario C). As an example: Assuming that runoff events impact in-stream concentrations 7% of the time (a conservative estimate for this watershed), if the geometric mean of fecal coliform concentrations during non-runoff event periods is 100 cfu/100 ml, then the geometric mean of fecal coliform concentrations during runoff events could be as much as 4 orders of magnitude greater and the state's water quality standard (30-day, geometric mean < 200 cfu/100 ml) would still be met.

While Figure 5.2 shows that a significant reduction in the 30-day geometric mean concentration can be achieved through a reduction in the land-based sources during wet seasons, it is important to remember that the geometric mean is not an additive quantity. Therefore, a reduction in the land-based sources is **not necessary** in order to meet the standard. Since violations during the dry seasons were not influenced by the land-based sources, reductions in the direct deposition sources **were necessary** to reach the standard.

Additional scenarios were modeled to achieve the target through the reduction of direct deposition, the dominant impacting source for these low flow conditions. A scenario including lateral flow from septic systems within 50 feet of streams had only a minor impact on the geometric mean for the low flow period. A scenario removing all sources except wildlife direct

deposition resulted in continued exceedances in fall 1991, a period of particularly low flows (Table 5.1, Scenario D).

Several model runs were made investigating scenarios that involved the reduction of wildlife required to meet the standard for the low flow condition. The final scenario involved an 85% reduction (Table 5.1, Figure 5.4). In meeting the standard during the dry seasons, reductions were sufficient so as not to require a reduction in land-based sources during the wet seasons. The load allocation becomes no reduction of land applied fecal material, no reduction of septic systems within fifty feet of streams since the impact was negligible, 100% reduction of livestock in-stream deposition, 100% reduction of uncontrolled residential discharges and 85% reduction of wildlife in-stream deposition (Tables 5.2 and 5.3). Although there is no reduction of land applied fecal material, implicit in allocation is a need to maintain loadings at or below the current levels.

Table 5.1 Percentage of 30-day geometric mean values exceeding 190 cfu/100 ml fecal coliform in the Maggodee Creek impairment.

Scenario Description	Exceedances
Existing conditions as of 1999	92.3%
Scenario A: -100% human straight pipes, - 90% livestock direct deposition	26.3%
Scenario B: -100% livestock direct deposition, -100% human straight pipes	8.2%
Scenario C: -100% livestock direct deposition, -100% human straight pipes, -50% of land-based loads from livestock, pets, and failed septic	7.0%
Scenario D: Wildlife loads only included	4.3%
Final Allocation Scenario	0.0%
-100% human straight pipes, -100% livestock direct deposition, -85% wildlife direct deposition	




Figure 5.4 Allocation and existing scenarios for Maggodee Creek impairment.

Table 5.2 Land-based nonpoint source load reductions in the Maggodee Creek impairment for final allocation.

Land use	Total annual loading for existing run (cfu/yr)	Total annual loading for allocation run (cfu/yr)	Percent Reduction
Good Pasture	1.69E+15	1.69E+15	0
Poor Pasture	5.89E+15	5.89E+15	0
Cropland	1.92E+16	1.92E+16	0
Forest	1.20E+15	1.20E+15	0
Urban	1.09E+15	1.09E+15	0
Farmstead	4.47E+13	4.47E+13	0
Livestock Access	1.31E+14	4.36E+14	-233
Loafing Lot	1.86E+15	1.86E+15	0

Table 5.3 Load reductions to direct nonpoint sources in the Maggodee Creek impairment for final allocation.

Subw'shed	Wildlife (cfu/year)			Straight Pipes (cfu/year)		
	Existing load	Allocated load	% Red.	Existing load	Allocated load	% Red.
1	3.30E+12	4.94E+11	85	1.04E+13	0.00E+00	100
2	2.17E+12	3.25E+11	85	5.74E+12	0.00E+00	100
3	8.33E+11	1.25E+11	85	2.05E+12	0.00E+00	100
4	1.54E+12	2.30E+11	85	1.14E+13	0.00E+00	100
5	2.55E+12	3.83E+11	85	1.19E+13	0.00E+00	100
6	2.97E+12	4.46E+11	85	5.59E+12	0.00E+00	100
7	1.62E+12	2.43E+11	85	7.07E+12	0.00E+00	100
8	1.27E+12	1.91E+11	85	1.78E+11	0.00E+00	100
9	4.82E+12	7.22E+11	85	8.36E+12	0.00E+00	100
10	4.29E+12	6.44E+11	85	1.74E+12	0.00E+00	100
TOTAL	2.54E+13	3.8E+12	85	6.44E+13	0.00E+00	100

Subw'shed	Lateral Flow (cfu/year)			Livestock (cfu/year)		
	Existing load	Allocated load	% Red.	Existing load	Allocated load	% Red.
1	1.08E+09	1.08E+09	0	6.31E+12	0	100
2	3.85E+08	3.85E+08	0	0.00E+00	0	--
3	6.99 E+07	6.99 E+07	0	0.00E+00	0	--
4	7.17E+08	7.17E+08	0	2.16E+09	0	100
5	3.60E+08	3.60E+08	0	3.93E+11	0	100
6	1.33E+08	1.33E+08	0	1.35E+14	0	100
7	2.34E+08	2.34E+08	0	1.40E+14	0	100
8	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	--	4.35E+13	0	100
9	61005470	61005470	0	8.02E+14	0	100
10	5.24E+07	5.24E+07	0	1.58E+14	0	100
TOTAL	3.09E+09	3.09E+09	0	1.28E+15	0	100

The practical implications of a required reduction in wildlife direct deposition would suggest that some alternative water quality target may be in order, as implied by the state's legislative language regarding naturally occurring and low-flow conditions (Section 1.2). However, the purpose of the TMDL development process is to assess **all** sources contributing to the impairment. It is this assessment that identifies these naturally occurring and/or low flow conditions and thereby can serve as a means of triggering the legislative response (i.e. removal of a designated use, Virginia State Law Section 9VAC25-260-10, Subsection G).

Future growth was estimated and projected to the year 2004. Population growth was based on 0.9% increase for the period from 1990 through 2000 and 0.57% from 2000 to 2010 (FCBS, 1995). Dairy numbers were found to be increasing at the rate 0.75% per year with beef numbers decreasing at the rate of 2.33% per year (VASS,1995; VASS, 1999; MapTech, 1999). Because of significantly larger dairy herds, the effective projected increase was calculated as 4.5% per year. For the year 2004 projection, the percent increase in land-based and directly deposited waste was calculated. Because the TMDL specifies 100% exclusion of livestock from streams and 100% elimination of straight pipes, direct load allocations for this projection are based solely on an increase in lateral flow from septic systems within 50 ft of a stream. This increase in direct loads is negligible (i.e. <0.0001% increase). Increases in land-based waste were projected to increase by 22%. Based on the sensitivity analysis, a worst-case scenario would occur in a situation similar to June 1995. In which case, the modeled maximum 30-day geometric mean concentration would increase by approximately 114 cfu/100-ml. However, Figure 5.4 shows that, during this time period, an increase of approximately 150 cfu/100ml in the geometric mean could be tolerated without violating the standard.

In considering the impact of biosolids applications, it is important to consider the projections described above. In a worst-case scenario for land-based loadings (i.e. conditions mimicking June 1995) and considering the projected growth described above, an additional increase in the maximum, 30-day, geometric mean of 36 cfu/100ml could be tolerated. Based on the sensitivity analysis, this increase corresponds to an 8% increase in land-applied loads (i.e. 2.49×10^{15} cfu). Assuming a fecal coliform density of 101 cfu/g, biosolids applications totaling approximately 27 million tons could be applied without violating the standard. However, if the allowable fecal coliform density (i.e. 1,995,262 cfu/g) is assumed, biosolids applications totaling approximately 1,400 tons could be tolerated. It should be noted that this analysis does not consider the seasonal nature of applications or wet weather.

6. IMPLEMENTATION

6.1 Follow-Up Monitoring

The Department of Environmental Quality will maintain the existing monitoring stations in the Maggodee Creek watershed (4AMEE002.38, 4AMEE007.85, 4AMEE0021.13, 4AMHA000.01, 4AMHA001.59 and 4AMHA001.79) in accordance with its ambient monitoring program. VADEQ and VADCR will continue to use data from these monitoring stations to evaluate reductions in fecal bacteria counts and the effectiveness of the TMDL in attaining and maintaining water quality standards.

6.2 TMDL Implementation Process

The goal of this TMDL is to establish a three-step path that will lead to expeditious attainment of water quality standards. The first step in this process was to develop an implementable TMDL. The second step is to develop a TMDL implementation plan, and the final step is to implement the TMDL and attain water quality standards.

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and current EPA regulations do not require the development of implementation strategies. However, Virginia's 1997 Water Quality Monitoring, Information and Restoration Act (WQ MIRA) directs VADEQ in section 62.1-44.19.7 to "develop and implement a plan to achieve fully supporting status for impaired waters". The Act also establishes that the implementation plan shall include that date of expected achievement of water quality objectives, measurable goals, corrective actions necessary and the associated cost, benefits and environmental impact of addressing the impairments. EPA outlines the minimum elements of an approvable implementation plan in its 1999 "Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions: The TMDL Process". The listed elements include implementation actions/management measures, time line, legal or regulatory controls, time required to attain water quality standards, monitoring plan and milestones for attaining water quality standards.

Since this TMDL consists primarily of NPS load allocations, VADCR will have the lead for the development of the implementation plan. Watershed stakeholders will have opportunities to provide input and to participate in the development of the implementation plan, which will also be supported by regional and local offices of VADEQ, VADCR and other cooperating agencies.

Once developed, VADEQ intends to incorporate the TMDL implementation plan into the Roanoke River Water Quality Management Plan, in accordance with the CWA's Section 303(e). In response to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between EPA and VADEQ, VADEQ also submitted a draft Continuous Planning Process to EPA in which VADEQ commits to regularly updating the WQMPs. Thus, the WQMPs will be, among other things, the repository for all TMDLs and TMDL implementation plans developed within a river basin.

One potential source of funding for TMDL implementation is Section 319 of the Clean Water Act. In response to the federal Clean Water Action Plan, Virginia developed a Unified Watershed Assessment that identifies watershed priorities. Watershed restoration activities, such as TMDL implementation, within these priority watersheds are eligible for Section 319 funding. Increases in Section 319 funding in future years will be targeted towards TMDL implementation and watershed restoration. Other funding sources for implementation include the USDA's CREP program, the State's revolving loan program, and the VA Water Quality Improvement Fund.

6.3 Stage I Implementation Goal

Implementation of best management practices (BMPs) in the watersheds will occur in stages. The benefit of staged implementation is that it provides a mechanism for developing public support and for evaluating the adequacy of the TMDL in achieving the water quality standard. The stage I allocation developed for Maggodee Creek requires a 100% reduction of uncontrolled residential discharges and a 90% reduction in livestock direct deposition to the stream (Tables 6.1 and 6.2).

Table 6.1 Nonpoint source allocations in the Maggodee Creek impairment for Stage I implementation.

Land use	Total annual loading for existing run (cfu/yr)	Total annual loading for allocation run (cfu/yr)	Percent Reduction
Good Pasture	1.69E+15	1.69E+15	0
Poor Pasture	5.89E+15	5.89E+15	0
Cropland	1.92E+16	1.92E+16	0
Forest	1.20E+15	1.20E+15	0
Urban	1.09E+15	1.09E+15	0
Farmstead	4.47E+13	4.47E+13	0
Livestock Access	1.31E+14	4.05E+14	-210
Loafing Lot	1.86E+15	1.86E+15	0

Table 6.2 Load reductions to direct nonpoint sources in the Maggodee Creek impairment for Stage I implementation.

Subw'shed	Wildlife (cfu/year)			Straight Pipes (cfu/year)		
	Existing load	Allocated load	% Red.	Existing load	Allocated load	% Red.
1	3.30E+12	3.30E+12	0	1.04E+13	0.00E+00	100
2	2.17E+12	2.17E+12	0	5.74E+12	0.00E+00	100
3	8.33E+11	8.33E+11	0	2.05E+12	0.00E+00	100
4	1.54E+12	1.54E+12	0	1.14E+13	0.00E+00	100
5	2.55E+12	2.55E+12	0	1.19E+13	0.00E+00	100
6	2.97E+12	2.97E+12	0	5.59E+12	0.00E+00	100
7	1.62E+12	1.62E+12	0	7.07E+12	0.00E+00	100
8	1.27E+12	1.27E+12	0	1.78E+11	0.00E+00	100
9	4.82E+12	4.82E+12	0	8.36E+12	0.00E+00	100
10	4.29E+12	4.29E+12	0	1.74E+12	0.00E+00	100
TOTAL	2.54E+13	2.54E+13	0	6.44E+13	0.00E+00	100

Subw'shed	Lateral Flow (cfu/year)			Livestock (cfu/year)		
	Existing load	Allocated load	% Red.	Existing load	Allocated load	% Red.
1	1.08E+09	1.08E+09	0	6.31E+12	6.31E+11	90
2	3.85E+08	3.85E+08	0	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	--
3	6.99E+07	6.99E+07	0	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	--
4	7.17E+08	7.17E+08	0	2.16E+09	2.16E+08	90
5	3.60E+08	3.60E+08	0	3.93E+11	3.93E+10	90
6	1.33E+08	1.33E+08	0	1.35E+14	1.35E+13	90
7	2.34E+08	2.34E+08	0	1.40E+14	1.40E+13	90
8	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	--	4.35E+13	4.35E+12	90
9	6.10E+07	6.10E+07	0	8.02E+14	8.02E+13	90
10	5.20E+07	5.20E+07	0	1.58E+14	1.58E+13	90
TOTAL	3.09E+09	3.09E+09	0	1.28E+15	1.28E+14	90

6.4 Wildlife Contribution

VADEQ and VADCR have developed fecal coliform TMDLs for a number of impaired waters in the State. In some of the streams, as is the case for Maggodee Creek, fecal coliform bacteria counts contributed by wildlife result in standards violations, particularly during base flow conditions. Wildlife densities obtained from the Department of Game and Inland Fisheries and

analysis or “typing” of the fecal coliform bacteria show that the high densities of muskrat, beaver, and waterfowl are responsible for the elevated fecal bacteria counts in these streams.

6.4.1 Designated Uses

All waters in the Commonwealth have been designated as "primary contact" for the swimming use regardless of size, depth, location, water quality or actual use. The fecal coliform bacteria standard is described in 9 VAC 25-260-170 and on page 1–4 in Section 1 of this report. This standard is to be met during all stream flow levels and was established to protect bathers from ingestion of potentially harmful bacteria. However, many headwater streams are small and shallow during base flow conditions when surface runoff has minimal influence on stream flow. Even in pools, these shallow streams do not allow full body immersion during periods of base flow. In larger streams, lack of public access often precludes the swimming use.

Base flow conditions of a stream occur at a higher frequency than flow conditions influenced by precipitation runoff events. As a result, the vast majority of the water quality sampling in the watershed used to determine the impairment occurred during base flow conditions. Therefore, a critical period for modeling to insure the attainment of water quality standards is during base flow conditions with little or no storm runoff.

In the TMDL public participation process, the residents in these watersheds often report that "people do not swim in this stream." It is obvious that many streams within the state are not used for recreational purposes. In many cases, insufficient depth of the streams along with other physical factors and lack of public accessibility do not provide suitable conditions for swimming or primary contact recreation.

6.4.2 TMDL Allocations

The wildlife contributions of fecal bacteria from muskrats, beavers, and waterfowl are at their highest counts during base flow conditions when there is little or no pollutant wash-off from the adjacent land areas. Therefore, base flow events represent the critical condition because the allocations needed to attain water quality standards during these flow regimes insure that standards were met in all other flow ranges.

For many of these streams, even the removal of all of the sources of fecal coliform (other than wildlife) does not allow the stream to attain standards during these critical conditions (or low flows). TMDL allocation reductions of this magnitude are not realistic and do not meet EPA's guidance for reasonable assurance. Based on the water quality modeling, many of these streams will not be able to attain standards without some reduction in wildlife. **Virginia and EPA are not proposing the elimination of wildlife to allow for the attainment of water quality standards.** This is obviously an impractical action. Clearly, the reduction of wildlife or changing a natural background condition is not the intended goal of a TMDL or any other federal and state water quality management programs.

6.4.3 Options for Resolution of Wildlife Issue

To address the wildlife problem, EPA and Virginia have developed a TMDL strategy that will provide the reasonable assurance necessary under EPA guidance. The first step in this strategy is to develop a phased approach for the attainment of water quality standards in the TMDL. The first phase is to select an interim reduction goal, such as the Stage I implementation target described below. This goal has been presented to the stakeholders in the watershed and is provided here for EPA's approval as part of the TMDL process. In the interim goal or target, the pollutant reductions contained in the allocation were made only on controllable sources identified in the TMDL, setting aside any reduction of wildlife. During the first implementation phase, all reductions from controllable sources called for in the TMDL allocation would be reduced to their appropriate levels. The first phase would be a labor-intensive process that could occur on an incremental basis. While the first phase is underway, Virginia would be working concurrently on the second phase to address the wildlife issue.

Following completion of the first phase reductions, the VADEQ would re-assess the streams to determine if water quality standards had been attained. This effort will also determine if the modeling assumptions and approaches are correct. If it were found that water quality standards are not met, the second phase allocations would be initiated at a level necessary to meet existing standards. In some cases, the effort may never have to go to the second phase.

The second phase of the TMDL will result in the attainment of water quality standards. This phase involves a number of components outlined below:

- ◆ EPA has recommended that all States adopt an *E. coli* or enterococci standard for fresh water and enterococci criteria for marine waters by 2003. EPA is pursuing the States' adoption of these standards because there is a stronger correlation between the concentration of these organisms (*E. coli* and enterococci) and the incidence of gastrointestinal illness than with fecal coliform. *E-coli* and enterococci are both bacteriological organisms that can be found in the intestinal tract of warm-blooded animals. Like fecal coliform bacteria, these organisms indicate the presence of fecal contamination. The adoption of the *E. coli* and enterococci standard is scheduled for 2002 in Virginia.
- ◆ Recognizing that all waters in the Commonwealth are not used extensively for swimming, VA is currently looking at re-designation of the swimming use based on actual swimming frequency and risk assessment. The new designation of the swimming use could contain the following 4 levels:
 - Designated bathing beach (currently all waters protected to this level),
 - Moderate swimming,
 - Low swimming, and
 - Infrequent swimming.

Each of the four swimming use levels would have protection criterion based on risk analysis. The current high levels of protection would continue to be applied to waters in which people are more likely to engage in an activity that results in the ingestion of water. The primary contact recreational uses recommended above are from EPA's Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria, 1986.

The re-designation of the current swimming use may require the completion of a use attainability analysis. A Use Attainability Analysis (UAA), is a structured scientific assessment of the factors affecting the attainment of the use which may include physical, chemical, biological, and economic factors as described in the Federal Regulations. The stakeholders in the watershed, Virginia, and EPA will have an opportunity to comment on these special studies.

- ◆ Most states apply their water quality standards only to flows above a statistical low flow frequency that is defined as a 7-day average occurring once every 10 years (7Q10). However Virginia's fecal coliform bacteria standard is applied to all flows. Some headwater streams have very minimal flow during periods of low precipitation or droughts. During such low flow events, the counts of fecal coliform bacteria deposited directly into the stream are concentrated because the small flow is unable to dilute the deposition of wastes. In order to attain standards during low flow conditions, it is necessary to reduce the amount of waste deposited directly to the stream. Sources of these wastes include cattle in-stream, wildlife in-stream, septic systems, and wastes conveyed directly to the stream from milking parlors. By applying the standard only to flows greater than 7Q10, the TMDL would not need to insure the attainment of standards during extreme drought flow conditions when stream flow falls below 7Q10.
- ◆ Another option that EPA allows for the states is to adopt site-specific criteria based on natural background levels of fecal coliforms. The State must demonstrate that the source of fecal contamination is natural and uncontrollable by effluent limitations and BMPs.

6.5 Public Participation

A key element in the development of a TMDL is public participation. During the course of developing the TMDL for Maggodee Creek, seven meetings were held (Table 6.3). One meeting was semi-public, three public meetings were conducted during development of the upper four Blackwater TMDLs but had participation of citizens throughout the Blackwater River watershed, two public meetings were conducted during development of the lower two Blackwater impairments (including the Lower Blackwater/Maggodee Creek), and one was open to a select group of farmers. The first was convened on September 2, 1999 at Ferrum College. Members of each stakeholders group were invited to participate in discussions outlining the development process and subsequent meetings. This meeting focused on all fecal coliform TMDLs within the Blackwater River. Three public meetings focused on the upper four impairments on the Blackwater River. Two additional meetings were open to the public at large and focused on the lower two impairments of the Blackwater River watershed. A basic

description of the TMDL process, and the agencies involved, and details of the hydrologic calibration and pollutant sources were presented at the first of these two meetings. The final model simulations and the TMDL load allocations were presented during the final public meeting. All meetings were advertised in the *Virginia Register* and the *Franklin News Post*. Additionally, public announcements were made on the local cable television network. Presentation materials were distributed at each meeting.

Comments from the meetings ranged from the simplistic view of resolving the violations of the *beneficial use standard* by posting “no trespassing” signs at the waters edge, to the more insightful view that *maybe we shouldn’t be importing fecal coliform* in reference to biosolids used within the watershed. Few comments were made that specifically addressed the development approach and/or the data utilized. Of those made, the spatial identification of septic systems and their failure rates were of concern. Regarding spatially locating septic systems, all available data were considered. The locations of each septic system are documented on paper copies of the issued permits and archived with the Franklin County Health Department. It was considered impractical to compile a digital database locating the septic systems given the time constraints of this study. It should also be noted that these records are incomplete due to the age of some systems and when permitting was initiated. In order to spatially distribute septic systems, 1990 census block group data were used (USCB, 1990). One question arose from the proposed use of 9% for a failure rate of septic systems. The 9% was obtained from the local agency that issues permits for septic system installations and repairs, and was a function of the number of permits issued for septic system repairs. After reviewing the concern with agency personnel, it was concluded the 9% did not reflect the failure rate as defined by the number of permits issued for septic failures divided by the total number of septic systems. The failure rate was revised to 1.3%, which incorporated this definition.

In addition to the open public meetings, MapTech, Inc. conducted a meeting on November 22, 1999 with twelve local farmers. The farmers were identified and assembled by the Franklin County Farm Bureau. The intent of the meeting was to gain information of local farming practices that impact the delivery of fecal coliform to the streams. MapTech, Inc. personnel conducted a survey of agricultural practices at the meeting, and the survey results formed much of the basis of the modeling described in the earlier sections.

In addition to the more direct public presentations described above, two special one-hour programs and the public meeting held on February 16, 2000 were video-taped and televised. These programs were available to 8,500 county households with cable television access, as well as local institutions such as Ferrum College.

Table 6.3 Public participation in the TMDL development for the Maggodee Creek Watershed.

¹ Date	Location	Attendance ¹	Format
09/02/1999	Ferrum College; Ferrum, Va.	26 (38% from the community)	Stakeholders by invitation
11/04/1999	Rocky Mount Town Hall; Rocky Mount, VA	34 (70% from the community)	Open to public at large
11/22//1999	Franklin Co. Farm Bureau, Rocky Mount, VA	12 farmers, 5 project personnel	Local farmers by invitation
01/03/2000	Gabriel Communications; Redwood, VA	8,500 households in Franklin County, VA plus local institutions (e.g. Ferrum College) televised live and broadcast 10 times during the following week	One hour local cable program "Rise and Shine" hosted by Brian Duvall
02/16/2000	Rocky Mount Town Hall; Rocky Mount, VA	38 (82% from the community)	Open to public at large
		8,500 households in Franklin County, VA plus local institutions (e.g. Ferrum College) televised 5 times during the following two weeks	Video-taped for local cable network
03/08/2000	Gabriel Communications; Redwood, VA	8,500 households in Franklin County, VA plus local institutions (e.g. Ferrum College) televised live and broadcast 10 times during the following week	One hour local cable program "Rise and Shine" hosted by Steve Oakes
03/15/2000	Ferrum College; Ferrum, VA	56 (68% from the community) 97 (from head count) (85% from the community)	Open to public at large
		8,500 households in Franklin County, VA plus local institutions (e.g. Ferrum College) televised 5 times during the following two weeks	Video-taped for local cable network
06/22/2000	Rocky Mount Town Hall; Rocky Mount, VA	40 (70% from the community)	Open to public at large
12/05/2000	Rocky Mount Town Hall; Rocky Mount, VA	29 (55% from the community)	Open to public at large

¹ The number of attendants is estimated from sign up sheets provided at each meeting. These numbers are known to under estimate the actual attendance.

APPENDIX: A
FECAL COLIFORM DISTRIBUTIONS FOR EACH SAMPLING STATION IN
MAGGODEE CREEK




Figure A.1 Frequency analysis of fecal coliform concentrations at station 4AMEE002.38 in the Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure A.2 Frequency analysis of fecal coliform concentrations at station 4AMEE007.85 in the Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure A.3 Frequency analysis of fecal coliform concentrations at station 4AMEE0021.13 in the Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure A.4 Frequency analysis of fecal coliform concentrations at station 4AMHA001.59 in the Maggodee Creek impairment.




Figure A.5 Frequency analysis of fecal coliform concentrations at station 4AMHA001.79 in the Maggo dee Creek impairment.

APPENDIX: B
FECAL COLIFORM LOADS IN EXISTING CONDITIONS

Table B.1 Current conditions (1999) of land applied fecal coliform load for Maggodee Creek impairment.

	Good Pasture cfu/ac*da y	Poor Pasture cfu/ac*da y	Cropland cfu/ac*day	Forest cfu/ac*day	Urban cfu/ac*day	Farmstead cfu/ac*day	Livestock Access cfu/ac*day	Loafing Lot cfu/ac*day
January	1.24E+11	5.87E+10	1.21E+10	2.12E+09	3.00E+10	1.15E+10	1.67E+10	1.50E+11
February	1.25E+11	5.91E+10	1.38E+10	2.12E+09	3.00E+10	1.15E+10	1.68E+10	1.50E+11
March	1.23E+11	5.90E+10	1.19E+11	2.12E+09	3.00E+10	1.15E+10	3.11E+10	1.48E+11
April	1.21E+11	5.96E+10	1.19E+11	1.99E+09	2.99E+10	1.15E+10	4.54E+10	1.45E+11
May	1.21E+11	6.04E+10	1.19E+11	1.99E+09	2.99E+10	1.15E+10	4.54E+10	1.44E+11
June	2.02E+11	9.81E+10	1.91E+09	1.99E+09	2.99E+10	1.15E+10	5.97E+10	1.43E+11
July	2.02E+11	9.87E+10	2.04E+09	1.86E+09	2.99E+10	1.15E+10	5.97E+10	1.42E+11
August	2.02E+11	9.87E+10	2.04E+09	1.86E+09	2.99E+10	1.15E+10	5.97E+10	1.42E+11
September	1.21E+11	6.16E+10	3.65E+10	1.86E+09	2.99E+10	1.15E+10	4.54E+10	1.43E+11
October	1.24E+11	6.24E+10	1.19E+11	1.86E+09	2.99E+10	1.15E+10	3.11E+10	1.44E+11
November	1.23E+11	6.13E+10	1.19E+11	1.86E+09	2.99E+10	1.15E+10	3.09E+10	1.45E+11
December	1.25E+11	6.08E+10	1.21E+10	2.12E+09	2.99E+10	1.15E+10	1.67E+10	1.47E+11

Table B.2 Monthly, directly-deposited, fecal coliform loads in the Maggodee Creek impairment.

Reach	Source	Jan (cfu/day)	Feb (cfu/day)	Mar (cfu/day)	Apr (cfu/day)	May (cfu/day)	Jun (cfu/day)
1	Wildlife	9.16E+09	9.16E+09	9.16E+09	9.04E+09	9.04E+09	9.04E+09
	Human	2.84E+10	2.84E+10	2.84E+10	2.84E+10	2.84E+10	2.84E+10
	Livestock	8.10E+09	9.90E+09	1.51E+10	2.04E+10	2.04E+10	2.56E+10
2	Wildlife	6.03E+09	6.03E+09	6.03E+09	5.94E+09	5.94E+09	5.94E+09
	Human	1.57E+10	1.57E+10	1.57E+10	1.57E+10	1.57E+10	1.57E+10
	Livestock	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
3	Wildlife	2.31E+09	2.31E+09	2.31E+09	2.28E+09	2.28E+09	2.28E+09
	Human	5.61E+09	5.61E+09	5.61E+09	5.61E+09	5.61E+09	5.61E+09
	Livestock	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
4	Wildlife	4.25E+09	4.25E+09	4.25E+09	4.21E+09	4.21E+09	4.21E+09
	Human	3.13E+10	3.13E+10	3.13E+10	3.13E+10	3.13E+10	3.13E+10
	Livestock	2.36E+06	2.36E+06	4.73E+06	7.09E+06	7.09E+06	9.46E+06
5	Wildlife	7.11E+09	7.11E+09	7.11E+09	7.00E+09	7.00E+09	7.00E+09
	Human	3.27E+10	3.27E+10	3.27E+10	3.27E+10	3.27E+10	3.27E+10
	Livestock	4.30E+08	4.30E+08	8.60E+08	1.29E+09	1.29E+09	1.72E+09
6	Wildlife	8.18E+09	8.18E+09	8.18E+09	8.15E+09	8.15E+09	8.15E+09
	Human	1.53E+10	1.53E+10	1.53E+10	1.53E+10	1.53E+10	1.53E+10
	Livestock	1.49E+11	1.50E+11	2.96E+11	4.41E+11	4.41E+11	5.87E+11
7	Wildlife	4.45E+09	4.45E+09	4.45E+09	4.45E+09	4.45E+09	4.45E+09
	Human	1.94E+10	1.94E+10	1.94E+10	1.94E+10	1.94E+10	1.94E+10
	Livestock	1.56E+11	1.61E+11	3.10E+11	4.59E+11	4.59E+11	6.08E+11
8	Wildlife	3.48E+09	3.48E+09	3.48E+09	3.49E+09	3.49E+09	3.49E+09
	Human	4.89E+08	4.89E+08	4.89E+08	4.89E+08	4.89E+08	4.89E+08
	Livestock	4.75E+10	4.75E+10	9.51E+10	1.43E+11	1.43E+11	1.90E+11
9	Wildlife	1.32E+10	1.32E+10	1.32E+10	1.32E+10	1.32E+10	1.32E+10
	Human	2.29E+10	2.29E+10	2.29E+10	2.29E+10	2.29E+10	2.29E+10
	Livestock	8.81E+11	8.89E+11	1.76E+12	2.63E+12	2.63E+12	3.50E+12
10	Wildlife	1.18E+10	1.18E+10	1.18E+10	1.18E+10	1.18E+10	1.18E+10
	Human	4.78E+09	4.78E+09	4.78E+09	4.78E+09	4.78E+09	4.78E+09
	Livestock	1.75E+11	1.79E+11	3.48E+11	5.17E+11	5.17E+11	6.86E+11

Table B.2 Monthly, directly-deposited, fecal coliform loads in the Maggodee Creek impairment. (Continued)

Reach	Source	Jul (cfu/day)	Aug (cfu/day)	Sep (cfu/day)	Oct (cfu/day)	Nov (cfu/day)	Dec (cfu/day)
1	Wildlife	8.92E+09	8.92E+09	8.92E+09	8.92E+09	8.92E+09	9.16E+09
	Human	2.84E+10	2.84E+10	2.84E+10	2.84E+10	2.84E+10	2.84E+10
	Livestock	2.56E+10	2.56E+10	2.04E+10	1.51E+10	1.24E+10	8.10E+09
2	Wildlife	5.86E+09	5.86E+09	5.86E+09	5.86E+09	5.86E+09	6.03E+09
	Human	1.57E+10	1.57E+10	1.57E+10	1.57E+10	1.57E+10	1.57E+10
	Livestock	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
3	Wildlife	2.26E+09	2.26E+09	2.26E+09	2.26E+09	2.26E+09	2.31E+09
	Human	5.61E+09	5.61E+09	5.61E+09	5.61E+09	5.61E+09	5.61E+09
	Livestock	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
4	Wildlife	4.18E+09	4.18E+09	4.18E+09	4.18E+09	4.18E+09	4.25E+09
	Human	3.13E+10	3.13E+10	3.13E+10	3.13E+10	3.13E+10	3.13E+10
	Livestock	9.46E+06	9.46E+06	7.09E+06	4.73E+06	4.73E+06	2.36E+06
5	Wildlife	6.89E+09	6.89E+09	6.89E+09	6.89E+09	6.89E+09	7.11E+09
	Human	3.27E+10	3.27E+10	3.27E+10	3.27E+10	3.27E+10	3.27E+10
	Livestock	1.72E+09	1.72E+09	1.29E+09	8.60E+08	8.60E+08	4.30E+08
6	Wildlife	8.12E+09	8.12E+09	8.12E+09	8.12E+09	8.12E+09	8.18E+09
	Human	1.53E+10	1.53E+10	1.53E+10	1.53E+10	1.53E+10	1.53E+10
	Livestock	5.87E+11	5.87E+11	4.41E+11	2.96E+11	2.94E+11	1.49E+11
7	Wildlife	4.45E+09	4.45E+09	4.45E+09	4.45E+09	4.45E+09	4.45E+09
	Human	1.94E+10	1.94E+10	1.94E+10	1.94E+10	1.94E+10	1.94E+10
	Livestock	6.08E+11	6.08E+11	4.59E+11	3.10E+11	3.03E+11	1.56E+11
8	Wildlife	3.49E+09	3.49E+09	3.49E+09	3.49E+09	3.49E+09	3.48E+09
	Human	4.89E+08	4.89E+08	4.89E+08	4.89E+08	4.89E+08	4.89E+08
	Livestock	1.90E+11	1.90E+11	1.43E+11	9.51E+10	9.51E+10	4.75E+10
9	Wildlife	1.32E+10	1.32E+10	1.32E+10	1.32E+10	1.32E+10	1.32E+10
	Human	2.29E+10	2.29E+10	2.29E+10	2.29E+10	2.29E+10	2.29E+10
	Livestock	3.50E+12	3.50E+12	2.63E+12	1.76E+12	1.75E+12	8.81E+11
10	Wildlife	1.18E+10	1.18E+10	1.18E+10	1.18E+10	1.18E+10	1.18E+10
	Human	4.78E+09	4.78E+09	4.78E+09	4.78E+09	4.78E+09	4.78E+09
	Livestock	6.86E+11	6.86E+11	5.17E+11	3.48E+11	3.42E+11	1.75E+11

Table B.3 Existing annual loads from land-based sources for Maggodee Creek impairment.

Source	Good Pasture (cfu/yr)	Poor Pasture (cfu/yr)	Cropland (cfu/yr)	Forest (cfu/yr)	Urban (cfu/yr)	Farmstead (cfu/yr)	Livestock Access (cfu/yr)	Loafing Lot (cfu/yr)
<u>Pets</u>								
Dogs	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.01E+15	3.99E+13	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
Cats	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	6.66E+08	2.63E+07	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
Total	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.01E+15	3.99E+13	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
<u>Human</u>								
Failed Septic	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.67E+12	1.66E+11	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
<u>Livestock</u>								
Dairy	1.47E+15	5.69E+15	1.88E+16	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.15E+14	1.85E+15
Beef	1.43E+14	1.15E+14	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.04E+13	0.00E+00
Sheep	4.71E+11	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.98E+08	0.00E+00
Goat	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
Horse	6.12E+12	4.59E+12	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.29E+11	0.00E+00
Donkey	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
Total	1.62E+15	5.81E+15	1.88E+16	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.36E+14	1.85E+15
<u>Wildlife</u>								
Raccoon	5.62E+13	6.33E+13	2.63E+14	6.86E+14	6.71E+13	3.91E+12	5.86E+12	8.31E+12
Muskrat	1.92E+12	3.22E+12	1.68E+13	2.56E+13	3.75E+11	2.05E+11	1.26E+12	3.60E+11
Deer	4.50E+12	1.95E+12	8.30E+13	3.83E+14	1.75E+12	3.78E+10	2.69E+11	7.89E+10
Turkey	3.72E+08	6.77E+07	1.55E+09	1.66E+10	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.77E+06	2.73E+06
Goose	7.81E+05	1.31E+06	6.83E+06	1.04E+07	1.53E+05	8.36E+04	5.13E+05	1.47E+05
Duck	7.79E+05	1.31E+06	6.81E+06	1.04E+07	1.52E+05	8.33E+04	5.12E+05	1.46E+05
Unquantifiable	6.26E+12	6.85E+12	3.63E+13	1.09E+14	6.92E+12	4.15E+11	7.39E+11	8.75E+11
Total	6.89E+13	7.53E+13	3.99E+14	1.20E+15	7.61E+13	4.57E+12	8.12E+12	9.63E+12

Table B.4 Existing annual loads from direct-deposition sources for Maggodee Creek impairment.

Source	Fecal Coliform Load (cfu/yr)
<u>Human</u>	
Straight Pipes	1.30E+13
Lateral Flow	5.39E+08
Total	1.30E+13
<u>Livestock</u>	
Dairy	4.15E+14
Beef	2.04E+13
Sheep	4.98E+08
Goat	0.00E+00
Horse	2.29E+11
Donkey	0.00E+00
Total	4.36E+14
<u>Wildlife</u>	
Raccoon	2.92E+12
Muskrat	2.73E+12
Beaver	1.85E+09
Deer	2.40E+11
Turkey	9.40E+06
Goose	6.05E+05
Duck	9.17E+05
Unquantifiable	1.94E+10
Total	5.91E+12

APPENDIX: C

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY TMDL REVIEW AND
SUBSEQUENT RESPONSE TO REVIEW**

Gold.Peter@epamail., 03:19 PM 11/27/20, Issues for Tomorrow's Call

From: Gold.Peter@epamail.epa.gov
Date: Mon, 27 Nov 2000 15:19:37 -0500
Subject: Issues for Tomorrow's Call
To: pmcClellan@maptech-inc.com
Cc: mshelcr@dcrr.state.va.us, chmartin@deq.state.va.us,
dslazarus@deq.state.va.us, mbennett@dcrr.state.va.us,
Carkhuff.Ann@epamail.epa.gov
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.3 March 21, 2000
X-MINETTrack: Serialize by Router on EPAHUB11/USEPA/US (Release 5.0.5 (September
22, 2000) at 11/27/2000 03:19:41 PM

Phil,

As per your request, attached are the items we would like to go over in
Tomorrow's (11-28) call. The call is scheduled from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. and
the call in number is 215-814-5994. Thanks

(See attached file: questionsfor1128.wpd)
Attachment Converted: "C:\Users\pmcClellan\Attachments\questionsfor1128.wpd"

Items for 11-28-00 Conference Call

1. Briefly discuss the modeling procedure for the TMDL.
2. The calibration for the hydrology appears to overestimate the severity of low flows (simulated flow for the lowest 50% of flows is 20% less than the observed). Is this causing the model to underestimate the impacts of nonpoint source loading of fecal coliform?
3. It is mentioned on page 4-21, that during low flows, the model underestimated fecal coliform concentrations, and that a factor was developed to adjust the simulated concentrations. Would increasing the concentration of fecal coliform in the interflow and/or the groundwater help address this discrepancy? How was the factor evaluated in the model and allocations?
4. Figure 4.14 (page 4-29), it appears as though the model is not accurately reflecting some of the capped concentration values (8,000 cfu/100 ml).
5. Figure 5.1 (page 5-2), it appears as though the model is far more sensitive to changes in the land application of wastes. A 100% reduction in the land application of wastes produced a 50% change in response, while a 100% reduction in the direct deposition of wastes produced a 0% change in response.
6. Figure 5.3 (page 5-3), We are interpreting the y-axis to mean the change in the geometric mean. Based on this interpretation of the y-axis, it seems as though a 100% reduction in direct deposits would affect the water quality in the months of June, July, and August with limited affects for the remainder of the year. Is this a correct interpretation of the figure?



1715 Pratt Drive, Suite 3200
Blacksburg, VA 24060
Phone: 540-961-7864
Fax: 540-961-6392

January 22, 2001

Mr. Mike Shelor
Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
203 Governor Street, Suite 213
Richmond, Virginia 23219-2094

Dear Mr. Shelor:

In response to the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) request for further documentation on several issues associated with the lower two TMDLs for the Blackwater River the following is provided.

Before addressing specific questions, it is important to briefly review the study area. The two impairments, Maggodee Creek and the Lower Blackwater, are down stream of the upper four impairments on the Blackwater River. Specifically, the South Fork and the North Fork of the Blackwater River join together to form the Upper Segment of the Blackwater, which flows into the Middle Segment of the Blackwater. The Middle Segment consisting of Mollies Branch and other smaller tributaries forms the headwaters of the Lower Blackwater, upstream of where Maggodee Creek joins the Lower Blackwater. Considering the proximity of the lower two Blackwater impairments to the upper four, it is reasonable to assume that wildlife densities, septic failures, agricultural production practices, etc. were similar in all six impairments. It is also worth noting that many of the stakeholders participating in the public review of the upper four TMDLs have also participated in the review of the lower two. Furthermore, the public has reviewed and appears to have accepted the upper four TMDLs for their technical merits.

Addressing specific comments, I have presented EPA's request in italics, directly quoted from Mr. Pete Gold's document to you dated November 27, 2000.

1. Briefly discuss the modeling procedure for the TMDL.

First we identified critical conditions, looking at flow vs. fecal coliforms and long term climatic/flow trends. No relationship between flow and fecal coliform concentration was identified. Long term trends of precipitation and flow were calculated and used in defining the modeling period that represented the long-term trends.

Secondly, a continuous flow record was developed for the outlet of the two impairments. A regression analysis was conducted using discrete flow measurements from station 4ABWR019.75 provided by the Department of Environmental Quality's (DEQ) regional office in Roanoke and the corresponding

flow values obtained from the continuous flow record for USGS station 02056900. The regression analysis resulted in the following equation.

$$q_{4ABWR019.75} = 2.3692 * q_{02056900}^{0.9242}$$

The variables $q_{4ABWR019.75}$ and $q_{02056900}$ are flow at the station identified by the subscript. The equation was developed after reviewing approximately 130 data points and including fifteen data points spanning the flow regime of the data set within the final analysis. An R^2 of 0.9991 was obtained for the equation.

Next the model was designed and parameterized. The design included discharge from the Upper Four impairments and discharge from the Boones Mill WWTP. Initialization of model parameters was derived from physical parameters such as slope of the land and soils. We also included as much temporal variation as data and the model allowed. For example, the direct deposition of fecal coliform was varied on a twelve hour time step, where as, the land applied fecal coliform build up rate was varied monthly.

We calibrated until we had a *good fit*.

The hydrologic calibration *goodness of fit* was evaluated graphically, as well as, numerically using the six criterion: total annual runoff, total highest 10% of flows, total lowest 50% of flows, summer flow volume, winter flow volume and summer storm volume. The error for each of these criteria was kept below 10 percent deviation from observed values (see table 4.4). Both interflow and groundwater components were graphically evaluated with regard to expected hydrograph shape and the quantity of flow.

Validation simulations were made and evaluated in the same manner as the calibration simulations. Model parameters were not modified to improve the fit. As expected, the model did not fit as well as the calibration simulations but was considered a sufficient fit given that the calibration was developed utilizing observed mean 30 minute flow data, where as, the validation simulations were compared to observed mean daily flows.

The water quality *goodness of fit* was evaluated graphically and numerically (see TMDL document section 4.6.2 for details).

Once the calibrations were completed, fecal coliform loads were projected to current conditions. This established the basis for allocation reductions. Allocation simulations were made reducing loads from the various sources until the 30 day geometric mean standard including a five percent margin of safety was achieved.

2. *The calibration for the hydrology appears to overestimate the severity of low flows (simulated flow for the lowest 50% of flows is 20% less than the observed). Is this*

causing the model to underestimate the impacts of nonpoint source loading of fecal coliform?

It should be noted this question appears to be referring to the validation simulations and not the calibration. I should also note that the calibration runs were compared to mean thirty-minute flow data, where as, the validation runs were compared to mean daily flow data. Mean thirty-minute data was not available for the validation period.

The calibration simulations produced approximately an underestimation of flows by five percent. The difference in errors between calibration and validation simulation is considered to be a result of difference in the observed data (i.e. 30-minute data vs. mean daily data). The mean daily data would result in reducing the peaks and increasing the valleys (i.e. as a result of the averaging) of the hydrograph more so than the 30-minute data.

With a regard to the last part of the question, *Is this causing the model to underestimate the impacts of nonpoint source loading of fecal coliform, under low flow conditions runoff from nonpoint sources does not occur.*

- 3. It is mentioned on page 4-21, that during low flows, the model underestimated fecal coliform concentrations, and that a factor was developed to adjust the simulated concentrations. Would increasing the concentration of fecal coliform in the interflow and/or the groundwater help address this discrepancy? How was the factor evaluated in the model and allocations?*

A factor was developed to adjust simulated concentration of direct deposition of fecal matter. This factor was considered necessary after reviewing water quality calibration runs. This calibration factor was applied to the direct deposition loads because concentrations during low flow were under estimated. Since the underestimation occurred during low flow conditions (i.e. non runoff events), interflow was considered to have little impact. (Note: we did adjust interflow concentrations and as expected little change in the concentration during low flow conditions was observed) However, groundwater could have had an impact. We addressed the groundwater concentration during the model design. Research data considered during the model development indicated little fecal coliform contamination was present. Specifically, of samples collect by Va. Tech's Biological Systems Engineering Department from wells throughout Franklin County ninety-five percent had no fecal coliform contamination. Of the remaining five percent, contamination was considered to be a localized problem. It was therefore considered inappropriate to assign a fecal coliform load to the groundwater component. The calibration factor was developed and applied to all direct deposition sources for the calibration period and carried throughout the current condition and allocation runs.

-
4. Figure 4.14 (page 4-29), it appears as though the model is not accurately reflecting some of the capped concentration values (8,000 cfu/100 ml).

This figure refers to a validation run. With regard to the validation run (VR) plots, the simulations depicted were conducted without modification of the model parameters in order to assess the appropriateness of the calibrated model parameters with climatic conditions other than those used during the calibration runs. As pointed out, the model simulations do not reflect some of the capped concentration values. In general the simulation are characterized by both underestimates and overestimates. With variation at a sampling point, as high as, 4200 % between duplicate samples taken at the same location and time (3-15 minutes apart), the peaks for most instances unknown because of detection limits used, a homogeneous assumption assumed for the cross-section, in addition to model and information detail issues, we considered the validation run an acceptable simulation of reality.

The determination of the goodness of fit of the model simulations of fecal coliform as compared with the observed data is difficult to precisely quantify because of many complex and generally unknown factors. For example, limited number of observations, type of sampling (grab sample for a point/stream location rather than stream cross-section composite), the transport/delivery mechanisms and the spatial distribution of the pollutant and the censoring of data, both high and low, are factors that limit our ability to quantify the goodness of fit. Generally, these determinations are more subjective than objective and made using best professional judgment after careful evaluation of simulated and corresponding observed data and seasonal response to storm and base flows where observed data do not exist. This approach is supported from an extensive review of literature that shows an absence of quantitative measures of goodness of fit. Professional judgment becomes important in these types of evaluations (i.e. situations with limited observed quality data with unknown spatial and temporal error and complex system interactions). For example, relative conclusions such as, "... appears to provide a good fit" (EPA, 2000) and "... closely matched observed data" (WV DEP and EPA, 1997) are common and generally accepted for describing a model's goodness of fit at the completion of calibration and subsequent validation analysis.

Our evaluation of simulation results included three components and consisted of both subjective and objective criteria: 1) visual interpretation of graphical comparisons of simulated and observed data, 2) visual interpretation of graphic summary of data for selected time interval before and after observed data point, and 3) average standard error.

Visual interpretation of graphical comparisons of simulated and observed data: Visual interpretation involved among other things an evaluation of how well simulated fecal coliform counts for 15-minute time intervals relate to

corresponding observed point data. The evaluation involved examining trends, consistency, and maximum-minimum values during high and low flows, seasonal patterns and spatial variability over the calibration and subsequent validation time period. Since only limited observed data existed, trends in modeled data during low and high flow both before and after each observed time period were also carefully examined. The maximum instantaneous values were evaluated based on very limited uncensored data available from previous research studies conducted in the Blackwater River watershed. These research results provided limited insight into probable maximum values. During the calibration phase, the process was iterative in that many simulation runs were made that involved the adjustment of appropriate model parameters to improve the overall match. Visual interpretation is a subjective criteria, however, conclusions were based on sound professional judgment (i.e. the judgment of experienced modelers) as to when an "optimal" fit was achieved for all conditions experienced over the calibration period.

Visual interpretation of graphic summary of data for selected time interval before and after observed data point: This procedure was an attempt to summarize the simulated 15-minute fecal coliform counts (modeled instantaneous values) for a 24-hour period before and after the observance of fecal coliform concentrations (censored). Graphics included a plot of the maximum and minimum simulated 15-minute values with associated observed point data. These graphs provided a relative comparison between simulated values and observed points for a selected window around the observed points. In general, we would expect a significant number of the observed points to fall within the upper (maximum) and lower (minimum) boundaries established from the simulated values. This, however, is only a guide, as this relationship gives no insight to other spatial and temporal impacts.

Standard error: The standard error calculation was an attempt to incorporate more objectivity into the assessment. The objective with these criteria was to minimize the standard error. The calculation of the standard error (or pseudo standard error) is described in the Blackwater TMDL reports (sections 4.6.2). We considered this a pseudo standard error simply because observed data do not exist for all simulated values around the time period of the observation. From this assessment, the average standard error (across all impairments) did not exceed 150 cfu/100 ml. This was on the same order of magnitude as the lower detection limit (LDL) and the variation seen between field duplicate samples (i.e. duplicate samples taken at the same location and time).

Based on professional experience with hydrologic/water quality modeling and our careful evaluation of the calibration/validation data obtained from numerous simulations that resulted from adjustment of appropriate model parameters, we concluded that an acceptable calibration was achieved for all impaired segments. This conclusion acknowledges that some points are either over or underestimated more than we would like. However, attempts to improve the match for these

points resulted in unacceptable comparisons in other areas. The difficult points are most likely attributed to unknown spatiotemporal variability in fecal coliform loads, possible unknown activity within the stream and/or landscape (e.g. regrowth), homogeneous assumption made for point data when an unknown heterogeneous variation most likely exists over the stream cross-section at the sampling location, and/or variations in the hydrologic response due to unknown spatial variability in precipitation.

5. *Figure 5.1 (page 5-2), it appears as though the model is far more sensitive to changes in the land application of wastes. A 100% reduction in the land application of wastes produced a 50% change in response, while a 100% reduction in the direct deposition of wastes produced a 0% change in response.*

Figure 5.1 depicts the percent change in total annual load (i.e. not concentration or geometric mean) from the various sources within the Maggodee Creek and/or Lower Blackwater River impairments. There remains a contribution originating from the upper four Blackwater River impairments. This figure indicates that runoff contributes the majority of the total annual fecal load delivered to the stream. This indicates that within the lower two impairments the total annual load from land-based sources is greater than that from direct sources. It does not reflect the relationship of land-based sources and the water quality standard.

6. *Figure 5.3 (page 5-3), We are interpreting the y-axis to mean the change in the geometric mean. Based on this interpretation of the y-axis, it seems as though a 100% reduction in direct deposits would affect the water quality in the months of June, July, and August with limited affects for the remainder of the year. Is this a correct interpretation of the figure?*

This is the correct interpretation of the graph. It is necessary to keep in mind:

- i. This graph represents the response for one year, specifically 1995.
- ii. Reductions were only applied to the study area and not to the upper four impairments. The contributing land area in the Lower Blackwater is small in proportion to the contributing land area in the Upper Four impairments.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any further concerns/requests.

Sincerely,

Phillip W. McClellan
President

References

- EPA. 2000. Fecal Coliform TMDL Modeling Report Cottonwood Creek Watershed Idaho County, Idaho. EPA Office of Water, Office of Science and Technology, Standards and Applied Science Division, Exposure Assessment Branch, Washington D.C.
- WV DEP and EPA. 1997. Fecal Coliform TMDL Development for South Branch Potomac [River] including Lunice Creek, Mill Creek, and North Fork, West Virginia. State of West Virginia, Division of Environmental Protection 1201 Greenbrier St., Charleston, WV and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III 841 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA .

GLOSSARY

Note: *All entries in italics are taken from USEPA (1999).*

303(d). A section of the Clean Water Act of 1972 requiring states to identify and list water bodies that do not meet the states' water quality standards.

Allocations. *That portion of a receiving water's loading capacity attributed to one of its existing or future pollution sources (nonpoint or point) or to natural background sources. (A wasteload allocation [WLA] is that portion of the loading capacity allocated to an existing or future point source, and a load allocation [LA] is that portion allocated to an existing or future nonpoint source or to natural background levels. Load allocations are best estimates of the loading, which can range from reasonably accurate estimates to gross allotments, depending on the availability of data and appropriate techniques for predicting loading.)*

Ambient water quality. *Natural concentration of water quality constituents prior to mixing of either point or nonpoint source load of contaminants. Reference ambient concentration is used to indicate the concentration of a chemical that will not cause adverse impact on human health.*

Anthropogenic. *Pertains to the [environmental] influence of human activities.*

Antidegradation Policies. *Policies that are part of each states water quality standards. These policies are designed to protect water quality and provide a method of assessing activities that might affect the integrity of waterbodies.*

Aquatic ecosystem. *Complex of biotic and abiotic components of natural waters. The aquatic ecosystem is an ecological unit that includes the physical characteristics (such as flow or velocity and depth), the biological community of the water column and benthos, and the chemical characteristics such as dissolved solids, dissolved oxygen, and nutrients. Both living and nonliving components of the aquatic ecosystem interact and influence the properties and status of each component.*

Assimilative capacity. *The amount of contaminant load that can be discharged to a specific waterbody without exceeding water quality standards or criteria. Assimilative capacity is used to define the ability of a waterbody to naturally absorb and use a discharged substance without impairing water quality or harming aquatic life.*

Background levels. *Levels representing the chemical, physical, and biological conditions that would result from natural geomorphological processes such as weathering or dissolution.*

Bacteria. *Single-celled microorganisms. Bacteria of the coliform group are considered the primary indicators of fecal contamination and are often used to assess water quality.*

Bacterial decomposition. Breakdown by oxidation, or decay, of organic matter by heterotrophic bacteria. Bacteria use the organic carbon in organic matter as the energy source for cell synthesis.

Bacteria source tracking (BST). A collection of scientific methods used to track sources of fecal contamination.

Benthic. Refers to material, especially sediment, at the bottom of an aquatic ecosystem. It can be used to describe the organisms that live on, or in, the bottom of a waterbody.

Benthic organisms. Organisms living in, or on, bottom substrates in aquatic ecosystems.

Best management practices (BMPs). Methods, measures, or practices determined to be reasonable and cost-effective means for a landowner to meet certain, generally nonpoint source, pollution control needs. BMPs include structural and nonstructural controls and operation and maintenance procedures.

Biosolids. Biologically treated solids originating from municipal waste water treatment plants.

Box and whisker plot. A graphical representation of the mean, lower quartile, upper quartile, upper limit, lower limit, and outliers of a data set.

Calibration. The process of adjusting model parameters within physically defensible ranges until the resulting predictions give a best possible good fit to observed data.

Channel. A natural stream that conveys water; a ditch or channel excavated for the flow of water.

Chloride. An atom of chlorine in solution; an ion bearing a single negative charge.

Clean Water Act (CWA). The Clean Water Act (formerly referred to as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972), Public Law 92-500, as amended by Public Law 96-483 and Public Law 97-117, 33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq. The Clean Water Act (CWA) contains a number of provisions to restore and maintain the quality of the nation's water resources. One of these provisions is Section 303(d), which establishes the TMDL program.

Concentration. Amount of a substance or material in a given unit volume of solution; usually measured in milligrams per liter (mg/L) or parts per million (ppm).

Concentration-based limit. A limit based on the relative strength of a pollutant in a waste stream, usually expressed in milligrams per liter (mg/L).

Confluence. The point at which a river and its tributary flow together.

Contamination. The act of polluting or making impure; any indication of chemical, sediment, or biological impurities.

Continuous discharge. A discharge that occurs without interruption throughout the operating hours of a facility, except for infrequent shutdowns for maintenance, process changes, or other similar activities.

Conventional pollutants. As specified under the Clean Water Act, conventional contaminants include suspended solids, coliform bacteria, high biochemical oxygen demand, pH, and oil and grease.

Conveyance. A measure of the of the water carrying capacity of a channel section. It is directly proportional to the discharge in the channel section.

Cost-share program. A program that allocates project funds to pay a percentage of the cost of constructing or implementing a best management practice. The remainder of the costs are paid by the producer (s).

Cross-sectional area. Wet area of a waterbody normal to the longitudinal component of the flow.

Critical condition. The critical condition can be thought of as the "worst case" scenario of environmental conditions in the waterbody in which the loading expressed in the TMDL for the pollutant of concern will continue to meet water quality standards. Critical conditions are the combination of environmental factors (e.g., flow, temperature, etc.) that results in attaining and maintaining the water quality criterion and has an acceptably low frequency of occurrence.

Decay. The gradual decrease in the amount of a given substance in a given system due to various sink processes including chemical and biological transformation, dissipation to other environmental media, or deposition into storage areas.

Decomposition. Metabolic breakdown of organic materials; the formation of by-products of decomposition releases energy and simple organic and inorganic compounds. See also **Respiration**.

Designated uses. Those uses specified in water quality standards for each waterbody or segment whether or not they are being attained.

Deterministic model. A model that does not include built-in variability: same input will always result in the same output.

Dilution. The addition of some quantity of less-concentrated liquid (water) that results in a decrease in the original concentration.

Direct runoff. Water that flows over the ground surface or through the ground directly into streams, rivers, and lakes.

Discharge. Flow of surface water in a stream or canal, or the outflow of groundwater from a flowing artesian well, ditch, or spring. Can also apply to discharge of liquid effluent from a facility or to chemical emissions into the air through designated venting mechanisms.

Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR). Report of effluent characteristics submitted by a municipal or industrial facility that has been granted an NPDES discharge permit.

Discharge permits (under NPDES). A permit issued by the U.S. EPA or a state regulatory agency that sets specific limits on the type and amount of pollutants that a municipality or industry can discharge to a receiving water; it also includes a compliance schedule for achieving those limits. The permit process was established under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, under provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act.

Dispersion. The spreading of chemical or biological constituents, including pollutants, in various directions at varying velocities depending on the differential in-stream flow characteristics.

Diurnal. Actions or processes that have a period or a cycle of approximately one tidal-day or are completed within a 24-hour period and that recur every 24 hours. Also, the occurrence of an activity/process during the day rather than the night.

DNA. Deoxyribonucleic acid. The genetic material of cells and some viruses.

Domestic wastewater. Also called sanitary wastewater, consists of wastewater discharged from residences and from commercial, institutional, and similar facilities.

Drainage basin. A part of a land area enclosed by a topographic divide from which direct surface runoff from precipitation normally drains by gravity into a receiving water. Also referred to as a watershed, river basin, or hydrologic unit.

Dynamic model. A mathematical formulation describing and simulating the physical behavior of a system or a process and its temporal variability.

Dynamic simulation. Modeling of the behavior of physical, chemical, and/or biological phenomena and their variations over time.

Ecosystem. An interactive system that includes the organisms of a natural community association together with their abiotic physical, chemical, and geochemical environment.

Effluent. Municipal sewage or industrial liquid waste (untreated, partially treated, or completely treated) that flows out of a treatment plant, septic system, pipe, etc.

Effluent guidelines. The national effluent guidelines and standards specify the achievable effluent pollutant reduction that is attainable based upon the performance of

treatment technologies employed within an industrial category. The National Effluent Guidelines Program was established with a phased approach whereby industry would first be required to meet interim limitations based on best practicable control technology currently available for existing sources (BPT). The second level of effluent limitations to be attained by industry was referred to as best available technology economically achievable (BAT), which was established primarily for the control of toxic pollutants.

Effluent limitation. *Restrictions established by a state or EPA on quantities, rates, and concentrations in pollutant discharges.*

Empirical model. *Use of statistical techniques to discern patterns or relationships underlying observed or measured data for large sample sets. Does not account for physical dynamics of waterbodies.*

Endpoint. *An endpoint (or indicator/target) is a characteristic of an ecosystem that may be affected by exposure to a stressor. Assessment endpoints and measurement endpoints are two distinct types of endpoints commonly used by resource managers. An assessment endpoint is the formal expression of a valued environmental characteristic and should have societal relevance (an indicator). A measurement endpoint is the expression of an observed or measured response to a stress or disturbance. It is a measurable environmental characteristic that is related to the valued environmental characteristic chosen as the assessment endpoint. The numeric criteria that are part of traditional water quality standards are good examples of measurement endpoints (targets).*

Enhancement. *In the context of restoration ecology, any improvement of a structural or functional attribute.*

Evapotranspiration. *The combined effects of evaporation and transpiration on the water balance. Evaporation is water loss into the atmosphere from soil and water surfaces. Transpiration is water loss into the atmosphere as part of the life cycle of plants.*

Existing use. *Use actually attained in the waterbody on or after November 28, 1975, whether or not it is included in the water quality standards (40 CFR 131.3).*

Fate of pollutants. *Physical, chemical, and biological transformation in the nature and changes of the amount of a pollutant in an environmental system. Transformation processes are pollutant-specific. Because they have comparable kinetics, different formulations for each pollutant are not required.*

Fecal Coliform. *Indicator organisms (organisms indicating presence of pathogens) associated with the digestive tract.*

Feedlot. *A confined area for the controlled feeding of animals. Tends to concentrate large amounts of animal waste that cannot be absorbed by the soil and, hence, may be carried to nearby streams or lakes by rainfall runoff.*

First-order kinetics. *The type of relationship describing a dynamic reaction in which the rate of transformation of a pollutant is proportional to the amount of that pollutant in the environmental system.*

Flux. *Movement and transport of mass of any water quality constituent over a given period of time. Units of mass flux are mass per unit time.*

Geometric mean. A measure of the central tendency of a data set that minimizes the effects of extreme values.

GIS. Geographic Information System. A system of hardware, software, data, people, organizations and institutional arrangements for collecting, storing, analyzing and disseminating information about areas of the earth. (Dueker and Kjerne, 1989)

Ground water. *The supply of fresh water found beneath the earth's surface, usually in aquifers, which supply wells and springs. Because ground water is a major source of drinking water, there is growing concern over contamination from leaching agricultural or industrial pollutants and leaking underground storage tanks.*

HSPF. Hydrological Simulation Program – Fortran. A computer simulation tool used to mathematically model nonpoint source pollution sources and movement of pollutants in a watershed.

Hydrograph. *A graph showing variation of stage (depth) or discharge in a stream over a period of time.*

Hydrologic cycle. *The circuit of water movement from the atmosphere to the earth and its return to the atmosphere through various stages or processes, such as precipitation, interception, runoff, infiltration, storage, evaporation, and transpiration.*

Hydrology. *The study of the distribution, properties, and effects of water on the earth's surface, in the soil and underlying rocks, and in the atmosphere.*

Hyetograph. *Graph of rainfall rate versus time during a storm event.*

IMPLND. An impervious land segment in HSPF. It is used to model land covered by impervious materials, such as pavement.

Indicator. *A measurable quantity that can be used to evaluate the relationship between pollutant sources and their impact on water quality.*

Indicator organism. *An organism used to indicate the potential presence of other (usually pathogenic) organisms. Indicator organisms are usually associated with the other organisms, but are usually more easily sampled and measured.*

Infiltration capacity. *The capacity of a soil to allow water to infiltrate into or through it during a storm.*

In situ. *In place; in situ measurements consist of measurements of components or processes in a full-scale system or a field, rather than in a laboratory.*

Interflow. Runoff which travels just below the surface of the soil.

Isolate. An inbreeding biological population that is isolated from similar populations by physical or other means.

Leachate. *Water that collects contaminants as it trickles through wastes, pesticides, or fertilizers. Leaching can occur in farming areas, feedlots, and landfills and can result in hazardous substances entering surface water, ground water, or soil.*

Limits (upper and lower). The lower limit equals the lower quartile – 1.5x(upper quartile – lower quartile), and the upper limit equals the upper quartile + 1.5x(upper quartile – lower quartile). Values outside these limits are referred to as outliers.

Loading, Load, Loading rate. *The total amount of material (pollutants) entering the system from one or multiple sources; measured as a rate in weight per unit time.*

Load allocation (LA). *The portion of a receiving waters loading capacity attributed either to one of its existing or future nonpoint sources of pollution or to natural background sources. Load allocations are best estimates of the loading, which can range from reasonably accurate estimates to gross allotments, depending on the availability of data and appropriate techniques for predicting the loading. Wherever possible, natural and nonpoint source loads should be distinguished. (40 CFR 130.2(g))*

Loading capacity (LC). *The greatest amount of loading a water can receive without violating water quality standards.*

Margin of safety (MOS). *A required component of the TMDL that accounts for the uncertainty about the relationship between the pollutant loads and the quality of the receiving waterbody (CWA Section 303(d)(1)(C)). The MOS is normally incorporated into the conservative assumptions used to develop TMDLs (generally within the calculations or models) and approved by EPA either individually or in state/EPA agreements. If the MOS needs to be larger than that which is allowed through the conservative assumptions, additional MOS can be added as a separate component of the TMDL (in this case, quantitatively, a TMDL = LC = WLA + LA + MOS).*

Mass balance. *An equation that accounts for the flux of mass going into a defined area and the flux of mass leaving the defined area. The flux in must equal the flux out.*

Mass loading. *The quantity of a pollutant transported to a waterbody.*

Mathematical model. *A system of mathematical expressions that describe the spatial and temporal distribution of water quality constituents resulting from fluid transport and the one or more individual processes and interactions within some prototype aquatic*

ecosystem. A mathematical water quality model is used as the basis for waste load allocation evaluations.

Mean. The sum of the values in a data set divided by the number of values in the data set.

MGD. Million gallons per day. A unit of water flow, whether discharge or withdraw.

Mitigation. *Actions taken to avoid, reduce, or compensate for the effects of environmental damage. Among the broad spectrum of possible actions are those which restore, enhance, create, or replace damaged ecosystems.*

Monitoring. *Periodic or continuous surveillance or testing to determine the level of compliance with statutory requirements and/or pollutant levels in various media or in humans, plants, and animals.*

Mood's median test. A nonparametric (distribution-free) test used to test the equality of medians from two or more populations.

Narrative criteria. *Nonquantitative guidelines that describe the desired water quality goals.*

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). *The national program for issuing, modifying, revoking and reissuing, terminating, monitoring, and enforcing permits, and imposing and enforcing pretreatment requirements, under Sections 307, 402, 318, and 405 of the Clean Water Act.*

Natural waters. *Flowing water within a physical system that has developed without human intervention, in which natural processes continue to take place.*

Nonpoint source. *Pollution that originates from multiple sources over a relatively large area. Nonpoint sources can be divided into source activities related to either land or water use including failing septic tanks, improper animal-keeping practices, forest practices, and urban and rural runoff.*

Numeric targets. *A measurable value determined for the pollutant of concern which, if achieved, is expected to result in the attainment of water quality standards in the listed waterbody.*

Numerical model. *Model that approximates a solution of governing partial differential equations which describe a natural process. The approximation uses a numerical discretization of the space and time components of the system or process.*

Organic matter. *The organic fraction that includes plant and animal residue at various stages of decomposition, cells and tissues of soil organisms, and substances synthesized by the soil population. Commonly determined as the amount of organic material contained in a soil or water sample.*

Peak runoff. *The highest value of the stage or discharge attained by a flood or storm event; also referred to as flood peak or peak discharge.*

PERLND. A pervious land segment in HSPF. It is used to model a particular land use segment within a subwatershed (e.g. pasture, urban land, or crop land).

Permit. *An authorization, license, or equivalent control document issued by EPA or an approved federal, state, or local agency to implement the requirements of an environmental regulation; e.g., a permit to operate a wastewater treatment plant or to operate a facility that may generate harmful emissions.*

Permit Compliance System (PCS). *Computerized management information system that contains data on NPDES permit-holding facilities. PCS keeps extensive records on more than 65,000 active water-discharge permits on sites located throughout the nation. PCS tracks permit, compliance, and enforcement status of NPDES facilities.*

Phased/Staged approach. *Under the phased/staged approach to TMDL development, load allocations and wasteload allocations are calculated using the best available data and information recognizing the need for additional monitoring data to accurately characterize sources and loadings. The phased/staged approach is typically employed when nonpoint sources dominate. It provides for the implementation of load reduction strategies while collecting additional data.*

Point source. *Pollutant loads discharged at a specific location from pipes, outfalls, and conveyance channels from either municipal wastewater treatment plants or industrial waste treatment facilities. Point sources can also include pollutant loads contributed by tributaries to the main receiving water stream or river.*

Pollutant. *Dredged spoil, solid waste, incinerator residue, sewage, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical wastes, biological materials, radioactive materials, heat, wrecked or discarded equipment, rock, sand, cellar dirt, and industrial, municipal, and agricultural waste discharged into water. (CWA Section 502(6)).*

Pollution. *Generally, the presence of matter or energy whose nature, location, or quantity produces undesired environmental effects. Under the Clean Water Act, for example, the term is defined as the man-made or man-induced alteration of the physical, biological, chemical, and radiological integrity of water.*

Postaudit. *A subsequent examination and verification of a model's predictive performance following implementation of an environmental control program.*

Privately owned treatment works. *Any device or system that is (a) used to treat wastes from any facility whose operator is not the operator of the treatment works and (b) not a publicly owned treatment works.*

Public comment period. *The time allowed for the public to express its views and concerns regarding action by EPA or states (e.g., a Federal Register notice of a proposed rule-making, a public notice of a draft permit, or a Notice of Intent to Deny).*

Publicly owned treatment works (POTW). *Any device or system used in the treatment (including recycling and reclamation) of municipal sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature that is owned by a state or municipality. This definition includes sewers, pipes, or other conveyances only if they convey wastewater to a POTW providing treatment.*

Quartile. *The 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles of a data set. A percentile (p) of a data set ordered by magnitude is the value that has at most p% of the measurements in the data set below it, and (100-p)% above it. The 50th quartile is also known as the median. The 25th and 75th quartiles are referred to as the lower and upper quartiles, respectively.*

Raw sewage. *Untreated municipal sewage.*

Receiving waters. *Creeks, streams, rivers, lakes, estuaries, ground-water formations, or other bodies of water into which surface water and/or treated or untreated waste are discharged, either naturally or in man-made systems.*

Reserve capacity. *Pollutant loading rate set aside in determining stream waste load allocation, accounting for uncertainty and future growth.*

Residence time. *Length of time that a pollutant remains within a section of a stream or river. The residence time is determined by the streamflow and the volume of the river reach or the average stream velocity and the length of the river reach.*

Restoration. *Return of an ecosystem to a close approximation of its presumed condition prior to disturbance.*

Riparian areas. *Areas bordering streams, lakes, rivers, and other watercourses. These areas have high water tables and support plants that require saturated soils during all or part of the year. Riparian areas include both wetland and upland zones.*

Riparian zone. *The border or banks of a stream. Although this term is sometimes used interchangeably with floodplain, the riparian zone is generally regarded as relatively narrow compared to a floodplain. The duration of flooding is generally much shorter, and the timing less predictable, in a riparian zone than in a river floodplain.*

Roughness coefficient. *A factor in velocity and discharge formulas representing the effects of channel roughness on energy losses in flowing water. Manning's "n" is a commonly used roughness coefficient.*

Runoff. *That part of precipitation, snowmelt, or irrigation water that runs off the land into streams or other surface water. It can carry pollutants from the air and land into receiving waters.*

Seasonal Kendall test. A statistical tool used to test for trends in data, which is unaffected by seasonal cycles.

Septic system. An on-site system designed to treat and dispose of domestic sewage. A typical septic system consists of a tank that receives waste from a residence or business and a drain field or subsurface absorption system consisting of a series of percolation lines for the disposal of the liquid effluent. Solids (sludge) that remain after decomposition by bacteria in the tank must be pumped out periodically.

Sewer. *A channel or conduit that carries wastewater and storm water runoff from the source to a treatment plant or receiving stream. Sanitary sewers carry household, industrial, and commercial waste. Storm sewers carry runoff from rain or snow. Combined sewers handle both.*

Simulation. *The use of mathematical models to approximate the observed behavior of a natural water system in response to a specific known set of input and forcing conditions. Models that have been validated, or verified, are then used to predict the response of a natural water system to changes in the input or forcing conditions.*

Slope. *The degree of inclination to the horizontal. Usually expressed as a ratio, such as 1:25 or 1 on 25, indicating one unit vertical rise in 25 units of horizontal distance, or in a decimal fraction (0.04), degrees (2 degrees 18 minutes), or percent (4 percent).*

Spatial segmentation. *A numerical discretization of the spatial component of a system into one or more dimensions; forms the basis for application of numerical simulation models.*

Stakeholder. Any person with a vested interest in the TMDL development.

Standard. In reference to water quality (e.g. 200 cfu/100ml geometric mean limit).

Standard deviation. A measure of the variability of a data set. The positive square root of the variance of a set of measurements.

Standard error. The standard deviation of a distribution of a sample statistic, esp. when the mean is used as the statistic.

Statistical significance. An indication that the differences being observed are not due to random error. The p-value indicates the probability that the differences are due to random error (i.e. a low p-value indicates statistical significance).

Steady-state model. *Mathematical model of fate and transport that uses constant values of input variables to predict constant values of receiving water quality concentrations. Model variables are treated as not changing with respect to time.*

Storm runoff. Storm water runoff, snowmelt runoff, and surface runoff and drainage; rainfall that does not evaporate or infiltrate the ground because of impervious land surfaces or a soil infiltration rate lower than rainfall intensity, but instead flows onto adjacent land or into waterbodies or is routed into a drain or sewer system.

Streamflow. Discharge that occurs in a natural channel. Although the term "discharge" can be applied to the flow of a canal, the word "streamflow" uniquely describes the discharge in a surface stream course. The term "streamflow" is more general than "runoff" since streamflow may be applied to discharge whether or not it is affected by diversion or regulation.

Stream restoration. Various techniques used to replicate the hydrological, morphological, and ecological features that have been lost in a stream because of urbanization, farming, or other disturbance.

Surface area. The area of the surface of a waterbody; best measured by planimetry or the use of a geographic information system.

Surface runoff. Precipitation, snowmelt, or irrigation water in excess of what can infiltrate the soil surface and be stored in small surface depressions; a major transporter of nonpoint source pollutants.

Surface water. All water naturally open to the atmosphere (rivers, lakes, reservoirs, ponds, streams, impoundments, seas, estuaries, etc.) and all springs, wells, or other collectors directly influenced by surface water.

Technology-based standards. Effluent limitations applicable to direct and indirect sources that are developed on a category-by-category basis using statutory factors, not including water quality effects.

Timestep. An increment of time in modeling terms. The smallest unit of time used in a mathematical simulation model (e.g. 15-minutes, 1-hour, 1-day).

Topography. The physical features of a geographic surface area including relative elevations and the positions of natural and man-made features.

Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). The sum of the individual wasteload allocations (WLAs) for point sources, load allocations (LAs) for nonpoint sources and natural background, plus a margin of safety (MOS). TMDLs can be expressed in terms of mass per time, toxicity, or other appropriate measures that relate to a state's water quality standard.

Transport of pollutants (in water). Transport of pollutants in water involves two main processes: (1) advection, resulting from the flow of water, and (2) dispersion, or transport due to turbulence in the water.

TRC. Total Residual Chlorine. A measure of the effectiveness of chlorinating treated waste water effluent.

Tributary. *A lower order-stream compared to a receiving waterbody. "Tributary to" indicates the largest stream into which the reported stream or tributary flows.*

Validation (of a model). *Process of determining how well the mathematical model's computer representation describes the actual behavior of the physical processes under investigation. A validated model will have also been tested to ascertain whether it accurately and correctly solves the equations being used to define the system simulation.*

Variance. A measure of the variability of a data set. The sum of the squared deviations (observation – mean) divided by (number of observations) – 1.

VADACS. Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

VADCR. Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation.

VADEQ. Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

VDH. Virginia Department of Health.

Wasteload allocation (WLA). *The portion of a receiving waters' loading capacity that is allocated to one of its existing or future point sources of pollution. WLAs constitute a type of water quality-based effluent limitation (40 CFR 130.2(h)).*

Wastewater. *Usually refers to effluent from a sewage treatment plant. See also **Domestic wastewater**.*

Wastewater treatment. *Chemical, biological, and mechanical procedures applied to an industrial or municipal discharge or to any other sources of contaminated water to remove, reduce, or neutralize contaminants.*

Water quality. *The biological, chemical, and physical conditions of a waterbody. It is a measure of a waterbody's ability to support beneficial uses.*

Water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBEL). *Effluent limitations applied to dischargers when technology-based limitations alone would cause violations of water quality standards. Usually WQBELs are applied to discharges into small streams.*

Water quality-based permit. *A permit with an effluent limit more stringent than one based on technology performance. Such limits might be necessary to protect the designated use of receiving waters (e.g., recreation, irrigation, industry, or water supply).*

Water quality criteria. *Levels of water quality expected to render a body of water suitable for its designated use, composed of numeric and narrative criteria. Numeric criteria are scientifically derived ambient concentrations developed by EPA or states for*

various pollutants of concern to protect human health and aquatic life. Narrative criteria are statements that describe the desired water quality goal. Criteria are based on specific levels of pollutants that would make the water harmful if used for drinking, swimming, farming, fish production, or industrial processes.

Water quality standard. *Law or regulation that consists of the beneficial designated use or uses of a waterbody, the numeric and narrative water quality criteria that are necessary to protect the use or uses of that particular waterbody, and an antidegradation statement.*

Watershed. *A drainage area or basin in which all land and water areas drain or flow toward a central collector such as a stream, river, or lake at a lower elevation.*

WQIA. Water Quality Improvement Act.

REFERENCES

- ASAE Standards, 45th Edition. 1998. D384.1 DEC93. Manure Production and Characteristics. St. Joseph, Mich.: ASAE.
- Baker, T. 1999. Virginia Department of Health. Personal telecommunication, 12/6/99.
- Baker, T. 2000. Virginia Department of Health. Personal telecommunication, 2/22/00-2/23/00.
- Chow, V.T. 1959. Open Channel Hydraulics. McGraw-Hill Book Company. NY.
- Collins, E.R., T.M. Younos, B.B. Ross, J.M. Swisher, R.F. Shank, and K.G. Wooden. 1996. Dairy Loafing Lot Rotational Management System Non-Point Source Pollution Assessment and Demonstration. VADCR-DSWC. Agreement No. C199-319-95-10.
- Costanzo, G. 2000, Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. Personal telecommunication, 1/31/00.
- Cowan, W.L. 1956. Estimating hydraulic roughness coefficients. *Agricultural Engineering*, 37(7), pp. 473-475.
- Farrar, R. 2000. Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. Personal telecommunication, 2/14/00.
- FCBS. 1995. Inventing Franklin County's Future: 1995 Comprehensive Plan. Franklin County Board of Supervisors. Rocky Mount, VA.
- Fire Effects Information System. 1999. <http://www.huntana.com/feis/animals/mammals>.
- Geldreich, E. E. 1978. Bacterial Populations and Indicator Concepts in Feces, Sewage, Stormwater, and Solid Wastes. In *Indicators of Viruses in Water and Food*, ed. G. Berg. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ann Arbor Science Publishers, Inc.
- Keeling, W. 2000. Correspondence reporting numbers from Randy Farrar, DGIF fur-bearing animal biologist.
- Knox, M. 1999. Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. Personal telecommunication, 11/22/99.
- MapTech. 1999a. Unpublished source sampling data. Blackwater River TMDL Study.
- MapTech. 1999b. Blackwater River Riparian NPS Pollution Control Project: Database development and modeling analysis. Submitted to: David Johnson, Ferrum College. MapTech, Inc.

- MapTech. 2000. Inspection of VADEQ monthly field reports of biosolids applications in Franklin County, 2/9/00.
- Norman, G.W. 1999. Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. Personal telecommunication, 12/7/99.
- Norman, G. W. and N. W. Lafon. 1998. 1997-1998 Virginia Wild Turkey Status Report. Department of Game and Inland Fisheries.
- Reneau, R.B. 2000. Crop and Soil Environmental Sciences. Virginia Tech. Personal Conversation. 1/7/00.
- Rose, R.K., Cranford, J.A. 1987. Handbook of Virginia Mammals. Final Report, Project No. 567460. VA Dept. Game & Inland Fisheries, Richmond, VA: 121.
- USCB. 1990. *1990 Census*. United States Census Bureau. Washington D.C.
- USEPA. 1998. Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Program. Draft TMDL Program Implementation Strategy. <http://www.epa.gov/OWOW/tmdl/strategy/glossary.html> 2/12/98.
- USEPA. 1999. Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions: The TMDL Process. <http://www.epa.gov/OWOW/tmdl/decisions/dec1c.html>.
- USEPA. 1998. EPA Website. Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Program. Draft TMDL Program Implementation Strategy. <http://www.epa.gov/OWOW/tmdl/strategy/glossary.html> 2/12/98
- VADEQ. 2000. Fecal Coliform TMDL Development for Lower Dry River, Rockingham County, Virginia. Prepared by Virginia Tech Department of Biological Systems Engineering and Department of Biology. Submitted to EPA by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, and the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation.
- VADEQ. 1999. Fecal Coliform TMDL Development for Muddy Creek, Virginia. Prepared by the Muddy Creek TMDL Establishment Workgroup. Submitted to EPA by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, and the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation.
- VADEQ. 1998. 303(D) Total Maximum Daily Load Priority List and Report (DRAFT).
- VADGIF. 1999. <http://www.dgif.state.va.us> The Virginia Fish and Wildlife Information Service.
- VDH. 1997. Biosolids Use Regulations 12 VAC 5-585. Virginia Department of Health. Richmond, VA.

VASS. 1995. Virginia Agricultural Statistics Bulletin 1994. Virginia Agricultural Statistics Service. Richmond, VA.

VASS. 1999. Virginia Agricultural Statistics Bulletin 1998. Virginia Agricultural Statistics Service. Richmond, VA.

Weiskel, P. A., B. L. Howes, and G. R. Heufelder. 1996. Coliform contamination of a coastal embayment: sources and transport pathways. Environ. Sci. Technol. 30:1872-1881.

Wheelabrator. 2000. BioGro, a division of Wheelabrator Water Technologies Inc. Correspondence regarding biosolids applications in Franklin County, 2/2/00.

Yagow, E. 1999. Unpublished monitoring data. Mountain Run TMDL Study.

Yagow, G., V.O. Shanholtz, R. Seale, R. Stephens, D. Johnson, C. Lunsford. 1999. Preliminary fecal coliform assessment in the Blackwater River watershed. ASAE Paper No. 99-2185, ASAE, St. Joseph, MI.

ADDENDUM A

The TMDL developed for Maggodee Creek was based on the Virginia State Standard for fecal coliform. As detailed in Section 1.2, the fecal coliform standard states that the 30-day, geometric-mean concentration shall not exceed 200 cfu/100 ml. As such, pollutant concentrations were modeled over the entire duration of a representative modeling period, and pollutant loads were adjusted until the standard, reduced by a margin of safety equal to 5%, was met (Figure 5.4). Table AA.1 represents the average annual loads during the modeled period after allocation of pollutant loads. Loads from permitted point sources (WLA) and nonpoint sources (LA) are represented, as are the load associated with the margin of safety (MOS) and the sum of these three loads (TMDL). It is worth noting that the MOS is much less than 5% of the TMDL. This outcome illustrates the inherent difference between concentration, which is the amount of a pollutant (e.g. numbers of fecal coliforms) in a given volume of water, and annual loads, which is the total amount of the pollutant regardless of the volume of water. Additionally, this situation reflects the fact that it would be inappropriate to use annual loads, such as those in Table AA.1, as a target goal for meeting a water quality standard that is based on concentrations.

Table AA.1 Average annual loads (cfu/year) modeled after TMDL allocation in the Maggodee Creek Watershed.

Impairment	WLA	LA	MOS	TMDL
Maggodee Creek ¹	8.27E+10	3.52E+15	4.39E+12	3.52E+15

¹ The only point source permitted for fecal control in the Maggodee Creek drainage is Boones Mill Wastewater Treatment Plant (VPDES # VA0067245).