


Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Development for the Lewis Creek Watershed

Aquatic Life Use (Benthic) Impairment



Prepared by:

George Mason University

Tetra Tech, Inc. Fairfax, Virginia

March 2004

Prepared for:

Virginia Department of Environmental Quality

Acknowledgments

Special thanks to the following people who provided assistance on this project:

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| Nancy Norton | VADEQ - South West Regional Office |
| Ed Cumbow | VADEQ - South West Regional Office |
| Jutta Schneider | VADEQ - Central Office |
| David Lazarus | VADEQ - Central Office |
| Joey O'Quinn | VADMME |

Also, thanks to all the local and state environmental personnel and watershed stakeholders that participated throughout the TMDL development process.

George Mason University, Department of Environmental Science and Policy and Tetra Tech, Inc. of Fairfax, Virginia, supported this study through funding provided by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents i
List of Tables iii
List of Figures iv
Executive Summary v
Section 1 Introduction 1-1
 1.1 Background 1-1
 1.1.1 TMDL Definition and Regulatory Information 1-1
 1.1.2 Impairment Listing 1-1
 1.1.3 Watershed Location 1-1
 1.2 Designated Uses and Applicable Water Quality Standards 1-2
 1.2.1 Designation of Uses (9 VAC 25-260-10) 1-2
 1.2.2 Water Quality Standards 1-3
 1.3 Biomonitoring Assessment 1-3
Section 2 Benthic TMDL Endpoint Determination 2-1
 2.1 Reference Watershed Approach 2-1
 2.2 Watershed Characterization 2-1
 2.2.1 General Information 2-1
 2.2.2 Geology 2-2
 2.2.3 Soils 2-2
 2.2.4 Climate 2-3
 2.2.5 Land Use 2-4
 2.2.6 Ecoregion 2-5
 2.3 Reference Watershed Selection 2-7
 2.4 Selected Reference Watershed 2-8
Section 3 Stressor Identification 3-1
 3.1 Stressor Identification Process 3-1
 3.2 Candidate Causes 3-1
 3.2.1 Low Dissolved Oxygen 3-1
 3.2.2 Sedimentation 3-2
 3.2.3 Habitat Alteration 3-2
 3.2.4 Toxic Pollutants 3-2
 3.3 Monitoring Stations 3-3
 3.4 Monitoring Data Summary 3-4
 3.4.1 Water Quality Criteria 3-4
 3.4.2 Water Quality Summary Plots 3-5
 3.4.3 DO Analysis 3-19
 3.4.4 Biomonitoring Data 3-20
 3.4.5 Rapid Bioassessment Protocol - Habitat Data 3-21

| | |
|---|------|
| 3.5 Toxic Pollutants - Surface Water | 3-22 |
| 3.6 Toxic Pollutants - Sediment | 3-23 |
| 3.7 EPA Toxicity Testing | 3-23 |
| 3.8 Summary | 3-23 |
| Section 4 Source Assessment - Sediment | 4-1 |
| 4.1 Assessment of Nonpoint Sources | 4-1 |
| 4.1.1 Agricultural Land | 4-1 |
| 4.1.2 Forest Land | 4-2 |
| 4.1.3 Urban Areas | 4-2 |
| 4.1.4 Previously Mined Lands and Abandoned Mine Lands (AML) | 4-2 |
| 4.2 Assessment of Point Sources | 4-3 |
| Section 5 Watershed Modeling | 5-1 |
| 5.1 Overall Technical Approach | 5-1 |
| 5.2 Watershed Model | 5-1 |
| 5.3 Model Setup | 5-2 |
| 5.4 Explanation of Important Model Parameters | 5-3 |
| 5.5 Hydrology Calibration | 5-4 |
| Section 6 TMDL Methodology | 6-1 |
| 6.1 TMDL Calculation | 6-1 |
| 6.2 Waste Load Allocation | 6-2 |
| 6.3 Load Allocation | 6-2 |
| 6.4 Consideration of Critical Conditions | 6-4 |
| 6.5 Consideration of Seasonal Variations | 6-4 |
| Section 7 Reasonable Assurance and Implementation | 7-1 |
| 7.1 TMDL Implementation | 7-1 |
| 7.2 Staged Implementation | 7-1 |
| 7.3 Link to Ongoing Restoration | 7-2 |
| 7.4 Reasonable Assurance for Implementation | 7-2 |
| 7.4.1 Follow-Up Monitoring | 7-2 |
| 7.4.2 Regulatory Framework | 7-3 |
| 7.4.3 Implementation Funding Sources | 7-3 |
| Section 8 Public Participation | 8-1 |
| References | R-1 |

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Bioassessment scoring matrix (Plafkin et al. 1989) 1-4

Table 2.1 MRLC and consolidated land uses in the Lewis Creek watershed 2-4

Table 2.2 Reference watershed selection data 2-8

Table 2.3 Bioassessment index comparison 2-8

Table 3.1 Monitoring stations on Lewis Creek 3-3

Table 3.2 Virginia numeric criteria for Class IV waters 3-4

Table 3.3 VADEQ diurnal DO study (September 2002) 3-20

Table 3.4 VaSCI standardized scores for Lewis Creek 3-20

Table 3.5 GMU macroinvertebrate assessment 3-21

Table 3.6 VADEQ RBP habitat scores for Lewis Creek 3-22

Table 3.7 GMU RBP habitat scores for Lewis Creek 3-22

Table 4.1 Percent imperviousness of urban land uses 4-2

Table 4.2 VPDES permitted facilities in the Lewis Creek watershed 4-3

Table 4.3 VADMME mining discharge points in the Lewis Creek watershed 4-3

Table 5.1 Weather stations used in modeling studies 5-3

Table 5.2 USGS gaging stations used in modeling studies 5-3

Table 5.3 GWLF flow calibration statistics 5-5

Table 6.1 Existing sediment loadings in the Lewis Creek watershed 6-1

Table 6.2 TMDL for Lewis Creek 6-2

Table 6.3 Recommended sediment allocations for Lewis Creek 6-3

Table 6.4 Alternative sediment allocations for Lewis Creek 6-4

List of Figures

| | |
|---|------|
| Figure 1.1 Location of impaired watershed | 1-2 |
| Figure 2.1 STATSGO soil types in the Lewis Creek watershed | 2-3 |
| Figure 2.2 MRLC land use in the Lewis Creek watershed | 2-5 |
| Figure 2.3 Level IV ecoregions in the Lewis Creek watershed | 2-7 |
| Figure 2.4 Reference watershed location and monitoring stations | 2-9 |
| Figure 2.5 MRLC land use in the impaired and reference watersheds | 2-10 |
| Figure 2.6 STATSGO soil types in the impaired and reference watersheds | 2-11 |
| Figure 2.7 Level IV ecoregions in the impaired and reference watersheds | 2-12 |
| Figure 3.1 Location of Lewis Creek monitoring stations | 3-4 |
| Figure 3.2 Time-series DO values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-6 |
| Figure 3.3 Time-series temperature values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-7 |
| Figure 3.4 Time-series pH values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-8 |
| Figure 3.5 Time-series lab conductivity values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-9 |
| Figure 3.6 Time-series BOD5 values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-10 |
| Figure 3.7 Time-series total phosphorus values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-11 |
| Figure 3.8 Time-series orthophosphate values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-12 |
| Figure 3.9 Time-series nitrate values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-13 |
| Figure 3.10 Time-series nitrite values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-14 |
| Figure 3.11 Time-series nitrite+nitrate values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-14 |
| Figure 3.12 Time-series TKN values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-15 |
| Figure 3.13 Time-series total ammonia values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-16 |
| Figure 3.14 Time-series N:P ratios for Lewis Creek stations | 3-17 |
| Figure 3.15 Time-series TSS values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-18 |
| Figure 3.16 Time-series turbidity values for Lewis Creek stations | 3-19 |
| Figure 5.1 Walker Creek hydrology calibration using USGS gage 03173000 | 5-5 |
| Figure 5.2 Lewis Creek hydrology calibration using USGS gage 03524000 | 5-6 |

Executive Summary

Background

The Lewis Creek watershed is located in Russell County, Virginia, in the Tennessee/Big Sandy River Basin (USGS Hydrologic Unit Code, 06010205) (Figure 1.1). The waterbody identification code (WBID, Virginia Hydrologic Unit) is VAS-P04R.

Virginia 305(b)/303(d) guidance states that support of the aquatic life beneficial use is determined by the assessment of conventional pollutants (dissolved oxygen, pH, and temperature); toxic pollutants in the water column, fish tissue and sediments; and biological evaluation of benthic community data (VADEQ 1997). Benthic community assessments are, therefore, used to determine compliance with the General Criteria section of Virginia's Water Quality Standards (9 VAC 25-260-20). In general, the stream reach that a biomonitoring station represents is classified as impaired if the EPA's Rapid Bioassessment Protocol (RBP) ranking is either moderately or severely impaired. As a result, Lewis Creek was listed as impaired due to violations of the general standard (aquatic life).

Water quality data analyses and field observations indicate that the primary cause of the benthic community impairment in Lewis Creek is increased amounts of sediment. In order to improve water quality conditions that have resulted in benthic community impairments, a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) was developed for the impaired stream, taking into account all sources of sediment in the watershed, plus a margin of safety (MOS).

Upon implementation, the TMDL will ensure that water quality conditions relating to benthic impairment will meet the allowable loadings estimated by use of a reference watershed (a non-impaired watershed with characteristics similar to those of the impaired watersheds).

Sources of Sediment

Sediment sources can be divided into point and non point sources. Currently, there is only one VPDES permitted point source facility in the Lewis Creek watershed (Table 1). In addition, there are several NPDES permitted mining discharge points located in the watershed (Table 2). Mining permits are issued by the Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals, and Energy (VADMME).

Table 1. VPDES permitted facilities in the Lewis Creek watershed

| VPDES Permit No. | Facility Name | Discharge Type | TSS Permitted Concentration (mg/L) | Design Flow (MGD) | TSS Load (lbs/yr) |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| VA0026387 | Honaker STP | Municipal | 30 | 0.2000 | 18,276 |

Table 2. VADMME mining discharge points in the Lewis Creek watershed

| NPDES Permit No. | Discharge Point (Outfall) | Company Name | Average TSS Concentration (mg/L) | Average or Design Flow (MGD) | Annual Sediment Load (lbs/yr) |
|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1201497 | 1 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0003 | 35.31 |
| 1201497 | 2 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0072 | 767.61 |
| 1200614 | 1 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0072 | 767.61 |
| 1200614 | 2 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0010 | 104.40 |
| 1200614 | 3 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0066 | 706.20 |
| 1200614 | 5 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0072 | 767.61 |
| 1200614 | 6 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0014 | 153.52 |
| 1200614 | 7 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0014 | 153.52 |

Sediment loads are primarily contributed by nonpoint sources in the Lewis Creek watershed. The major sources of sediment are agricultural land and lands classified as barren/transitional/quarries. These lands can contribute excessive sediment loads through erosion and build-up/washoff processes. Agricultural and barren lands are particularly susceptible to erosion due to less vegetative coverage.

Modeling

TMDLs were developed using BasinSim 1.0 and the GWLF model. GWLF is a continuous-simulation model that uses daily time steps for weather data and water balance calculations. Monthly calculations are made for sediment, based on daily water balance totals that are summed to give monthly values.

Daily streamflow data are needed to calibrate watershed hydrologic parameters in the GWLF model. The USGS streamflow gage (003524000), located on Clinch River at Cleveland, VA, was used to calibrate hydrology for the impaired watershed (Lewis Creek) and USGS streamflow gage (03173000), located on Walker Creek at Bane, VA, was used to calibrate hydrology for the reference watershed. Flow data were available from these gages for the calibration periods: April 1, 1991 - September 30, 2002 (impaired) and April 1, 1981 through May 31, 1999 (reference). The calibration period covered a range of hydrologic conditions, including low- and high-flow conditions as well as seasonal variations. The calibrated GWLF model adequately simulated the hydrology of the impaired watershed.

TMDL development requires the identification of impairment causes and the establishment of numeric endpoints that will allow for the attainment of designated uses and water quality criteria. Numeric endpoints represent the water quality goals that are to be achieved by implementing the load reductions specified in the TMDL. Virginia does not currently have numeric criteria for nutrients (i.e., total phosphorus and total nitrogen), sediment, and other parameters that may be contributing to the impaired condition of the benthic community in these streams. Therefore, a reference watershed approach was used to determine the primary benthic community stressors and to establish

numeric endpoints for these stressors. This approach is based on selecting a non-impaired watershed that shares similar land use, ecoregion, and geomorphological characteristics with the impaired watershed. Stream conditions in the reference watershed are assumed to be representative of the conditions needed for the impaired stream to attain its designated uses. Walker Creek was chosen as the reference watershed and sediment reductions required for Lewis Creek were based on the load calculated for Walker Creek.

Existing Conditions

Impaired and reference watershed models were calibrated for hydrology using different modeling periods and weather input files. To establish baseline (reference watershed) loadings for sediment the GWLF model for Walker Creek was used. For TMDL calculation both the calibrated reference and impaired watersheds were modeled for an eight-year period from 4/1/1991 to 3/31/1999. This was done to standardize the modeling period. In addition, the total area for the reference watershed was reduced to be equal to its paired target watershed. This was necessary because watershed size influences sediment delivery to the stream and other model variables.

The seven-year means for pollutants of concern were determined for each land use/source category in the reference and the impaired watershed. This modeling period was used, after calibration, to represent a broad range of recent weather and hydrologic conditions.

Margin of Safety

While developing allocation scenarios for the TMDL, an explicit margin of safety (MOS) of 10% was used. 10% of the reference sediment load was calculated and added to the sum of the load allocation (LA) and waste load allocation (WLA) to produce the TMDL. It is assumed that a MOS of 10% will account for any uncertainty in the data and the computational methodology used for the analysis, as well as provide an additional level of protection for designated uses.

Allocation Scenarios

Load or waste load allocations were assigned to each source category in the watersheds. Several allocation scenarios were developed for the Lewis Creek watershed to examine the outcome of various load reduction combinations. The recommended scenario for Lewis Creek (Table 3) is based on maintaining the existing percent load contribution from each source category, except for the “barren/transitional/quarries” category which is primarily represented by previously mined lands and abandoned mine lands (AML). A greater sediment reduction was required for these lands (80%) based on discussions with VADMME personnel. Two additional scenarios are presented for comparison purposes (Table 4). Load reductions from agricultural sources are minimized in the first alternative and reductions from urban lands are minimized in the second alternative. In each scenario, loadings from certain source categories were allocated according to their existing loads.

For instance, sediment loads from forest lands represent the natural condition that would be expected to exist; therefore, the loading from forest lands was not reduced. Also, sediment loads from point sources were not reduced because these facilities are currently meeting their pollutant discharge limits and other permit requirements and because these loads were insignificant as compared with other sources. Current permit requirements are expected to result in attainment of the WLAs as required by the TMDL. Point source contributions, even in terms of maximum flow, are minimal, therefore, no reasonable potential exists for these facilities to have a negative impact on water quality and there is no reason to modify the existing permits.

Note that streambank erosion loads were not calculated separately due to the lack of available data. TMDL implementation should include streambank stabilization measures, which can lead to a reduction in sediment loads in these watersheds.

Table 3. Recommended sediment allocations for Lewis Creek

| Source Category | Sediment Load Allocation (lbs/yr) | Sediment % Reduction |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Forest | 302,028 | 0% |
| Water | 0 | 0% |
| Pasture/Hay | 1,412,700 | 33% |
| Cropland | 555,340 | 33% |
| Barren/Transitional/Quarries | 1,421,098 | 80% |
| Urban (includes pervious & impervious) | 109,486 | 33% |
| Groundwater | 0 | 0% |
| Point Sources | 21,732 | 0% |
| TMDL Load (minus MOS) | 3,822,385 | 63.7% |

Table 4. Alternative sediment allocations for Lewis Creek

| Source Category | Minimize Agricultural Reductions | Minimize Urban Reductions |
|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Forest | 0% | 0% |
| Water | 0% | 0% |
| Pasture/Hay | 0% | 35% |
| Cropland | 0% | 34% |
| Barren/Transitional/Quarries | 92% | 80% |
| Urban (includes pervious & impervious) | 92% | 0% |
| Groundwater | 0% | 0% |
| Point Sources | 0% | 0% |

The TMDLs established for these streams consist of a point source waste load allocation (WLA), a nonpoint source load allocation (LA), and an implicit margin of safety (MOS). The sediment TMDLs were based on the total load calculated for the Walker Creek watershed (area adjusted to the appropriate watershed size).

The TMDL equation is as follows:

$$\text{TMDL} = \text{WLA} + \text{LA} + \text{MOS}$$

Benthic TMDL Development for Lewis Creek

The WLA portion of this equation is the total loading assigned to point sources. The LA portion represents the loading assigned to nonpoint sources. The MOS is the portion of loading reserved to account for any uncertainty in the data and the computational methodology used for the analysis.

TMDLs were calculated by adding reference watershed loads for sediment together with point source loads to give the TMDL value (Table 5).

Table 5. TMDL for Lewis Creek

| TMDL (lbs/yr) | LA (lbs/yr) | WLA (lbs/yr) | MOS (lbs/yr) | Overall % Reduction |
|--|-------------|--|--------------|---------------------|
| 4,247,458 | 3,800,653 | Total = 21,732 | 425,072 | 63.7% |
| | | <i>Honaker STP = 18,276</i> | | |
| | | <i>Harold Keene Coal Company:</i> | | |
| | | <i>1201497, discharge point 1 = 35.31</i> | | |
| | | <i>1201497, discharge point 2 = 767.61</i> | | |
| | | <i>1200614, discharge point 1 = 767.61</i> | | |
| | | <i>1200614, discharge point 2 = 104.40</i> | | |
| | | <i>1200614, discharge point 3 = 706.20</i> | | |
| | | <i>1200614, discharge point 5 = 767.61</i> | | |
| | | <i>1200614, discharge point 6 = 153.52</i> | | |
| <i>1200614, discharge point 7 = 153.52</i> | | | | |

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 TMDL Definition and Regulatory Information

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and EPA's Water Quality Planning and Management Regulations (40 CFR Part 130) require states to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for waterbodies that are exceeding water quality standards. TMDLs represent the total pollutant loading that a waterbody can receive without violating water quality standards. The TMDL process establishes the allowable loadings of pollutants or other quantifiable parameters for a waterbody based on the relationship between pollution sources and in-stream water quality conditions. By following the TMDL process, states can establish water quality based controls to reduce pollution from both point and nonpoint sources to restore and maintain the quality of their water resources (USEPA 1991).

1.1.2 Impairment Listing

Lewis Creek is listed as impaired on Virginia's Section 303(d) Total Maximum Daily Load Priority List and Report due to violations of the General Standard (Benthics) (VADEQ 1998 & 2002). Lewis Creek was placed on Virginia's Section 303(d) list in 1998 for partial support of the Aquatic Life Use based on the results of three Rapid Bioassessment Protocol II (RBP II) efforts conducted at VADEQ biomonitoring station 6BLWS000.90. The impaired segment is 4.84 miles and extends from the Lewis Creek/Stone Branch confluence downstream to its confluence with the Clinch River.

1.1.3 Watershed Location

The Lewis Creek watershed is located in Russell County, Virginia, in the Tennessee/Big Sandy River Basin (USGS Hydrologic Unit Code, 06010205) (Figure 1.1). The waterbody identification code (WBID, Virginia Hydrologic Unit) is VAS-P04R.




Figure 1.1 Location of impaired watershed

1.2 Designated Uses and Applicable Water Quality Standards

According to Virginia Water Quality Standards (9 VAC 25-260-5), the term “Water quality standards” means provisions of state or federal law which consist of a designated use or uses for the waters of the Commonwealth and water quality criteria for such waters based upon such uses. Water quality standards are to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the State Water Control Law (§ 62.1-44.2 et seq. of the Code of Virginia) and the federal Clean Water Act (33 USC § 1251 et seq.).

1.2.1 Designation of Uses (9 VAC 25-260-10)

A. All state waters 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).

Lewis Creek does not support the aquatic life designated use due to violations of the general (benthic) criteria (see Section 1.2.2).

1.2.2 Water Quality Standards

General Criteria (9 VAC 25-260-20)

A. All state waters, including wetlands, shall be free from substances attributable to sewage, industrial waste, or other waste in concentrations, amounts, or combinations which contravene established standards or interfere directly or indirectly with designated uses of such water or which are inimical or harmful to human, animal, plant, or aquatic life.

Specific substances to be controlled include, but are not limited to: floating debris, oil scum, and other floating materials; toxic substances (including those which bioaccumulate); substances that produce color, tastes, turbidity, odors, or settle to form sludge deposits; and substances which nourish undesirable or nuisance aquatic plant life. Effluents which tend to raise the temperature of the receiving water will also be controlled.

1.3 Biomonitoring and Assessment

Direct investigations of biological communities using rapid bioassessment protocols, or other biosurvey techniques, are best used for detecting aquatic life impairments and assessing their relative severity (Plafkin et al. 1989). Biological communities reflect overall ecological integrity; therefore, biosurvey results directly assess the status of a waterbody relative to the primary goal of the Clean Water Act. Biological communities integrate the effects of different pollutant stressors and thus provide a holistic measure of their aggregate impact. Communities also integrate the stresses over time and provide an ecological measure of fluctuating environmental conditions.

Many state water quality agencies use benthic macroinvertebrate community data to assess the biological condition of a waterbody. Virginia uses EPA's Rapid Bioassessment Protocol (RBP II) to determine the status of a stream's benthic macroinvertebrate community. This procedure relies on comparisons of the benthic macroinvertebrate community between a monitoring station and its designated reference site. Measurements of the benthic community, called metrics, are used to identify differences between monitored and reference stations. Metrics used in the RBP II protocol include taxa richness, percent contribution of dominant family, and other measurements that provide information on the abundance of pollution tolerant versus pollution intolerant organisms. Biomonitoring stations are typically sampled in the spring and fall of each year. The biological condition scoring criteria and the bioassessment matrix are discussed in the technical document, *Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Streams and Rivers: Benthic Macroinvertebrates and Fish* (Plafkin et al. 1989). The RBPII bioassessment scoring matrix is presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Bioassessment scoring matrix (Plafkin et al. 1989)

| % Compare to Reference Score (a) | Biological Condition Category | Attributes |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| >83% | Non-Impaired | Optimum community structure (composition and dominance). |
| 54 - 79% | Slightly Impaired | Lower species richness due to loss of some intolerant forms. |
| 21 - 50% | Moderately Impaired | Fewer species due to loss of most intolerant forms. |
| <17% | Severely Impaired | Few species present. Dominant by one or two taxa. Only tolerant organisms present. |
| (a) Percentage values obtained that are intermediate to the above ranges require subjective judgement as to the correct placement. | | |

Virginia 305(b)/303(d) guidance states that support of the aquatic life beneficial use is determined by the assessment of conventional pollutants (dissolved oxygen, pH, and temperature); toxic pollutants in the water column, fish tissue and sediments; and biological evaluation of benthic community data (VADEQ 1997). Benthic community assessments are, therefore, used to determine compliance with the General Criteria section of Virginia’s Water Quality Standards (9 VAC 25-260-20). In general, the stream reach that a biomonitoring station represents is classified as impaired if the RBP ranking is either moderately or severely impaired. As a result, Lewis Creek was listed as impaired due to violations of the general standard (aquatic life).

SECTION 2

BENTHIC TMDL ENDPOINT DETERMINATION

2.1 Reference Watershed Approach

Biological communities respond to any number of environmental stressors, including physical impacts and changes in water and sediment chemistry. According to Virginia's 2002 303(d) list, the probable cause of benthic impairment was attributed to siltation from urban non-point sources.

TMDL development requires the identification of impairment causes and the establishment of numeric endpoints that will allow for the attainment of designated uses and water quality criteria. Numeric endpoints represent the water quality goals that are to be achieved by implementing the load reductions specified in the TMDL. Virginia does not currently have numeric criteria for nutrients (i.e., total phosphorus and total nitrogen), sediment, and other parameters that may be contributing to the impaired condition of the benthic community in this stream. A reference watershed approach was, therefore, used to determine the primary benthic community stressors and to establish numeric endpoints for these stressors. This approach is based on selecting non-impaired watersheds that share similar land use, ecoregion, and geomorphological characteristics with the impaired watershed. Stream conditions in the reference watershed are assumed to be representative of the conditions needed for the impaired stream to attain its designated uses. The Virginia Stream Condition Index (VaSCI) was used to define differences in the benthic communities in impaired and reference streams (USEPA, 2003a). Loading rates for pollutants of concern are determined for impaired and reference watersheds through modeling studies. Both point and nonpoint sources are considered in the analysis of pollutant sources and in watershed modeling. Numeric endpoints are based on reference watershed loadings for pollutants of concern and load reductions necessary to meet these endpoints are determined. TMDL load allocation scenarios are then developed based on an analysis of the degree to which contributing sources can be reasonably reduced

2.2 Watershed Characterization

2.2.1 General Information

The Lewis Creek watershed is located in Russell County, Virginia, in the Tennessee/Big Sandy River Basin (USGS Hydrologic Unit Code, 06010205) (Figure 1.1). The watershed is located approximately 4.5 miles southwest of the northeast corner of Russell County and directly abuttes the Russell County/Buchanan County line. The waterbody identification code (WBID, Virginia Hydrologic Unit) is VAS-P04R. The impaired stream length is approximately 4.84 miles and

extends from the Lewis Creek/Stone Branch confluence to its confluence with the Clinch River. The Lewis Creek watershed is approximately 13,959 acres.

2.2.2 Geology

Lewis Creek is located in the transitional Appalachian Plateau (Cumberland Mountains) to Valley and Ridge physiographic province.

The Valley and Ridge physiographic province is characterized by elongate parallel ridges and valleys that are underlain by folded Paleozoic sedimentary rock. This topography is the result of the continuous differential weathering of linear belts of rocks that have been repeatedly exposed and covered by folding and faulting. Cambrian clastic sediments of the western Blue Ridge are overlain by carbonates that made up the Great American Bank. Today these carbonates (up to 3.5 km in thickness) are exposed in the Great Valley (Shenandoah Valley). Well-developed karst topography is characteristic of the Great Valley and many caverns are located on the subsurface.

The Appalachian Plateau lies to the northwest of the Valley and Ridge province. The boundary between the two provinces is a transition from the tight folds of the Valley and Ridge to low-amplitude folds and flat-lying rocks in the Plateau. Although some parts of the Plateau exhibit a low relief plateau-like morphology, much of the Appalachian Plateau is strongly dissected by stream erosion and the topography is rugged. Regional scale folds in the Plateau formed in response to shortening on thrust faults that do not reach the surface and are rooted to the east in the Valley and ridge province. The upper Paleozoic strata of the Plateau are rich in mineral resources such as coal, natural gas, and petroleum.

2.2.3 Soils

Soils data were obtained from the State Soil Geographic (STATSGO) database which includes general soils data and map unit delineations for the United States. GIS coverages provide accurate locations for the soil map units (MUIDs) at a scale of 1:250,000 (NRCS, 1994). A map unit is composed of several soil series having similar properties. STATSGO map units that cover a portion of the Lewis Creek watershed are shown in Figure 2.1. The predominant map unit in this watershed is VA078. Also present are STATSGO map units VA003 and VA017. The following soil descriptions are based on NRCS Official Soil Descriptions (1998-2002)

STATSGO map unit - VA0078 is composed of the following soil series, in order of dominance: Berks, Pineville, Buchanan, Cedar creek, Chagrin, Dekalb, Gilpin, Kaymine, Lily, and Rock Outcrop. The two dominant soil series are the Berks series (40%) and the Pineville series (30%). The Berks series consists of moderately deep, well drained soils formed in residuum weathered from shale, silstone and fine grained sandstone on rounded and dissected uplands. Permeability is moderate or moderately rapid and slopes range from 0 to 80 percent. The Pineville series consists

of very deep, well drained soils with moderately rapid permeability. Formed in colluvium derived sandstone, shale, and siltstone, these soils are found on mountain coves, lower sideslopes, and footslopes. Slopes range from 8 to 80 percent, but are predominantly 25 to 60 percent.




Figure 2.1 STATSGO soil types in the Lewis Creek watershed

2.2.4 Climate

The area's climate is typical of other transitional Appalachian Plateau to Valley and Ridge areas in Virginia. Weather data for this watershed can be characterized using the Grundy meteorological station (NCDC), which is located approximately 11.98 miles north-northwest of the watershed (period of record: 1948-2003). The growing season lasts from April 20 through October 24 in a typical year (SERCC 2003). Average annual precipitation is 44.25 inches with July having the highest average precipitation (4.92 inches). Average annual snowfall is 17.5 inches, most of which occurs in January and February. The average annual maximum and minimum daily temperature is

68.5°F and 42.7°F, respectively. The highest monthly temperatures are recorded in August (86.4°F - avg. maximum) and the lowest temperatures are recorded in January (22.3°F - avg. minimum).

2.2.5 Land Use

General land use/land cover data for the Lewis Creek watershed was extracted from the Multi-Resolution Land Characterization (MRLC) database for the state of Virginia (MRLC, 1992) and is shown in Figure 2.2. This database was derived from satellite imagery taken during the early 1990s and is the most current detailed land use data available. Land uses in the watershed include various urban, agricultural, and forest categories (Table 2.1 and Figure 2.2). Over 82% of the watershed is forested, while approximately 13% of the watershed is used for agricultural purposes. Lands classified as barren/transitional/quarries account for approximately 3% of the watershed. This land use category is primarily represented by previously mined lands and abandoned mine lands (AML) in the watershed. Urban lands account for less than 2% of the watershed. Individual land use types were consolidated into six broader categories that have similar erosion/pollutant transport attributes for modeling.

Table 2.1 MRLC and consolidated land uses in the Lewis Creek watershed

| MRLC Land Use | Area (acres) | Percent | Consolidated Land Use | Area (acres) | Percent |
|---|--------------|---------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------|
| Woody Wetlands | 1.0 | 0.01% | Forest | 11,489.6 | 82.31% |
| Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands | 1.2 | 0.01% | | | |
| Deciduous Forest | 9,561.7 | 68.50% | | | |
| Evergreen Forest | 344.7 | 2.47% | | | |
| Mixed Forest | 1,581.0 | 11.33% | | | |
| Open Water | 16.1 | 0.12% | Water | 16.1 | 0.12% |
| Pasture/Hay | 1,595.3 | 11.43% | Pasture/Hay | 1,595.3 | 11.43% |
| Row Crops | 228.6 | 1.64% | Cropland | 228.6 | 1.64% |
| Quarries/Strip Mines/Gravel Pits | 74.6 | 0.53% | Barren/ Transitional/ Quarries* | 396.1 | 2.84% |
| Transitional | 321.5 | 2.30% | | | |
| High Intensity Residential | 1.7 | 0.01% | Urban (pervious & impervious) | 233.5 | 1.67% |
| High Intensity Commercial/ Industrial/ Transportation | 0.7 | 0.01% | | | |
| Low Intensity Residential | 206.1 | 1.48% | | | |
| High Intensity Commercial/ Industrial/ Transportation - impervious | 0.7 | 0.01% | | | |
| High Intensity Residential - impervious | 1.2 | 0.01% | | | |
| Low Intensity Residential - impervious | 23.0 | 0.16% | | | |
| Total | 13,959 | 100% | Total | 13,959 | 100% |

*Note: The Barren/Transitional/Quarries land use category is primarily represented by previously mined lands and abandoned mine lands (AML) in the Lewis Creek watershed.




Figure 2.2 MRLC land use in the Lewis Creek watershed

2.2.6 Ecoregion

The Lewis Creek watershed is located in the transitional Central Appalachians to Central Appalachian Ridges and Valleys ecoregion - Level III classifications 69 and 67 respectively (Woods et al. 1999).

The Central Appalachian ecoregion, stretching from central Pennsylvania to northern Tennessee, is primarily a high, dissected, rugged plateau composed of sandstone, shale, conglomerate, and coal. The rugged terrain, cool climate, and infertile soils limit agriculture, resulting in a mostly forested land cover. The high hills and low mountains are covered by a mixed mesophytic forest with areas of Appalachian oak and northern hardwood forest. Bituminous coal mines are common, and have caused the siltation and acidification of streams.

The Central Appalachian Ridges and Valley is a northeast-southwest trending, relatively low-lying, but diverse ecoregion, sandwiched between generally higher, more rugged mountainous regions with greater forest cover. As a result of extreme folding and faulting events, the region's roughly parallel ridges and valleys have a variety of widths, heights, and geologic materials, including limestone, dolomite, shale, siltstone, sandstone, chert, mudstone, and marble. Springs and caves are relatively numerous. Present-day forests cover about 50% of the region. The ecoregion has a diversity of aquatic habitats and species of fish.

At a finer scale, the Lewis Creek watershed is located in the Dissected Appalachian Plateau, Southern Limestone/Dolomite Valleys, Southern Shale Valleys, Southern Sandstone Ridges and Southern Dissected Ridges and Knobs subcoregions - Level IV classifications 69d, 67f, 67g, 67h and 67i respectively (Woods et al. 1999) (Figure 2.3).

The Dissected Appalachian Plateau, or Cumberland Mountains, subcoregion is a strongly dissected region with steep slopes, very narrow ridgetops, and extensive forests. It is primarily underlain by flat-lying Pennsylvania sandstone, shale, and coal of the Pottsville Group. Typically crests range in elevation from 1,200 feet to about 3,699 feet and are from 350 to 550 feet above narrow valleys. Well-drained soils of low fertility have developed on the sedimentary rocks, which originally supported mixed Mesophytic Forest (Kuchler, 1964). Today, commercial woodland is common in the region and approximately 90% of the rugged ecoregion is forested, or reverting to it. Much of the remainder is mined for coal, and stream degradation has occurred. In wider valleys, scattered towns and small-scale livestock farms are found.

The Southern Limestone/Dolomite Valleys subcoregion is a lowland characterized by broad, undulating, fertile valleys that are extensively farmed. Sinkholes, underground streams, and other karst features have developed on the underlying limestone/dolomite, and as a result, the drainage density is low. Where streams occur they tend to have gentle gradients, plentiful year round flow, and distinctive fish assemblages. Ordovician and Cambrian limestone and dolomite commonly underlie the region. Interbedded with the carbonates are other rocks, including shale. Crestal elevations vary from 1,640 to 3,200 feet.

The Southern Shale Valleys subcoregion is characterized by rolling valleys and low hills and is underlain mostly by fine grained rock. The Brallier, Rome, Elbrook, Chemung, and Clinton formations commonly underlie the regions. The underlying rock is not as permeable as limestone, so surface streams are larger and drainage density is higher than in limestone areas. There is also more erosion within the subcoregion and stream turbidity can, therefore, be comparatively high and the riverine habitat relatively impaired. Local relief varies from about 125 feet to 650 feet and woodlands generally occur on steeper sites, while farming is common elsewhere.

The Southern Sandstone Ridges subcoregion is composed of high, steep, forested ridges with narrow crests. The ridge-forming strata are composed of folded, interbedded Paleozoic sandstone

and conglomerate. Other less resistant rocks, such as shale and siltstone, form the side slopes. Today, extensive forest covers the region. Crestal elevations range from about 2,300 feet to 3,450 feet and local relief ranges from approximately 500 to 1,500 feet.




Figure 2.3 Level IV ecoregions in the Lewis Creek watershed

2.3 Reference Watershed Selection

The reference watershed selection process is based on a comparison of key watershed, stream and biological characteristics. The goal of the process is to select one or several similar, unimpaired reference watersheds that can be used to identify benthic community stressors and develop TMDL endpoints. Reference watershed selection was based on the results of VADEQ biomonitoring studies and comparisons of key watershed characteristics. Data used in the reference watershed selection process for Lewis Creek are shown in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2 Reference watershed selection data

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Biomonitoring Data | Ecoregion Coverages |
| Topography | Land use Distribution |
| Soils | Watershed Size |
| Water Quality Data | Point Source Inventory |

Tetra Tech, VADEQ, and USEPA recently developed the Virginia Stream Condition Index (VaSCI), which provides a more detailed and reliable assessment of the benthic macroinvertebrate community in Virginia’s non-coastal, wadeable streams (USEPA, 2003a). This new multi-metric index, was used to compare relative differences in the benthic community between impaired and reference streams. This index allows for the evaluation of biological condition as a factor in the reference watershed selection process and can be used to measure improvements in the benthic macroinvertebrate community in the future. VADEQ biomonitoring data were used to calculate the VaSCI scores shown in Table 2.3. The Walker Creek scores are shown for comparison.

Table 2.3 Bioassessment index comparison

| Station ID | Organization | Stream | Number of Samples | VaSCI Score |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|
| 6BLWS000.90 | DEQ | Lewis Creek | 8 | 43 |
| 6BLWS003.88 | DEQ | | 2 | 56 |
| Lewis1 | GMU | | 1 | 42 |
| Average | | | | 47 |
| WLK050.85 | DEQ | Walker Creek | 2 | 75 |

2.4 Selected Reference Watershed

The Walker Creek watershed, delineated at the VADEQ biomonitoring station, was selected as the reference for this TMDL study (Figure 2.4). This determination was based on the degree of similarity between this stream and its associated watershed to the impaired stream and the results of the VaSCI scores. Figures 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7 show comparisons of the MRLC land use, soils, and subcoregion distributions within the Lewis Creek watershed and the Walker Creek watershed. Few streams monitored by VADEQ in the region were assessed as unimpaired or slightly impaired; therefore, the availability of reference streams is limited. The land use distributions for Walker Creek and Lewis Creek are similar with forest and pasture/hay lands the dominant land uses in both watersheds. The upper portion of the Lewis Creek watershed is located within the Cumberland Mountains geologic and subcoregion province, which is not represented in the Walker Creek watershed. The Lewis Creek impaired segment, however, is located in the lower portion of the watershed that has more similar soil and subcoregion characteristics by comparison.




Figure 2.4 Reference watershed location and monitoring stations




Figure 2.5 MRLC land use in the impaired and reference watersheds




Figure 2.6 STATSGO soil types in the impaired and reference watersheds




Figure 2.7 Level IV ecoregions in the impaired and reference watersheds

SECTION 3

STRESSOR IDENTIFICATION

3.1 Stressor Identification Process

Biological assessments are useful in detecting impairment, but they do not necessarily identify the cause(s) of impairment. EPA developed the *Stressor Identification: Technical Guidance Document* to assist water resource managers in identifying stressors or combinations of stressors that cause biological impairment (Cormier et al. 2000). Elements of the stressor identification process were used to evaluate and identify the primary stressors of the benthic community in Lewis Creek. Watershed and water quality data from this stream, reference watershed data, and field observations were used to help identify candidate causes.

3.2 Candidate Causes

Based on information provided by VADEQ and watershed data collected at the beginning of the TMDL study, it was hypothesized that excessive sedimentation was responsible for the listed benthic impairments. Field visits to Lewis Creek were conducted by Tetra Tech, GMU, and VADEQ personnel on April 10 and June 26, 2003 to gather information on stream and watershed characteristics for stressor identification and modeling studies. Field observations confirmed the likelihood that sedimentation was primarily responsible for negative impacts to the benthic macroinvertebrate community in this stream. Potential stressors and their relationships to benthic community condition are discussed below.

3.2.1 Low Dissolved Oxygen

Organic enrichment can cause low dissolved oxygen (DO) levels which stress benthic organisms. In general, high nitrogen and phosphorus levels can lead to increased production of algae and macrophytes, which can result in the depletion of oxygen in the water column through metabolic respiration. In addition, at higher water temperatures the concentration of dissolved oxygen is lower because the solubility of oxygen (and other gases) decreases with increasing temperature. Higher water temperatures can be caused by the loss of shading, higher evaporation rates, reduced stream flow, and other factors.

Aquatic organisms, including benthic macroinvertebrates, are dependent upon an adequate concentration of dissolved oxygen. Less tolerant organisms generally cannot survive or are out-competed by more tolerant organisms under low dissolved oxygen conditions. This process reduces

diversity and alters community composition from a natural state. Aquatic insects and other benthic organisms serve as food items for fishes, therefore, alterations in the benthic community can impact fish feeding ecology (Hayward and Margraf 1987; Leach et al. 1977).

3.2.2 Sedimentation

Excessive sedimentation from anthropogenic sources is a common problem that can impact the stream biota in a number of ways. Deposited sediments reduce habitat complexity by filling pools, critical riffle areas, and the interstitial spaces used by aquatic invertebrates. Substrate size is a particularly important factor that influences the abundance and distribution of aquatic insects. Sediment particles at high concentrations can directly affect aquatic invertebrates by clogging gill surfaces and lowering respiration capacity. Suspended sediment also increases turbidity in the water column which can affect the feeding efficiency of visual predators and filter feeders. In addition, pollutants, such as phosphorus, adsorb to sediment particles and are transported to streams through erosion processes.

3.2.3 Habitat Alteration

The relative lack of riparian vegetation along sections of these streams was considered to be a potential factor affecting the benthic community. Minimal riparian vegetation was observed in specific areas during the TMDL field visit. In this watershed, riparian areas are often used to grow crops and as pasture for livestock. Riparian areas perform many functions that are critical to the ecology of the streams that they border. Functional values include:

- Flood detention
- Plant roots stabilize banks and prevent erosion
- Canopy vegetation provides shading (decreases water temperature and increases baseflow through lower evaporation rates)
- Nutrient cycling
- Wildlife habitat

3.2.4 Toxic Pollutants

Toxic pollutants in the water column and sediment can result in acute and chronic effects on aquatic organisms. Increased mortality rates, reduced growth and fecundity, respiratory problems, tumors, deformities, and other consequences have been documented in toxicity studies of aquatic organisms. Degraded water quality conditions and other environmental stressors can lead to higher rates of incidence of these problems.

3.3 Monitoring Stations

There are two current and two historical VADEQ water quality monitoring stations located in the Lewis Creek watershed. Biomonitoring data are collected at the VADEQ station 6BLWS000.90, which is located south of the Town of Honaker. As part of the benthic TMDL study, George Mason University (GMU) personnel conducted water quality and biomonitoring at three stations on Lewis Creek. GMU station LewisWQ1 is co-located with VADEQ water quality monitoring station 6BLWS000.06, near the mouth. Benthic samples collected at GMU stations LewisWQ2 and LewisWQ3 are currently being processed. All of the VADEQ and GMU monitoring stations located on Lewis Creek are listed in Table 3.1 and Figure 3.1.

Table 3.1 Monitoring stations on Lewis Creek

| Station | Organization | Station Type | Location | Data Period |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---|-------------|
| 6BLWS000.06 | VADEQ | WQ | Near Honaker, Rt. 653 bridge, 45 yards upstream of confluence | 2001-2003 |
| 6BLWS000.61 | VADEQ | WQ | Off Rt. 653, below Honaker STP | 1972-1979 |
| 6BLWS000.90 | VADEQ | Bio | Rt. 624, below STP | 1995-2002 |
| 6BLWS001.61 | VADEQ | WQ | Rt. 80 bridge above Honaker STP | 1973-1976 |
| 6BLWS003.88 | VADEQ | WQ, Bio | Near Honaker off Rt. 637 | 2001 |
| LewisWQ1 | GMU | WQ, Bio | Lewis Cr @just above mouth | 2003 |
| LewisWQ2 | GMU | WQ, Bio | Lewis Cr @624 (Hickory Junction) | 2003 |
| LewisWQ3 | GMU | WQ, Bio | Lewis Cr @upper site off Rt. 624 | 2003 |




Figure 3.1 Location of Lewis Creek monitoring stations

3.4 Monitoring Data Summary

3.4.1 Water Quality Criteria

Lewis Creek is classified as a Mountainous Zone Water (Class IV) in Virginia’s Water Quality Standards (9 VAC 25-260-50). Numeric criteria for dissolved oxygen (DO), pH, and maximum temperature for Class IV waters are shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Virginia numeric criteria for Class IV waters

| Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | | pH (standard units) | Maximum Temperature (°C) |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Minimum | Daily Average | | |
| 4 | 5 | 6.0 - 9.0 | 31 |

3.4.2 Water Quality Summary Plots

Selected parameters were plotted to examine spatial trends and to compare to reference stream conditions. Water quality monitoring data collected by VADEQ and GMU are shown in a time-series format for a period of record that includes data from 1985 onwards (Figures 3.2 through 3.16). Time-series plots show all the individual observations over the period of record for each station.

Water quality data collected during biomonitoring field visits are summarized separately for each station. No historical biomonitoring data are available. The historical data collected at Stations 6BLWS001.61 (1973-1976) and 6BLWS000.61 (1972-1979) give additional information regarding past water quality conditions on Lewis Creek.

*Note that GMU water quality data were added to the VADEQ data set for each station because of the approximate co-location of VADEQ and GMU monitoring stations on both streams. Stations are identified using VADEQ station codes in each plot. Time-series plots show the individual observations for all VADEQ and GMU data.

Dissolved Oxygen

DO data for Lewis Creek are shown in figure 3.2. DO concentrations measured at VADEQ and GMU monitoring stations were above established criteria. The lowest measurements were recorded at VADEQ station 6BLWS0000.06.




Figure 3.2 Time-series DO values for Lewis Creek stations (no 1970's data available)

Water Temperature

Surface water temperature data for all monitoring stations are shown in Figure 3.3. All observations were below the Class IV maximum criteria (31 degrees Celsius). For the current dataset (2001 to present), the highest single observation was recorded at GMU station LewisWQ1, which is co-located with VADEQ station 6BLWS000.06.




Figure 3.3 Time-series temperature values for Lewis Creek stations

pH

pH data for Lewis Creek are shown in Figure 3.4. All pH values were within the acceptable Class IV range (6.0 – 9.0 standard units). VADEQ station 6BLWS000.06 displayed the greatest fluctuation in pH conditions (2001 to present).




Figure 3.4 Time-series pH values for Lewis Creek stations

Conductivity (Specific Conductance)

Conductivity data are presented in Figure 3.5. High conductivity values were recorded at each monitoring station. Overall, station 6CBEV000.06 had the highest conductivity measurements.




Figure 3.5 Time-series lab conductivity values for Lewis Creek stations (no 1970's data available)

Phosphorus

Phosphorus is generally present in waters and wastewaters in different species of soluble (dissolved) and insoluble (particulate or suspended) phosphates, including inorganic (ortho- and condensed) phosphates and organic phosphates. Major sources of phosphorus include detergents, fertilizers, domestic sewage, and agricultural runoff. Total phosphorus and orthophosphate data are presented in Figures 3.7 and 3.8. GMU station LewisWQ2 had the highest single observation, followed by VADEQ station 6BLWS000.06. These observations were just above 0.10 mg/L. These data are considered to be within the range of expected background conditions for this stream type.




Figure 3.7 Time-series total phosphorus values for Lewis Creek stations (no 1970's data available)

Nitrogen

Major sources of nitrogen include municipal and industrial wastewater, septic tanks, feed lot discharges, animal wastes, runoff from fertilized agricultural field and lawns, and discharges from car exhausts. Nitrate and Nitrite data are presented in Figures 3.9 through 3.11. For the recent data period, VADEQ station 6BLWS000.06 had the highest concentrations. For the entire period of record, the highest observations were recorded during the 1970's.




Figure 3.9 Time-series nitrate values for Lewis Creek stations




Figure 3.10 Time-series nitrite values for Lewis Creek stations




Figure 3.11 Time-series nitrite+nitrate values for Lewis Creek stations

Benthic TMDL Development for Lewis Creek

TKN data are presented in Figure 3.12.




Figure 3.12 Time-series TKN values for Lewis Creek stations




Figure 3.16 Time-series turbidity values for Lewis Creek stations

Station 6BLWS000.61 often showed the poorest water quality of all sampling stations on Lewis Creek. This station had the highest BOD5, orthophosphate, nitrate, nitrite, TKN and total ammonia concentrations and recorded the lowest pH level.

Land use in the Lewis Creek watershed is shown in Section 2. The watershed primarily consists of forest land and pasture/hay land, though the impaired stream flows through the town of Honaker, which is heavily developed along its stream banks.

3.4.3 DO Analysis

Primary producers (algae and macrophytes) produce oxygen during the day through photosynthesis and use oxygen at night through respiration. This diel photosynthesis/respiration cycle results in higher DO concentrations during the day and lower concentrations at night. VADEQ and GMU AWQM data collected at Lewis Creek stations were compared to the daily average (5.0 mg/L) and minimum (4 mg/L) DO criteria listed in Virginia’s Water Quality Standards to help determine if DO conditions are considered to be a primary cause of the benthic impairment. DO data collected indicated acceptable DO conditions in Lewis Creek (Figure 3.2). There were no ambient observations below the 5.0 mg/L daily average criteria. The lowest DO measurement recorded (at VADEQ station 6BLWS0000.61) was above 7.0 mg/L. To further assess DO conditions in Lewis Creek, VADEQ measured DO at stations 6BLWS000.06 and 6BLWS000.90 in the early morning

hours on September 10, 2002 (Table 3.3). DO concentrations during this sampling event were also greater than the daily average and minimum DO criteria.

Table 3.3 VADEQ diurnal DO study (September 2002)

| Station | Date/Time | Temperature (Celsius) | PH (std. units) | Conductivity (umhos) | DO (mg/L) |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------|
| 6BLWS000.06 | 9/10/02 7:15am | 16.65 | 7.74 | 537 | 7.28 |
| 6BLWS000.90 | 9/10/02 6:23am | 17.4 | 7.48 | 556 | 5.94 |

3.4.4 Biomonitoring Data

Available biomonitoring data were summarized to help characterize the benthic community in Lewis Creek. The Virginia Stream Condition Index (VaSCI) was used to assess the biological community in each stream. The benthic multimetric scores provided by this index allow for a more detailed and reliable assessment of the benthic macroinvertebrate community. VADEQ and GMU biomonitoring data were used to calculate the VaSCI score for the biomonitoring station (Table 3.4). These scores are lower than comparable scores at several reference stations in the region.

Table 3.4 VaSCI standardized scores for Lewis Creek

| Station ID | Organization | Stream | Sample Date | VaSCI Index Score |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| 6BLWS000.90 | VADEQ | Lewis Creek | 5/9/95 | 33 |
| | | | 11/30/95 | 54 |
| | | | 5/21/97 | 42 |
| | | | 10/30/97 | 57 |
| | | | 6/22/98 | 42 |
| | | | 11/4/99 | 49 |
| | | | 6/6/00 | 25 |
| | | | 6/5/02 | 43 |
| Average | | | | 43 |
| 6BLWS003.88 | VADEQ | Lewis Creek | 4/30/01 | 58 |
| | | | 10/18/01 | 53 |
| Average | | | | 56 |
| Lewis1 | GMU | Lewis Creek | 6/26/03 | 42 |
| Average | | | | 42 |

Taxa data collected by GMU personnel in June of 2003 are shown in Table 2-4. This table includes data for one site on Lewis Creek. The high number of hydrropsychids, chironomids, and oligochaetes indicate excessive sedimentation and corresponding habitat problems.

Table 3.5 GMU macroinvertebrate assessment

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Site ID | | LewisWQ1 |
| Stream name | | Lewis Creek |
| Site location brief description | | Just above mouth |
| Corresponding DEQ station | | Near 6BLWS000.06 |
| Date | | 6/26/2003 |
| Organisms Identified | | |
| Order | Family | Count |
| Trichoptera (Caddisflies) | Hydropsychidae | 24 |
| Ephemeroptera (Mayflies) | Ephemerellidae | 3 |
| Plecoptera (Stoneflies) | Chloroperlidae | 3 |
| Diptera (True flies) | Chironomidae (midges) | 30 |
| | Simuliidae (Black flies) | 24 |
| | Tipuliidae (crane flies) | 5 |
| Coleoptera (Water Beetles) | Elmidae | 17 |
| | Psephenidae | 9 |
| Hemiptera (Waterbugs) | | |
| Crustacea | Isopoda/ Asellidae (sowbugs) | 1 |
| | Decapoda/ Astacidae (Crayfish) | 1 |
| P. Annelida | C. Oligochaeta (Earthworms) | 94 |
| | C. Hirudinea (Leeches) | 2 |
| P. Mollusca | C. Gastropoda (Snails) | 1 |
| Total | | 214 |

3.4.5 Rapid Bioassessment Protocol - Habitat Data

Rapid Bioassessment Protocol (RBP) habitat data for Lewis Creek VADEQ biomonitoring stations are shown in Table 3.6. In June of 2003, GMU personnel conducted an assessment of the habitat at one site on Lewis Creek. These habitat scores are shown in Table 3.7. Low scores were noted for sedimentation-related parameters. These data were used to examine possible sedimentation and other habitat impacts to the benthic community, along with the TSS and turbidity data discussed above. All habitat scores were evaluated and rated by observation (0-20, with higher scores being better). The following parameters are included in the habitat assessment for Lewis Creek:

- Channel alteration – measure of large-scale changes in the shape of the stream channel
- Bank condition/stability – whether the stream banks are eroded (or have the potential for erosion)
- Bank vegetative protection – the amount of vegetative protection afforded to the stream bank and the near-stream portion of the riparian zone
- In-stream cover (for fish)
- Embeddedness – extent to which rocks (gravel, cobble, and boulders) and snags are covered or sunken into the silt, sand, or mud of the stream bottom
- Channel flow status – degree to which the channel is filled with water
- Grazing or other bank disruptive pressure
- Frequency of riffles

- Riparian vegetation zone width – width of natural vegetation from the edge of the stream bank out through the riparian zone
- Sediment deposition – amount of sediment that has accumulated in pools and the changes that have occurred to the stream bottom as a result of deposition
- Epifaunal substrate – relative quantity and variety of natural structures in the stream for spawning and nursery functions of aquatic macrofauna
- Velocity/depth regimes

Table 3.6 VADEQ RBP habitat scores for Lewis Creek

| StationID | CollDate | Total Habitat Score | Bank condition | Bank vegetative protection | Channel alteration | Channel flow status | Embed-dedness | Grazing/ bank disruptive pressure | Instream Cover | Rifle frequency of stream | Riparian zone width | Sediment deposition | Velocity-depth regimes |
|-----------|------------|---------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| LWS000.90 | 5/9/1995 | 177 | 14 | 18 | 19 | 19 | 9 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 10 | 10 | 17 |
| LWS000.90 | 11/30/1995 | 178 | 15 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 13 | 12 | 15 | 17 | 8 | 11 | 15 |
| LWS000.90 | 5/21/1997 | 173 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 6 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 15 | 9 | 15 |
| LWS000.90 | 10/30/1997 | 173 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 13 | 9 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 10 | 12 | 15 |
| LWS000.90 | 6/22/1998 | 189 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 19 | 15 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 12 | 17 | 15 |
| LWS000.90 | 11/4/1999 | 147 | Habitat Data are currently available, however, a key to notation needs to be supplied by VA DEQ | | | | | | | | | | |
| LWS000.90 | 6/6/2000 | 183 | Habitat Data are currently available, however, a key to notation needs to be supplied by VA DEQ | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 3.7 GMU RBP habitat scores for Lewis Creek

| StationID | CollDate | Total Habitat Score | Bank Stability | Vegetative Protection | Channel Alteration | Channel Flow Status | Embed-dedness | Epifaunal substrate/ Available cover | Frequency of Riffles | Riparian Vegetative Zone Width | Sediment Deposition | Velocity/ Depth Regime |
|-----------|-----------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| LewisWQ1 | 6/26/2003 | 101 | 3.5 | 8 | 14 | 17 | 6 | 11 | 15 | 6.5 | 5 | 15 |

Total suspended solids (TSS) data, habitat data collected during biomonitoring site visits, and field observations made during TMDL site visits were used to examine the likelihood of sedimentation impacts on the benthic community in Lewis Creek. Station 6BLWS00.161 had the highest TSS concentrations recorded.

3.5 Toxic Pollutants - Surface Water

Virginia Water Quality Standards list acute and chronic criteria for surface waters (9 VAC 25-260-140). These numeric criteria were developed for metals, pesticides, and other toxic chemicals which can cause acute and chronic toxicity effects on aquatic life and human health. Available water quality data were compared to these criteria to determine possible effects on aquatic life. Ammonia data collected on Lewis Creek (see Section 3.4.2, Figure 3.13) were compared to the calculated acute and chronic criteria. An exceedance of the acute criteria for ammonia was recorded at VADEQ station 6BLWS000.61 on August 26, 1974. The total ammonia concentration was 4.7 mg/L and the calculated acute criteria for non-trout waters was 3.20 mg/L. Six exceedances of the chronic criteria for ammonia were noted from October 30, 1974 through July 19, 1976. There were no exceedances

recorded since 1976. All other available water quality data were compared to these criteria to determine possible effects on aquatic life and there were no exceedances of water column metals criteria.

3.6 Toxic Pollutants - Sediment

Virginia's Water Quality Standards and updated 305(b) assessment guidance for sediment parameters were consulted to determine if the available data indicate high levels for metals, pesticides, or other constituents that can cause acute or chronic toxicity effects on aquatic life. Sediment data were assessed using EPA Probable Effects Concentration (PEC) thresholds and the NOAA Effects Range-Median (ER-M) and Effects Range-Low (ER-L) screening values. No exceedances were noted for sampled parameters.

3.7 EPA Toxicity Testing

A chronic toxicity study using fathead minnows (*Pimephales promelas*) and *Ceriodaphnia dubia* was conducted on ambient water samples collected from Lewis Creek on January 27-29, 2003. Test results did not indicate an acute or chronic toxic response in the bioassay organisms.

3.8 Summary

Based on the above analysis, it is hypothesized that excessive sedimentation from non-point source inputs is primarily responsible for the benthic impairment in Lewis Creek. Possible toxicity problems were not indicated; however, stakeholders discussed historic mining activities in the watershed at the first public meeting. DO concentrations are aVADEQuate to support aquatic life, therefore, nutrient (phosphorus) reductions do not appear to be required.

SECTION 4

SOURCE ASSESSMENT - SEDIMENT

Point and nonpoint sources of sediment were assessed in TMDL development. The source assessment was used as the basis of model development and analysis of TMDL allocation options. A variety of information was used to characterize sources in impaired and reference watersheds including: MRLC land use/land cover data, water quality monitoring and point source data provided by VADEQ, STATSGO soils data (NRCS), site visit observations, literature sources, and other information. Procedures and assumptions used in estimating sediment sources in impaired and reference watersheds are described in the following sections. Whenever possible, data development and source characterization was accomplished using locally-derived information.

4.1 Assessment of Nonpoint Sources

Erosion of the land results in the transport of sediment to receiving waters through various processes. Factors that influence erosion include characteristics of the soil, vegetative cover, topography, and climate. Nonpoint sources, such as agricultural land uses and construction areas, are large contributors of sediment because the percentage of vegetative cover is typically lower. Urban areas can also contribute quantities of sediment to surface waters through the build-up and eventual washoff of soil particles, dust, debris, and other accumulated materials. Pervious urban areas, such as lawns and other green spaces contribute sediment in the same fashion as low-intensity pasture areas or other similar land uses. In addition, streambank erosion and scouring processes can result in the transport of additional sediment loads.

4.1.1 Agricultural Land

Agricultural land was identified as a primary source of sediment in the Lewis Creek watershed. Agricultural runoff can contribute increased pollutant loads when farm management practices allow soils rich in nutrients from fertilizers or animal waste to be washed into the stream, increasing in-stream sediment and phosphorus levels. The erosion potential of cropland and over-grazed pasture land is particularly high due to the lack of year-round vegetative cover. The use of cover crops and other management practices have been shown to reduce the transport of pollutant loads from agricultural lands. Streambank erosion is also a potential source of sediment in agricultural watersheds, due to the removal of riparian vegetation and other factors. Bank stabilization measures and riparian plantings can significantly reduce streambank erosion.

MRLC land use coverages for Lewis Creek and Walker Creek are shown in Section 2.

4.1.2 Forest Land

Agricultural and urban development in these watersheds has replaced some mature forest areas, especially along the stream and at lower elevations. The sediment yield from undisturbed forest lands, especially during the growing season, is low due to the amount of dense vegetative cover which stabilizes soils and reduces rainfall impact.

4.1.3 Urban Areas

Urban land uses represented in the MRLC land use coverage include commercial, industrial, transportation, and residential areas. Urban land uses consist of pervious and impervious areas. Stormwater runoff from impervious areas, such as paved roads and parking lots, contribute pollutants that accumulate on these surfaces directly to receiving waters without being filtered by soil or vegetation. Sediment deposits in impervious areas originate from vehicle exhaust, industrial and commercial activities, outdoor storage piles, and other sources. In addition, stormwater runoff can cause streambank erosion and bottom scouring through high flow volumes, resulting in increased sedimentation and other habitat impacts.

The primary urban sources of sediment are construction sites and other pervious lands. Construction sites have high erosion rates due to the removal of vegetation and top soil. Typical erosion rates for construction sites are 35 to 45 tons per acre per year as compared to 1 to 10 tons per acre per year for cropland. Residential lawns and other green spaces contribute sediment in the same fashion as low-intensity pasture areas or other similar land uses.

Urban land use areas were separated into pervious and impervious fractions based on the estimated percent impervious surface of each urban land use category. Field observations and literature values were used to determine the effective percent imperviousness of urban land uses (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 Percent imperviousness of urban land uses

| Urban land uses | Percent impervious |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| High Intensity Residential | 40% |
| Low Intensity Residential | 20% |

4.1.4 Previously Mined Lands & Abandoned Mine Lands (AML)

Mining activities can contribute excessive sedimentation to streams through runoff events. Active mining operations are permitted by the Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy (VADMME) and are issued NPDES permits (see Section 4.2). Previously mined lands and abandoned mine lands (AML) are nonpoint sources of sediment because of the lack of adequate

cover, erosion control, and other sediment control practices. These lands are included in the “barren/transitional/quarries” land use category, as described in Section 2.

4.2 Assessment of Point Sources

Point sources can contribute sediment loads to surface waters through effluent discharges. These facilities are permitted through the Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) program that is managed by VADEQ. VPDES individual permits are issued to facilities that must comply with permit conditions that include specific discharge limits and requirements. General permits are granted for smaller facilities that must comply with a standard set of permit conditions, depending on facility type. Currently, there is only one VPDES permitted point source facility in the Lewis Creek watershed (Table 4.2). In addition, there are several NPDES permitted mining discharge points located in the watershed (Table 4.3). Mining permits are issued by the Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals, and Energy (VADMME).

Table 4.2 VPDES permitted facilities in the Lewis Creek watershed

| VPDES Permit No. | Facility Name | Discharge Type | TSS Permitted Concentration (mg/L) | Design Flow (MGD) | TSS Load (lbs/yr) |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| VA0026387 | Honaker STP | Municipal | 30 | 0.2000 | 18,276 |

Table 4.3 VADMME mining discharge points in the Lewis Creek watershed

| NPDES Permit No. | Discharge Point (Outfall) | Company Name | Average TSS Concentration (mg/L) | Average or Design Flow (MGD) | Annual Sediment Load (lbs/yr) |
|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1201497 | 1 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0003 | 35.31 |
| 1201497 | 2 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0072 | 767.61 |
| 1200614 | 1 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0072 | 767.61 |
| 1200614 | 2 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0010 | 104.40 |
| 1200614 | 3 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0066 | 706.20 |
| 1200614 | 5 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0072 | 767.61 |
| 1200614 | 6 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0014 | 153.52 |
| 1200614 | 7 | Harold Keene Coal Company | 35 | 0.0014 | 153.52 |

SECTION 5

WATERSHED MODELING

5.1 Overall Technical Approach

As discussed in Section 2.1, a reference watershed approach was used in this study to develop TMDLs for Lewis Creek. A watershed model and stream module (developed by Tetra Tech, Inc.) were used to simulate the sediment loads from potential sources in impaired and reference watersheds. The watershed model used in this study was the Generalized Watershed Loading Functions (GWLF) model (Haith and Shoemaker 1987). GWLF modeling was accomplished using the BasinSim 1.0 watershed simulation program, which is a windows-based modeling system that facilitates the development of model input data and provides additional functionality (Dai et al. 2000). Numeric endpoints were based on the unit-area loading rates that were calculated for the reference watershed. A TMDL was then developed for the impaired stream segment based on these endpoints and the results from load allocation scenarios.

5.2 Watershed Model

TMDLs were developed using BasinSim 1.0 and the GWLF model. The GWLF model, which was originally developed by Cornell University (Haith and Shoemaker 1987, Haith et al. 1992), provides the ability to simulate runoff, sediment, and nutrient loadings from watersheds given variable-size source areas (e.g., agricultural, forested, and developed land). It also has algorithms for calculating septic system loads, and allows for the inclusion of point source discharge data. GWLF is a continuous simulation model that uses daily time steps for weather data and water balance calculations. Monthly calculations are made for sediment and nutrient loads, based on daily water balance totals that are summed to give monthly values.

GWLF is an aggregate distributed/lumped parameter watershed model. For surface loading, it is distributed in the sense that it allows multiple land use/cover scenarios. Each area is assumed to be homogenous with respect to various attributes considered by the model. Additionally, the model does not spatially distribute the source areas, but aggregates the loads from each area into a watershed total. In other words, there is no spatial routing. For subsurface loading, the model acts as a lumped parameter model using a water balance approach. No distinctly separate areas are considered for subsurface flow contributions. Daily water balances are computed for an unsaturated zone as well as for a saturated subsurface zone, where infiltration is computed as the difference between precipitation and snowmelt minus surface runoff plus evapotranspiration.

GWLF models surface runoff using the Soil Conservation Service Curve Number (SCS-CN) approach with daily weather (temperature and precipitation) inputs. Erosion and sediment yield are estimated using monthly erosion calculations based on the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) algorithm (with monthly rainfall-runoff coefficients) and a monthly composite of KLSCP values for each source area (e.g., land cover/soil type combination). The KLSCP factors are variables used in the calculations to depict changes in soil loss/erosion (K), the length/slope factor (LS), the vegetation cover factor (C), and the conservation practices factor (P). A sediment delivery ratio based on watershed size and a transport capacity based on average daily runoff are applied to the calculated erosion to determine sediment yield for each source area. Point source discharges also can contribute to loads to the stream. Evapotranspiration is determined using daily weather data and a cover factor dependent on land use/cover type. Finally, a water balance is performed daily using supplied or computed precipitation, snowmelt, initial unsaturated zone storage, maximum available zone storage, and evapotranspiration values. All of the equations used by the model can be found in the original GWLF paper (Haith and Shoemaker 1987) and GWLF User's Manual (Haith et al. 1992).

For execution, the model requires three separate input files containing transport, nutrient, and weather-related data. The transport file (TRANSPRT.DAT) defines the necessary parameters for each source area to be considered (e.g., area size, curve number) as well as global parameters (e.g., initial storage, sediment delivery ratio) that apply to all source areas. The nutrient file (NUTRIENT.DAT) specifies the various loading parameters for the different source areas identified (e.g., number of septic systems, urban source area accumulation rates, manure concentrations). The nutrient file is necessary for the model to run but is not used in any of the calculations. The weather file (WEATHER.DAT) contains daily average temperature and total precipitation values for each year simulated.

5.3 Model Setup

Watershed data needed to run the GWLF model in BasinSim 1.0 were generated using GIS spatial coverages, water quality monitoring and streamflow data, local weather data, literature values, and other information. Watershed boundaries for Lewis Creek and Walker Creek were delineated based on hydrologic and topographic data (USGS 7.5 minute digital topographic maps (24K DRG - Digital Raster Graphics)), and the location of VADEQ monitoring stations. The outlet of the Lewis Creek watershed is the downstream limit of the impaired segment, which is also the mouth. The reference watershed outlet is located at the VADEQ biomonitoring station on Walker Creek. To equate target and reference watershed areas for TMDL development, the total area for the reference watershed was reduced to be equal to the area of each Lewis Creek subwatershed, after hydrology calibration. To accomplish this, land use areas (in the reference watershed) were proportionally reduced based on the percent land use distribution.

Local rainfall and temperature data were used to simulate flow conditions in modeled watersheds. Daily precipitation and temperature data were obtained from local National Climatic Data Center

(NCDC) weather stations. The weather station that corresponds with the modeled watersheds is shown in Table 5.1. The periods of record selected for model calibration runs (April 1, 1991 through September 30, 2002 for the Lewis Creek model and April 1, 1981 through May 31, 1999 for the reference model) were based on the availability of recent weather data and corresponding streamflow records.

Table 5.1 Weather stations used in modeling studies

| Watershed | Weather Station | Data Type | Data Period Used |
|--------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Lewis Creek | Hurley 4S (VA4180) | Daily Precipitation | 4/1/1990 - 3/31/2003 |
| | Lebanon (VA4777) | Daily Temperature | 4/1/1990 - 3/31/2003 |
| Walker Creek | Wytheville 1S (VA9031) | Daily Precipitation | 4/1/1980 - 5/31/1999 |

Daily streamflow data are needed to calibrate watershed hydrologic parameters in the GWLF model. A USGS gage station located on Clinch River at Cleveland, VA was used to calibrate the impaired watershed and a USGS gage on Walker Creek at Bane, VA was used to calibrate the reference watershed. Table 5.2 lists the USGS gaging stations along with the period of record used for the watersheds.

Table 5.2 USGS gaging stations used in modeling studies

| Modeled Watershed | USGS station number | USGS gage location | Data Period Used |
|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| Upper Clinch River | 03524000 | Clinch River at Cleveland, VA | 4/1/1991 - 9/30/2002 |
| Walker Creek | 03173000 | Walker Creek at Bane, VA | 4/1/1981 - 5/31/1999 |

5.4 Explanation of Important Model Parameters

In the GWLF model, the nonpoint source load calculation is affected by terrain conditions, such as the amount of agricultural land, land slope, soil erodibility, farming practices used in the area, and by background concentrations of nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) in soil and groundwater. Various parameters are included in the model to account for these conditions and practices. Some of the more important parameters are summarized as follows:

Areal extent of different land use/cover categories: The MRLC land use coverage was used to calculate the area of each land use category in impaired and reference watersheds, respectively.

Curve number: This parameter determines the amount of precipitation that infiltrates into the ground or enters surface water as runoff. It is based on specified combinations of land use/cover and hydrologic soil type and is calculated directly using digital land use and soils coverages. Soils data

for both the impaired and reference watersheds were obtained from the State Soil Geographic (STATSGO) database for Virginia, developed by NRCS.

K factor: This factor relates to inherent soil erodibility, and it affects the amount of soil erosion taking place on a given unit of land. The K factor and other Universal Soils Loss Equation (USLE) parameters were downloaded from the NRCS Natural Resources Inventory (NRI) database (1992). Average values for specific crops/land uses in the watershed county were used (Russell County). The predominant crop grown in this watershed is corn; therefore, cropland values were based on data collected in corn crops.

LS factor: This factor signifies the steepness and length of slopes in an area and directly affects the amount of soil erosion.

C factor: This factor is related to the amount of vegetative cover in an area. In agricultural areas, this factor is largely controlled by the crops grown and the cultivation practices used. Values range from 0 to 1.0, with larger values indicating a higher potential for erosion.

P factor: This factor is directly related to the conservation practices used in agricultural areas. Values range from 0 to 1.0, with larger values indicating a lower potential for erosion.

Sediment delivery ratio: This parameter specifies the percentage of eroded sediment delivered to surface water and is empirically based on watershed size.

Unsaturated available water-holding capacity: This parameter relates to the amount of water that can be stored in the soil and affects runoff and infiltration.

Other less important factors that can affect sediment loads in a watershed also are included in the model. More detailed information about these parameters and those outlined above can be obtained from the GWLF User's Manual (Haith et al. 1992). Pages 15 through 41 of the manual provide specific details that describe equations and typical parameter values used in the model.

5.5 Hydrology Calibration

Using the input files created in the BasinSim 1.0, GWLF predicted overall water balances in impaired and reference watersheds. As discussed in Section 5.3, the modeling period is determined based on the availability of weather and flow data that were collected during the same time period. For the impaired watershed (Lewis Creek) weather data obtained from the NCDC meteorological stations located at Hurley and Lebanon were used to model the watersheds. However, the calibration period was governed by the availability of the USGS gaging data. The Lewis Creek watershed was calibrated for a period of 11.5 years from 4/1991 to 9/2002 using the streamflow gage data from the nearby USGS gage 03524000 on the Clinch River at Cleveland, VA, and the Walker Creek

watershed (reference watershed) was calibrated for a period of 18 years from 4/1981 to 6/1999 using the streamflow gage data from the nearby USGS gage 03173000 on Walker Creek at Bane, VA. Although the streamflow gages are in close proximity to the reference and the impaired streams, the gages did not coincide with the pour points of the watersheds. Hence, the streamflow measurements were normalized by area to facilitate calibration. Calibration statistics are presented in Table 5.3. These results indicate a good correlation between simulated and observed results for these watersheds. A total flow volume error percentage of less than 8 percent was achieved in calibration of the model for the impaired watershed, and less than four percent for the reference watershed. In general the seasonal trends and peaks are captured reasonably well for the ten and 18 year periods in the impaired and reference watersheds, respectively. Hydrology calibration results and the modeled time period for the reference and the impaired watersheds are given in Figures 5.1 and 5.2. Differences between observed and modeled flows in these watersheds are likely due to inherent errors in flow estimation procedures based on normalization for watershed size and possibly due to the proximity of the location of the weather station to the watersheds and the flow gage.

Table 5.3 GWLF flow calibration statistics

| Modeled Watershed | Simulation Period | R2 (Correlation) Value | Total Volume % Error |
|-------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Lewis Creek | 4/1/1991 - 9/30/2002 | 0.4413 | 7.5% |
| Walker Creek | 4/1/1981 - 5/31/1999 | 0.4383 | 3.4% |




Figure 5.1 Walker Creek hydrology calibration using USGS gage 03173000




Figure 5.2 Lewis Creek hydrology calibration using USGS gage 03524000

SECTION 6

TMDL METHODOLOGY

6.1 TMDL Calculation

Impaired and reference watershed models were calibrated for hydrology using different modeling periods and weather input files. To establish baseline (reference watershed) loadings for sediment the GWLF model for Walker Creek was used. For TMDL calculation both the calibrated reference and impaired watershed were run for an eight-year period from 4/1/1991 to 3/31/1999. This was done to standardize the modeling period. Based on the weather and limited flow data it is assumed that this period sufficiently captures hydrologic and weather conditions. In addition, the total area for the reference watershed was reduced to be equal to each target subwatershed, as discussed in Section 5.3. This was necessary because watershed size influences sediment delivery to the stream and other model variables.

Table 6.1 Existing sediment loadings in the Lewis Creek watershed

| Source Category | Sediment Load (pounds per year) | Sediment % of Total |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| Forest | 302,028 | 2.9% |
| Water | 0 | 0.0% |
| Pasture/Hay | 2,108,508 | 20.0% |
| Cropland | 828,865 | 7.9% |
| Barren/Transitional/Quarries* | 7,105,491 | 67.5% |
| Urban (includes pervious & impervious) | 163,413 | 1.6% |
| Groundwater | 0 | 0.0% |
| Point Source | 21,732 | 0.2% |
| Total Existing Load | 10,530,038 | 100.0% |

*Note: The Barren/Transitional/Quarries land use category is primarily represented by previously mined lands and abandoned mine lands (AML) in the Lewis Creek watershed.

The seven-year means for pollutants of concern were determined for each land use/source category in the reference and the impaired watershed. The first few months of the model run were excluded from the pollutant load summaries because the GWLF model takes a few months in the first year to stabilize. Model output is only presented for the years following the initialization year, although the model was run for an eight-year time period. The existing average annual sediment loads for Lewis Creek are presented in Table 6.1.

The TMDLs established for Lewis Creek consist of a point source waste load allocation (WLA), a nonpoint source load allocation (LA), and a margin of safety (MOS). The sediment TMDL for Lewis Creek was based on the total load calculated for Walker Creek (area adjusted to the

appropriate watershed size). Loads for urban areas have been lumped together (pervious and impervious). The sediment loadings from the impervious urban areas were estimated by multiplying literature values of the unit area loading rates (840 kg/ha/yr) times the impervious urban area in the watershed.

The TMDL equation is as follows:

$$\text{TMDL} = \text{WLA} + \text{LA} + \text{MOS}$$

The WLA portion of this equation is the total loading assigned to point sources. The LA portion represents the loading assigned to nonpoint sources. The MOS is the portion of loading reserved to account for any uncertainty in the data and the computational methodology used for the analysis. An explicit MOS of 10 percent was used in TMDL calculations to provide an additional level of protection for designated uses.

The TMDL for Lewis Creek was calculated by adding reference watershed loads for sediment together with point source loads to give the TMDL value (Table 6.2).

Table 6.2 TMDL for Lewis Creek

| TMDL (lbs/yr) | LA (lbs/yr) | WLA (lbs/yr) | MOS (lbs/yr) | Overall % Reduction |
|---------------|-------------|---|--------------|---------------------|
| 4,247,458 | 3,800,653 | Total = 21,732 <i>Honaker STP (VA0026387) = 18,276</i> <i>Harold Keene Coal Company:</i> <i>1201497, discharge point 1 = 35.31</i> <i>1201497, discharge point 2 = 767.61</i> <i>1200614, discharge point 1 = 767.61</i> <i>1200614, discharge point 2 = 104.40</i> <i>1200614, discharge point 3 = 706.20</i> <i>1200614, discharge point 5 = 767.61</i> <i>1200614, discharge point 6 = 153.52</i> <i>1200614, discharge point 7 = 153.52</i> | 425,072 | 63.7% |

6.2 Waste Load Allocation

A waste load allocation was assigned to all point source facilities in the watershed. Point sources were represented by their current permit conditions and no reductions were required from the point sources in the TMDLs. Current permit requirements are expected to result in attainment of WLAs as required by the TMDL.

6.3 Load Allocation

Load or waste load allocations were assigned to each source category in the watersheds. Several allocation scenarios were developed for the Lewis Creek watershed to examine the outcome of various load reduction combinations. The recommended scenario for Lewis Creek (Table 6.3) is based on maintaining the existing percent load contribution from each source category, except for the “barren/transitional/quarries” category which is primarily represented by previously mined lands and abandoned mine lands (AML). A greater sediment reduction was required for these lands (80%) based on discussions with VADMME personnel. Two additional scenarios are presented for comparison purposes (Table 6.4). Load reductions from agricultural sources are minimized in the first alternative and reductions from urban lands are minimized in the second alternative. In each scenario, loadings from certain source categories were allocated according to their existing loads. For instance, sediment loads from forest lands represent the natural condition that would be expected to exist; therefore, the loading from forest lands was not reduced. Also, sediment loads from point sources were not reduced because these facilities are currently meeting their pollutant discharge limits and other permit requirements and because these loads were insignificant as compared with other sources (~0.2% of the total load). Current permit requirements are expected to result in attainment of the WLAs as required by the TMDL. Point source contributions, even in terms of maximum flow, are minimal, therefore, no reasonable potential exists for these facilities to have a negative impact on water quality and there is no reason to modify the existing permits.

Note that streambank erosion loads were not calculated separately due to the lack of available data. TMDL implementation should include streambank stabilization measures, which can lead to a reduction in sediment loads in these watersheds.

Table 6.3 Recommended sediment allocations for Lewis Creek

| Source Category | Sediment Load Allocation (lbs/yr) | Sediment % Reduction |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Forest | 302,028 | 0% |
| Water | 0 | 0% |
| Pasture/Hay | 1,412,700 | 33% |
| Cropland | 555,340 | 33% |
| Barren/Transitional/Quarries | 1,421,098 | 80% |
| Urban (includes pervious & impervious) | 109,486 | 33% |
| Groundwater | 0 | 0% |
| Point Sources | 21,732 | 0% |
| TMDL Load (minus MOS) | 3,822,385 | 63.7% |

Table 6.4 Alternative sediment allocations for Lewis Creek

| Source Category | Minimize Agricultural Reductions | Minimize Urban Reductions |
|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Forest | 0% | 0% |
| Water | 0% | 0% |
| Pasture/Hay | 0% | 35% |
| Cropland | 0% | 34% |
| Barren/Transitional/Quarries | 92% | 80% |
| Urban (includes pervious & impervious) | 92% | 0% |
| Groundwater | 0% | 0% |
| Point Sources | 0% | 0% |

6.4 Consideration of Critical Conditions

The GWLF model is a continuous-simulation model that uses daily time steps for weather data and water balance calculations. Monthly calculations are made for sediment and nutrient loads, based on the daily water balance accumulated to monthly values. Therefore, all flow conditions are taken into account for loading calculations. Because there is usually a significant lag time between the introduction of sediment to a waterbody and the resulting impact on beneficial uses, establishing this TMDL using average annual conditions is protective of the waterbody.

6.5 Consideration of Seasonal Variations

The continuous-simulation model used for this analysis considers seasonal variation through a number of mechanisms. Daily time steps are used for weather data and water balance calculations. The model requires specification of the growing season and hours of daylight for each month. The combination of these model features accounts for seasonal variability.

SECTION 7

REASONABLE ASSURANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION

7.1 TMDL Implementation

The goal of the TMDL program is to establish a three-step path that will lead to attainment of water quality standards. The first step in the process is to develop TMDLs that will result in meeting water quality standards. This report represents the culmination of that effort for the benthic impairments on Lewis Creek. The second step is to develop a TMDL implementation plan. The final step is to implement the TMDL implementation plan, and to monitor stream water quality to determine if water quality standards are being attained.

Once a TMDL has been approved by EPA, measures must be taken to reduce pollution levels in the stream. These measures, which can include the use of better treatment technology and the installation of best management practices (BMPs), are implemented in an iterative process that is described along with specific BMPs in the implementation plan. The process for developing an implementation plan has been described in the recent "TMDL Implementation Plan Guidance Manual", published in July 2003 and available upon request from the VADEQ and VADCR TMDL project staff or at <http://www.deq.state.va.us/tmdl/implans/ipguide.pdf>. With successful completion of implementation plans, Virginia will be well on the way to restoring impaired waters and enhancing the value of this important resource. Additionally, development of an approved implementation plan will improve a locality's chances for obtaining financial and technical assistance during implementation.

7.2 Staged Implementation

In general, Virginia intends for the required reductions to be implemented in an iterative process that first addresses those sources with the largest impact on water quality. Among the most efficient sediment BMPs for both urban and rural watersheds are infiltration and retention basins, riparian buffer zones, grassed waterways, streambank protection and stabilization, and wetland development or enhancement. The iterative implementation of BMPs in the watershed has several benefits:

1. It enables tracking of water quality improvements following BMP implementation through follow-up stream monitoring;
2. It provides a measure of quality control, given the uncertainties inherent in computer simulation modeling;

3. It provides a mechanism for developing public support through periodic updates on BMP implementation and water quality improvements;
4. It helps ensure that the most cost effective practices are implemented first; and
5. It allows for the evaluation of the adequacy of the TMDL in achieving water quality standards.

Watershed stakeholders will have opportunity to participate in the development of the TMDL implementation plan. Specific goals for BMP implementation will be established as part of the implementation plan development.

It is anticipated that reclamation of abandoned mined lands will be part of the initial implementation plan for the Lewis Creek TMDL. One way to accelerate reclamation of abandoned mined lands is through re-mining. The Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals, and Energy, The Nature Conservancy, The Powell River Project, and the United States Office of Surface Mining have combined resources to develop several incentives to promote economically viable and environmentally beneficial re-mining. Work groups continue to examine ways to promote re-mining and to remove obstacles for re-mining. Based on a study of load reduction via re-mining completed by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) and published by EPA, the load reductions proposed in the Lewis Creek should not present an obstacle for re-mining in the watershed. When lands are reclaimed through re-mining and best management practices utilized, the PADEP study indicates that pollution load reductions for several water quality parameters examined averaged approximately 40%.

7.3 Link to Ongoing Restoration Efforts

Implementation of this TMDL will contribute to on-going water quality improvement efforts aimed at restoring water quality in the Chesapeake Bay. The BMPs required for the implementation of the sediment allocations in the watersheds contribute directly to the sediment reduction goals set as part of the Chesapeake Bay restoration effort. A new tributary strategy is currently being developed for the Shenandoah-Potomac River Basin to address the nutrient and sediment reductions required to restore the health of the Chesapeake Bay. Up-to-date information on tributary strategy development can be found at <http://www.snr.state.va.us/Initiatives/TributaryStrategies/shenandoah.cfm>.

7.4 Reasonable Assurance for Implementation

7.4.1 Follow-Up Monitoring

VADEQ will continue monitoring 6BLWS000.90 in accordance with its biological monitoring program. VADEQ will continue to use data from this monitoring station and related ambient

monitoring stations to evaluate improvements in the benthic community and the effectiveness of TMDL implementation in attainment of the general water quality standard.

7.4.2 Regulatory Framework

While section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and current EPA regulations do not require the development of TMDL implementation plans as part of the TMDL process, they do require reasonable assurance that the load and wasteload allocations can and will be implemented. Additionally, Virginia's 1997 Water Quality Monitoring, Information and Restoration Act (the "Act") directs the State Water Control Board to "develop and implement a plan to achieve fully supporting status for impaired waters" (Section 62.1-44.19.7). The Act also establishes that the implementation plan shall include the date of expected achievement of water quality objectives, measurable goals, corrective actions necessary and the associated costs, benefits and environmental impacts 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, timelines, legal or regulatory controls, time required to attain water quality standards, monitoring plans and milestones for attaining water quality standards.

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 appropriate Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), in accordance with the Clean Water Act'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.

7.4.3 Implementation Funding Sources

One potential source of funding for TMDL implementation is Section 319 of the Clean Water Act. Section 319 funding is a major source of funds for Virginia's Nonpoint Source Management Program. Other funding sources for implementation include the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Conservation Reserve Enhancement and Environmental Quality Incentive Programs, the Virginia State Revolving Loan Program, and the Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund. The TMDL Implementation Plan Guidance Manual contains additional information on funding sources, as well as government agencies that might support implementation efforts and suggestions for integrating TMDL implementation with other watershed planning efforts.

SECTION 8

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A stakeholder and TMDL study kickoff meeting was held on April 10, 2003. A site visit to Lewis Creek was also conducted on this date. Important information regarding likely stressors and sources was discussed with state environmental personnel and local stakeholders.

The first public meeting on the development of TMDLs for Lewis Creek was held on June 26, 2003 from 7-10 p.m. at the Honaker Town Hall in Honaker, Virginia. Copies of the presentation materials were made available for public distribution at the meeting.

The second public meeting on the TMDL development for Lewis Creek will be held on February 12, 2004 from 7-10 p.m. at the Honaker Town Hall in Honaker, Virginia. Copies of the Draft TMDL report and presentation materials will be made available for public distribution at the meeting.