


---

Division of Surface Water

# Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Walnut Creek Watershed

---



*Walnut Creek at Pontius Road in Franklin County*

**Final Report**  
**February 2, 2010**

Ted Strickland, Governor  
Chris Korleski, Director

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Executive summary .....</b>  | <b>x</b>  |
| <b>1 Introduction .....</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 The Clean Water Act requirement to address impaired waters.....                           | 1         |
| 1.2 Public involvement .....  | 3         |
| <b>2 Description of the project area .....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| 2.1 Project delineation.....  | 4         |
| 2.2 Water resources.....  | 4         |
| 2.3 Land cover .....  | 7         |
| 2.4 Soils, geology and topography.....  | 8         |
| 2.5 Population and growth trends and economic development .....                               | 9         |
| <b>3 Applicable water quality standards.....</b>  | <b>13</b> |
| 3.1 Ohio WQS.....   | 13        |
| 3.1.1 Recreational beneficial use designations.....   | 14        |
| 3.1.2 Aquatic life beneficial use designations.....   | 15        |
| <b>4 Watershed assessment results: status of water quality relative to the standards.....</b> | <b>18</b> |
| 4.1 Recreation use attainment .....   | 18        |
| 4.2 Aquatic life use attainment .....   | 21        |
| 4.3 Public drinking water use attainment .....  | 28        |
| 4.4 Human health use (fish tissue).....   | 28        |
| <b>5 Linkage analyses .....</b>   | <b>29</b> |
| 5.1 Stressors causing impaired uses .....   | 29        |
| 5.1.1 Pathogens .....   | 29        |
| 5.1.2 Habitat.....  | 30        |
| 5.1.3 Sediment (siltation).....   | 31        |
| 5.1.4 Flow alteration and disrupted floodplain function .....                                 | 31        |
| 5.2 Sources of the stressors .....  | 33        |
| 5.2.1 Permitted wastewater discharges .....   | 34        |
| 5.2.2 Sanitary sewer overflows .....  | 34        |
| 5.2.3 Home sewage treatment systems .....   | 35        |
| 5.2.4 Livestock wastes and stream use .....   | 37        |
| 5.2.5 Cropland runoff.....  | 37        |
| 5.2.6 Ditch maintenance.....  | 38        |
| 5.2.7 Land development and urban and residential land uses.....                               | 39        |
| <b>6 Methods of TMDL development.....</b>   | <b>42</b> |
| 6.1 Selection of bacteria water quality target values.....                                    | 42        |
| 6.2 Selection of habitat and sediment target values .....                                     | 42        |
| 6.3.1 Hydrologic response.....  | 45        |
| 6.3.2 Fecal coliform loads to the stream .....  | 49        |
| 6.3.3 Habitat quality and sediment analysis.....  | 62        |
| 6.4 Critical conditions and seasonality .....   | 47        |
| 6.5 Margin of safety.....   | 48        |
| <b>7 Results of TMDL development .....</b>  | <b>64</b> |
| <b>8 Strategy for achieving water quality goals.....</b>                                      | <b>71</b> |
| 8.1 Sources to prioritize .....   | 71        |
| 8.1.1 Recreational use impairments.....   | 71        |
| 8.1.2 Aquatic life use impairments .....  | 75        |
| 8.2 Water quality improvement strategy.....   | 80        |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| 8.2.1 Point sources.....  | 81         |
| 8.2.2 Livestock access to streams .....                                     | 81         |
| 8.2.3 Ditch maintenance.....  | 82         |
| 8.2.4 Crop production and field drainage .....                              | 83         |
| 8.2.5 Home septic treatment systems .....                                   | 84         |
| 8.2.6 Conversion to urban land use .....                                    | 85         |
| 8.3 Programs for implementing abatement strategy .....                      | 87         |
| 8.3.1 Point sources.....  | 88         |
| 8.3.2 Nonpoint sources .....  | 88         |
| 8.3.3 Land conversion and storm water management .....                      | 93         |
| 8.4 Summary of restoration strategy .....                                   | 98         |
| <b>9 Future evaluations of the project area and corrective actions.....</b> | <b>104</b> |
| 9.1 Current and ongoing monitoring.....                                     | 104        |
| 9.2 Schedule for Ohio EPA monitoring .....                                  | 105        |
| 9.3 Approach for making needed revisions.....                               | 105        |
| <b>References.....</b>  | <b>106</b> |

## APPENDICES

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| Appendix A | NPDES Facilities in the TMDL Project Area   |
| Appendix B | Justification for Use of Category 4b Alternative(s) Pickerington Wastewater Treatment Plant |
| Appendix C | Response Summary to Public Comments on the Draft Walnut Creek TMDL Report                   |

## LIST OF TABLES

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table 1.1 A summary of the 2008 303(d) listed impairments in the Walnut Creek TMDL study area.....  | 2   |
| Table 1.2 Summary of causes of impairment to aquatic life and recreational uses for the Walnut Creek watershed and actions taken to address them.....                                     | 2   |
| Table 2.1 14-digit HUC watersheds within the Walnut Creek watershed.....  | 5   |
| Table 2.2 Named streams in the Walnut Creek watershed. ....   | 6   |
| Table 2.3 Cumulative acres of various land cover types. ....  | 8   |
| Table 3.1. Distribution of aquatic life use designations. ....  | 16  |
| Table 3.2 Biocriteria applicable for the Eastern Corn Belt Plains Ecoregion (ECBP) .....  | 17  |
| Table 4.1 Sample results for fecal coliform bacteria during the 2005 recreation season. ....  | 20  |
| Table 4.2 Results of the biological assessment.....   | 24  |
| Table 4.3 Reasons for biological use impairments. ....  | 26  |
| Table 6.1 Habitat TMDL targets.....   | 43  |
| Table 6.2 Sediment (bedload) TMDL targets.....  | 44  |
| Table 7.1 Results of the TMDL analyses for fecal coliform bacteria.....   | 65  |
| Table 7.2 Existing loads and load allocations for nonpoint sources for fecal coliform bacteria. ....  | 66  |
| Table 7.3 Existing loads and load allocations for point sources for fecal coliform bacteria. ....   | 67  |
| Table 7.4 Wasteload allocations for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Areas (MS4s) for fecal coliform bacteria.....  | 68  |
| Table 7.5 Wasteload allocations for NPDES dischargers for fecal coliform bacteria.....  | 69  |
| Table 7.6 Results of the TMDL analyses for sediment (bedload) and habitat. ....   | 70  |
| Table 8.2 Natural Resource Conservation Service's (NRCS) conservation practices (CPs) eligible for full cost share assistance to eliminate livestock access to streams. ....              | 82  |
| Table 8.3 Natural Resource Conservation Service's (NRCS) conservation practices eligible for full (100%) cost share assistance to address impacts from crop production and drainage. .... | 83  |
| Table 8.4 Programs best suited to address nonpoint sources in the watershed but not including sources related to storm water or urban development.....                                    | 91  |
| Table 8.5 Projected population growth for three fastest growing counties in the watershed. ....   | 93  |
| Table 8.6 Inventory of TMDL Action Items Walnut Creek — HUC 05060001-170 .....  | 99  |
| Table 8.7 Inventory of TMDL Action Items Walnut Creek — HUC 05060001-180 .....  | 101 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure 2.1 Walnut Creek's 14-digit HUCs and various political boundaries.....                                    | 5  |
| Figure 2.2 Map of named streams in the Walnut Creek watershed.....   | 6  |
| Figure 2.3 Map of land cover classes. ....   | 7  |
| Figure 2.4 Pie chart of the distribution of land cover types. ....   | 8  |
| Figure 2.5 Map of population density. ....   | 10 |
| Figure 2.6 Map of recent and projected development. ....   | 11 |
| Figure 2.7 Pie charts of recent and projected development. ....  | 12 |
| Figure 2.8 Existing and proposed sewer service. ....   | 12 |
| Figure 3.2 Map of aquatic life use designations .....  | 17 |
| Figure 4.1 Fecal coliform load duration curve using 2005 Ohio EPA data and 2000-2005 City of Ashville data ..... | 19 |
| Figure 4.2 Map of the attainment status of aquatic life uses at survey sites in the 170 11-digit HUC. ....       | 23 |
| Figure 4.3 Map of the attainment status of aquatic life uses at survey sites in the 180 11-digit HUC. ....       | 27 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure 5.1 Photo of an illicit discharge from a storm sewer outlet. ....   | 30 |
| Figure 5.2 Photo of Walnut Creek at RM 14.9 in Franklin County. ....   | 30 |
| Figure 5.3 Photo showing fine sediment that has covered the bottom of Mann’s Run<br>(RM 0.3 end of Miller Road) in Pickaway County. ....   | 31 |
| Figure 5.4 Photo of Walnut Creek overflowing its banks in Canal Winchester during<br>a spring 2008 rain event. . ....  | 33 |
| Figure 5.5 Photo of a sanitary sewer overflow pipe in the Walnut Creek Sewer District<br>Leitnaker Road Pump Station. ....   | 35 |
| Figure 5.6 Photos of failed home septic treatment. . ....  | 36 |
| Figure 5.7 Photo of livestock with access to Mud Run on the west side of Goodman<br>Road north of Perrill Road in Pickaway County. ....  | 37 |
| Figure 5.8 Photo of a livestock operation north of the Village of Carroll on the west<br>side of Carroll Northern Road. . ....   | 38 |
| Figure 5.9 Photo of highly maintained ditch used for agricultural drainage in<br>the Hocking River watershed in Fairfield County. ....   | 40 |
| Figure 6.1 Comparison of average daily flow values from January 2005 to December<br>2006 to the historic flows record at the USGS gage on the Hockign River at Enterprise.. ....   | 45 |
| Figure 6.2 Ashville and Enterprise Flow Correlation.....   | 47 |
| Figure 6.3 Corresponding values between the values for average daily flow at the<br>USGS gage on Walnut Creek in Ashville and the projected flows based on the<br>USGS gage on the Hocking River at Enterprise. ....               | 47 |
| Figure 6.4 Flow duration curve for the USGS gage on Walnut Creek at river mile 4.1.....  | 48 |
| Figure 6.5 Representative 2005 Ohio EPA dataset used for fecal coliform attainment<br>analysis at the Ashville gage site.....  | 49 |
| Figure 6.6 Diagram of the hydrologic cycle (National Engineering Handbook<br>Part 630 Chapter 10, USDA/NRCS 210-VI-NEH July 2004).....   | 53 |
| Figure 6.7 First-order wash-off function curves. Equation and curve fitting assumption<br>of 90% of accumulation washes off of an urban land use in response to 1/2" runoff are<br>as cited in the SWMMS and GWLF literature. .... | 56 |
| Figure 7.1 Areas analyzed for TMDL development. ....   | 64 |
| Figure 8.1 Graph showing the loading ratios between sources of fecal coliform loading<br>that are required to obtain NPDES permits and sources that have no such requirements.....   | 73 |
| Figure 8.2 Graph showing the loading ratios between sources of fecal coliform loading<br>that are not required to obtain NPDES permits.....  | 73 |
| Figure 8.3 Graph showing existing fecal coliform loading from three unregulated sources.....   | 74 |
| Figure 8.4 Graph showing allocations for fecal coliform loading from three<br>unregulated sources. ....  | 74 |
| Figure 8.5 Maps showing status of aquatic life use attainment and causes (above)<br>and sources (below) at sites not fully attaining their use designation in the 170 HUC 11<br>watershed. ....                                    | 76 |
| Figure 8.6 Maps showing status of aquatic life use attainment and causes (left) and<br>sources (right) at sites not fully attaining their use designation in the 180 HUC 11 watershed. .   | 78 |
| Figure 8.7 Photos of livestock with access to Mud Run (left) and bank erosion on<br>a ditched section of Turkey Run (right). ....  | 79 |
| Figure 8.8 Aerial photos showing sources of stress to a tributary to Pawpaw Creek<br>(left) in Fairfield County and Mud Run (right) in Pickaway County. ....   | 79 |
| Figure 8.9 Aerial photo and graphical depiction showing recently urbanized areas (formerly<br>rural) having an adverse impact on water quality on Georges and Sycamore Creeks. ....  | 80 |
| Figure 8.10 Graphic showing recommended management for three designated zones<br>within a hypothetical riparian buffer. ....   | 87 |

Figure 8.11 Map of the areas included in the Southeast Area Plan (olive color) and the Southeast Area Plan Bixby Road Economic Development Amendment (brown color). .....97

Figure 8.12 Photos showing the use of pervious pavement (tan color) alongside asphalt within the area of the Canal Winchester Street Project.. .....98

## List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| BIT             | Bacteria Indicator Tool                            |
| BMP             | best management practice                           |
| cm              | centimeter   |
| CNMP            | Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan             |
| cnt/seas        | counts per season                                  |
| CO              | consent agreement                                  |
| Corps           | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers                       |
| CREP            | Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program           |
| CRP             | Conservation Reserve Program                       |
| CSO             | combined sewer overflow                            |
| CSS             | combined sewer system                              |
| CWA             | Clean Water Act                                    |
| CWH             | Cold Water Habitat                                 |
| DA              | drainage area                                      |
| DEFA            | Division of Environmental and Financial Assistance |
| DFFOs           | Directors Final Findings and Orders                |
| DNAP            | Division of Natural Areas and Preserves            |
| DSW             | Division of Surface Water                          |
| DSWC            | Division of Soil and Water Conservation            |
| ECBP            | Eastern Corn Belt Plains                           |
| EQIP            | Environmental Quality Incentives Program           |
| EWH             | Exceptional Warmwater Habitat                      |
| FC              | Fecal Coliform                                     |
| FSA             | Farm Service Agency                                |
| gpd             | gallons per day                                    |
| GPS             | geographic positioning system                      |
| GW              | ground water                                       |
| HSTS            | household sewage treatment system                  |
| HUC             | hydrologic unit code                               |
| IBI             | Index of Biotic Integrity                          |
| ICI             | Invertebrate Community Index                       |
| LA              | load allocations                                   |
| lb/yr           | pounds per year                                    |
| LEAP            | Livestock Environmental Assurance Program          |
| LID             | low impact development                             |
| LTCP            | Long term Control Plan                             |
| mg/L            | milligrams per liter                               |
| MGD             | million gallons per day                            |
| MHP             | Mobile Home Park                                   |
| MIWB            | Modified Index of Well-Being                       |
| mi <sup>2</sup> | square mile  |
| ml              | milliliter   |
| MOR             | monthly operating reports                          |
| MORPC           | Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission              |
| MOS             | margin of safety                                   |
| MS4             | municipal separate storm sewer system              |
| MWH             | Modified Warmwater Habitat                         |
| NACD            | National Association of Conservation Districts     |
| NEMO            | Nonpoint Education for Municipal Official          |

---

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| NLCD     | National Land Cover Dataset   |
| NPDES    | National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System                       |
| NPS      | nonpoint source   |
| NRCS     | Natural Resource Conservation Service                                 |
| OAC      | Ohio Administrative Code  |
| OAEA     | Ohio Agricultural Environmental Assurance                             |
| ODNR     | Ohio Department of Natural Resources                                  |
| ODOT     | Ohio Department of Transportation                                     |
| OFAER    | On Farm Assessment and Environmental Review                           |
| OFBF     | Ohio Farm Bureau Federation   |
| OLC      | Ohio Livestock Coalition  |
| ORC      | Ohio Revised Code   |
| PCR      | Primary Contact Recreation  |
| PIR      | Pollution Investigation Report  |
| PTI      | Permit to Install   |
| QHEI     | Qualitative Habitat Evaluative Index                                  |
| RC&D     | Resource Conservation and Development                                 |
| RI       | return interval   |
| RM       | river mile  |
| SCR      | Secondary Contact Recreation  |
| SCS      | Soil Conservation Service   |
| SSO      | sanitary sewer overflow   |
| SSO      | separate sewer overflow   |
| SSS      | sanitary sewer system   |
| SWCD     | Soil and Water Conservation District                                  |
| TMDL     | total maximum daily load  |
| tn/yr    | tons per year   |
| TP       | total phosphorus  |
| TSS      | total suspended solids  |
| U.S. EPA | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency                                  |
| USDA-ARS | United States Department of Agriculture-Agricultural Research Service |
| USGS     | U.S. Geologic Survey  |
| WHC      | Wildlife Habitat Council  |
| WLA      | wasteload allocations   |
| WPCLF    | Water Pollution Control Loan Fund                                     |
| WQC      | Water Quality Certification   |
| WQMP     | Water Quality Management Plan   |
| WQS      | water quality standards   |
| WRP      | Wetland Reserve Program   |
| WRRSP    | Water Resource Restoration Sponsor Program                            |
| WTP      | water treatment plant   |
| WWH      | Warmwater Habitat   |
| WWTP     | wastewater treatment plant  |

## Acknowledgements

The following Ohio EPA staff provided technical expertise on this project:

- Biological and habitat assessment - Bob Miltner and Ed Moore
- Water quality/sediment sampling – Paul Vandermeer and Jeff Lewis
- Water quality modeling- Joe Bishop
- Permits (NPDES) – John Owen and Jan Rice
- Stormwater –John Morrison, Jason Fyffe, Harry Kallipolitis and Greg Sanders
- Nonpoint sources –Vince Mazeika
- Fish Consumption – Mylynda Shaskus
- TMDL Coordination – Gregg Sablak and Erin Sherer
- Team Leader – Jan Rice

Other full- and part-time staff also participated in field monitoring.

The Ohio EPA appreciates the cooperation of the property owners who allowed access to Walnut Creek and its tributaries.

Our gratitude extends to all of the groups and individuals who have participated in this TMDL. The following are particularly noteworthy:

County Soil and Water Conservation Districts  
County Health departments

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Walnut Creek watershed is located in Central Ohio between the cities of Columbus and Lancaster. This 286 square mile watershed area is home to more than 65,000 people and encompasses all or part of 15 municipalities in Fairfield, Franklin Licking, Perry, and Pickaway counties.

In 2005, Ohio EPA staff sampled 55 sites on streams in this watershed. Through this survey, the usability of the stream resources for recreation and suitability for aquatic wildlife were evaluated. This evaluation was based on whether data collected were consistent with minimum criteria established in Ohio's Water Quality Standards (WQS) to protect those stream uses.

Details regarding this water quality survey were published in December 2006 in the *Biological and Water Quality Study of Walnut Creek and Tributaries* (available at <http://www.epa.ohio.gov/portals/35/documents/WalnutCreek2005TSD.pdf>). An interactive map showing sampling site locations in this watershed is available at <http://wwwapp.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/gis/bio/index.php>.

The survey results show Walnut Creek to be an exceptional water resource, particularly in its ability to support unique and pollution sensitive aquatic species. The spotted, Tippecanoe, and state endangered bluebreast darters were recorded for the first time in Walnut Creek. The variegate darter was also found which is, like these others, particularly sensitive to poor water quality. The darters' presence indicates that Walnut Creek is healthy. However, 22 percent of the sites, all of which were on tributary streams, did not fully attain WQS for aquatic life while 45 percent failed to meet quality criteria for recreation.

Degraded water quality was due to an excess of fine sediment such as silts and clays in the streams, unnatural channel shape due either to the ditching of small drainageways or channel erosion, and impacts of urban/suburban land uses that increase runoff and export pollutants. These stresses result in adverse impacts on the aquatic wildlife community as shown by low species diversity and an absence of native fishes that are sensitive to stress. Additionally, high concentrations of dissolved solids from Pickerington's waste water treatment facility adversely impacted stream insects. (The City of Pickerington disputes these results has retained a consultant to resample the area; results of the study have not been submitted to Ohio EPA for review as of February 1, 2010).

Recreational uses were impaired due to the elevated risk for water-borne illness from pathogen contamination. This is evidenced by high concentrations of bacteria associated with fecal matter. Reasons for these failures include poorly treated human waste coming from home septic systems and livestock wastes, particularly where they have substantial access to stream or riparian areas.

Total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) were calculated for fecal coliform bacteria, sediment, and habitat quality. Watershed hydrology and estimates of fecal coliform loading from all sources were approximated using simple modeling methods based on mathematical equations and watershed characteristics. The sediment and habitat TMDLs were generated through a direct comparison of scores from a habitat evaluation index to target scores for that index.

The calculated amount of total load reductions needed for fecal coliform bacteria ranged from 30 percent to 95 percent. The portion of the watershed upstream from and including Sycamore Creek (corresponding to the 11-digit HUC of 05060001-170) was more widely impacted and generally required larger reductions than the lower portion (corresponding to the 11-digit HUC of

05060001-180). Sediment load reductions and habitat improvements were needed in both the upper (170) and lower (180) HUCs although not widely distributed and deviations from the targets were generally modest.

Addressing the nonpoint sources of these water quality stressors can be accomplished through system upgrades or better management of home septic systems. Restricting access to streams and riparian areas for livestock will drastically improve the conditions in some localized areas. Sediment loading is most likely originating from the cropland surrounding these problem areas. Cover crops, conservation crop rotation, improvements in tillage methods, and sediment capture areas such as filter areas or wetlands would alleviate a large proportion of the problem. Riparian planting and a more naturalized approach to drainage infrastructure would improve habitat and also increase the stability and sustainability of these channels. Storm water impacts from existing urbanized areas should be minimized by retrofitting storm water infrastructure as opportunities arise, and using a proactive storm water management approach for new development. In particular, impervious surfaces should be minimized, sensitive or critical areas protected, and localized storm water management (as opposed to larger centralized systems) could be used to better mimic a natural hydrology.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The Walnut Creek watershed is located in Central Ohio between the cities of Columbus and Lancaster. This 286 square mile watershed area is home to more than 65,000 people and encompasses all or part of 15 municipalities in Fairfield, Franklin Licking, Perry, and Pickaway Counties.

Ohio EPA conducted a comprehensive physical, chemical and biological survey in the Walnut Creek watershed in 2005. The water quality survey included monitoring of Walnut Creek and several tributary streams. There were stream segments not meeting the Ohio water quality standards identified during the survey. These findings and other information regarding water quality and habitat conditions are summarized in this report.

Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) have been developed for pollutants and stressors that have impaired water uses and precluded attainment of applicable water quality standards. This report summarizes the approach taken and results for these TMDL analyses. This report also includes a discussion about actions and land management that can abate the identified water resource problems.

Specific TMDLs that have been developed and are described in this report include:

- Pathogens (using fecal coliform as an indicator of contamination)
- Sediment (using a qualitative index to assess the degree of in-stream sedimentation)
- Habitat (using a qualitative index to assess the quality of habitat features)

Section 8 in this report provides strategies for restoring the full uses of surface waters in the Walnut Creek watershed. Strategies for control of point sources and some non point sources involve use of regulatory wastewater and storm water permits to control pollutant discharge in the watershed. Corrective measures have already been initiated to address use impairment caused by regulated entities.

### 1.1 The Clean Water Act requirement to address impaired waters

The Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 303(d) requires States, Territories, and authorized Tribes to list and prioritize waters for which technology-based limits alone do not ensure attainment of water quality standards. Lists of these impaired waters (the Section 303(d) lists) are made available to the public for comment, then submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) for approval in even-numbered years. Further, the CWA and U.S. EPA regulations require that Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) be developed for all waters on the Section 303(d) lists. The Ohio EPA identified several subwatersheds (11-digit Hydrologic Unit Code) as impaired on the 2008 303(d) list (contained in the 2008 Integrated Report (Ohio EPA, 2008), available at <http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/tmdl/2008IntReport/2008OhioIntegratedReport.aspx>).

Not only does the 303(d) list account for the waterbodies that are not meeting water quality standards, but also lists the environmental stressors that are responsible for the substandard water quality. These stressors are often a specific pollutant or suite of pollutants; however, the physical condition of the stream systems (e.g., poor habitat quality) may also stress the system. Additionally the sources from which these stressors originate are identified and listed. These listed parameters are then addressed through the TMDL development process.



## 1.2 Public involvement

Public involvement is key to the success of water restoration projects, including TMDL efforts. From the beginning, Ohio EPA has invited participation in all aspects of the TMDL program. The Ohio EPA convened an external advisory group in 1998 to assist the Agency with the development of the TMDL program in Ohio. The advisory group issued a report in July 2000 to the Director of Ohio EPA on their findings and recommendations. The Walnut Creek watershed TMDL project has been completed using the process endorsed by the advisory group.

Consistent with Ohio's current Continuous Planning Process (CPP), the draft TMDL report will be available for public review from November 12 through December 14, 2009. A copy of the draft report will be posted on Ohio EPA's web page (<http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/tmdl/index.aspx>). A summary of the comments received and the associated responses will be completed after the public comment period and included in Appendix C in the final report.

Ohio EPA has been in communication with representatives from local agencies and organizations regarding the findings of the watershed assessments and preliminary TMDL results. These include: regional planning, soil and water conservation districts, county Natural Resource Conservation Service offices, and a watershed group, the Walnut Action Group, which has significant participation from local officials. Meetings were held in which results of the watershed assessment and preliminary TMDL analyses were shared and approaches towards water quality restoration were discussed.

Continued public involvement is critical to the success of any TMDL project. Ohio EPA will continue to support the implementation process and will facilitate, to the fullest extent possible, restoration actions that are acceptable to the communities and stakeholders in the study area and to Ohio EPA. Ohio EPA is reluctant to rely solely on regulatory actions and strongly advocates voluntary actions facilitated by the local stakeholders, watershed organization, and agency partners to restore the Walnut Creek watershed.

## 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AREA

### 2.1 Project delineation

In Ohio, TMDL projects are primarily watershed based. Watersheds are assigned identifying numbers based on the U.S. Geological Survey's (USGS) hydrologic unit codes (HUCs). These HUCs are uniquely assigned to a specific watershed area. The codes are based on a nested system where fewer digits in the HUC correspond to larger watershed areas while HUCs with those same and more digits correspond to unique subdivisions of that larger watershed area. At the time of the development of this TMDL Ohio EPA was using 11-digit HUCs (also referred as HUC11s) as the equivalent of a water quality assessment unit.

The Walnut Creek watershed is comprised of two 11-digit HUCs, the upper Walnut (05060001-170) and the lower Walnut (05060001-180). For the purpose of achieving higher resolution in the watershed analyses, 14-digit HUCs (also referred as HUC14s), and in some cases subdivisions of these, were analyzed individually and results presented accordingly.

Table 2.1 lists the 14-digit HUCs in the Walnut Creek watershed as well as the respective 11-digit HUC (and assessment unit) to which they belong (i.e., the first 11 of the 14 digits). Figure 2.1 is a map of the entire Walnut Creek watershed with the respective 14-digit HUCs labeled with the last six of the 14 digits and identified by color.

### 2.2 Water resources

Walnut Creek flows almost 58 miles from headwaters in northwest Perry County to the mouth at the Scioto River. Walnut Creek joins the Scioto River approximately five miles upstream from the confluence of Big Darby Creek and the Scioto River in Circleville, Ohio. The nearness of the exceptionally diverse aquatic ecosystem of the Big Darby Creek watershed in conjunction with improved water quality in the Scioto mainstem has allowed rare and sensitive species to recolonize historic ranges, including Walnut Creek, from the Big Darby.

Principle tributaries to Walnut Creek include Sycamore, Little Walnut, Georges, Poplar, and Pawpaw creeks. Figure 2.2 is a map showing these and other named tributaries in the watershed, while Table 2.2 is a list of tributaries along with their respective lengths, average gradient, and drainage areas. Many tributaries in the watershed drain coarse glacial material, and consequently receive ground water that sustains ample baseflow even during drier times of the year. Aided by the stabilizing effect of ground water, habitat quality is generally good and capable of sustaining healthy biological communities.

There are no surface water intakes for public drinking water supplies, sizeable lakes for recreation, or any other type of resource that stands out from typical river and stream uses. Satellite imagery shows that wetlands account for less than one percent of the watershed area, amounting to about 1,000 acres.




Figure 2.1 Walnut Creek's 14-digit HUCs and various political boundaries.

Table 2.1 14-digit HUC watersheds within the Walnut Creek watershed.

| HUC14        | TMDL Watershed or Assessment Unit | Narrative Description | Area (square miles)  |      |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|------|
| 05060001-170 | 010                               | Upper Walnut          | Walnut Creek above Pawpaw Creek                              | 42.5 |
|              | 020                               | Upper Walnut          | Pawpaw Creek   | 17.5 |
|              | 030                               | Upper Walnut          | Walnut Creek below Pawpaw Creek to above Poplar Creek        | 9.6  |
|              | 040                               | Upper Walnut          | Poplar Creek   | 17.4 |
|              | 050                               | Upper Walnut          | Walnut Creek below Sycamore Creek to above George Creek      | 27.4 |
|              | 060                               | Upper Walnut          | Sycamore Creek   | 23.6 |
| 05060001-180 | 010                               | Lower Walnut          | Walnut Creek Below Sycamore Creek to above George Creek      | 23.0 |
|              | 020                               | Lower Walnut          | George Creek   | 14.6 |
|              | 030                               | Lower Walnut          | Walnut Creek Below George Creek to above Little Walnut Creek | 52.1 |
|              | 040                               | Lower Walnut          | Little Walnut Creek Headwaters to above Turkey Run           | 17.0 |
|              | 050                               | Lower Walnut          | Turkey Run   | 14.3 |
|              | 060                               | Lower Walnut          | Little Walnut Creek Below Turkey Run to Walnut Creek         | 12.7 |
|              | 070                               | Lower Walnut          | Walnut Creek Below Little Walnut Creek to Scioto River       | 13.9 |




Figure 2.2 Map of named streams in the Walnut Creek watershed.

Table 2.2 Named streams in the Walnut Creek watershed.

| 11-digit HUC | Stream Name                   | Length <sup>1</sup> (miles) | Average gradient <sup>2</sup> (feet / mile) | Drainage area <sup>2</sup> (square mile) |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| N/A          | Walnut Creek                  | 57.9                        | 9.4   | 286                                      |
| 170          | Sycamore Creek                | 16.5                        | 22.6  | 23.6                                     |
| 180          | Little Walnut Creek           | 14.3                        | 27.7  | 44.0                                     |
| 180          | Mud Run                       | 11.2                        | na <sup>3</sup>                             | na <sup>3</sup>                          |
| 170          | PawPaw Creek                  | 7.7                         | 30.0  | 17.5                                     |
| 170          | Poplar Creek                  | 10.8                        | 29.5  | 17.4                                     |
| 180          | Turkey Run                    | 10.2                        | 27.9  | 14.3                                     |
| 180          | George Creek                  | 10.1                        | 10.9  | 14.6                                     |
| 180          | Big Run                       | 9.0                         | 20.8  | 8.1                                      |
| 180          | Slate Run                     | 5.0                         | na <sup>3</sup>                             | na <sup>3</sup>                          |
| 180          | Bull Run                      | 3.6                         | na <sup>3</sup>                             | na <sup>3</sup>                          |
| 180          | Cherry Run                    | 3.4                         | 25.4  | 5.7                                      |
| 180          | Lick Run                      | 2.8                         | 45.6  | 2.14                                     |
| 170          | Deep Cut                      | 1.6                         | na <sup>3</sup>                             | na <sup>3</sup>                          |
| N/A          | All unnamed tributary streams | 394.8                       | na <sup>3</sup>                             | na <sup>3</sup>                          |
|              | <b>GRAND TOTAL</b>            | <b>559</b>                  |   |  |

<sup>1</sup> Based on National Hydrography Dataset

<sup>2</sup> Based on information from the Gazetteer of Ohio Streams (Ohio DNR, 2001)

<sup>3</sup> "na" indicates these data are not available in the Gazetteer of Ohio Streams

## 2.3 Land cover

Land use within the basin is dominated by row-crop agriculture and residential development as portrayed in Figure 2.3. Urban/suburban land use is concentrated in the northwest third of the catchment with the highest densities in southeastern Franklin County and in Violet Township in Fairfield County. Current land use trends have increased the potential for nonpoint source pollution of the stream system. Increased frequency in the number of construction sites, large lot development, horse and novelty livestock operations, and on-site home sewage treatment systems (HSTS) contribute to this potential.

Areas protected from land development include Slate Run in Pickaway County, Pickerington Ponds in Franklin and Fairfield Counties, and Chestnut Ridge in Fairfield County. These areas encompass approximately 5 square miles; a relatively insignificant area compared to Walnut Creek's 286 square mile drainage area. Although thinned out in areas, a well defined riparian zone can be seen along the lower Walnut Creek channel. Other forested lands are located on ridges and areas that are marginal for crop production or pasturing. The percent of each land use type is given in Figure 2.3.




Figure 2.3 Map of land cover classes. Land cover is based on Landsat 7 imagery taken around 2001 and compiled in 2006 by the Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics (MRLC) consortium.




Figure 2.4 Pie chart of the distribution of land cover types.

Table 2.3 Cumulative acres of various land cover types.

| Land cover                | Acres   | Percent |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|
| Cultivated crop           | 106,138 | 58.1%   |
| Forest                    | 25,120  | 13.7%   |
| Pasture/hay               | 23,586  | 12.9%   |
| Low density development   | 17,419  | 9.5%    |
| High density development  | 8,241   | 4.5%    |
| Grassland and shrub/scrub | 1,255   | 0.7%    |
| Wetlands and open water   | 985     | 0.5%    |
| TOTAL                     | 182,745 | 100%    |

## 2.4 Soils, geology and topography

The Walnut Creek watershed lies within the Central Lowland physiographic region exhibiting an undulating topography intermixed with extensive flat areas. The bedrock underlying the Walnut Creek watershed is acidic sandstone or shale. The Cuyahoga fine grained sandstone interbedded with shale is found west of the Perry county line to approximately Pickerington Road, where Berea sandstone bedrock appears. Though sandstone and shale comprise the bedrock of the watershed, the stream itself flows over a mix of relatively deep, fine-grained calcareous till and outwash deposits of Wisconsinan origin overlaying lacustrine clays of Illinoian origin. The clay acts as an occluding layer directing ground water to move laterally to stream channels that have eroded down to the clay. The major associations, all formed in till,

outwash and or alluvium, are Bennington-Cardington, Brookston-Crosby, and Cardington-Bennington-Marengo.

Surface soil deposits in the Walnut Creek basin are primarily Wisconsinan ground and end moraines overlying hardpan of Illinoian origin. The former supplies gravel and cobble substrates to the streambed, and the later acts as a confining layer that supplies numerous ground water seeps to the stream. This combination of gravel-cobble substrates and sustained baseflow ameliorates the embedding silt and sand that tend to pervade intensively cropped drainages, Walnut Creek included.

## 2.5 Population and growth trends and economic development

As is noted in the preceding figures, development is projected to continue for many areas in this watershed. One of these areas which will likely see rapid economic development is along the Rt. 33 corridor in the Fairfield County portion of this watershed. Additional information regarding this corridor can be viewed at <http://fairfield33.com/>.

A second area likely to experience rapid growth is in the northeast quadrant of Pickaway County where the Rickenbacker Intermodal is located. Additional information regarding this facility can be found at <http://www.rickenbacker.org/intermodal/>.

A third area expected to see rapid economic development is located in Etna Township, Licking County, in the Sycamore Creek headwaters. Etna Township and the City of Pataskala are involved in development projects in this area.

This trend, if not managed appropriately, may result in continued riparian corridor loss along streams. This loss will be detrimental for water quality. Counties, municipalities, townships and individual landowners must work to protect and, when possible, restore riparian corridors. Riparian corridors provide benefits ranging from water quality enhancement to flood protection as well as open space for parks and trails.




Figure 2.5 Map of population density. Based on the 2000 census provided by the Ohio Department of Development in a spatially referenced database.




Figure 2.6 Map of recent and projected development. Spatial data from Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission ([http://www.morpc.org/info\\_center/dataport/gis\\_downloadable.asp](http://www.morpc.org/info_center/dataport/gis_downloadable.asp)).




Figure 2.7 Pie charts of recent and projected development.




Figure 2.8 Existing and proposed sewer service. Existing sewer service is within the gray regions, while the yellow regions are areas of proposed sewer facilities. Incorporated boundaries are highlighted in orange. Spatial data from Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission ([http://www.morpc.org/info\\_center/dataport/gis\\_downloadable.asp](http://www.morpc.org/info_center/dataport/gis_downloadable.asp)).

### 3 APPLICABLE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

Under the Clean Water Act, every state must adopt water quality standards to protect, maintain and improve the quality of the nation's surface waters. These standards represent a level of water quality that will support the Clean Water Act goal of "swimmable and fishable" waters. TMDLs are required when a waterbody fails to meet water quality standards (WQS) that have been established for a stream.

#### 3.1 Ohio WQS

Ohio's WQS, set forth in Chapter 3745-1 of the Ohio Administrative Code (OAC), include four major components:

- Beneficial use designations
- Narrative criteria
- Numeric criteria
- Antidegradation provisions

Beneficial use designations describe the existing or potential uses of a waterbody. They consider use and value of a waterbody for public water supply; protection and propagation of aquatic life; recreation in and on the water; and agricultural, industrial or other purposes. Ohio EPA assigns beneficial use designations to each waterbody in the state. There may be more than one use designation assigned to a water body. Examples of beneficial use designations include: public water supply, primary contact recreation, and aquatic life uses (warmwater habitat, exceptional warmwater habitat, etc.) Use designations are defined in paragraph (B) of rule 3745-1-07 of the OAC and are assigned in rules 3745-1-08 to 3745-1-32. Attainment of uses is based on numeric and narrative criteria.

Numeric criteria are chemical concentrations, degree of aquatic life toxicity, and physical conditions allowable in a waterbody without adversely affecting its beneficial uses. To ensure protection of those beneficial uses, Ohio EPA determines maximum acceptable concentrations for over 100 chemicals.

Narrative criteria describe general water-quality goals that apply to all surface waters. These criteria state that all waters shall be free from sludge, floating debris, oil, scum, color and odor producing materials; substances that are harmful to human or animal health; and nutrients in concentrations that may cause nuisance algal growth.

Much of Ohio EPA's present strategy regarding water quality based permitting is based upon the narrative free from, "no toxics in toxic amounts." Ohio EPA developed its strategy based on an evaluation of the potential for significant toxic impacts within receiving waters. Other components of this evaluation are the biological survey program and the biological criteria used to judge aquatic life use attainment.

Biological criteria are based on aquatic structural and functional community characteristics. These criteria are used to evaluate attainment of aquatic life uses. Data collected in these assessments are used to characterize aquatic life impairment and to help diagnose the cause of this impairment.

The Ohio EPA Antidegradation Policy aims to keep clean waters clean. Antidegradation provisions describe conditions under which water quality may be lowered in surface waters.

Existing beneficial uses and the existing water quality, even if better than that needed to protect existing beneficial use, must be maintained and protected unless lower quality is deemed necessary to allow important economic or social development. Antidegradation provisions are in Sections 3745-1-05 and 3745-1-54 of the OAC.

### 3.1.1 Recreational beneficial use designations

Two recreational use designations are applicable to stream segments in the Walnut Creek watershed: Primary Contact Recreation (PCR) and Secondary Contact Recreation (SCR). PCR is applied to waters suitable for full-body contact such as swimming and canoeing. Ohio EPA assigns the PCR use designation to a stream unless it is demonstrated through use attainment analysis that the combination of remoteness, accessibility, and depth makes full-body contact recreation by adults or children unlikely. In those cases, the SCR designation is assigned.

SCR is applied to waters suitable for partial-body contact recreation such as wading. Recreational use designations are in effect for only the recreation season. The recreation season is defined as May 1<sup>st</sup> through October 15<sup>th</sup>. Recreational use designations are in Section 3745-1-07 of the OAC.

Attainment of the recreation use designation is evaluated by comparison to bacteriological numeric and narrative criteria. Ohio currently has bacteriological criteria for two parameters: fecal coliform and *E. coli*. Narrative criteria state that only one of the two criteria must be met to result in attainment. Bacteriological criteria apply outside the mixing zone of permitted discharges.

The numeric criteria for PCR state the geometric-mean fecal coliform content shall not exceed 1,000 colony forming units (cfu) per 100 milliliters (ml), and fecal coliform content shall not exceed 2,000 cfu per 100 ml in more than ten percent of samples taken. The numeric criteria for PCR also state that the geometric-mean *E. coli* content shall not exceed 126 cfu per 100 ml, and *E. coli* content shall not exceed 298 cfu per 100 ml in more than ten percent of samples taken. The numeric criteria for SCR state fecal coliform and *E. coli* content shall not exceed 5,000 cfu per 100 ml and 576 cfu per 100 ml, respectively, in more than ten percent of samples taken. Fecal coliform and *E. coli* content is to be evaluated on no less than 5 samples collected within a 30-day period for both PCR and SCR. Bacteriological criteria apply outside the mixing zone of permitted discharges.

There are 180 stream miles designated as PCR while 23 miles are SCR accounting for eleven percent of all the stream miles given a recreation use designation. There are no other recreation use designations in the Walnut Creek watershed.

The SCR designations are distributed among six different streams within five unique 14-digit HUCs. Three of these 14-digit HUCs are in the 170 11-digit HUC, while only one 14-digit HUC and three streams are located in the 180 11-digit HUC. Figure 3.1 is a map of recreation use designations.




Figure 3.1 Map of recreation use designations.

### 3.1.2 Aquatic life beneficial use designations

Four aquatic life beneficial use designations are applicable in the Walnut Creek watershed:

- Warmwater Habitat
- Exceptional Warmwater Habitat
- Coldwater Habitat
- Modified Warmwater Habitat

The aquatic life use assigned to a waterbody is dependent upon its present or potential condition and the biological community it is capable of supporting. See <http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/default/tabid/11879/Default.aspx> for an overview of aquatic biological communities.

Warmwater Habitat (WWH) waters are capable of supporting and maintaining a balanced integrated community of warm water aquatic organisms. WWH represents the principal restoration target for the majority of water resource management efforts in Ohio and is in line with the Clean Water Act goal of fishable waters.

Exceptional Warmwater Habitat (EWH) represents a protection goal for the management of Ohio's best water resources. Waters designated as EWH are capable of supporting exceptional or unusual assemblages of aquatic organisms which are characterized by a high diversity of

species, particularly those which are highly pollutant intolerant and/or are rare, threatened, or endangered (i.e., declining species).

Coldwater Habitat (CWH) is applied to waters that support native communities of cold-water organisms, and/or those that support trout stocking and management under the auspices of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources.

Modified Warmwater Habitat (MWH) is applied to waters that have been subject to maintenance, which essentially permanently modifies the stream. The MWH designation is appropriate if the modification is such that WWH criteria are unattainable. Additionally, the modification must be sanctioned by state or federal law. MWH aquatic communities are generally composed of species that are tolerant to low dissolved oxygen, silt, nutrient enrichment and poor quality habitat. Where this use designation is applied, the allowable conditions in the MWH-designated stream may be driven by the need to protect a higher downstream aquatic life use designation (e.g., WWH, EWH).

Aquatic life use attainment is dependent upon numeric biological criteria (biocriteria). Biocriteria are based on aquatic community characteristics that are measured both structurally and functionally. The rationale for using biocriteria has been extensively discussed elsewhere (Karr, 1991; Ohio EPA, 1987a,b; Yoder, 1989; Miner and Borton, 1991; Yoder, 1991; Yoder and Rankin, 1995).

Attainment of aquatic life uses is determined directly by measuring fish and aquatic macroinvertebrate populations, and comparing results to expectations derived from least impacted reference sites. Attainment benchmarks (i.e., expectations) drawn from the least impacted reference population are established in the WQS in the form of biocriteria. If measurements of an aquatic community do not achieve any one of the three biocriterion (fish: Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) and Modified Index of Well-being (MIwb)); aquatic macroinvertebrates: Invertebrate Community Index (ICI)) the stream is considered in non attainment. If the aquatic communities achieve at least one of the biological criteria and none of the other criteria are rated as poor, the stream is said to be in partial attainment. A stream that is in partial attainment is not achieving its designated aquatic life use, whereas a stream that meets all of the biocriteria benchmarks is in full attainment.

Table 3.1 and Figure 3.2 show the distribution of aquatic life uses in the watershed. Table 3.2 presents biocriteria applicable in the Walnut Creek watershed. Biocriteria do not currently exist for CWH; attainment is determined on a case-by-case basis.

Table 3.1. Distribution of aquatic life use designations.

| Aquatic Life Uses                     | Stream Length (miles) | Relative %  |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Warmwater habitat (WWH)               | 163                   | 80.3%       |
| Coldwater habitat (CWH)               | 21                    | 10.2%       |
| Exceptional warmwater habitat (EWH)   | 14                    | 7.1%        |
| Modified warmwater habitat (MWH)      | 5                     | 2.4%        |
| <b>Total designated stream length</b> | <b>203</b>            | <b>100%</b> |




Figure 3.2 Map of aquatic life use designations .

Table 3.2 Biocriteria applicable for the Eastern Corn Belt Plains Ecoregion (ECBP)

| Biological Index                    | Assessment Method | WWH             | EWH             | MWH             |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI)     | Headwater         | 40              | 50              | 24              |
|                                     | Wading            | 40              | 50              | 24              |
|                                     | Boat              | 42              | 48              | 24              |
| Modified Index of Well Being (MIwb) | Headwater         | NA <sup>1</sup> | NA <sup>1</sup> | NA <sup>1</sup> |
|                                     | Wading            | 8.3             | 9.4             | 4.0             |
|                                     | Boat              | 8.5             | 9.6             | 4.0             |
| Invertebrate Community Index (ICI)  | All <sup>2</sup>  | 36              | 46              | 22              |

1 Not applicable to drainage areas less than 20 mi<sup>2</sup>

2 Limited to sites with appropriate conditions for artificial-substrate placement

## 4 WATERSHED ASSESSMENT RESULTS: STATUS OF WATER QUALITY RELATIVE TO THE STANDARDS

The following sub-sections discuss the results of the watershed-wide water quality survey which was conducted by the Ohio EPA between June and October of 2005. Fifty-five sites were monitored across the 286 mi<sup>2</sup> watershed and were evaluated as two HUC-11 watershed assessment units (AUs). Attainment status of the designated uses and accompanying statistics (e.g., percent attainment) are reported by AU in the Integrated Report.


### 4.1 Recreation use attainment

Recreation use attainment at each sample site is based on the geometric mean and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of all samples. Data collected by the Ohio EPA during the 2005 recreation season was used to assess the status of recreation use attainment. A summary of the data is provided in Table 4.1.

Twenty-five of the 55 sites sampled failed to meet criteria for recreation use amounting to 45 percent of all sites. Fifteen sites (27 percent) did not meet the geometric mean criterion, and each of these also failed to meet the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile criterion. Ten other sites only failed in meeting the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile criterion. The upper 11-digit HUC (170) had substantially more recreation use impairment with 18 sites not meeting standards compared to only seven in the lower HUC (180). The impairment in the 170 HUC was distributed among five of the six 14-digit HUCs amounting to an area of 118 out of 135 square miles (83 percent). Only three of seven were impaired in the 180 HUC accounting for 50 out of 148 square miles (34 percent).

Data collected during heavy rainfall related to Hurricane Katrina between 8/29/05 and 9/1/05 at various sites was not used for attainment calculations because it was ultimately determined to be an atypical occurrence. The excessive pulse loading of fecal coliform, which occurred after a dry spell of below normal flows, was analyzed and not considered appropriate for representing water quality. The average daily flow on 8/31/05 ranked near the recreation season's seven percent flow exceedence, where the flow before the storm was below 90 percent exceedence. The load duration curve in Figure 4.1 was developed from data collected at the USGS flow gage 03229796 near Ashville. The USGS gage site was sampled the morning of 9/1/05 after the previous day's peak flow, resulting in a 7300cfu/100ml fecal coliform concentration. The instantaneous flow was conservatively estimated at 450cfs at the time of this site's sample, but somewhat missed the full magnitude of the event. If an 8/31/05 sample would have been taken at the gage, it would likely have a much higher load due to the washoff and peak flow timing. The 9/1/05 sample captured the residual concentration of the main washoff along with post washoff effects. The other Walnut Creek subwatershed sites sampled between 8/29/05 and 9/1/05 all responded in the same manner, though at different times through the hydrograph. It was decided to exclude all samples during this time to ensure the remaining datasets are evenly weighted.

Figure 4.1 depicts fecal coliform loads (shown as a diamond) derived from samples taken between 2000 and 2005. Ohio EPA samples taken in 2005 are denoted with a plus sign, and the remaining data was all sampled by the City of Ashville WWTP as part of their NPDES permit requirements. Data highlighted with a red dot are samples taken on days where greater than 30% of the total stream flow is from runoff (or less than 70% of the flow is base flow from groundwater and point sources). The Ohio EPA atypical 9/1/05 sample at this site is highlighted with a red square. The remainder of the Ohio EPA samples was taken in the dry weather flow



| Flow regime load analysis<br>fecal coliform (billion organisms/day) | High   | Wet weather | Mid-range<br>summer | Dry weather | Low     |
|---|--------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|---------|
| Flow duration regime interval                                       | 0-10%  | 10-40%      | 40-60%              | 60-90%      | 90-100% |
| Samples per regime  | 3      | 3           | 5                   | 11          | 1       |
| Median sample load  | 5,771  | 3,849       | 944                 | 341.9       | 256.4   |
| Target criteria load (mid regime)                                   | 19,822 | 4,875       | 2,099               | 1,012.8     | 523.5   |
| Median % sample load above criteria                                 | None   | None        | None                | None        | None    |

Figure 4.1 Fecal coliform load duration curve using 2005 Ohio EPA data and 2000-2005 City of Ashville data

range. The City of Ashville stream monitoring data fills in all the flow regimes, providing a reliable dataset to review various fecal coliform loadings to the criteria. With the 9/1/05 sample included, the data compiled between 2000 and 2005 show that the chronic (i.e., based on a geometric mean) recreation use criteria is met across a reasonably wide range of flow conditions. There is not enough City of Ashville data per recreation season to determine if the acute (i.e., based on a ninetieth percentile) criteria is met within each subset of flow ranges or overall. However, the grouped data demonstrates that this section of Walnut Creek is in attainment for the recreation season, and no reductions would be needed at any flow regime. The Ashville site's attainment based on Ohio EPA data geometric mean criteria is met with (474cfu/100mL) or without (321cfu/100mL) the 9/1/05 sample. The maximum criteria based on Ohio EPA data using a 90th percentile of a recreation season's site sample dataset as an attainment metric is not met with (2519cfu/100mL) the 9/1/05 sample, but demonstrates full attainment without (428cfu/100mL). Based on the Ashville gage site analysis, the 8/29/05-9/1/05 fecal coliform data was removed from all site datasets to avoid false positive maximum criteria nonattainment issues.

Table 4.1 Sample results for fecal coliform bacteria during the 2005 recreation season.

| Sample site location         |                |                               |                               | Data statistics <sup>1,2</sup> |            |                   | Attainment status <sup>3</sup> |                   |     |     |
|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| 14-digit HUC (last 6 digits) | Stream         | River mile                    | Drainage area (sq mile)       | Geo <sup>4</sup>               | Single max | 90th <sup>5</sup> | Geo <sup>4</sup>               | 90th <sup>5</sup> |     |     |
| 170                          | 010            | Pleasantville Creek           | 3.40                          | 1.6                            | 1,428      | 3,100             | 2,980                          | NON               | NON |     |
|                              |                |                               | 2.40                          | 5.1                            | 1,036      | 2,300             | 2,120                          | NON               | NON |     |
|                              |                |                               | 0.40                          | 11.2                           | 2,789      | 20,000            | 12,500                         | NON               | NON |     |
|                              |                | Walnut Creek                  | 54.20                         | 4.0                            | 2,062      | 3,800             | 3,560                          | NON               | NON |     |
|                              |                |                               | 53.00                         | 7.6                            | 924        | 3,300             | 2,640                          |                   | NON |     |
|                              |                |                               | 47.00                         | 21.1                           | 559        | 1,900             | 1,234                          |                   |     |     |
|                              | 45.40          |                               | 34.0                          | 1,022                          | 2,100      | 2,100             | NON                            | NON               |     |     |
|                              | 020            | Trib. to Pawpaw Cr. @ RM 1.79 | W. Br. Paw Paw Creek          | 0.30                           | 4.2        | 277               | 2,800                          | 2,260             |     | NON |
|                              |                |                               |                               | 1.30                           | 5.1        | 324               | 3,900                          | 1,998             |     |     |
|                              |                | Pawpaw Creek                  | W. Br. Paw Paw Creek          | 0.10                           | 5.5        | 291               | 700                            | 640               |     |     |
|                              |                |                               |                               | 0.80                           | 10.5       | 1,692             | 60,000                         | 26,520            | NON | NON |
|                              |                |                               | 0.60                          | 14.0                           | 2,014      | 27,000            | 18,600                         | NON               | NON |     |
|                              |                |                               | 0.30                          | 17.5                           | 1,190      | 3,000             | 2,580                          | NON               | NON |     |
|                              | 030            | Walnut Creek                  | 41.20                         | 60.0                           | 600        | 1,500             | 1,500                          |                   |     |     |
|                              |                |                               | 36.90                         | 66.0                           | 207        | 590               | 434                            |                   |     |     |
|                              | 040            | Poplar Creek                  | 8.00                          | 5.2                            | 655        | 4,300             | 4,180                          |                   | NON |     |
|                              |                |                               | 6.60                          | 8.1                            | 706        | 10,000            | 4,780                          |                   | NON |     |
|                              |                |                               | 0.70                          | 17.2                           | 603        | 1,700             | 1,142                          |                   |     |     |
|                              | 050            | Gillette Run                  | Trib. To Walnut Cr. @ RM 29.9 | 0.10                           | 6.1        | 1,959             | 6,000                          | 5,220             | NON | NON |
|                              |                |                               |                               | 1.30                           | 2.9        | 617               | 5,100                          | 3,420             |     | NON |
| 29.90                        |                |                               |                               | 114.0                          | 611        | 2,000             | 1,460                          |                   |     |     |
| 060                          | Sycamore Creek | 12.20                         | 4.6                           | 650                            | 2,900      | 2,540             |                                | NON               |     |     |
|                              |                | 9.60                          | 8.7                           | 345                            | 3,000      | 1,750             |                                |                   |     |     |
|                              |                | 4.70                          | 17.3                          | 1,029                          | 60,000     | 25,740            | NON                            | NON               |     |     |
|                              |                | 4.18                          | 18.6                          | 585                            | 20,000     | 8,480             |                                | NON               |     |     |
|                              |                | 2.60                          | 21.6                          | 807                            | 5,900      | 3,620             |                                | NON               |     |     |
|                              |                | 0.13                          | 24.3                          | 573                            | 1,800      | 1,440             |                                |                   |     |     |
| 180                          | 010            | Tussing Ditch                 | 0.40                          | 4.0                            | 481        | 900               | 702                            |                   |     |     |
|                              |                |                               | Trib. to Walnut Cr. @ RM 23.7 | 1.66                           | 1.8        | 719               | 1,200                          | 960               |     |     |
|                              |                | Walnut Creek                  | 24.45                         | 151.0                          | 451        | 560               | 560                            |                   |     |     |
|                              |                |                               | 23.52                         | 155.0                          | 376        | 520               | 514                            |                   |     |     |
|                              | 020            | Trib. to George Cr. @ RM 2.00 | 6.00                          | 1.5                            | 1,285      | 5,700             | 5,340                          | NON               | NON |     |
|                              |                |                               | 2.40                          | 5.3                            | 1,017      | 2,100             | 2,040                          | NON               | NON |     |
|                              |                | George Creek                  | 2.10                          | 4.5                            | 1,069      | 6,600             | 3,720                          | NON               | NON |     |
|                              |                |                               | 0.10                          | 14.6                           | 702        | 2,200             | 1,900                          |                   |     |     |
|                              | 030            | Big Run                       | 3.85                          | 4.6                            | 576        | 1,700             | 1,226                          |                   |     |     |
|                              |                |                               | 1.60                          | 6.3                            | 1,737      | 15,000            | 10,200                         | NON               | NON |     |

| Sample site location         |                               |                     |                         | Data statistics <sup>1,2</sup> |            |                   | Attainment status <sup>3</sup> |                   |     |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 14-digit HUC (last 6 digits) | Stream                        | River mile          | Drainage area (sq mile) | Geo <sup>4</sup>               | Single max | 90th <sup>5</sup> | Geo <sup>4</sup>               | 90th <sup>5</sup> |     |
|                              | S. Rickenbacker Run @ RM 2.00 | 0.10                | 0.6                     | 727                            | 1,600      | 1,228             |                                |                   |     |
|                              | Mud Run                       | 1.50                | 5.2                     | 791                            | 2,000      | 1,880             |                                |                   |     |
|                              | Slate Run                     | 0.50                | 5.0                     | 416                            | 4,300      | 2,920             |                                | NON               |     |
|                              | Mud Run                       | 0.70                | 11.5                    | 444                            | 1,400      | 968               |                                |                   |     |
|                              | Manns Run                     | 0.30                | 4.7                     | 257                            | 1,500      | 1,380             |                                |                   |     |
|                              | Walnut Creek                  |                     | 16.90                   | 188.0                          | 219        | 560               | 482                            |                   |     |
|                              |                               |                     | 14.90                   | 196.0                          | 286        | 580               | 538                            |                   |     |
|                              |                               |                     | 11.00                   | 215.0                          | 332        | 480               | 462                            |                   |     |
|                              |                               |                     | 9.30                    | 212.0                          | 173        | 430               | 298                            |                   |     |
|                              | 040                           | Little Walnut Creek | 6.40                    | 8.8                            | 587        | 1,000             | 982                            |                   |     |
|                              |                               |                     | 3.40                    | 15.5                           | 644        | 1,700             | 1,250                          |                   |     |
|                              | 050                           | Cherry Run          | 0.55                    | 4.6                            | 947        | 2,600             | 2,240                          |                   | NON |
|                              |                               | Turkey Run          | 6.50                    | 2.8                            | 298        | 1,000             | 730                            |                   |     |
|                              |                               |                     | 5.30                    | 9.3                            | 1,233      | 2,900             | 2,480                          | NON               | NON |
|                              |                               |                     | 0.20                    | 14.2                           | 656        | 2,200             | 1,700                          |                   |     |
|                              | 060                           | Bull Run            | 0.20                    | 4.4                            | 830        | 2,200             | 1,660                          |                   |     |
|                              |                               | Little Walnut Creek | 0.50                    | 44.0                           | 189        | 310               | 292                            |                   |     |
|                              | 070                           | Walnut Creek        | 4.10                    | 273.0                          | 321        | 470               | 428                            |                   |     |

1 Values presented as counts per 100 ml of sample

2 Statistics based on seven samples collected at each site with the exception of two sites which had only six samples collected

3 Empty spaces indicate full attainment of the designated recreation use, "NON" indicates that one or both criteria were not met. Recreation use criteria are discussed in Section 3.1.1.

4 "Geo" refers to the geometric mean.

5 "90th" refers to the 90th percentile

## 4.2 Aquatic life use attainment

The biological survey results show Walnut Creek to be an exceptional water resource, particularly in its ability to support unique and pollution sensitive aquatic species. In fact, the spotted, Tippecanoe, and state endangered bluebreast darters were recorded for the first time in Walnut Creek. The variegate darter was also found which is, like these others, particularly sensitive to poor water quality. The darters' presence indicates that Walnut Creek is healthy. However, 22 percent of the sites, all of which were on tributary streams, did not fully attain WQS for aquatic life while 45 percent failed to meet quality criteria for recreation.

Aquatic life use attainment was assessed at 55 sites in the Walnut Creek watershed that ranged in drainage area from 0.6 mi<sup>2</sup> to 44 mi<sup>2</sup>. Forty-three of the sites (78%) are in full attainment of their designated or recommended aquatic life use. Six of the sites (11%) are in partial attainment, and six of the sites (11%) are in non-attainment. Table 4.2 provides a presentation

of the attainment results, including biological index scores and Table 4.3 shows the causes and sources of impairment. Figure 4.2 illustrates aquatic life use attainment in the Walnut Creek watershed.




Figure 4.2 Map of the attainment status of aquatic life uses at survey sites in the 170 11-digit HUC. Two sites partially attaining their biocriteria on Sycamore Creek (RMs 4.2 and 2.6) may currently be in full attainment based on data collected in 2009.

Table 4.2 Results of the biological assessment.

| Hydrologic unit code<br>(last 3 digits) |        | Stream name                       | River<br>mile | Drainage area<br>(sq. mile) | QHEI | Indices for biocriteria <sup>1</sup> |                   |                   |                  | Attainment<br>status |
|---|--------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| HUC 11                                  | HUC 14 |                                   |               |                             |      | IBI                                  |                   | MIWB <sup>3</sup> | ICI <sup>4</sup> |                      |
|   |        |                                   |               |                             |      | Actual                               | Dev. <sup>2</sup> |                   |                  |                      |
| 170                                     | 010    | Walnut Creek                      | 45.4          | 34                          | 56.5 | 48                                   | 8                 | 9.2               | 34               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Walnut Creek                      | 47.0          | 21                          | 67.5 | 48                                   | 8                 | 9.3               | MG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Walnut Creek                      | 51.6          | 9                           | 63.0 | 48                                   | 8                 | -                 | VG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Walnut Creek                      | 54.2          | 4                           | 74.5 | 52                                   | 12                | -                 | E                | FULL                 |
|   |        | Pleasantville Creek               | 0.5           | 11                          | 67.0 | 28                                   | -12               | -                 | F                | <b>NON</b>           |
|   |        | Pleasantville Creek               | 2.4           | 5                           | 37.5 | 28                                   | -12               | -                 | F                | <b>NON</b>           |
|   |        | Pleasantville Creek               | 3.4           | 2                           | 42.0 | 40                                   | 0                 | -                 | MG               | FULL                 |
|   | 020    | Pawpaw Creek                      | 0.3           | 18                          | 56.0 | 40                                   | 0                 | -                 | G                | FULL                 |
|   |        | Pawpaw Creek                      | 0.8           | 11                          | 69.0 | 46                                   | 6                 | -                 | G                | FULL                 |
|   |        | Trib to Pawpaw 1.79               | 0.3           | 4                           | 50.0 | 40                                   | 0                 | -                 | F                | <b>PARTIAL</b>       |
|   |        | W. Br. Pawpaw Creek               | 0.1           | 7                           | 65.5 | 36                                   | -4                | -                 | G                | FULL                 |
|   |        | W. Br. Pawpaw Creek               | 1.3           | 6                           | 66.5 | 44                                   | 4                 | -                 | G                | FULL                 |
|   | 030    | Walnut Creek                      | 36.9          | 67                          | 73.5 | 51                                   | 11                | 9.8               | 52               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Walnut Creek                      | 41.2          | 60                          | 73.5 | 47                                   | 7                 | 8.7               | 42               | FULL                 |
|   | 040    | Poplar Creek <sup>5</sup>         | 0.7           | 17                          | 71.0 | 48                                   | -2                | -                 | 48               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Poplar Creek <sup>5</sup>         | 6.6           | 8                           | 69.0 | 52                                   | 2                 | -                 | VG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Poplar Creek <sup>5</sup>         | 8.0           | 5                           | 67.0 | 48                                   | -2                | -                 | G                | <b>PARTIAL</b>       |
|   | 050    | Walnut Creek                      | 29.9          | 110                         | 81.0 | 49                                   | 9                 | 9.5               | 50               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Gillette Run                      | 0.1           | 6                           | 50.0 | 40                                   | 0                 | -                 | F                | FULL                 |
|   |        | Trib to Walnut 29.83 <sup>5</sup> | 1.3           | 3                           | 55.5 | 44                                   | 4                 | -                 | E                | FULL                 |
|   | 060    | Sycamore Creek                    | 0.2           | 24                          | 74.0 | 49                                   | 9                 | 9.3               | 50               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Sycamore Creek                    | 2.6**         | 21                          | 79.0 | 51                                   | 11                | 7.3               | 36               | <b>PARTIAL**</b>     |
|   |        | Sycamore Creek                    | 4.2**         | 19                          | 75.0 | 48                                   | 8                 | -                 | LF               | <b>PARTIAL**</b>     |
|   |        | Sycamore Creek                    | 4.7           | 17                          | 76.0 | 54                                   | 14                | -                 | MG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Sycamore Creek                    | 9.6           | 9                           | 68.5 | 40                                   | 0                 | -                 | MG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Sycamore Creek                    | 12.2          | 5                           | 69.5 | 34                                   | -6                | -                 | F                | <b>NON</b>           |
|   | 180    | 010                               | Walnut Creek  | 23.6                        | 155  | 78.5                                 | 53                | 13                | 9.6              | 52                   |
| Walnut Creek                            |        |                                   | 24.4          | 151                         | 82.5 | 53                                   | 13                | 10.0              | 56               | FULL                 |
| Tussing Ditch <sup>5</sup>              |        |                                   | 0.4           | 4                           | 48.5 | 40                                   | 16                | -                 | F                | FULL                 |

| Hydrologic unit code<br>(last 3 digits) |        | Stream name                       | River<br>mile | Drainage area<br>(sq. mile) | QHEI | Indices for biocriteria <sup>1</sup> |                   |                   |                  | Attainment<br>status |
|---|--------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| HUC 11                                  | HUC 14 |                                   |               |                             |      | IBI                                  |                   | MIWB <sup>3</sup> | ICI <sup>4</sup> |                      |
|   |        |                                   |               |                             |      | Actual                               | Dev. <sup>2</sup> |                   |                  |                      |
|   |        | Trib to Walnut 23.70              | 1.7           | 2                           | 70.5 | 48                                   | 8                 | -                 | VG               | FULL                 |
|   | 020    | George Creek                      | 0.1           | 15                          | 62.5 | 38                                   | -2                | -                 | G                | FULL                 |
|   |        | George Creek                      | 2.0           | 11                          | 66.5 | 38                                   | -2                | -                 | MG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Trib to George Creek              | 2.4           | 5                           | 66.0 | 34                                   | -6                | -                 | MG               | <b>PARTIAL</b>       |
|   |        | Trib to George Creek              | 6.0           | 2                           | 57.0 | 32                                   | -8                | -                 | 28               | <b>NON</b>           |
|   |        |                                   |               |                             |      |                                      |                   |                   |                  |                      |
|   | 030    | Slate Run                         | 0.5           | 5                           | 65.0 | 50                                   | 10                | -                 | G                | FULL                 |
|   |        | Walnut Creek                      | 9.3           | 222                         | 84.5 | 53                                   | 11                | 9.0               | 52               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Walnut Creek                      | 11.0          | 215                         | 80.5 | 52                                   | 10                | 9.4               | E                | FULL                 |
|   |        | Walnut Creek                      | 13.8          | 198                         | 79.5 | 48                                   | 8                 | 8.7               | E                | FULL                 |
|   |        | Walnut Creek                      | 16.9          | 192                         | 67.5 | 51                                   | 11                | 9.6               | 54               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Big Run                           | 1.6           | 6                           | 40.0 | 30                                   | -10               | -                 | F                | <b>NON</b>           |
|   |        | Big Run <sup>5</sup>              | 3.9           | 5                           | 71.0 | 50                                   | 10                | -                 | VG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Mud Run                           | 0.7           | 12                          | 65.0 | 42                                   | 2                 | -                 | VG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Mud Run                           | 1.5           | 5                           | 43.0 | 34                                   | -6                | -                 | F                | <b>NON</b>           |
|   |        | Trib to Walnut 15.54 <sup>5</sup> | 0.1           | 1                           | 38.0 | 38                                   | -2                | -                 | F                | FULL                 |
|   |        | Manns Run                         | 0.3           | 5                           | 47.0 | 44                                   | 4                 | -                 | MG               | FULL                 |
|   | 040    | Little Walnut Creek <sup>5</sup>  | 3.5           | 16                          | 70.0 | 54                                   | 4                 | -                 | VG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Little Walnut Creek <sup>5</sup>  | 6.4           | 9                           | 63.0 | 44                                   | -6                | -                 | VG               | FULL                 |
|   | 050    | Turkey Run <sup>5</sup>           | 0.2           | 14                          | 47.0 | 48                                   | -2                | -                 | F                | <b>PARTIAL</b>       |
|   |        | Turkey Run <sup>5</sup>           | 5.3           | 9                           | 67.5 | 42                                   | -8                | -                 | VG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Turkey Run <sup>5</sup>           | 6.5           | 3                           | 70.0 | 46                                   | -4                | -                 | VG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Cherry Run                        | 0.6           | 4                           | 70.0 | 50                                   | 10                | -                 | VG               | FULL                 |
|   | 060    | Bull Run                          | 0.2           | 4                           | 0.0  | --                                   | --                | -                 | MG               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Little Walnut Creek               | 0.5           | 44                          | 68.5 | 50                                   | 10                | 9.3               | 48               | FULL                 |
|   |        | Little Walnut Creek               | 1.5           | 39                          | 77.5 | 42                                   | 2                 | 8.2               |                  | FULL                 |
|   | 070    | Walnut Creek                      | 4.1           | 274                         | 68.0 | 48                                   | 6                 | 9.5               | 46               | FULL                 |

1 Abbreviations for the indices are as follows: IBI = Index of Biotic Integrity; MIWB = Modified Index of Well-Being; ICI = Invertebrate Community index

2 "Dev." Refers to deviation of the observed IBI score to the minimum criterion for the given use designation and stream size (based on drainage area). Some scores substantially exceed the minimum criteria and reflect attainment while others fall below the criterion leading to impaired status or a non-significant departure from the criterion meaning that status is considered in attainment.

3 MIWB criteria are not applicable to streams with a drainage area less than 20 square miles (headwater streams).

- 4 Where number scores are not provided only a narrative evaluation is available (and have accompanying criteria thresholds). Abbreviations mean the following : E = exceptional; VG = very good; G = good; MG = marginally good; F = fair.
- 5 Blue highlight indicates exceptional warmwater habitat (EWH) designation, orange indicates modified warmwater habitat (MWH) and green indicates coldwater habitat (CWH). No color is used for sites designated as warm water habitat (WWH). Aquatic life use attainment for CWH is determined on a case-by-case basis since there are no criteria established specifically for this use.
- \*\* The City of Pickerington disputes these results and has retained a consultant to resample the area; results of the study have not been submitted to Ohio EPA for review as of February 1, 2010.

Table 4.3 Reasons for biological use impairments.

| Hydrologic unit code (last 3 digits) |        | Stream name               | River mile | Attainment status | Causes of impairment (stressors)               | Sources of impairment (sources of the stressors)                       |
|--------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|--|--|
| HUC 11                               | HUC 14 |                           |            |                   |  |  |
| 170                                  | 010    | Pleasantville Creek       | 0.5        | NON               | Sediment, low dissolved oxygen                 | Unfenced pasture   |
|                                      |        | Pleasantville Creek       | 2.4        | NON               | Sediment, low dissolved oxygen                 | Sanitary sewer overflows, cropland                                     |
|                                      | 020    | Trib to Pawpaw 1.79       | 0.3        | PARTIAL           | Sediment                                       | Channelization   |
|                                      | 040    | Poplar Creek <sup>1</sup> | 8.0        | PARTIAL           | Natural conditions                             | Not applicable   |
|                                      | 060    | Sycamore Creek            | 2.6**      | PARTIAL           | Total dissolved solids                         | Pickerington wastewater treatment plant                                |
|                                      |        | Sycamore Creek            | 4.2**      | PARTIAL           | Total dissolved solids, solids, total toxicity | Pickerington wastewater treatment plant                                |
|                                      |        | Sycamore Creek            | 12.2       | NON               | Organic enrichment, low dissolved oxygen       | Urban storm water and septic systems                                   |
| 180                                  | 020    | Trib to George Creek      | 2.4        | PARTIAL           | Toxicity                                       | Urban land use   |
|                                      |        | Trib to George Creek      | 6.0        | NON               | Toxicity                                       | Urban land use   |
|                                      | 030    | Big Run                   | 1.6        | NON               | Flow alterations, organic enrichment           | Unknown, unverified water withdrawal, minor wastewater treatment plant |
|                                      |        | Mud Run                   | 1.5        | NON               | Sediment/poor habitat                          | Hydromodification-Ag, unfenced livestock                               |
|                                      | 050    | Turkey Run <sup>1</sup>   | 0.2        | PARTIAL           | Habitat alterations                            | Hydromodification-Ag, channelization                                   |

1 Blue shading indicates exceptional warmwater habitat (EWH) while no shading refers to warm water habitat (WWH).

\*\* The City of Pickerington disputes these results and has retained a consultant to resample the area; results of the study have not been submitted to Ohio EPA for review as of February 1, 2010.




Figure 4.3 Map of the attainment status of aquatic life uses at survey sites in the 180 11-digit HUC.

### 4.3 Public drinking water use attainment

There are no known entities within this watershed that are using surface water as a source of drinking water. Communities within this watershed obtain their drinking water supply from ground water wells.

### 4.4 Human health use (fish tissue)

Walnut Creek has been sampled for fish tissue contamination by Ohio EPA twice in the past ten years, in 1999 and again in 2005.

In 1999, some of the fish sampled had levels of PCBs that were both above the threshold for a one meal per month advisory and above the threshold used in listing waters as impaired in Ohio's Integrated Report to U.S. EPA (303(d) list). Therefore, Walnut Creek is listed in Ohio's Integrated Report as impaired for PCBs in fish tissue and has a one meal per month fish consumption advisory for channel catfish due to PCBs.

Sampling conducted in 2005 resulted in no PCBs detected in eighteen samples of fish tissue. According to Ohio EPA's methodologies for determining advisories and impairments for fish tissue, another round of sampling is required to remove the current consumption advisory, or to delist Walnut Creek from the Integrated Report impairment list.

PCBs are currently banned from use in the U.S. and are expected to decrease in streams over time. Therefore, no further action other than continued monitoring for PCBs in fish in Walnut Creek will be taken.

The only other contaminant found in fish in Walnut Creek in quantities of concern to human health was mercury. The concentrations of mercury were found in the two meals per week to one meal per month advisory range, depending on the species. The concentrations were below the listing threshold for mercury impairment for Ohio's Integrated Report.

Mercury is a ubiquitous contaminant in streams throughout the U.S. and its primary source is thought to be mercury deposited from the atmosphere. Mercury as a surface water pollutant is being addressed in a variety of ways outside of the traditional TMDL process, including limits on mercury emissions from air sources, mercury take-back programs, and legislation prohibiting the sale of most mercury-containing products. Unless there are known or suspected local surface water sources of mercury, mercury is best addressed outside of the individual watershed TMDL framework.

Additional information regarding fish consumption can be found at:  
<http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/fishadvisory/index.aspx>.

## 5 LINKAGE ANALYSES

A linkage analysis evaluates the most likely connection between the observed water quality and the source of concern.

In Ohio, biocriteria are used for aquatic life use designations, so when results show that the biological community fails to satisfy minimum criteria, the stressors that impair the biological community must be identified. Stressor identification uses both current scientific understanding and professional judgment acquired over years of biological survey work. Results from the data collection in conjunction with the observations made in the field are measured against this knowledge. The causes of impairment are ultimately submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as a part of biennial reporting required through Sections 305(b) and 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.

For nutrients and habitat there are no water quality criteria established for the stressors identified as causing impairment, therefore reliable target conditions are needed. These targets have been established through robust statistical analyses comparing biological performance (as evidenced through scores for the biocriteria indices) and various water quality stressors. The results of these analyses are published in the [Association Between Nutrients, Habitat, and the Aquatic Biota in Ohio Rivers and Streams](#) (Ohio EPA, 1999).

All water quality criteria for recreation uses are based on concentrations of pollutants, which are measured as a part of the water quality survey. Without the concentration data impairment cannot be determined. In this case the link between the impairment and the stressor causing impairment is direct.

### 5.1 Stressors causing impaired uses

The following sub-sections discuss how stressors impair water uses and focus on **pathogens**, **habitat** and **sediment** for which TMDLs are developed as well as **flow alterations** and **lack of floodplain connection**, which is also detrimental to water quality.

#### 5.1.1 Pathogens

The WQS for fecal coliform bacteria are meant to protect recreational water uses by limiting risk for human illness due to exposure to pathogenic microorganisms. Pathogenic organisms include bacteria, viruses, and protozoa. Contamination by pathogens is a human health issue, as skin contact or accidental ingestion can lead to various conditions such as skin irritation, gastroenteritis, or other more serious illnesses.

Fecal coliform is a measure of the number of organisms within the fecal coliform sub-group of bacteria. Fecal coliform reside in the intestinal tracts of warm blooded animals and are excreted in their wastes. Generally speaking, fecal coliform bacteria are not pathogenic organisms. However, if their numbers exceed a threshold value it becomes increasingly probable that pathogenic organisms are present in sufficient numbers to threaten public health.

The reason for measuring fecal coliform bacteria instead of other pathogenic organisms is that they are much easier to detect and identify than the many individual pathogenic organisms that may be present. Since the majority of pathogens that enter waterbodies do so in association with human or animal wastes, fecal coliform are appropriate surrogates for pathogenic organisms. Figure 5.1 shows an illicit discharge, which is a common source of pathogens.



Figure 5.1 Photo of an illicit discharge from a storm sewer outlet.

### 5.1.2 Habitat

In order for an aquatic community to be healthy it must have adequate habitat. The absence or low quality of stream habitat hampers the ability of aquatic organisms to successfully reproduce, acquire food, or find protection from other species and stressful environmental conditions leading to reduced or absent populations of aquatic species. A compounding effect of widespread degraded habitat is that source populations of sensitive aquatic species dwindle and migrate to areas that do have suitable habitat quality. Figure 5.2 shows a section for Walnut Creek with high quality habitat as evidenced by sinuosity, good substrate, and structure provided by streamside trees in the intact riparian zone.



Figure 5.2 Photo of Walnut Creek at RM 14.9 in Franklin County.

### 5.1.3 Sediment (siltation)

Although sediment alone can be damaging to the aquatic community, its negative impact is typically restricted to the fact that it degrades stream habitat. Specifically, sediment fills in void spaces that occur between larger substrates such as cobbles and gravels rendering those spaces inaccessible to organisms. The function of the substrate also decreases because flow of water through these spaces is limited, and with it dissolved oxygen and nutrition sources.



Figure 5.3 Photo showing fine sediment that has covered the bottom of Mann's Run (RM 0.3 end of Miller Road) in Pickaway County.

### 5.1.4 Flow alteration and disrupted floodplain function

Although floodplains and stream flow are not directly addressed with TMDLs for the Walnut Creek watershed, they are very important aspects of the stream system and have a critical influence over its health and stability. In particular, it is important to avoid urban or commercial development in floodplains in the Walnut Creek watershed. The following paragraphs provide an explanation of the importance of floodplains.

#### *Importance of floodplains*

The flow of water is a primary factor in shaping the stream channel and therefore influencing stream habitat. Flowing water moves sand, gravel, cobble and other substrates, as well as erodes banks and the stream bed. Higher flows associated with storm events do the vast majority of the work of shaping the stream channel. In particular, flows that have a return frequency of about 1 to 2 years are the most influential. The shape of stream channels is the result of flow patterns that have occurred over long periods of time, where a variety of naturally occurring channel adjustments has resulted in a stable configuration.

A major shift in flow patterns can have a profound effect on the shape and stability of the channel and on habitat quality. An increase in the intensity as well as frequency of high flows can lead to more severe erosion of bed and bank material. Such changes in flow patterns follow major changes in land cover such as a change from cropland to urban or commercial lands.

Adequate floodplains have a dampening effect on the rate of flow pattern change because of their ability to diffuse the energy of high flows. In particular, water depth increases more slowly in relation to increases in flow volume because water is spread out horizontally across a much wider area rather than be confined in the stream channel itself. This is important because depth of flowing water is directly related to the capacity to erode and transport sediment. Floodplains also temporarily store flood waters, which reduces the potential for severe erosion and downstream flooding.



Figure 5.4 Photo of Walnut Creek overflowing its banks in Canal Winchester during a spring 2008 rain event. Such events occur several times each year in this basin.

Floodplains also foster the separation of fine sediment from coarser, more functional bed substrates. This happens because finer grained material such as sands, silts and clays more readily fall out of suspension in the slower waters of the floodplain as opposed to the heavier gravels and cobbles that are less likely to leave the main channel. Floodplain soils are also especially well suited to assimilate other pollutants such as nutrients and organic based pollutants.

In order to maintain a healthy aquatic community that is able to meet the WQS, the stream system should have a stable channel form that includes floodplains. Rapid changes in land use from agricultural to residential and commercial are reducing available floodplains in the Walnut Creek watershed. Figure 5.4 is a photo chronic flooding on Walnut Creek which may be due in part to reduction in available floodplain storage in the watershed.

Additional information regarding floodplains is available at <http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/water/floodpln/default/tabid/3511/Default.aspx>.

## 5.2 Sources of the stressors

The preceding discussed water quality stressors that are causing designated use impairment. This section discusses the sources of these stressors.

Primary stressor sources identified in the Walnut Creek watershed are:

### Point sources

- permitted wastewater discharges
- sanitary sewer overflows
- home sewerage treatment systems
- storm sewers

### Nonpoint sources

- livestock wastes and stream use
- cropland runoff
- ditch maintenance
- land development and
- urban/suburban land uses

In several instances an individual source may contribute multiple stressors to the water resource.

### **5.2.1 Permitted wastewater discharges**

All wastewater discharges to waters of the state must be permitted through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). NPDES permits limit the quantity of pollutants, such as fecal coliform and suspended solids discharged and impose monitoring requirements. NPDES permits are designed to protect both public health and the aquatic environment by helping to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations.

Because point sources generally discharge wastewater continuously under all flow conditions, their impact on water quality tends to be greatest under average to low flow conditions, because the potential for dilution is lower. NPDES dischargers located near the origin of a stream or on a small tributary have a much greater influence over water quality and the potential to violate water quality standards.

This TMDL classifies NPDES dischargers as major, minor, or miscellaneous. Majors are those that discharge more than one-million gallons per day (MGD). Minors are small- or medium-sized wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs), such as those serving small municipalities, schools, private businesses, and developments. Miscellaneous facilities are those discharging process, cooling, or storm water, such as industrial complexes, water treatment plants (WTPs), and quarries. A listing of wastewater discharge permit holders in this watershed is included in Appendix A of this report.

In the Sycamore Creek subwatershed, data from Ohio EPA's 2005 survey shows that the discharge from the Pickerington WWTP is precluding WQS attainment. This facility discharges elevated amounts of total dissolved solids (TDS), which has had an adverse impact on several important macroinvertebrate species. Pickerington WWTP receives waste from the Pickerington water treatment plant, which has elevated TDS. This issue is being addressed in the NPDES permit; therefore a TMDL is not needed. Instead a category 4B option is used (see Appendix B). The City of Pickerington disputes Ohio EPA's 2005 results and has retained a consultant to resample the area; results of the study have not been submitted to Ohio EPA for review as of February 1, 2010.

### **5.2.2 Sanitary sewer overflows**

A sanitary sewer overflow (SSO) results when the hydraulic capacity of a sanitary sewer collection system designed to collect and transport only wastewater is exceeded. Ground water infiltration and storm water inflow into a sanitary sewer system may contribute to an SSO. Ground water infiltration results when the integrity of sanitary sewer pipes is compromised. Inflow of storm water into a sanitary sewer collection system results from the illegal connection of roof and /or building foundation drains or from poorly-sealed man holes.

Wastewater from a SSO is untreated and may discharge directly to a stream, storm sewer or city street. Such events are illegal and must be reported to Ohio EPA. A plan for SSO elimination is then required.



Figure 5.5 Photo of a sanitary sewer overflow pipe in the Walnut Creek Sewer District Leitnaker Road Pump Station. When the pump station becomes hydraulically overloaded, untreated wastewater discharges through the pipe to an unnamed tributary of Pleasantville Creek.

SSO discharges, when occurring, increase bacteria concentrations in a receiving stream and may result in organic solids deposits on the stream bottom. SSO discharges can contribute to stream and habitat degradation and to the total watershed pollutant load.

The SSO shown in Figure 5.5 is within the Walnut Creek Sewer District (WCSD) sanitary sewer collection system and is impairing designated uses in Pleasantville Creek. Currently actions are being taken by WCSD to rectify this source of impairment.

### 5.2.3 Home sewage treatment systems

Household Sewage Treatment Systems (HSTs) are small wastewater treatment units serving individual homes or businesses. HSTs are typically located on the property of the home or business from which they treat waste. Depending on site conditions, such systems may or may not have been designed to discharge wastewater to a stream.

There are many types of HSTs, but those most common in the Walnut Creek watershed are septic tanks with soil-adsorption fields, septic tanks with sand filters, and aeration systems. The efficiency of each treatment system is dependent upon its age, the manner in which it is maintained, and characteristics of the site where it is located. Important site characteristics include soil drainage, water-table depth, bedrock depth, land slope, and parcel-lot size.

HSTs affect water quality under multiple conditions. HSTs discharging directly to a stream or river, such as many aeration or illicit systems, behave similarly to a point source. These types of systems primarily affect water quality under dry, low-flow conditions. HSTs discharging indirectly to a stream via a tile drain or intermittent ditch may exhibit effects similar to a nonpoint source.



Figure 5.6 Photos of failed home septic treatment. The top picture is an example of a home sewage treatment system discharge pipe outlet. The grayish discoloration of the discharge in this photograph and in picture below is typical for a system that is discharging inadequately treated wastewater. Failing systems such as this contribute to elevated bacteria counts noted in watersheds.

Wastewater discharged to a dry tile or ditch may be of insufficient volume to sustain flow to the stream. Additional pollutant delivery pathways associated with HSTs exist, but those discussed above are believed the most significant in the Walnut Creek watershed.

HSTs are regulated by permits issued by local health authorities. Pollution from HSTs contributes to the total wasteload if it is directly discharging, such as an aeration system, or the total load if it is non-discharging such as leach field system.

There is a large proportion of the Walnut Creek watershed in which HSTs are used for sewage treatment. Improperly functioning systems are resulting in high bacteria loading and WQS nonattainment in some areas.

#### 5.2.4 Livestock wastes and stream use

Livestock with stream access contribute large pollutant loads to the stream. Of particular concern is bacterial contamination because unrestricted livestock can deposit waste directly into the stream. This results in very high localized bacterial counts, and can impair downstream use attainment as well.



Figure 5.7 Photo of livestock with access to Mud Run on the west side of Goodman Road north of Perrill Road in Pickaway County.

Livestock with stream access can also contribute to habitat and channel degradation. Livestock often graze to the stream edge, eliminating riparian vegetation which, among other benefits, protects against bank erosion. Further, livestock may trample, collapse, and de-stabilize stream banks as can be seen in Figures 5.7 and 5.8. This can result in an increase in sediment discharge to a stream and lead to downstream siltation. Grazing livestock with stream access is a source of impairment in the Walnut Creek watershed where specific locations have been noted as having obvious impact. These areas, such as that along an unnamed tributary located near Pleasantville, should be of higher priority when addressing these specific water quality issues in the watershed.

#### 5.2.5 Cropland runoff

Crop production requires intense land management and there are several unintended consequences that can negatively affect water quality. Practices that pose the greatest threats are tillage and the application of agro-chemicals, especially fertilizers. Although different from runoff, sub-surface drainage, which is extensively used in Ohio, also provides a means for land applied substances to reach surface waters.

Tillage is used for seedbed preparation and weed-control and is often carried out in the spring before planting or in the fall after harvest. After tillage, soil is vulnerable to sheet erosion and

can be transported to surface waters during a rain event or as snow melts. Cropland topography has a strong influence on the degree to which this type of erosion occurs where steeper slopes yield higher soil losses. Other means for soil erosion result in the formation of rills and gullies where runoff is concentrated and has more power to erode soil. Management to minimize soil losses include conservation tillage, cover cropping and grassed waterways.



Figure 5.8 Photo of a livestock operation north of the Village of Carroll on the west side of Carroll Northern Road. This photograph shows dry weather feedlot drainage and unrestricted stream access within the pasture. Note the high potential for manure washoff from the pasture during wet weather events. The stream at this location is Gillette Run.

Agro-chemicals are transported with soil particles especially those that readily bind to soil. Phosphorus and a number of herbicides are often associated with sediment as these chemicals readily bind with soil. More soluble agro-chemicals are transported in runoff or through sub-surface drainage tiles. Nitrate loading is most strongly associated with water from sub-surface drainage tiles. A number of areas in the Walnut Creek watershed have been adversely affected by fine sediment originating from cropland runoff.

### 5.2.6 Ditch maintenance

Ditch maintenance refers to work that is done to an open channel to sustain some minimum level of water conveyance. The increase in conveyance can support more efficient surface drainage and/or shallow ground water being drained through field tiles. Ditch maintenance often entails removal of woody material in the channel, suppression of woody vegetation along the banks and riparian zone, and periodic dredging and/or restructuring the shape of the channel with excavation equipment. Figure 5.9 illustrates a ditch in Fairfield County that is likely having routine ditch maintenance performed.

The benefits of ditch maintenance include reduction in surface ponding or flooding in urban and residential areas which protects against property damage and/or nuisance conditions, but its

application is far more widely used to increase trafficability of crop fields during wetter times of the year and improve crop yields. Ditch projects are often supported by local assessment fees where a county agency is then responsible for managing and/or carry out the necessary work. Such arrangements follow a petition process that is decided upon by local officials; however, private ditch maintenance is not at all uncommon.

Water quality problems associated with ditch maintenance include the diminished capacity of the drainage way to assimilate nutrients and organic pollutants, to sort and store fine sediment, and to dampen the intensity of high flow events. Additionally, the channels are maintained in ways that reduce habitat diversity and quality an often lead to erosion within the channel that exacerbates water quality problems associated with fine sediment.

Alternatives to the type of ditch maintenance typically performed are believed to be less damaging to water quality. These include a greater toleration of woody vegetation and trees along the banks and riparian areas and wider excavation of the ditch to provide limited floodplain function during smaller more frequent flow events. Additionally, fewer out of the ditch flood events occur due to increased capacity of the wider configuration. Fewer out of ditch floods benefit both water quality and crop production.

The Ohio State University Extension Service and Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) are developing updated ditch design guidance, which intends to provide sufficient drainage capacity while reducing the transport of pollutants and floodwaters as compared with the typical trapezoidal ditch designs. See the following link for an explanation of these efforts [http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/Portals/12/programs/rural\\_drainage/docs/Drainage%20Report.pdf](http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/Portals/12/programs/rural_drainage/docs/Drainage%20Report.pdf).



Figure 5.9 Photo of highly maintained ditch used for agricultural drainage in the Hocking River watershed in Fairfield County. Although not within the Walnut Creek watershed, this ditch typifies many small drainageways in intensely farmed areas.

### 5.2.7 Land development and urban and residential land uses

Land cover has an important role in terms of watershed hydrology as well as water quality. The rate at which precipitation that falls on the landscape reaches streams and rivers is strongly influenced by land cover, specifically whether or not the type of cover slows or diverts the flow of water. This affects flooding issues, in-stream erosion, and the transport of pollutants from the landscape to streams and rivers. Additionally, land cover influences water quality because

certain cover types are larger sources of pollutants and/or have a diminished capacity to keep those pollutants from washing off the landscape and into surface waters.

Impervious surfaces, such as those associated with urban, residential, commercial, or industrial land uses, offer the lowest capacity to slow or divert surface runoff. These surfaces have negligible infiltration and storage capacity and their relative smoothness does not effectively slow runoff. This results in more frequent and intense flooding; increases the potential for channel erosion, and leads to an overall decline in water quality. For this reason most storm water infrastructure subject to regulatory authority must include storage components such as detention ponds. As the amount of impervious surface increases, the amount of precipitation that infiltrates to ground water is lessened leading to less stream flow during the dry months and less ground water.

Due to the intensity of land use and land management associated with impervious surfaces (e.g., roads and parking lots, lawn care), they are among the most substantial sources for water pollutants. Among those pollutants that act as stressors are organic-based chemicals such as oils, toxic substances and metals, and an increase in temperature of runoff that reaches surface waters.

The Sycamore Creek, Georges Creek and East Fork of Georges Creek sub-watersheds are among the most rapidly developing in the Walnut Creek watershed, and the negative effects of this land conversion are detected in the water quality survey. Figure 5.10 is an aerial photo showing recent development in this area of the watershed.



Figure 5.10 Development in the Pickerington area near Pickerington Ponds Metropolitan Park.

### **Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s)**

A Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) is a sewer system constructed to only receive storm water runoff which is subsequently discharged to surface waters. Since storm water runoff from urban areas can have significant impacts on water quality, many MS4s must obtain NPDES coverage for their discharges. This requirement is predicated on the size of the population serviced by the MS4, where municipalities with a population greater than 100,000 fall under Phase I of these storm water rules and MS4s in urbanizing areas (as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau) fall under Phase II of the rules. A list of the MS4s and a map showing their locations in the Walnut Creek watershed is found in Appendix A of this report.

MS4s must comply with the specifications in their NPDES permits. See the following web link for more information: [http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/storm/ms4\\_index.aspx](http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/storm/ms4_index.aspx)

## 6 METHODS OF TMDL DEVELOPMENT

This section describes how TMDLs were developed for the Walnut Creek watershed. A TMDL is the total amount of a pollutant that a receiving waterbody can assimilate while still achieving water quality standards. TMDLs can be expressed in terms of mass per time or by other appropriate measures. TMDLs are composed of the sum of individual WLAs for point sources and load allocations (LAs) for nonpoint sources and natural background levels. In addition, the TMDL must include a margin of safety (MOS), either implicitly or explicitly, that accounts for the uncertainty in the relationship between pollutant loads and the quality of the receiving waterbody. When future growth (FG) is a concern and can be quantified, it is also included. Conceptually, this is defined by the following equation:

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

*Where:*

TMDL = total maximum daily load

WLA = waste load allocation

LA = load allocation

MOS = margin of safety

AFG = allowance for future growth

### 6.1 Selection of bacteria water quality target values

Numeric targets for fecal coliform are derived from bacteriological water quality standards (see 3.1.1). As such all primary contact waters are expected to remain below a fecal coliform average concentration of 1,000 cfu per 100 ml of sample during the recreation season.

### 6.2 Selection of habitat and sediment target values

The Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI) is a tool developed and used by Ohio EPA to assess stream habitat quality (Rankin 1989, 1995). This index is designed to provide an empirical evaluation of general habitat characteristics that are essential to fish communities and generally important to other aquatic life.

The empirical nature of the QHEI and the data that underlie it provide measurable targets that are analogous to a loading capacity for a pollutant. The components provide a way to evaluate whether habitat is a limiting factor for the fish community and which attributes are the likely stressors. The QHEI can assess both the source of the sediment (riparian corridor, bank stability) and the effects on the stream itself (i.e., the historic sediment deposition) and thus, has aspects of both a loading model and a receiving stream model. When used with biological indices, the numeric measurability of the index provides a means to monitor progress when implementing a TMDL and to validate that a target has been reached.

The QHEI is composed of six principal habitat categories: substrate quality, in-stream cover (physical structure), stream channel morphology and condition, riparian quality and bank erosion, pool and run-riffle quality, and gradient. Total QHEI score equals the sum of habitat category scores, with a maximum possible QHEI score of one-hundred (100). The QHEI score of a stream segment is established in the field by a trained evaluator.

QHEI scores have demonstrated a strong direct correlation to measures of biological community health (Ohio EPA, 1999). Analysis of an extensive dataset of paired QHEI and IBI scores led to

the development of target QHEI scores generally shown to be supportive of the biological - assemblages typical of WWH and EWH (Ohio EPA, 1999). For the aquatic life use designation of warmwater habitat (WWH) an overall QHEI score of 60 has been shown to provide reasonable certainty that habitat is not deficient to the point of precluding attainment of the biocriteria. An overall QHEI score of 75 is targeted for streams designated as exceptional warm water habitat (EWH).

Comparisons between the QHEI attributes within each component and the IBI resulted in a list of specific habitat attributes that are particularly associated with degraded communities (referred to as modified attributes). These attributes were then grouped as either high influence or moderate influence modified attributes based on the statistical relationship of the presence of an attribute and the IBI score at each site. For streams designated WWH, there should be no more than four modified attributes of which no more than one should be a high influence attribute. Table 6.1 lists modified and high influence modified attributes and provides the QHEI targets used for this habitat TMDL. For simplicity, a pass/fail distinction is made telling whether each of the three targets are being met. Targets are set for: 1) the total QHEI score, 2) maximum number of all modified attributes, and 3) maximum number of high influence modified attributes only. If the minimum target is satisfied, then that category is assigned a "1", if not, it is assigned a "0". To satisfy the habitat TMDL, the stream segment in questions should achieve a score of three.

Table 6.1 Habitat TMDL targets

|   | Overall QHEI Score      | All Modified Attributes  |   |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|
|   |                         | High Influence Modified Attributes   | All Other Modified Attributes   |
| Range of Possibilities                      | 12 to 100 points        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Channelized or No Recovery</li> <li>- Silt/Muck Substrate</li> <li>- Low Sinuosity</li> <li>- Sparse/No Cover</li> <li>- Max Pool Depth &lt; 40 cm (wadeable streams only)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recovering Channel</li> <li>- Sand Substrate (boat sites)</li> <li>- Hardpan Substrate Origin</li> <li>- Fair/Poor Development</li> <li>- Only 1-2 Cover Types</li> <li>- No Fast Current</li> <li>- High/Moderate Embeddedness</li> <li>- Ext/Mod Riffle Embeddedness</li> <li>- No Riffle</li> </ul> |
| Target                                      | Overall score $\geq$ 60 | Total number < 2   | Total number < 5 <sup>a</sup>   |
| TMDL Points Assigned if Target is Satisfied | + 1                     | + 1  | + 1   |

<sup>a</sup> Total number of modified attributes includes those counted towards the high influence modified attributes.

### Sediment TMDL targets and QHEI

The QHEI is also used to develop the sediment TMDL for this project. Numeric targets for sediment are based on the metrics of the QHEI. Although QHEI evaluates the overall quality of

stream habitat, some of the component metrics consider particular aspects of stream habitat that are closely related to and/or impacted by the sediment delivery and transport processes occurring in the system

The QHEI metrics used in the sediment (bedload) TMDL are the substrate, riparian, and channel metrics. All of these evaluate stream attributes related to substrate quality and the amount of fines in the sediment. Substrate is a QHEI category that measures the type, origin, quality, and degree of embeddedness of stream substrates. Degree of embeddedness refers to the extent to which gravel, cobble, and boulders are surrounded, buried by, or covered by fine materials such as sand or silt. The riparian QHEI category evaluates riparian width, quality, and bank erosion. The channel QHEI category describes stream physical morphology including sinuosity and extent of development. Each of these factors influences the degree to which siltation affects a stream, and cumulatively serves as its numeric target.

The targets were established based on a paired analysis of IBI scores with corresponding values of these QHEI metrics. The targets are set at the fiftieth percentile of the site that achieve a minimum IBI score of 40, which is meant to reflect a warmwater habitat fish community. Table 6.1 summarizes the sediment TMDL targets that are used to address sedimentation.

Table 6.2 Sediment (bedload) TMDL targets

|                        |                  |          |                           |          |                                   |                 |
|------------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Sediment TMDL =</b> | <b>Substrate</b> | <b>+</b> | <b>Channel Morphology</b> | <b>+</b> | <b>Riparian Zone/Bank Erosion</b> |                 |
| <i>For WWH &gt;=</i>   | 13               | +        | 14                        | +        | 5                                 | <i>&gt;= 32</i> |

The sedimentation scores can be thought of as a “concentration”, as they measure the current amount of sediment in the stream. This means that the load allocations (LAs) and wasteload allocations (WLAs) are the same as the loading capacity (e.g., score = 32).

### 6.3 Methods of quantifying existing loads

Analysis methods selected address the major impairing factors in the Walnut Creek watershed; each individual method addresses one or more of the following areas listed by section number:


- Section 6.3.1: Determine the hydrologic response by quantifying the recreation season baseflow and runoff distribution per subwatershed.
- Section 6.3.2: Determine the load contributions to the stream from nonpoint source activities originating on the watershed landscape, municipal and industrial facilities and activities, and septic system inputs.
- Section 6.3.3: Establish current habitat conditions and quantify desired habitat goals per site.

The techniques selected are the most appropriate, applicable, and available methods for the goals and constraints of this project.

### 6.3.1 Hydrologic response

Pollutant concentration is an important metric for water quality assessment, and many regulated pollutant limits are based entirely on concentration. The mass per volume approach allows for a representation of a fecal coliform contact level a swimmer would experience, which is a useful metric across various level of stream flow. However, concentration alone does not give an indication of the extent of pollutant source loading to a stream, or how much is transported downstream. The loading analysis of a stream allows for an understanding of the extent of various source loads being transported downstream to possibly sensitive areas.

A stream's daily load of fecal coliform can be highly variable depending on the particular flow level of the day and the types of sources that contribute during different weather patterns. The total load of a recreation season load can also vary across years due to patterns of drought and excess. One of the first steps in assessing how representative a single season's fecal coliform dataset is to observe the hydrologic conditions under which the samples were taken. This is done by reviewing cyclical data from a long term flow gage that is characteristic of the study area. The most representative long term gage in the region monitors the drainage of the southern half of Fairfield County. The Hocking River gage station 03157500 at Enterprise has been operated by USGS for over seven decades. While the Walnut Creek watershed is not connected to the Hocking river, it is an adjacent watershed and has similar drainage patterns and mixed land use characteristics.



| Explanation - Percentile classes |              |        |              |                         | Flow |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------|--------------|-------------------------|------|
| lowest-10th percentile           | 10-24        | 25-75  | 76-90        | 90th percentile-highest |      |
| Much below normal                | Below normal | Normal | Above normal | Much above normal       |      |

Figure 6.1. Comparison of average daily flow values from January 2005 to December 2006 to the historic flows record at the USGS gage on the Hockign River at Enterprise..

USGS provides analysis of flow condition for long term gages as shown in Figure 6.1. Historic flow range is tracked on a daily basis and percentiles of flow are assigned for a day's record. A year's 7 day average flows can be reviewed against this daily percentile range, as provided by USGS. Using a 7 day average dampens short term extremes and provides a more stable flow trend for analysis. Walnut Creek fecal coliform samples in 2005 were focused at the months of July and August. The flow pattern for these months borders on the below normal flow regime. This indicates that the 7 day average flow pattern was stable and somewhat low for the particular time of year in this region. Storm runoff would have much less direct contribution in this flow regime, indicating that the 2005 sample's geometric mean and maximum violations are indeed indicating a chronic issue in the non-attaining Walnut subwatersheds.

Another method of analyzing the flow conditions under which samples were taken is by use of a load duration curve. A load duration curve provides a means to review loading characteristics of different flow regimes for a particular sample site. The target curve, for example fecal coliform's 1000cfu/100mL geometric mean criteria, is created by multiplying the flow and a conversion factor to the concentration target. Load duration curves are better suited for sites where a long term flow record has been established. The use of a long term record provides an averaging effect for cyclical flow patterns, and allows both high and low extremes to be better represented. This thorough definition of a load duration curve makes it useful for review against a particular year's samples, revealing a site's seasonal flow trend and sample flow variability. For pollutants with seasonal criteria, it may be more intuitive to deviate from using the full annual record in order to eliminate trends not seen during the period of interest. In the case of fecal coliform, the recreation season flows from May 1st to October 15th are of interest.

USGS established a gage on Walnut Creek for the Ohio EPA study, which was used to develop the load duration curve shown in Figure 4.1. USGS gage 03229796 at Ashville near Walnut Creek's mouth has a 274 square mile drainage area. At the time of this analysis, USGS had released a provisional record set of daily flows beginning 10/1/2005. Since this record began after the Ohio EPA fecal coliform sample dates, a method was needed to establish a representative flow record both for the sample dates and for a long term record. The watershed of the Hocking River Enterprise gage has comparable drainage area and hydrology characteristics of the Walnut Creek gage's watershed, and is used to construct a representative flow record. Since the Ashville gage captured the complete 2006 Walnut Creek recreation season daily flow dataset, this period was used to build a correlation between the two gages. As seen in Figure 6.1, the 2006 season was found to be suitable for correlation due to a varying range of typical summer flows followed by above normal flows at the end of the season.




Figure 6.2 Ashville and Enterprise Flow Correlation

The regression equation shown in Figure 6.2 was developed based on the daily comparison of the 2006 recreation season data from the two gages. The coefficient of determination (the  $R^2$  value) is a statistic that can indicate the relationship between two data sets and is a unitless measure ranging from 0 to 1. Higher values indicate the curve representing the model results is closer to observed data curve with 1 being a perfect fit. The gage correlation results in a  $R^2$  value equal to 0.78. The 2006 correlated Walnut Creek data compared to the USGS gage's Walnut Creek data is shown in Figure 6.3. The comparison confirms that both base flow and peak flow representation are agreeable by the flow data correlated data from the Hocking River.




Figure 6.3 Corresponding values between the values for average daily flow at the USGS gage on Walnut Creek in Ashville and the projected flows based on the USGS gage on the Hocking River at Enterprise.

With a method established to estimate daily recreation season flow for the Walnut Creek at Ashville site, a ten year record was calculated from 1997 to 2006. These ten years in this region of Ohio have a range of flow trends from drought to above normal flow, which makes the period of record representative of seasonal variation. The flow duration curve depicted in figure 6.4 demonstrates the nature of Walnut Creek's recreation season flow range for the ten year period.





Figure 6.4 Flow duration curve for the USGS gage on Walnut Creek at river mile 4.1.

The Walnut Creek flow duration curve for the Ashville site is the basis for the development of the fecal coliform load duration curve in Figure 4.1, and shown only with representative Ohio EPA data in Figure 6.5. Referring to the representative 2005 Ohio EPA dataset isolated in Figure 6.5, and understanding that all subwatershed sites follow a similar flow pattern on their sample days, each site has a few representative samples taken within the dry weather flow regime (between 60-90% flows exceeding). The sample sets at various subwatersheds reveal a chronic issue during a dry weather flow regime, but do not provide information on other flow regimes where other contributing source loads could be better estimated. The full attainment Ashville site's combined Ohio EPA and Ashville WWTP monitoring data shown in Figure 4.1 provide a comprehensive loading estimate for multiple flow regimes. Unfortunately, there is no direct way to estimate the loading of other non attaining subwatershed sites at the other normal recreation flow regimes (mid-range and wet weather).



| Flow regime load analysis<br>fecal coliform (billion organisms/day) | High    | Wet weather | Mid-range<br>summer | Dry weather | Low     |
|---|---------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|---------|
| Flow duration regime interval                                       | 0-10%   | 10-40%      | 40-60%              | 60-90%      | 90-100% |
| Samples per regime  |         |             |                     | 7           |         |
| Median sample load  |         |             |                     | 365.9       |         |
| Target criteria load (mid regime)                                   | 19,822  | 4,875       | 2,099               | 1,012.8     | 523.5   |
| Median % sample load above criteria                                 | No Data | No Data     | No Data             | None        | No Data |

Figure 6.5 Representative 2005 Ohio EPA dataset used for fecal coliform attainment analysis at the Ashville gage site

Fecal coliform washoff from various non-point sources may have a significant load contribution not observed in 2005, which impacts the accuracy of TMDL derivation of load allocations to sources. Two methods of determining fecal coliform loadings from varying flow regimes are to resample at non-attaining sites through another season across a range of flows, or determining the fecal coliform loading through modeling, which is what was done.

### 6.3.2 Fecal coliform loads to the stream

Model selection is a key part of the TMDL development process. The type of model used is dependent on site attainment issues, spatial variability of non-attaining sites, sample representation, hydrology, land usage, available source data, time allocated for modeling, staff model experience, management goals, and other issues. The simplest model can use field samples directly to derive load allocations for the site in question. Load duration curves have already been excluded from consideration due to the small range of flows under which the representative Ohio EPA 2005 samples were collected. There are also other issues with load duration curves, such as sites with no flow data, and sites that may not represent the intended sub-watershed due to substantial in-stream decay of fecal coliform, or proximity to a local source. The other extreme is using a high level model such as HSPF. HSPF can simulate daily flow at multiple points within a watershed and determine the fecal coliform loadings and needed reductions from multiple sources with a higher level of certainty. However, HSPF is data intensive for calibration and can take considerably more time to develop a representative model.

Walnut Creek's non-attaining sites are mostly isolated to HUC-14 level tributaries, and most of Walnut Creek does not need load allocations defined. The sites that do not meet recreation criteria are only represented by fecal coliform samples during the dry weather flow regime and little site flow measurement data exists. There is not an appropriate dataset to directly calculate the tributary loadings for a representative flow range, and the percentage of non-attaining sub-watersheds is not enough to justify the expense of modeling the entire watershed with HSPF. A compromise in modeling approach was needed.

The Ohio EPA modeling section's in-house fecal coliform model SLAPIT (Stream Load Allocating Pathogen Indicator Tool) was used for load modeling. It is a series of algorithms written in an Excel spreadsheet that computes point source loading, non-point source in-stream loading, and non-point source wash-off loading from runoff events. It is suitable for calculating fecal coliform loading of small ungaged sub-watersheds where in-stream decay is negligible. Flow calibration is not possible since there is little to no flow measurement data at the individual sub-watersheds, but daily precipitation records from nearby sources and estimates from an encompassing flow gage provide a sufficient flow estimate. The model utilizes readily available data through various GIS coverages and County based data such as septic systems, livestock, and wildlife. While the county averaged data is somewhat coarse, it gives a conservative estimate of available loadings and the data mining process is less time consuming. Since the uncalibrated loadings are based on having all land based loads entirely available for wash-off and does not consider current BMPs, the approach provides an implicit margin of safety within the TMDL calculations. SLAPIT integrates in stream sources such as NPDES permitted point sources, wildlife, and cattle with stream access. The model can also differentiate between a point source MS4 storm water permit region as opposed to storm water wash-off from a nonpoint source developed area. This approach addresses loadings from multiple flow regimes where 2005 data load duration curves can not, and does not have the cost investment of a higher level modeling approach.

#### *Sources of Data*

Land use, soil, and weather data are critical components of a watershed model. The land use data is taken from the National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD). The NLCD was compiled from satellite imagery circa 2001 and includes fifteen classes of land use as 30x30 meter rasterized units. These fifteen classes are aggregated through GIS into 6 classes: built-up, cropland, pastureland, forest, water, other (typically barren land). Soil properties and distribution is documented by the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) through county level soil surveys. This data is tabularized and is available in a newer version through the National Soil Information System (NASIS) or the original format the Map Unit Interpretation Record (MUIR). These tables are linked with a digitized mapping system into the Soil Survey Geographic Database (SSURGO). SSURGO is the most detailed soil information available through NRCS and is available on a county basis. The soil hydrologic group is assigned a letter A through D which indicates the extent of a soil's infiltration capacity. The selected weather stations are located close to the Walnut Creek watershed. Daily precipitation data was supplied by NOAA weather stations at Buckeye Lake and the Port Columbus airport. The three modeled sub-watersheds in the northeast corner of Fairfield County are modeled using the Buckeye Lake gage, while the remaining sub-watershed models reference the Port Columbus airport gage.

Point source data is available through the NPDES permitting program. Average design flows listed in a permit is used to model flow in the model. Unless no fecal coliform source is discharged by a point source, the allowable load is set to the permit concentration limit (fecal coliform 1000cfu/100ml) multiplied by the design flow. Combined sewer overflows (CSO) are not noted in the watershed. However, there are some known sanitary sewer overflows, which

are illegal and are assigned a zero load without further modeling (See Figure 5.5). Regions with existing and proposed sewer service are mapped by the Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC) and are shown in Figure 2.8. The region is experiencing considerable growth due to improving infrastructure and the population increase of the Columbus metropolitan region. Fairfield County and Pickaway County have targeted key growth areas that will need sewer service in order to protect human health and water quality. The sewer service mapping is imported into GIS and used primarily to determine areas that should not have septic systems in use. Future development could have negative aquatic impacts on stream quality which could be minimized by best management practices. However, future development could have a positive recreation attainment impact for controlling septic system discharge as they are replaced with centralized treatment systems.

The population on septic systems was estimated using US 2000 Census block map data. The number of conventional septic systems is assigned a 20% failure rate. The number and location of mechanical (aerator) systems was obtained from the Fairfield County Health Department. While Fairfield County has required a leach field with any new mechanical system for a number of years, there are still many that have no secondary treatment and may have direct influences on nearby streams or wells. The quantity of mechanical systems of the bordering counties is assumed to be similar, and is estimated for each impaired sub-watershed. USEPA considers mechanical HSTS systems to have a 100% failure rate. The septic system mapping is imported into GIS for spatial analysis. An example of septic system model input is provided in Table 6.2 for sub-watershed 170-010PV. While SLAPIT is capable of modeling direct stream septic flow from straight pipe or failing septic systems, no localized evidence was collected and the direct stream simulation was turned off. Septic system load reduction is a special case of the model in that the percent reduction is determined before washoff simulation. The percent reduction is based on the number of existing failures and a calculated acceptable failure level which is based on a 1% failure rate for a septic system with a 20 year design life. After the wash-off simulation, this percent reduction is used on the load that reaches the stream to determine a stream load allocation. The percent reduction based on system design life is intended to ensure correction of failing septic systems polluting State waters with organics and pathogens, and will also help protect against such systems contaminating nearby private drinking water wells.

Table 6.3 Watershed 170-010PV septic system data and % reduction calculation

| <b>Septic System and Failure Rate Determination for 2005</b> |          |
|--|----------|
| Estimated Households   | 407      |
| Estimated Population   | 1140     |
| Reported Aerators  | 116      |
| Additional Potential Aerators                                | 0        |
| Percent Of Aerator Systems                                   | 28.5     |
| Estimated Household Failure Rate % of other HSTS's           | 20       |
| Estimated other HSTS Failures as Households                  | 58.2     |
| Total Failures as Households                                 | 174.2    |
| Estimated Total Failure Rate%                                | 42.8     |
| Portion Estimated Failure% Represented as Ponding            | 100      |
| Portion Estimated Failure% Represented as Direct             | 0        |
| <b>Target a 1% failure rate for septic (20 year design)</b>  |          |
| Seasonal Load  | 2.17E+14 |
| Target Load  | 5.07E+12 |
| Direct Load  | 0.00E+00 |
| Direct % Reduction   | 100      |
| Remaining Load   | 2.17E+14 |
| %Reduction   | 97.66    |

Livestock numbers are obtained from the 2002 USDA NASS agricultural census at the County level. The County data was proportioned to a sub-watershed by a ratio of County pasture to sub-watershed pasture. The livestock numbers were further refined by "windshield survey" recons and review of high resolution aerial photography. Some livestock data was adjusted to reflect manure spreading within the sub-watershed instead of direct deposition, depending on species and housing practices. Table 6.4 provides an example of livestock estimation for the 170-010PV watershed. The model only considers cattle as being able to enter a stream. Direct stream input by cattle is limited only to those streams with evidence of cattle access as determined by Ohio EPA field staff (see Figure 5.7).

Table 6.4 Watershed 170-010PV livestock data

| Livestock       | County<br>Farms | Est SubWS<br>Farms | County<br>Number | Est SubWS<br>Number | LvStk/Farm<br>Est | Acre/LvStk<br>Est | BPJ<br>Est |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Grazed Cattle   | 238             | 8.2                | 10941            | 374.7               | 46.0              | 4.3               | 250        |
| Swine           | 69              | 2.4                | 13865            | 474.9               | 200.9             | 3.4               | 50         |
| Confined Cattle | 185             | 6.3                | 5495             | 188.2               | 29.7              | 8.5               | 175        |
| Poultry         | 196             | 6.7                | 7734             | 264.9               | 39.5              | 6.0               | 275        |
| Horses          | 42              | 1.4                | 2033             | 69.6                | 48.4              | 23.0              | 75         |
| Sheep           | 75              | 2.6                | 1616             | 55.3                | 21.5              | 28.9              | 75         |
| Other           | 88              | 3.0                | 747              | 25.6                | 8.5               | 62.6              | 25         |

Wildlife numbers are obtained from the Ohio Department of Natural Resources census data at County level. The total number of animals within the County was divided by the total number of acres of relevant land use in the watershed. The resulting animal densities (animals per acre) were used to estimate the animal populations within each sub-watershed. Direct stream deposition by wildlife was estimated using a percent of time that each animal type typically spends in or next to a stream. Table 6.5 provides a breakdown of wildlife load contribution to the 170-010PV watershed.

Table 6.5 Watershed 170-010PV wildlife data

| Wildlife Populations | Crop<br>An/SqMi | Pasture<br>An/SqMi | Forest<br>An/SqMi | Distribution | Direct Stream<br>Animal-Equiv | Direct Stream<br>Daily Load | Wildlife<br>Total Daily |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Animals              |                 |                    |                   |              |                               |                             |                         |
| Ducks                | 0.31            | 0.31               | 0.77              | Near Stream  | 1.75                          | 4.25E+09                    | Stream Load             |
| Geese                | 0.40            | 0.40               | 0.34              | Near Stream  | 0.30                          | 1.47E+10                    | 2.07E+10                |
| Deer                 | 9.25            | 9.25               | 17.46             | Watershed    | 1.50                          | 7.50E+08                    |                         |
| Beaver               | 0.03            | 0.03               | 1.98              | Near Stream  | 1.25                          | 3.13E+08                    | Total Rec Season        |
| Raccoons             | 25.00           | 25.00              | 25.00             | Watershed    | 2.50                          | 3.13E+08                    | Stream Load             |
| Other                | 10.00           | 10.00              | 10.00             | Watershed    | 0.10                          | 4.09E+08                    | 3.48E+12                |

#### Description of Method

SLAPIT stream flow is simulated using a combination of two methods to estimate daily storm runoff and groundwater base flow, resulting in a daily stream flow record. The method does not include all of the mechanisms shown in Figure 6.6, but does represent the major hydrologic functions for a small stream's watershed. Runoff is calculated as a percent of daily precipitation that does not route to deep infiltration. Base flow is calculated separately by estimation from a gaged watershed. The model predicts ten years of recreation season (May 1<sup>st</sup> through October 15<sup>th</sup>) stream flow based on precipitation, land uses, soil characteristics, and base flow estimate.




Figure 6.6 Diagram of the hydrologic cycle (National Engineering Handbook Part 630 Chapter 10, USDA/NRCS 210-VI-NEH July 2004)

Runoff is calculated using a form of the Natural Resources Conservation Service's Curve Number method (See chapter 10 "Estimation of Direct Runoff from Storm Rainfall" of NEH Part 630 for calculation methods). The curve number (CN) represents the amount of precipitation that runs off a particular land-use surface and is adjusted for detention potential and for soil characteristics. The characteristics needed to determine a CN are combined in GIS as 30x30 meter individual hydrologic response units (HRU). Table 6.14 lists developed HRUs and corresponding CNs for the 170-010PV sub-watershed. The CN's mathematical representation is the percent of runoff from a particular HRU, the higher the curve number the more runoff produced. Each HRU group is simulated separately and the individual runoff quantities from all HRUs are summed for the modeled watershed. The calculated flow of this method defines runoff as a combination of overland flow, shallow interflow, and drainage from field drainage tiles. The method does not incorporate hydrologic routing, so a day's total precipitation converted to runoff is assumed to contribute to the stream and leave the same day. This approach likely overestimates a storm day's stream flow and underestimates the following day's flow, but the total flow for a recreation season is all accounted. The model is designed to provide seasonal average output, and not daily output due to this and other limitations. That being said, a high percentage of the runoff will be through the system within one day for a small drainage area as targeted for these modeled sub-watersheds.

A sub-watershed stream's base flow is determined by estimation from the constructed ten year Ashville flow gage record, which was previously discussed. First, a sub-watershed is assigned a temporary ten year flow record by assigning a percent of the Ashville gage flow based on a

linear drainage area ratio. Then the sliding interval base flow separation method developed by Pettyjohn and Henning is used to remove flow derived from runoff. The sliding interval method assigns base flow as the minimum flow from a determined range of days before and after the day in question. The range of days assessed is based on the size of the drainage area of the reference gage. For these small sub-watersheds, base flow is predicted using the minimum of the three days before and after the target day.

SLAPIT borrows the core of the land based fecal coliform load estimating methodology as used in US EPA's Bacteria Indicator Tool (BIT). The BIT loading model requires three types of values: user-defined, default, and literature. User-defined values are specific to the study area. User-defined values required by the tool are land use distribution, numbers of livestock, and wildlife densities. Default values are supplied by the tool, but it is suggested that they be modified to reflect patterns in the study area. Default values include fraction of each manure type applied each month, fraction of manure type that is incorporated into the soil, and time spent grazing and confined by livestock. Like default values, literature values are supplied by the tool, but they may be replaced with user values if better information is available for the study area. Literature values required by the tool are animal waste production rates and fecal coliform bacteria content, fecal coliform bacteria accumulation rates for built-up land uses, and raw sewage fecal coliform bacteria content and waste production. Literature and most default values were unchanged because limited watershed-specific information was available.

Some modifications and additions were made to BIT within the SLAPIT model to better represent the Walnut Creek watershed, as discussed in the following descriptions. Load buildup is routed through direct deposition, manure spreading, accumulation in urban environments, and septic system hydraulic failure. Septic systems are not modeled as a direct stream source as they are in BIT, which was discussed in the data sources section. SLAPIT estimates a seasonally changing accumulation rate of fecal coliform on four land-use categories: built up, cropland, pastureland, and forest. Buildup is not assigned to the relatively small acreage of the "other" or "water" land uses, but they are integrated for flow calculation. The changing accumulation rate is controlled with 24 to 30 day time periods instead of months in order to better fit the recreation season. It is recognized that runoff from unmanaged feedlots can be a major source of a stream's fecal coliform load, but this source is lumped into the modeled pasture load for simplicity. All direct stream loads are estimated by SLAPIT, while BIT only estimates land accumulation. SLAPIT integrates NPDES point sources, CSOs, cattle with stream access, and wildlife.

Manure spreading is based on a storage approach, applying manure to crop and pasture lands in times of normal practice. The annual amount of stored manure is allocated for spreading over several time periods as a percent of the total available. The manure is assumed to be incorporated into the soil to a certain percent which limits the amount of fecal coliform available for wash-off. The different percents incorporated into the soil based on agricultural practices are for hog manure 80%, cattle manure 75%, horse manure 75%, and poultry litter 96%. Table 6.6 provides the distribution of manure application timing for all the modeled sub-watersheds. The approach allows for periods of different loading characteristics, such as pronounced application and planting in May. Any manure applied outside of the recreation season does not contribute to the modeled loadings. Since manure spreading between October 16th and April 30th, no attempt was made to make the time period representative for the Walnut Creek basin. Unlike BIT, SLAPIT assumes there is no manure spreading on full season croplands typically established toward the end of May (i.e. corn and soybeans), and routes the excess to multi-harvest grain croplands and pastureland. The percent of full season cropland is based on County level USDA NASS crop statistics, and sized down to the sub-watershed crop

percentages. The bulk of harvesting picks up in mid October, and fall manure spreading is assumed to pick up late October.

Table 6.6 SLAPIT manure application percent timing assignment for the Walnut Creek sub-watersheds (total year per animal type = 1)

| Manure Application | Jan    | Feb    | Mar    | Apr    | May1-May24 | May25-Jun23 | Jun24-Jul23 | Jul24-Aug22 | Aug23-Sep21 | Sep22-Oct15 | Oct16-Nov30 | Dec    |
|--------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| %Hog Manure        | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0.1    | 0.1        | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0.8         | 0      |
| %Cattle Manure     | 0.0375 | 0.0375 | 0.0375 | 0.05   | 0.05       | 0.0375      | 0.0375      | 0.0375      | 0.0375      | 0.03        | 0.57        | 0.0375 |
| %Horse Manure      | 0.1067 | 0.1067 | 0.1067 | 0.1067 | 0.0600     | 0.0600      | 0.0600      | 0.0600      | 0.0600      | 0.0480      | 0.1187      | 0.1067 |
| %Poultry Litter    | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0.1    | 0.1        | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0.8         | 0      |

All of the land based loading characteristics are processed and condensed into a daily buildup table distinguished by land-use and time period. See Table 6.7 for an example daily buildup table. The buildup of fecal coliform is asymptotically limited due to fecal coliform's attenuation rate, and the buildup limit is reached if no wash-off occurs over a period of days. The default limit values used are 1.5 times the maximum buildup for cropland and pastureland, and 1.8 times the daily buildup for forest and developed land. The Built-Up (developed) land-use is further broken down into nonpoint source Built-Up, entity point source MS4 Built-Up, and a special Built-Up to tie in septic systems for wash-off simulation. The septic system 210 HRU coding overlaps both point and non-point Built-Up, treating the wash-off derived from failing septic systems as a separate allocation from other fecal coliform sources within developed regions.

Table 6.7 Watershed 170-010PV fecal coliform land based buildup table

| MONTH                 | CODE          | May1-May24 | May25-Jun23 | Jun24-Jul23 | Jul24-Aug22 | Aug23-Sep21 | Sep22-Oct15 |
|-----------------------|---------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>BUILT-UP</b>       | <b>110</b>    | 1.46E+07   | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    |
| <b>CROP</b>           | <b>120</b>    | 2.14E+09   | 1.55E+08    | 1.55E+08    | 1.55E+08    | 1.55E+08    | 1.55E+08    |
| <b>PASTURE</b>        | <b>130</b>    | 1.51E+10   | 1.97E+10    | 1.97E+10    | 1.97E+10    | 1.97E+10    | 1.97E+10    |
| <b>FOREST</b>         | <b>140</b>    | 1.12E+08   | 1.12E+08    | 1.12E+08    | 1.12E+08    | 1.12E+08    | 1.12E+08    |
| <b>WATER</b>          | <b>150</b>    | 0.00E+00   | 0.00E+00    | 0.00E+00    | 0.00E+00    | 0.00E+00    | 0.00E+00    |
| <b>OTHER</b>          | <b>160</b>    | 0.00E+00   | 0.00E+00    | 0.00E+00    | 0.00E+00    | 0.00E+00    | 0.00E+00    |
| <b>SEPTIC</b>         | <b>210</b>    | 2.40E+10   | 2.40E+10    | 2.40E+10    | 2.40E+10    | 2.40E+10    | 2.40E+10    |
| <b>BUILT-UP MS4-1</b> | <b>50110</b>  | 1.46E+07   | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    |
| <b>BUILT-UP MS4-2</b> | <b>110110</b> | 1.46E+07   | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    |
| <b>BUILT-UP MS4-3</b> | <b>120110</b> | 1.46E+07   | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    | 1.46E+07    |

SLAPIT uses the land based fecal coliform buildup data in combination with the hydrology simulation to provide a discrete daily wash-off load. The amount of wash-off of accumulated fecal coliform is based on relationships proposed by Amy et al. (1974) and Sartor and Boyd (1972). The wash-off function was originally used in the SWMM model and is also used in GWLF. The first-order wash-off equation suggested by Amy et al. is based on the assumption that 1/2" of runoff in one hour will remove 90% of the accumulated load in an urban setting. The equation is bound by zero washoff and an asymptotic limit of 100% wash-off. Figure 6.7 illustrates the graphical depiction of the first order wash-off equation for various 1/2" wash-off efficiencies. In order to keep SLAPIT's fecal coliform wash-off methodology consistent across land-uses, the first order wash-off equation is applied to the non-urban land-uses with different assumed percent removal efficiencies at the 1/2" runoff point. The four accumulation model land uses are assigned wash-off curves based on estimation of what percent accumulation would wash-off under 1/2" runoff conditions. The land uses' wash-off curves are assigned as the 90% to urban land, the 80% to cropland, the 70% to pastureland, and the 50% to forested land.




Figure 6.7 First-order wash-off function curves. Equation and curve fitting assumption of 90% of accumulation washes off of an urban land use in response to 1/2" runoff are as cited in the SWMMS and GWLF literature.

Each HRU group is modeled separately for the ten year simulation and the resulting totals summarized by each year's recreation season and land-use type. An example of the daily sub-watershed 170-010PV simulation for the Built-Up 110 land-use for May of 1997 is provided in Table 6.15. The analysis keeps track of daily runoff, base flow, land based daily fecal coliform buildup, fecal coliform wash-off, and amount left for future wash-off for each HRU in a sub-watershed. A loss function was built into SLAPIT to account for accumulations prevented from washing off, but this method is not used for the Walnut Creek sub-watersheds. While this model provides a streamlined TMDL procedure, the user should be aware that this model assumes all runoff and all wash-off fecal coliform are designed to contribute in entirety on the same day of the precipitation driven event. Not incorporating lag time creates a discrete daily pulse load representation, which does not capture the continuous time frame and loading flux of fecal coliform in response to a storm hydrograph. Since the model is intended to be used as a means to estimate a total season's fecal coliform load for a small drainage area, the daily lag time issue becomes insignificant. The longer the stream reach modeled, the more significant the issue becomes. SLAPIT is best used to represent headwater HUC-14 sub-watersheds due to this limited capability, but can be used for an internal sub-watershed analysis if only the sub-watershed's water contributions are simulated.

There are two modeled sub-watersheds that receive flow upstream of their modeled boundary. Lower Sycamore Creek (170-070LS) and Walnut Creek between Poplar and Sycamore Creeks both (170-050) have upstream watershed contributions. The issue is handled by the assumption that the upstream waters meeting recreation criteria or are to be managed through a TMDL to have an average seasonal fecal coliform load that meets the fecal coliform 1000cfu/100mL target. This assumption allows the upstream flow and load to essentially be added to the lower basin's flow and load, and then subtracted out of the analysis since upstream waters are allocated to the target. The dry weather sample results from these two

sub-watersheds indicate that fecal coliform sources are internal loading issues, and non-attaining upstream sub-watersheds are being allocated their own TMDLs.

The resulting totals for the ten year simulation summarized in Excel pivot table format are presented in Table 6.8 for the 170-010PV watershed. The ten recreation season quantities for each landuse type are averaged to get values representative of a several seasons. These values are added to the seasonal base flow, direct stream source flow, and fecal coliform load tracked by SLAPIT. As shown in upper left sub-table in Table 6.9 for sub-watershed 170-010PV, the data aggregation provides a total representative recreation season flow and load for a sub-watershed.

Table 6.8 Sub-watershed 070-010PV SLAPIT seasonal runoff and load outputs aggregated by year and land-use

| Sum of Runoff (cf) |        | YEAR     |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|--------------------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| MS4                | INDEX  | 1997     | 1998     | 1999     | 2000     | 2001     | 2002     | 2003     | 2004     | 2005     | 2006     | Average  |
| 0                  | 110    | 7.65E+05 | 5.41E+05 | 1.80E+05 | 3.30E+05 | 3.52E+05 | 4.90E+05 | 5.14E+05 | 5.27E+05 | 5.54E+05 | 4.24E+05 | 4.68E+05 |
|                    | 120    | 1.08E+08 | 5.67E+07 | 1.36E+07 | 2.88E+07 | 3.04E+07 | 5.85E+07 | 5.21E+07 | 5.94E+07 | 8.06E+07 | 3.51E+07 | 5.24E+07 |
|                    | 130    | 1.03E+07 | 2.85E+06 | 2.51E+05 | 9.96E+05 | 1.05E+06 | 3.63E+06 | 2.27E+06 | 3.02E+06 | 7.36E+06 | 1.15E+06 | 3.28E+06 |
|                    | 140    | 4.90E+06 | 1.05E+06 | 2.29E+04 | 2.27E+05 | 3.04E+05 | 1.36E+06 | 6.26E+05 | 9.76E+05 | 3.36E+06 | 3.17E+05 | 1.31E+06 |
|                    | 150    | 2.76E+06 | 2.27E+06 | 1.13E+06 | 1.80E+06 | 1.88E+06 | 1.98E+06 | 2.56E+06 | 2.20E+06 | 2.09E+06 | 2.32E+06 | 2.10E+06 |
|                    | 160    | 4.06E+07 | 3.25E+07 | 1.32E+07 | 2.31E+07 | 2.43E+07 | 2.82E+07 | 3.37E+07 | 3.08E+07 | 2.93E+07 | 3.00E+07 | 2.86E+07 |
|                    | 210    | 1.96E+06 | 1.39E+06 | 4.64E+05 | 8.50E+05 | 9.07E+05 | 1.26E+06 | 1.32E+06 | 1.35E+06 | 1.42E+06 | 1.09E+06 | 1.20E+06 |
| 50000              | 50110  | 1.19E+06 | 8.49E+05 | 2.84E+05 | 5.20E+05 | 5.55E+05 | 7.67E+05 | 8.08E+05 | 8.26E+05 | 8.63E+05 | 6.69E+05 | 7.33E+05 |
| 110000             | 110110 | 2.30E+06 | 1.67E+06 | 5.69E+05 | 1.04E+06 | 1.10E+06 | 1.49E+06 | 1.59E+06 | 1.61E+06 | 1.66E+06 | 1.34E+06 | 1.44E+06 |
| 120000             | 120110 | 3.27E+06 | 2.33E+06 | 7.78E+05 | 1.42E+06 | 1.52E+06 | 2.10E+06 | 2.21E+06 | 2.26E+06 | 2.37E+06 | 1.83E+06 | 2.01E+06 |
| Sum of Base (cf)   |        | YEAR     |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| MS4                | INDEX  | 1997     | 1998     | 1999     | 2000     | 2001     | 2002     | 2003     | 2004     | 2005     | 2006     | Average  |
| 0                  | STREAM | 9.92E+07 | 9.99E+07 | 3.02E+07 | 5.64E+07 | 8.65E+07 | 9.56E+07 | 1.13E+08 | 1.58E+08 | 6.61E+07 | 7.80E+07 | 8.83E+07 |
| Sum of LOAD        |        | YEAR     |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| MS4                | INDEX  | 1997     | 1998     | 1999     | 2000     | 2001     | 2002     | 2003     | 2004     | 2005     | 2006     | Average  |
| 0                  | 110    | 7.19E+09 | 7.24E+09 | 3.12E+09 | 5.35E+09 | 5.65E+09 | 5.75E+09 | 7.09E+09 | 6.45E+09 | 5.30E+09 | 6.98E+09 | 6.01E+09 |
|                    | 120    | 1.27E+13 | 1.65E+13 | 6.12E+12 | 1.69E+13 | 3.10E+13 | 1.65E+13 | 1.75E+13 | 2.29E+13 | 2.49E+13 | 6.53E+12 | 1.71E+13 |
|                    | 130    | 8.52E+13 | 4.01E+13 | 4.63E+12 | 1.74E+13 | 1.43E+13 | 5.22E+13 | 3.82E+13 | 4.79E+13 | 7.46E+13 | 1.91E+13 | 3.94E+13 |
|                    | 140    | 2.21E+11 | 6.88E+10 | 1.73E+09 | 1.69E+10 | 2.19E+10 | 9.31E+10 | 4.58E+10 | 7.01E+10 | 1.84E+11 | 2.28E+10 | 7.45E+10 |
|                    | 150    | 0.00E+00 |
|                    | 160    | 0.00E+00 |
|                    | 210    | 2.58E+13 | 2.56E+13 | 1.08E+13 | 1.86E+13 | 1.96E+13 | 2.06E+13 | 2.52E+13 | 2.33E+13 | 1.92E+13 | 2.40E+13 | 2.13E+13 |
| 50000              | 50110  | 1.12E+10 | 1.13E+10 | 4.88E+09 | 8.36E+09 | 8.82E+09 | 8.95E+09 | 1.11E+10 | 1.00E+10 | 8.24E+09 | 1.09E+10 | 9.37E+09 |
| 110000             | 110110 | 2.15E+10 | 2.16E+10 | 9.47E+09 | 1.63E+10 | 1.71E+10 | 1.72E+10 | 2.15E+10 | 1.91E+10 | 1.58E+10 | 2.13E+10 | 1.81E+10 |
| 120000             | 120110 | 3.07E+10 | 3.09E+10 | 1.34E+10 | 2.29E+10 | 2.42E+10 | 2.46E+10 | 3.03E+10 | 2.75E+10 | 2.26E+10 | 2.99E+10 | 2.57E+10 |

### TMDL Calculation and Allocation

A total maximum daily load is calculated as a waterbody's waste load allocation for point sources added to a load allocation for non-point sources with an additional added margin of safety load. For Walnut Creek's fecal coliform TMDLs, the margin of safety is implicitly built into the load allocations based on the modeling strategy as discussed throughout this section and in Section 6.5.

The total seasonal averaged flow provided by the SLAPIT model is multiplied by the 1000cfu/100mL fecal coliform target to determine a sub-watershed's TMDL. Table 6.9 provides the seasonal TMDL calculation for the 170-010PV sub-watershed in the lower left sub-table. The percent reduction required is determined by comparing the total seasonal averaged load with the seasonal target load. The required reduction is further broken down into the source components tracked by the model. NPDES point sources are assigned a load based on their design flow and fecal coliform permitted concentration limit. Livestock with direct stream access are all expected to be fenced out and are assigned a 100% load reduction. No load reduction from direct stream deposits of wildlife is necessary. Septic system loading is assigned a percent reduction as demonstrated in Table 6.3. After the previous reductions are allocated, the wash-off from land-uses are allocated individual load reductions based on requiring that all

types are met the same percent load reduction. These allocated land uses include point source MS4 developed regions, nonpoint source developed regions, pastureland and cropland. Forest lands are not assigned a percent reduction, as the loading is considered to be at background levels. The right sub-table of Table 6.9 is the SLAPIT seasonal source breakout TMDLs based on the tracked sources for the 170-010PV sub-watershed.

Table 6.9 Sub-watershed 170-010PV SLAPIT recreation season fecal coliform TMDL allocation output

| Calculate TMDL                           |          | HUC 14:           | 05060001170010  |          |          |              |             |                |                    |
|--|----------|-------------------|---|----------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------------|
|  |          | Sub-Basin:        | Walnut Creek Creek Below Unnamed Tributary at RM 47.60 to Below Pleasantville Creek |          |          |              |             |                |                    |
|  |          | TMDL (Rec Season) | Existing Load   | WLA      | LA       | TMDL Balance | % Reduction | Load Reduction | Exceedence Balance |
| <b>Recreation Season Load and Volume</b> |          | <b>Point</b>      |   |          |          | 0.00E+00     |             |                | 4.66E+14           |
| Load                                     | 5.19E+14 | Walnut Creek SD   | 1.15E+12  | 1.15E+12 |          | 1.15E+12     | 0.00        | 0.00E+00       | 4.66E+14           |
| Volume of                                | 1.87E+08 | CSO               | 0.00E+00  | 0.00E+00 |          | 1.15E+12     | 100.00      | 0.00E+00       | 4.66E+14           |
| Concentration                            | 9827.08  | <b>Nonpoint</b>   |   |          |          | 1.15E+12     |             |                | 4.66E+14           |
|  |          | Direct Septics    | 0.00E+00  |          | 0.00E+00 | 1.15E+12     | 100.00      | 0.00E+00       | 4.66E+14           |
|  |          | Washoff Septics   | 2.13E+13  |          | 4.97E+11 | 1.65E+12     | 97.66       | 2.08E+13       | 4.46E+14           |
| <b>TMDL (Rec Season) Calculation</b>     |          | Direct Livestock  | 4.37E+14  |          | 0.00E+00 | 1.65E+12     | 100.00      | 4.37E+14       | 8.92E+12           |
| Allowed                                  | 1000     | Direct Wildlife   | 3.48E+12  |          | 3.48E+12 | 5.13E+12     | 0.00        | 0.00E+00       | 8.92E+12           |
| TMDL (Rec Season)                        | 5.28E+13 | Forest            | 7.45E+10  |          | 7.45E+10 | 5.21E+12     | 0.00        | 0.00E+00       | 8.92E+12           |
| Exceedence                               | 4.66E+14 | MS4               | 5.32E+10  | 4.48E+10 |          | 5.25E+12     | 15.77       | 8.38E+09       | 8.91E+12           |
| % Reduction Required                     | 89.82    | Built Up          | 6.01E+09  |          | 5.06E+09 | 5.26E+12     | 15.77       | 9.48E+08       | 8.91E+12           |
|  |          | Pasture           | 3.94E+13  |          | 3.32E+13 | 3.84E+13     | 15.77       | 6.21E+12       | 2.70E+12           |
|  |          | Crop              | 1.71E+13  |          | 1.44E+13 | 5.28E+13     | 15.77       | 2.70E+12       | 0.00E+00           |

Some pollutants with average concentration derived load reduction targets are more meaningful to watershed management if based on larger time scales other than a daily load. However, recent rulings have dictated that all TMDLs must have an actual daily load allocation. The derived seasonal fecal coliform load allocations for the Walnut Creek sub-watersheds are divided by the 168 days of the recreation season in order to provide the daily TMDLs presented in Tables 7.1 through 7.6. Tables 6.10 through 6.13 are taken from the 170-010PV SLAPIT seasonal TMDL module. The first table shows both seasonal and daily TMDLs for comparison. Walnut Creek's allocated fecal coliform TMDLs will ensure that watershed management will meet the geometric mean chronic recreation season criteria, as well as control acute washoff events.

Table 6.10 Sub-watershed 170-010PV lumped seasonal TMDL allocation, and reference daily TMDL allocations

| Fecal Coliform   | Total    | NonP    | Point Sources |      | Nonpoint Sources |            | Margin of Safety |
|--|----------|---------|---------------|------|------------------|------------|------------------|
|  | SubWS    | Septic  | NPDES         |      | Direct           | Washoff    |                  |
|  | Load     | Systems | WWTP          | MS4  | Livestock        | & Wildlife |                  |
| <b>Seasonal Allocated Load (May 1<sup>st</sup> through October 15<sup>th</sup>) cfu*10<sup>10</sup>/season</b> |          |         |               |      |                  |            |                  |
| Allowable  | 5284.67  | 49.67   | 115.11        | 4.48 | 0.00             | 5115.42    | Implicit         |
| Existing   | 51932.86 | 2125.80 | 115.11        | 5.32 | 43680.00         | 6006.63    | -                |
| % Reduction  | 90%      | 98%     | 0%            | 16%  | 100%             | 15%        | -                |
| <b>Reference Daily Allocated Load cfu*10<sup>9</sup>/day</b>   |          |         |               |      |                  |            |                  |
| Allowable  | 3145.64  | 29.56   | 68.52         | 2.67 | 0.00             | 3044.89    | Implicit         |
| Existing   | 30912.41 | 1265.36 | 68.52         | 3.16 | 26000.00         | 3575.38    | -                |
| % Reduction  | 90%      | 98%     | 0%            | 16%  | 100%             | 15%        | -                |

Table 6.11 Sub-watershed 170-010PV seasonal TMDL allocation breakout of non-point source wash-off and direct stream sources

| Fecal Coliform<br>(cfu*10 <sup>10</sup> /season) | Washoff Source |         |         |        | Direct Stream Source |          |
|--|----------------|---------|---------|--------|----------------------|----------|
|  | Developed      | Crop    | Pasture | Forest | Livestock            | Wildlife |
| Allowable  | 0.51           | 1443.91 | 3315.18 | 7.45   | 0.00                 | 348.37   |
| Existing   | 0.60           | 1714.27 | 3935.94 | 7.45   | 43680.00             | 348.37   |
| % Reduction                                      | 16%            | 16%     | 16%     | 0%     | 100%                 | 0%       |

Table 6.12 Sub-watershed 170-010PV seasonal TMDL allocation breakout of point source MS4 wash-off

|   |            |        |            |
|---|------------|--------|------------|
| <b>MS4 Acres</b> (Inhabited/Infrastructure/Open Urban):             |            |        | 532        |
| <b>Fecal Coliform MS4 Allocation</b> (cfu*10 <sup>10</sup> /season) |            |        | 4.48       |
| MS4 Jurisdiction  | % MS4      | % FC   | Load       |
|   | Total Area | Source | Allocation |
| Walnut Township   | 57.0%      | 18.0%  | 0.81       |
| Thurston  | 15.7%      | 32.4%  | 1.45       |
| Pleasantville   | 27.3%      | 49.6%  | 2.22       |

Table 6.13 Sub-watershed 170-010PV seasonal TMDL allocations breakout of NPDES permitted point.

| Fecal Coliform (cfu*10 <sup>10</sup> /season) Wasteload Allocations |                                  |        |                               |
|---|----------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|
| Permit#   | Facility                         | WLA    | Notes                         |
| 4PA00005  | Walnut Creek Sewer District WWTP | 115.11 | SSO issues are being resolved |

Table 6.14 Hydrologic Response Unit control module of SLAPIT model, populated with sub-watershed 170-010PV data

| MS4     | MS4 Name      | HRU | VALUE  | COUNT | HYDRO | INDEX  | LU | SUBWS | MS4 REGION | Use for Septic | WS/LU | LU          | MS4           | CN     | COUNT | ACRES   | CN W      | %OnSoilType |
|---------|---------------|-----|--------|-------|-------|--------|----|-------|------------|----------------|-------|-------------|---------------|--------|-------|---------|-----------|-------------|
| 50000   | Walnut Twp    | 1   | 113    | 2     | 3     | 110    | 10 | 100   | 0          | 10             | 110   | Built-Up    | None          | 85.00  | 2     | 0.45    | 37.89     | 2.08        |
| 110000  | Thurston      | 2   | 115    | 94    | 5     | 110    | 10 | 100   | 0          | 10             | 110   | Built-Up    | None          | 93.00  | 94    | 20.95   | 1948.60   | 97.92       |
| 120000  | Pleasantville | 3   | 121    | 10    | 1     | 120    | 20 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 120   | Cropland    | None          | 67.00  | 10    | 2.23    | 149.53    | 0.09        |
| 0       | None          | 4   | 123    | 419   | 3     | 120    | 20 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 120   | Cropland    | None          | 78.00  | 419   | 93.51   | 7294.12   | 3.58        |
|         |               | 5   | 125    | 11234 | 5     | 120    | 20 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 120   | Cropland    | None          | 85.00  | 11234 | 2507.26 | 213116.75 | 95.85       |
|         |               | 6   | 127    | 57    | 7     | 120    | 20 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 120   | Cropland    | None          | 89.00  | 57    | 12.72   | 1132.22   | 0.49        |
|         |               | 7   | 133    | 18    | 3     | 130    | 30 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 130   | Pastureland | None          | 61.00  | 18    | 4.03    | 245.57    | 0.50        |
|         |               | 8   | 135    | 3585  | 5     | 130    | 30 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 130   | Pastureland | None          | 74.00  | 3585  | 801.80  | 59333.24  | 99.42       |
|         |               | 9   | 137    | 3     | 7     | 130    | 30 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 130   | Pastureland | None          | 80.00  | 3     | 0.67    | 53.68     | 0.08        |
|         |               | 10  | 143    | 22    | 3     | 140    | 40 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 140   | Forest      | None          | 55.00  | 22    | 4.91    | 269.95    | 1.29        |
|         |               | 11  | 145    | 1600  | 5     | 140    | 40 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 140   | Forest      | None          | 70.00  | 1600  | 356.95  | 24986.70  | 93.84       |
|         |               | 12  | 147    | 83    | 7     | 140    | 40 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 140   | Forest      | None          | 77.00  | 83    | 18.52   | 1425.80   | 4.87        |
| LOC     | Location Name | 13  | 153    | 2     | 3     | 150    | 50 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 150   | Water       | None          | 100.00 | 2     | 0.44    | 44.48     | 10.00       |
| 100     | Watershed     | 14  | 155    | 18    | 5     | 150    | 50 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 150   | Water       | None          | 100.00 | 18    | 4.00    | 400.34    | 90.00       |
| 200     | Septic        | 15  | 163    | 47    | 3     | 160    | 60 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 160   | Other       | None          | 98.00  | 47    | 10.56   | 1034.83   | 4.69        |
|         |               | 16  | 165    | 955   | 5     | 160    | 60 | 100   | 0          | 0              | 160   | Other       | None          | 98.00  | 955   | 214.56  | 21026.77  | 95.31       |
| LU      | Name          | 17  | 50115  | 144   | 5     | 50110  | 10 | 100   | 50000      | 10             | 110   | Built-Up    | Walnut Twp    | 93.00  | 144   | 32.10   | 2985.09   | 98.63       |
| 10      | Built-Up      | 18  | 50117  | 2     | 7     | 50110  | 10 | 100   | 50000      | 10             | 110   | Built-Up    | Walnut Twp    | 97.00  | 2     | 0.45    | 43.24     | 1.37        |
| 20      | Cropland      | 19  | 50123  | 1447  | 3     | 50120  | 20 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 120   | Cropland    | Walnut Twp    | 78.00  | 1447  | 322.95  | 25189.95  | 8.22        |
| 30      | Pastureland   | 20  | 50125  | 15995 | 5     | 50120  | 20 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 120   | Cropland    | Walnut Twp    | 85.00  | 15995 | 3569.84 | 303436.21 | 90.90       |
| 40      | Forest        | 21  | 50127  | 155   | 7     | 50120  | 20 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 120   | Cropland    | Walnut Twp    | 89.00  | 155   | 34.59   | 3078.83   | 0.88        |
| 50      | Water         | 22  | 50133  | 532   | 3     | 50130  | 30 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 130   | Pastureland | Walnut Twp    | 61.00  | 532   | 118.98  | 7258.03   | 15.41       |
| 60      | Other         | 23  | 50135  | 2881  | 5     | 50130  | 30 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 130   | Pastureland | Walnut Twp    | 74.00  | 2881  | 644.35  | 47681.74  | 83.43       |
|         |               | 24  | 50137  | 40    | 7     | 50130  | 30 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 130   | Pastureland | Walnut Twp    | 80.00  | 40    | 8.95    | 715.69    | 1.16        |
| SSURGO  | Soil Group    | 25  | 50143  | 499   | 3     | 50140  | 40 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 140   | Forest      | Walnut Twp    | 55.00  | 499   | 111.32  | 6122.86   | 16.12       |
| 1       | A             | 26  | 50145  | 2577  | 5     | 50140  | 40 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 140   | Forest      | Walnut Twp    | 70.00  | 2577  | 574.92  | 40244.20  | 83.26       |
| 2       | A/D           | 27  | 50147  | 19    | 7     | 50140  | 40 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 140   | Forest      | Walnut Twp    | 77.00  | 19    | 4.24    | 326.39    | 0.61        |
| 3       | B             | 28  | 50153  | 24    | 3     | 50150  | 50 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 150   | Water       | Walnut Twp    | 100.00 | 24    | 5.34    | 533.79    | 25.81       |
| 4       | B/D           | 29  | 50155  | 40    | 5     | 50150  | 50 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 150   | Water       | Walnut Twp    | 100.00 | 40    | 8.90    | 889.65    | 43.01       |
| 5       | C             | 30  | 50157  | 29    | 7     | 50150  | 50 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 150   | Water       | Walnut Twp    | 100.00 | 29    | 6.45    | 644.99    | 31.18       |
| 6       | C/D           | 31  | 50163  | 70    | 3     | 50160  | 60 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 160   | Other       | Walnut Twp    | 98.00  | 70    | 15.73   | 1541.23   | 5.82        |
| 7       | D             | 32  | 50165  | 1127  | 5     | 50160  | 60 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 160   | Other       | Walnut Twp    | 98.00  | 1127  | 253.20  | 24813.79  | 93.68       |
|         |               | 33  | 50167  | 6     | 7     | 50160  | 60 | 100   | 50000      | 0              | 160   | Other       | Walnut Twp    | 98.00  | 6     | 1.35    | 132.11    | 0.50        |
| Washoff | 1/2" %Removal | 34  | 110115 | 222   | 5     | 110110 | 10 | 100   | 110000     | 0              | 110   | Built-Up    | Thurston      | 93.00  | 222   | 49.48   | 4602.02   | 84.09       |
| 110     | 90            | 35  | 110117 | 42    | 7     | 110110 | 10 | 100   | 110000     | 0              | 110   | Built-Up    | Thurston      | 97.00  | 42    | 9.36    | 908.10    | 15.91       |
| 120     | 80            | 36  | 110125 | 244   | 5     | 110120 | 20 | 100   | 110000     | 0              | 120   | Cropland    | Thurston      | 85.00  | 244   | 54.46   | 4628.85   | 98.79       |
| 130     | 70            | 37  | 110127 | 3     | 7     | 110120 | 20 | 100   | 110000     | 0              | 120   | Cropland    | Thurston      | 89.00  | 3     | 0.67    | 59.59     | 1.21        |
| 140     | 50            | 38  | 110135 | 73    | 5     | 110130 | 30 | 100   | 110000     | 0              | 130   | Pastureland | Thurston      | 74.00  | 73    | 16.33   | 1208.18   | 100.00      |
| 150     | 0             | 39  | 110145 | 27    | 5     | 110140 | 40 | 100   | 110000     | 0              | 140   | Forest      | Thurston      | 70.00  | 27    | 6.02    | 421.65    | 57.45       |
| 160     | 0             | 40  | 110147 | 20    | 7     | 110140 | 40 | 100   | 110000     | 0              | 140   | Forest      | Thurston      | 77.00  | 20    | 4.46    | 343.57    | 42.55       |
| 210     | 80            | 41  | 110165 | 70    | 5     | 110160 | 60 | 100   | 110000     | 0              | 160   | Other       | Thurston      | 98.00  | 70    | 15.73   | 1541.23   | 63.06       |
| 220     | 0             | 42  | 110167 | 41    | 7     | 110160 | 60 | 100   | 110000     | 0              | 160   | Other       | Thurston      | 98.00  | 41    | 9.21    | 902.72    | 36.94       |
| 230     | 0             | 43  | 120115 | 403   | 5     | 120110 | 10 | 100   | 120000     | 0              | 110   | Built-Up    | Pleasantville | 93.00  | 403   | 89.83   | 8354.12   | 100.00      |
| 240     | 0             | 44  | 120123 | 2     | 3     | 120120 | 20 | 100   | 120000     | 0              | 120   | Cropland    | Pleasantville | 78.00  | 2     | 0.45    | 34.82     | 2.41        |
| 250     | 0             | 45  | 120125 | 81    | 5     | 120120 | 20 | 100   | 120000     | 0              | 120   | Cropland    | Pleasantville | 85.00  | 81    | 18.08   | 1536.63   | 97.59       |
| 260     | 0             | 46  | 120135 | 29    | 5     | 120130 | 30 | 100   | 120000     | 0              | 130   | Pastureland | Pleasantville | 74.00  | 29    | 6.49    | 479.96    | 100.00      |
| 50110   | 90            | 47  | 120145 | 33    | 5     | 120140 | 40 | 100   | 120000     | 0              | 140   | Forest      | Pleasantville | 70.00  | 33    | 7.36    | 515.35    | 100.00      |
| 110110  | 90            | 48  | 120165 | 246   | 5     | 120160 | 60 | 100   | 120000     | 0              | 160   | Other       | Pleasantville | 98.00  | 246   | 55.27   | 5416.32   | 100.00      |
| 120110  | 90            |     |        |       |       |        |    |       |            |                |       |             |               |        |       |         |           |             |

Table 6.15 Sub-watershed 170-010PV abbreviated SLAPIT daily simulation example

| STEP | DATE      | MONTH | YEAR | Base Flow (cfs) | PRECIP(in) | INDEX | LU | MS4 | Q(in) | BUILD/ACRE | Loss     | Available | WASH/ACRE | Acres | LOAD     | Runoff (cf) | Base (cf) |
|------|-----------|-------|------|-----------------|------------|-------|----|-----|-------|------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| 1    | 5/1/1997  | 5     | 1997 | 8.7             | 0.055      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 1.46E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 1.46E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 7.55E+05  |
| 2    | 5/2/1997  | 5     | 1997 | 8.7             | 0.588      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.156 | 2.09E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.09E+07  | 1.07E+07  | 21.40 | 2.29E+08 | 1.21E+04    | 7.55E+05  |
| 3    | 5/3/1997  | 5     | 1997 | 8.7             | 0.561      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.140 | 1.90E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 1.90E+07  | 9.04E+06  | 21.40 | 1.93E+08 | 1.09E+04    | 7.55E+05  |
| 4    | 5/4/1997  | 5     | 1997 | 8.7             | 0.131      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 1.89E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 1.89E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 7.55E+05  |
| 5    | 5/5/1997  | 5     | 1997 | 13.1            | 0.085      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.28E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.28E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 1.13E+06  |
| 6    | 5/6/1997  | 5     | 1997 | 13.7            | 0.035      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.45E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.45E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 1.19E+06  |
| 7    | 5/7/1997  | 5     | 1997 | 13.7            | 0.000      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.53E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.53E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 1.19E+06  |
| 8    | 5/8/1997  | 5     | 1997 | 13.7            | 0.411      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.064 | 2.56E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.56E+07  | 6.52E+06  | 21.40 | 1.40E+08 | 4.97E+03    | 1.19E+06  |
| 9    | 5/9/1997  | 5     | 1997 | 13.7            | 0.190      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.002 | 2.29E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.29E+07  | 1.68E+05  | 21.40 | 3.61E+06 | 1.25E+02    | 1.19E+06  |
| 10   | 5/10/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 14.1            | 0.009      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.45E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.45E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 1.22E+06  |
| 11   | 5/11/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 12.9            | 0.000      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.52E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.52E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 1.11E+06  |
| 12   | 5/12/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 12.2            | 0.000      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.56E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.56E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 1.06E+06  |
| 13   | 5/13/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 12.2            | 0.000      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.57E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.57E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 1.06E+06  |
| 14   | 5/14/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 10.4            | 0.375      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.049 | 2.58E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.58E+07  | 5.23E+06  | 21.40 | 1.12E+08 | 3.82E+03    | 9.02E+05  |
| 15   | 5/15/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 9.5             | 0.155      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.35E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.35E+07  | 4.79E+00  | 21.40 | 1.02E+02 | 3.43E-03    | 8.23E+05  |
| 16   | 5/16/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 9.0             | 0.071      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.48E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.48E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 7.78E+05  |
| 17   | 5/17/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 8.8             | 0.235      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.008 | 2.54E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.54E+07  | 8.67E+05  | 21.40 | 1.86E+07 | 5.86E+02    | 7.58E+05  |
| 18   | 5/18/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 8.8             | 0.141      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.53E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.53E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 7.58E+05  |
| 19   | 5/19/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 7.6             | 0.640      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.187 | 2.56E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.56E+07  | 1.48E+07  | 21.40 | 3.16E+08 | 1.45E+04    | 6.55E+05  |
| 20   | 5/20/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 6.8             | 0.254      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.011 | 1.93E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 1.93E+07  | 9.79E+05  | 21.40 | 2.10E+07 | 8.80E+02    | 5.87E+05  |
| 21   | 5/21/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 6.4             | 0.000      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.25E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.25E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 5.50E+05  |
| 22   | 5/22/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 6.2             | 0.000      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.44E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.44E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 5.38E+05  |
| 23   | 5/23/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 6.2             | 0.000      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.52E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.52E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 5.38E+05  |
| 24   | 5/24/1997 | 5     | 1997 | 6.2             | 0.347      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.038 | 2.56E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.56E+07  | 4.15E+06  | 21.40 | 8.88E+07 | 2.99E+03    | 5.38E+05  |
| 25   | 5/25/1997 | 6     | 1997 | 6.2             | 0.384      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.053 | 2.39E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.39E+07  | 5.13E+06  | 21.40 | 1.10E+08 | 4.08E+03    | 5.38E+05  |
| 26   | 5/26/1997 | 6     | 1997 | 6.2             | 0.099      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.27E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.27E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 5.38E+05  |
| 27   | 5/27/1997 | 6     | 1997 | 7.4             | 0.000      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.45E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.45E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 6.36E+05  |
| 28   | 5/28/1997 | 6     | 1997 | 8.1             | 0.014      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.52E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.52E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 7.02E+05  |
| 29   | 5/29/1997 | 6     | 1997 | 8.1             | 0.155      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.56E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.56E+07  | 5.21E+00  | 21.40 | 1.11E+02 | 3.43E-03    | 7.02E+05  |
| 30   | 5/30/1997 | 6     | 1997 | 8.1             | 0.146      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.000 | 2.57E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.57E+07  | 0.00E+00  | 21.40 | 0.00E+00 | 0.00E+00    | 7.02E+05  |
| 31   | 5/31/1997 | 6     | 1997 | 8.1             | 0.935      | 110   | 10 | 0   | 0.392 | 2.58E+07   | 0.00E+00 | 2.58E+07  | 2.15E+07  | 21.40 | 4.61E+08 | 3.05E+04    | 7.02E+05  |

### 6.3.3 Habitat quality and sediment analysis

The habitat and sediment (bedload) TMDLs are based upon the QHEI. Since no processes are being simulated and source and transport mechanisms are not applicable, the TMDLs are generated strictly based on comparison of observed conditions (i.e., QHEI scores) to target conditions. (Section 6.2 lists the target values and provides information regarding the QHEI). For the sediment TMDLs, the target is based on the sum total of the substrate, channel, and riparian metric scores, and the deviation is calculated as the proportion of the difference between actual and target values to the target value. No percent deviation is calculated for the results of the habitat analysis and only the sum of each pass/fail score (i.e., one indicates “pass” while zero indicates “fail”), which ranges from zero and three, is used to convey the degree of habitat improvement needed. Specifically, the score shows how many of the aspects of habitat quality are in need of improvement.

### 6.4 Critical conditions and seasonality

#### *Aquatic Life*

The critical condition for aquatic organisms is the summer when the aquatic life activity and biomass production are at their highest levels and the organisms are most sensitive to environmental conditions. Summer is also when excessive algal growth, high in-stream temperatures, and reduced stream flows occur leading to the lowest dissolved oxygen concentrations. Ohio EPA biological and habitat targets are protective of the critical period as they are based on data collected only during the summer months. Further, assessing the biology during the summer months evaluates the biological performance during its most critical time of the year.

Seasonality is accounted for in the aquatic life indices. Biological and habitat indices are measures of aggregate annual conditions reflecting compounding factors over time. Such factors include episodic flow events and pollutant loads that are more extreme in nature and have long-term impact on the ecosystem. Other compounding factors might involve chronic stress such as high water temperatures and swings in dissolved oxygen. The use of these indices reflects the collective seasonal effects on the biota. The measurement of these indices during the summer period reflects the biotic performance during critical conditions.

#### *Pathogens*

The recreation season from May 1st to October 15th establishes a critical period when protection of the public from waterborne illness is most important. The recreation season's weather pattern is characterized by long periods of relatively stable warm weather with intermittent frontal storms. The recreation season's hydrology is characterized by beginning with stream flows of average span and continuing down to the lowest flow span observed throughout the year.

Chronic elevated pathogen levels present a critical condition for public safety. Though days of runoff from storms are a small fraction of the total recreation season, pathogens washed off as pulsed loads from various land uses during such events can contribute to a stream's chronic pathogen problems. Excessive wash-off of pathogens pose a critical condition to the extent of increasing a stream's chronic pathogen levels, and delivering significant pathogen loads to downstream waters.

#### *Habitat and Sediment*

The critical condition for the habitat and sediment TMDLs is the summer when environmental

stress upon aquatic organisms is greatest. It is during this period that the presence of high quality habitat features, such as deep pools and un-embedded substrate, is essential to provide refuge for aquatic life. QHEI scores, the basis of the habitat TMDLs, are assessed during the summer field season. The habitat and sediment TMDLs are therefore reflective of the critical condition.

## 6.5 Margin of safety

A TMDL must include a margin of safety to account for any lack of knowledge concerning the relationship between load and wasteload allocations and water quality (CWA § 303(d)(1)(C), 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(c)(1) ). U.S. EPA guidance explains that the margin of safety may be implicit (i.e., incorporated into the TMDL through conservative assumptions) in the analysis, or explicit (i.e., expressed in the TMDL as a loading set aside). The implicit and explicit margin of safety factors used in the analyses are described below.

### *The List of Impaired Waters (the 303(d) List)*

Ohio's integrated monitoring ensures that Ohio's water quality problems are being properly and thoroughly identified. Likewise, delisting requires attainment of the aquatic life use determined by the direct measurement of the aquatic biological community. This provides a high level of assurance (and an implicit margin of safety) that if the TMDL allocations do not lead to sufficiently improved water quality then the segments remain on the list until true attainment is achieved.

### *Pathogens*

A margin of safety was implicitly incorporated into the pathogen TMDL. The targeted fecal coliform concentration of 1000 cfu/100mL represents the Ohio EPA 30 day geometric mean standard, but is used for the allowable daily maximum load calculation. Using this target also provides a substantial implicit margin of safety by not basing maximum load calculations on the Ohio EPA maximum daily standard concentration of 2000 cfu/100mL.

The fecal coliform load to the streams in each sub-watershed was quantified, as was the fecal coliform loading capacity at the outlet of each sub-watershed. Loading capacity was calculated as the product of the seasonal flow volume and the fecal coliform target concentration. Rather, the load reductions recommended by this report are based upon a direct comparison between the two quantities. In reality, considerable die-off occurs between the source of loading and the TMDL endpoint, and this loss represents an implicit margin of safety (see *EPA's Protocol for Developing Pathogen TMDLs* (EPA 841-R-00-002)). Also, no attempt was made to link landuse buffering capacity efficiency with upstream loading via best management practices. The assumption that 100% of all fecal coliform sources are available for washoff considers a watershed with no pollutant reduction from containment or entrapment. While there are likely some washoff management strategies being practiced, not considering any landuse controls is also represented as the implicit margin of safety.

### *Habitat and sediment*

A MOS was implicitly incorporated into the habitat and sediment TMDLs through the use of conservative target values. The target values were developed through comparison of paired IBI and QHEI evaluations. Using an IBI score of 40 as representative of the attainment of WWH, individual components of the QHEI were analyzed to determine their magnitude at which WWH attainment is probable (OEPA, 1999). Attainment does, however, occur at levels lower than the established targets. The difference between the habitat and sediment targets and the levels at which attainment actually occurs is an implicit margin of safety.

## 7 RESULTS OF TMDL DEVELOPMENT

This section of the report provides the results of the TMDL analyses. These results indicate the needed pollution and/or stressor abatement needed in the watershed in order to meet the applicable water quality standards. Section 8.0 of the report focuses on strategies that might best achieve the needed water quality improvements.

Figure 7.1 is a map of the watershed illustrating the areas that were analyzed for the various TMDL parameters. Tables 7.1 through 7.4 present results for the fecal coliform TMDLs and Table 7.5 presents results for both the sediment and habitat TMDLs. Table 7.1 shows the overall TMDL and the major allocations for each assessed area (based on 14-digit HUCs or some smaller watershed sub-division). Table 7.2 focuses on the nonpoint source load allocations (LAs) in greater detail providing allocation to each of the applicable types of land cover. Table 7.3 shows the wasteload allocations for the applicable municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) and identifies each entity associated with each (MS4). Table 7.4 shows the wasteload allocations to the appropriate wastewater dischargers (i.e., NPDES permittees) in the watershed.




Figure 7.1 Areas analyzed for TMDL development. Areas without shading or diagonal lines were not subject to TMDL analysis.

Table 7.1 Results of the TMDL analyses for fecal coliform bacteria.

| HUC - 11 | HUC - 14   | Sub-watershed                                  | Existing loads (cfu * 10 <sup>8</sup> / day) |                  | Margin of safety | Allowable loads (cfu * 10 <sup>8</sup> / day) |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
|----------|------------|--|--|------------------|------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|-----|
|          |            |  | Point sources                                | Nonpoint sources |                  | Total WLA                                     | Percent reduction <sup>1</sup> | Total LA | Percent reduction <sup>1</sup> | TMDL    | Percent reduction <sup>1</sup> |     |
| 170      | 010        | Walnut Cr. Headwaters to upstream Buckeye Trib |  |                  |                  |   |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
|          |            | 170-010HW                                      | 0.25   | 45343.1          | implicit         | 0.21  | 17%                            | 2419.56  | 95%                            | 2419.77 | 95%                            |     |
|          |            | Walnut Cr. below Buckeye Tr to below Pleasant  |  |                  |                  |   |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
|          | 020        | 170-010PV                                      | 71.68  | 30840.73         | implicit         | 71.18   | 70%                            | 3074.45  | 90%                            | 3145.63 | 90%                            |     |
|          |            | Pawpaw Creek                                   |  |                  |                  |   |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
|          | 040        | 170-020  | 5.41   | 35294.98         | implicit         | 3.56  | 34%                            | 3671.15  | 90%                            | 3674.71 | 90%                            |     |
|          |            | Poplar Cr.                                     |  |                  |                  |   |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
|          | 050        | 170-040  | 2.01   | 22858.72         | implicit         | 1.08  | 46%                            | 4053.88  | 82%                            | 4054.96 | 82%                            |     |
|          |            | Walnut Cr. below Poplar Cr. to above Sycamore  |  |                  |                  |   |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
|          | 060        | 170-050  | 29.91  | 35922.75         | implicit         | 28.26   | 6%                             | 6503.35  | 82%                            | 6531.61 | 82%                            |     |
|          |            | Upper Sycamore Creek                           |  |                  |                  |   |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
|          |            | 170-060US                                      | 7.05   | 3394.63          | implicit         | 6.06  | 14%                            | 2228.21  | 34%                            | 2234.27 | 34%                            |     |
|          |            | Lower Sycamore Creek                           |  |                  |                  |   |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
|          | 180        | 020  | 170-060LS                                    | 927.42           | 8293.84          | implicit                                      | 923.06                         | 0.5%     | 4784.6                         | 42%     | 5707.66                        | 38% |
|          |            |  | Georges Creek                                |                  |                  |   |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
| 030      |            | 180-020  | 31.96  | 7181.45          | implicit         | 28.14   | 12%                            | 4987.98  | 31%                            | 5016.12 | 30%                            |     |
|          |            | Big Run  |  |                  |                  |   |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
|          |            | 180-030BR                                      | 10.7   | 4685.14          | implicit         | 10.35   | 32%                            | 2292.19  | 51%                            | 2302.54 | 51%                            |     |
|          |            | Mud Run  |  |                  |                  |   |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
| 050      | 180-030MR  | 0.19   | 11713.84                                     | implicit         | 0.12             | 36%   | 2850.46                        | 76%      | 2850.58                        | 76%     |                                |     |
|          | Turkey Run |  |  |                  |                  |   |                                |          |                                |         |                                |     |
| 180      | 050        | 180-050  | 0  | 5884.35          | implicit         | 0   | 0%                             | 2918.48  | 50%                            | 2918.48 | 50%                            |     |

<sup>1</sup> Percent reduction refers to reduction necessary to meet the allocation (allowable loading) based on the estimated existing loads.

Table 7.2 Existing loads and load allocations for nonpoint sources for fecal coliform bacteria.

| HUC<br>- 11 | HUC<br>- 14 | Sub-<br>watershed                              | Land cover type for washoff (cfu * 10 <sup>8</sup> / day) |      |          |         |          |         |          |       | Direct stream source (cfu * 10 <sup>8</sup> / day) |    |          |         |
|-------------|-------------|--|---|------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|-------|--|----|----------|---------|
|             |             |  | Developed <sup>1</sup>                                    |      | Cropland |         | Pasture  |         | Forest   |       | Livestock  |    | Wildlife |         |
|             |             |  | Existing  | LA   | Existing | LA      | Existing | LA      | Existing | LA    | Existing   | LA | Existing | LA      |
| 170         | 010         | Walnut Cr. Headwaters to upstream Buckeye Trib |   |      |          |         |          |         |          |       |  |    |          |         |
|             |             | 170-010HW                                      | 0.04  | 0.03 | 823.8    | 683.48  | 1868.86  | 1550.53 | 4.76     | 4.76  | 41600  | 0  | 146.21   | 146.21  |
|             |             | Walnut Cr. below Buckeye Tr to below Pleasant  |   |      |          |         |          |         |          |       |  |    |          |         |
|             |             | 170-010PV                                      | 0.36  | 0.3  | 1020.4   | 859.47  | 2342.82  | 1973.32 | 4.44     | 4.44  | 26000  | 0  | 207.36   | 207.36  |
|             |             | Pawpaw Creek                                   |   |      |          |         |          |         |          |       |  |    |          |         |
|             |             | 170-020  | **  | **   | 1487.46  | 978.54  | 3662.41  | 2409.34 | 7.74     | 7.74  | 28080  | 0  | 240.59   | 240.59  |
|             |             | Poplar Cr.                                     |   |      |          |         |          |         |          |       |  |    |          |         |
|             |             | 170-040  | **  | **   | 1373.38  | 734.95  | 5601.51  | 2997.6  | 16.06    | 16.06 | 12480  | 0  | 238.96   | 238.96  |
|             |             | Walnut Cr. below Poplar Cr. to above Sycamore  |   |      |          |         |          |         |          |       |  |    |          |         |
|             |             | 170-050  | 7   | 3.62 | 1911.03  | 988.32  | 8809.47  | 4555.94 | 34.17    | 34.17 | 20800  | 0  | 833.21   | 833.21  |
|             |             | Upper Sycamore Creek                           |   |      |          |         |          |         |          |       |  |    |          |         |
|             |             | 170-060US                                      | **  | **   | 712.27   | 611.65  | 1471.45  | 1263.58 | 13.58    | 13.58 | 0  | 0  | 321.46   | 321.46  |
|             |             | Lower Sycamore Creek                           |   |      |          |         |          |         |          |       |  |    |          |         |
|             |             | 170-060LS                                      | **  | **   | 1157.04  | 891.37  | 4334.29  | 3339.07 | 15.75    | 15.75 | 0  | 0  | 502.19   | 502.19  |
| 180         | 020         | Georges Creek                                  |   |      |          |         |          |         |          |       |  |    |          |         |
|             |             | 180-020  | **  | **   | 1625.55  | 1431.22 | 2511.39  | 2211.16 | 25.44    | 25.44 | 0  | 0  | 1282.74  | 1282.74 |
|             |             | Big Run  |   |      |          |         |          |         |          |       |  |    |          |         |
|             |             | 180-030BR                                      | 0.99  | 0.71 | 706      | 508.8   | 1996.62  | 1438.93 | 14.2     | 14.2  | 0  | 0  | 271.26   | 271.26  |
|             |             | Mud Run  |   |      |          |         |          |         |          |       |  |    |          |         |
|             |             | 180-030MR                                      | 0.85  | 0.54 | 734.76   | 467     | 3147.92  | 2000.78 | 22.42    | 22.42 | 6240   | 0  | 314.54   | 314.54  |
| 180         | 050         | Turkey Run                                     |   |      |          |         |          |         |          |       |  |    |          |         |
|             |             | 180-050  | 0.51  | 0.29 | 1058.44  | 603.02  | 3907.39  | 2226.15 | 5.82     | 5.82  | 0  | 0  | 49.54    | 49.54   |

Table 7.3 Existing loads and load allocations for point sources for fecal coliform bacteria.

| HUC-11  | HUC-14     | Sub-watershed                                  | Non point source                             |           | Point sources (cfu * 10 <sup>8</sup> / day) |          |           |       |
|---------|------------|--|--|-----------|---|----------|-----------|-------|
|         |            |  | Septic Systems (cfu * 10 <sup>8</sup> / day) |           | NPDES                                       |          |           |       |
|         |            |  | Existing                                     | Allocated | WWTP  |          | MS4       |       |
|         |            |  |  | Existing  | Allocated                                   | Existing | Allocated |       |
| 170     | 010        | Walnut Cr. Headwaters to upstream Buckeye Trib |  |           |   |          |           |       |
|         |            | 170-010HW                                      | 899.17                                       | 34.55     | 0   | 0        | 0.25      | 0.21  |
|         | 010        | Walnut Cr. below Buckeye Tr to below Pleasant  |  |           |   |          |           |       |
|         |            | 170-010PV                                      | 1265.36                                      | 29.56     | 68.52                                       | 68.52    | 3.16      | 2.66  |
|         | 020        | Pawpaw Creek                                   |  |           |   |          |           |       |
|         |            | 170-020  | 1816.78                                      | 34.94     | 0   | 0        | 5.41      | 3.56  |
|         | 040        | Poplar Cr.                                     |  |           |   |          |           |       |
|         |            | 170-040  | 3148.81                                      | 66.31     | 0   | 0        | 2.01      | 1.08  |
|         | 050        | Walnut Cr. below Poplar Cr. to above Sycamore  |  |           |   |          |           |       |
|         |            | 170-050  | 3527.85                                      | 88.09     | 26.5  | 26.5     | 3.41      | 1.76  |
|         | 060        | Upper Sycamore Creek                           |  |           |   |          |           |       |
|         |            | 170-060US                                      | 875.86                                       | 17.94     | 0   | 0        | 7.05      | 6.06  |
|         |            | Lower Sycamore Creek                           |  |           |   |          |           |       |
|         |            | 170-060LS                                      | 2284.58                                      | 36.22     | 908.5                                       | 908.5    | 18.92     | 14.56 |
|         | 180        | 020  | Georges Creek                                |           |   |          |           |       |
| 180-020 |            |  | 1736.33                                      | 37.42     | 0   | 0        | 31.96     | 28.14 |
| 030     |            | Big Run  |  |           |   |          |           |       |
|         |            | 180-030BR                                      | 1696.06                                      | 58.29     | 9.46  | 9.46     | 1.23      | 0.89  |
|         |            | Mud Run  |  |           |   |          |           |       |
|         | 180-030MR  | 1253.36  | 45.18  | 0         | 0   | 0.19     | 0.12      |       |
| 050     | Turkey Run |  |  |           |   |          |           |       |
|         | 180-050    | 862.65   | 33.66  | 0         | 0   | 0        | 0         |       |

Table 7.4 Wasteload allocations for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Areas (MS4s) for fecal coliform bacteria.

| HUC - 11         | HUC - 14         | Sub-watershed                                  | MS4 area (acres) | MS4 allocation (cfu * 10 <sup>8</sup> /day) | MS4 Permittees   | Proportion of area | Proportion of loading | Wasteload allocation (cfu * 10 <sup>3</sup> /day) |      |  |
|------------------|------------------|--|------------------|---|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---|------|--|
| 170              | 010              | Walnut Cr. Headwaters to upstream Buckeye Trib |                  |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |
|                  |                  | 170-010HW                                      | 194              | 0.21  | Walnut Township  | 100%               | 100%                  | 0.21  |      |  |
|                  |                  | Walnut Cr. below Buckeye Tr to below Pleasant  |                  |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |
|                  |                  | 170-010PV                                      | 532              | 2.66  | Walnut Township  | 57%                | 18%                   | 0.48  |      |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  |   | Thurston         | 16%                | 32%                   | 0.86  |      |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  |   | Pleasantville    | 27%                | 50%                   | 1.32  |      |  |
|                  |                  | 020  | Pawpaw Creek     |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |
|                  |                  |  | 170-020          | 921   | 3.56             | Walnut Township    | 17%                   | 5%  | 0.18 |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  |   |                  | Liberty Township   | 41%                   | 12%   | 0.42 |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  |   |                  | Baltimore          | 43%                   | 83%   | 2.96 |  |
|                  | 040              | Poplar Cr.                                     |                  |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |
|                  |                  | 170-040  | 1,016            | 1.08  | Violet Township  | 4%                 | 90%                   | 0.01  |      |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  |   | Liberty Township | 91%                | 81%                   | 0.87  |      |  |
|                  | Etna Township    |  |                  |   | 5%               | 18%                | 0.2                   |   |      |  |
|                  | 050              | Walnut Cr. below Poplar Cr. to above Sycamore  |                  |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |
|                  |                  | 170-050  | 738              | 1.76  | Violet Township  | 85%                | 92%                   | 1.61  |      |  |
|                  | Liberty Township |  |                  |   | 16%              | 9%                 | 0.15                  |   |      |  |
|                  | 060              | Upper Sycamore Creek                           |                  |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |
|                  |                  | 170-060US                                      | 1,015            | 6.06  | Violet Township  | 28%                | 15%                   | 0.91  |      |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  |   | Etna Township    | 70%                | 83%                   | 5   |      |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  |   | Pataskala        | 2%                 | 2%                    | 0.15  |      |  |
|                  |                  | Lower Sycamore Creek                           |                  |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |
|                  |                  | 170-060LS                                      | 2,835            | 14.56                                       | Violet Township  | 48%                | 30%                   | 4.34  |      |  |
| Liberty Township | 7%               |  |                  |   | 2%               | 0.23               |                       |   |      |  |
| Pickerington     | 45%              |  |                  |   | 69%              | 9.99               |                       |   |      |  |
| 020              | Georges Creek    |  |                  |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |
|                  | 180-020          | 3,510  | 28.14            | Madison Township                            | 11%              | 8%                 | 2.36                  |   |      |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  | Violet Township                             | 46%              | 41%                | 11.4                  |   |      |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  | Etna Township                               | 50%              | 50%                | 0.14                  |   |      |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  | Pickerington                                | 24%              | 24%                | 6.81                  |   |      |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  | Columbus                                    | 17%              | 22%                | 6.25                  |   |      |  |
|                  |                  |  |                  | Canal Winchester                            | 3%               | 4%                 | 1.18                  |   |      |  |
|                  | Big Run          |  |                  |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |
|                  | 180-030BR        | 349  | 0.89             | Madison Township                            | 100%             | 100%               | 0.89                  |   |      |  |
|                  | Mud Run          |  |                  |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |
|                  | 180-030MR        | 30   | 0.12             | Madison Township                            | 100%             | 100%               | 0.12                  |   |      |  |
| 050              | Turkey Run       |  |                  |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |
|                  | 180-050          | NO MS4 PRESENT                                 |                  |   |                  |                    |                       |   |      |  |

Table 7.5 Wasteload allocations for NPDES dischargers for fecal coliform bacteria.

| HUC - 11  | HUC - 14 | Sub-watershed                                 | Permit number (Ohio EPA) | Facility Name                    | Design Flow (MGD) | Wasteload allocation (cfu * 10 <sup>8</sup> /day) | Comments                      |
|-----------|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 170       | 010      | Walnut Cr. below Buckeye Tr to below Pleasant |                          |                                  |                   |   |                               |
|           |          | 170-010PV                                     | 4PA00005                 | Walnut Creek Sewer District WWTP | 0.181             | 68.52   | SSO issues are being resolved |
|           | 20       | Pawpaw Creek                                  |                          |                                  |                   |   |                               |
|           |          | 170-020                                       | 4IA00001                 | Ohio Paperboard Corp. WWTP       | 1.08              | 0   | Industrial effluent only      |
|           | 50       | Walnut Cr. below Poplar Cr. to above Sycamore |                          |                                  |                   |   |                               |
|           |          | 170-050                                       | 4PS00015                 | Village of Carroll WWTP          | 0.07              | 26.5  | Controlled discharge lagoon   |
|           | 60       | Lower Sycamore Creek                          |                          |                                  |                   |   |                               |
|           |          |   | 4PG00027                 | Sycamore Creek WRF               | 0.8               | 302.83  | Operated by Fairfield County  |
|           |          | 170-060LS                                     | 4PB00017                 | City of Pickerington WWTP        | 1.60              | 605.67  | No known overflows            |
|           | 180      | 30  | Big Run                  |                                  |                   |   |                               |
| 180-030BR |          |   | 4GS00011                 | Century Acres WWTP               | 0.025             | 9.46  | Operated by Franklin County   |

Table 7.6 Results of the TMDL analyses for sediment (bedload) and habitat.

| TMDL Targets   |                         | SEDIMENT (BEDLOAD) TMDL |                  |          |                      |                         |                        | HABITAT TMDL |                             |                             |          |                |                       |                     |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Use  |                         | Allocations             |                  |          | TMDL                 |                         |                        | Allocations  |                             |                             | TMDL     |                |                       |                     |
| EWH  | >15                     | >15                     | >5               |          | 35                   |                         |                        | >75=1        | 0=1                         | <3=1                        | 3 pts    |                |                       |                     |
| WWH  | >13                     | >14                     | >5               |          | 32                   |                         |                        | >60=1        | <2=1                        | <5=1                        | 3 pts    |                |                       |                     |
| Stream name (aquatic life use)                                   | SEDIMENT (BEDLOAD) TMDL |                         |                  |          |                      |                         | HABITAT TMDL           |              |                             |                             |          |                |                       |                     |
|  | River mile              | QHEI Categories         |                  |          | Total Sediment Score | % Deviation from Target | Main Impaired Category | QHEI Score   | # High influence Attributes | Total # Modified Attributes | Subscore |                |                       | Total Habitat Score |
|  |                         | Substrate               | Channel          | Riparian |                      |                         |                        |              |                             |                             | QHEI     | High Influence | # Modified Attributes |                     |
| <b>Walnut Cr. below Buckeye Tr to below Pleasant (170-010PV)</b> |                         |                         |                  |          |                      |                         |                        |              |                             |                             |          |                |                       |                     |
| Pleasantville Creek (WWH)  | 2.4                     | 5                       | 7                | 4.5      | 16.5                 | 48%                     | Substrate              | 39           | 4                           | 11                          | 0        | 0              | 0                     | 0                   |
|  | 0.4                     | 11                      | 15               | 5        | 31                   | 3%                      | Substrate              | 67           | 0                           | 6                           | 1        | 1              | 0                     | 2                   |
| <b>Pawpaw Creek (170-020)</b>                                    |                         |                         |                  |          |                      |                         |                        |              |                             |                             |          |                |                       |                     |
| Trib to Pawpaw 1.79  | 0.3                     | 20                      | 9.5 <sup>1</sup> | 8        | 37.5                 | 0% <sup>1</sup>         | Channel <sup>1</sup>   |              |                             |                             |          |                |                       |                     |
| <b>Upper Sycamore Creek (170-060US)</b>                          |                         |                         |                  |          |                      |                         |                        |              |                             |                             |          |                |                       |                     |
| Sycamore Creek (WWH)   | 12.2                    | 10                      | 16               | 3.5      | 29.5                 | 8%                      | riparian               |              |                             |                             |          |                |                       |                     |
| <b>Georges Creek (180-020)</b>                                   |                         |                         |                  |          |                      |                         |                        |              |                             |                             |          |                |                       |                     |
| East Fork Georges Creek (WWH)                                    |                         |                         |                  |          |                      |                         |                        | 56           | 2                           | 6                           | 0        | 0              | 0                     | 0                   |
|  |                         |                         |                  |          |                      |                         |                        | 65           | 0                           | 5                           | 1        | 1              | 0                     | 2                   |
| <b>Big Run (180-030BR)</b>                                       |                         |                         |                  |          |                      |                         |                        |              |                             |                             |          |                |                       |                     |
| Big Run (WWH)  | 1.6                     | 10.5                    | 11               | 4.5      | 26                   | 19%                     | channel                | 40           | 2                           | 9                           | 0        | 0              | 0                     | 0                   |
| <b>Mud Run (180-030MR)</b>                                       |                         |                         |                  |          |                      |                         |                        |              |                             |                             |          |                |                       |                     |
| Mud Run (WWH)  | 1.5                     | 12.5                    | 9                | 3.5      | 25                   | 22%                     | channel                | 51           | 1                           | 7                           | 0        | 1              | 0                     | 1                   |
| <b>Turkey Run (180-050)</b>                                      |                         |                         |                  |          |                      |                         |                        |              |                             |                             |          |                |                       |                     |
| Turkey Run (EWH)   |                         |                         |                  |          |                      |                         |                        | 47           | 2                           | 7                           | 0        | 0              | 0                     | 0                   |

<sup>1</sup> Sediment has been identified as a cause of impairment despite meeting the overall sediment TMDL target. However, one component of the sediment score, the channel metric, is significantly deficient (deviation = 32%) and should be noted.

## 8 STRATEGY FOR ACHIEVING WATER QUALITY GOALS

The purpose of this section of the report is to outline a strategy to improve water quality in the Walnut Creek watershed. Areas that are not meeting water quality standards and areas for which TMDLs were developed are the primary focus. However, water quality in the watershed is threatened by ongoing land development, which is known to substantially degrade water quality. Thus, a general strategy to minimize this impact is also included.

Ohio EPA provides an restoration strategy in its TMDL reports out of commitment to achieving water quality goals. The agency, along with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR), the Ohio Department of Health (ODH), Ohio Department of Agriculture (ODA) and other state agencies is directed to manage, protect, and improve water quality throughout Ohio. This plan therefore will reflect the actions that Ohio EPA intends to take as well as its recommendations for other agencies including federal and local agencies and governments that are also charged with protecting water quality.

### 8.1 Sources to prioritize

This section interprets the TMDL results to highlight the sources of pollution that most need to be addressed to protect and restore the streams.

#### 8.1.1 Recreational use impairments

Recreational uses are impaired due to contamination by fecal matter. All relevant sources have been accounted for in the watershed loading analysis and include: wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs), municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s), home sewage treatment systems, livestock with stream access, and various nonpoint sources. Figures 8.1 through 8.4 illustrate the distribution of bacteria loading from the various sources, while Section 5.2 provides background regarding these types of sources. Each bar in Figure 8.1 represents the ratio of the loads from all non-NPDES-regulated sources to the NPDES sources. The higher the ratio (i.e., the longer the bar in the graph in Figure 8.1) bar, the more extreme the load from non-NPDES-regulated sources. For example, in sub-watershed 170-020 (Pawpaw Creek), the sum of the loads from livestock, HSTS, and NPS is  $353 \text{ cfu} \times 10^{10}$  per day, while the NPDES –regulated load is  $0.05 \text{ cfu} \times 10^{10}$  per day. Thus, the ratio is:  $353 \text{ cfu} \times 10^{10} \text{ per day} / 0.05 \text{ cfu} \times 10^{10} \text{ per day}$  or 7,059 as shown in Figure 8.1.

It is clear through the TMDL analyses that NPDES permitted entities (MS4s and WWTPs) are very small sources of bacteria in comparison to other sources. Figure 8.1 shows that NPDES sources contribute about nine times to over 11,000 times less fecal coliform than other sources within each of the sub-watersheds. Effective wastewater treatment and permit compliance by WWTPs and the fact that MS4 areas account for ten percent or less of the areas analyzed are reasons for the very small proportion of the loading from those sources. However, this also reflects higher loading intensity from the other sources.

Among the other sources, manure directly deposited in the stream by livestock is the most significant (see Table 8.1 for the estimated distribution of livestock across the subwatersheds). Areas where livestock have direct access to streams, loading rates are from about four to nearly fifty times higher than that from failed home septic systems (i.e., HSTSs) and from about an equal contribution to about twelve times greater than other nonpoint sources (i.e., this varies by subwatershed). The combinations of other nonpoint sources such as pastures, cropland, developed lands and forested areas (i.e., wildlife contributions) contribute more than failed

HSTS, specifically, from just over one to about six times as much. Figure 8.2 shows the loading comparisons between livestock, nonpoint, and HSTS sources. Figures 8.3 and 8.4 show existing and allocated loading, respectively, for these three categories of sources.

Table 8.1 Estimated distributions of livestock across the impaired sub-watersheds. Estimates are based on multiple lines of evidence including the National Agricultural Statistics Service's database and field observations.

| Modeled area                 |                              |                              | Estimated livestock count |                    |       |         |        |       |       |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-------|---------|--------|-------|-------|
| HUC 11<br>(last 3<br>digits) | HUC 14<br>(last 3<br>digits) | Modeled<br>sub-<br>watershed | Grazed<br>Cattle          | Confined<br>Cattle | Swine | Poultry | Horses | Sheep | Other |
| 170                          | 010                          | 170010HW                     | 200                       | 125                | 50    | 175     | 45     | 35    | 20    |
|                              |                              | 170010PV                     | 250                       | 175                | 50    | 275     | 75     | 75    | 25    |
|                              | 020                          | 170020                       | 450                       | 275                | 250   | 400     | 100    | 80    | 40    |
|                              | 040                          | 170040                       | 300                       | 225                | 50    | 350     | 90     | 70    | 30    |
|                              | 050                          | 170050                       | 500                       | 250                | 50    | 450     | 125    | 100   | 50    |
|                              | 060                          | 170060HW                     | 50                        | 75                 | 50    | 100     | 100    | 25    | 25    |
|                              |                              | 170060PK                     | 250                       | 150                | 50    | 275     | 75     | 50    | 25    |
| 180                          | 020                          | 180020                       | 100                       | 200                | 50    | 150     | 40     | 25    | 10    |
|                              | 030                          | 180030BR                     | 100                       | 75                 | 50    | 100     | 30     | 20    | 10    |
|                              |                              | 180030MR                     | 150                       | 50                 | 1     | 100     | 50     | 20    | 10    |
|                              | 050                          | 180050                       | 200                       | 250                | 50    | 325     | 100    | 70    | 25    |




Figure 8.1 Graph showing the loading ratios between sources of fecal coliform loading that are required to obtain NPDES permits and sources that have no such requirements.




Figure 8.2 Graph showing the loading ratios between sources of fecal coliform loading that are not required to obtain NPDES permits.




Figure 8.3 Graph showing existing fecal coliform loading from three unregulated sources.




Figure 8.4 Graph showing allocations for fecal coliform loading from three unregulated sources.

## 8.1.2 Aquatic life use impairments

Aquatic life uses are impacted by excessive fine sediment on the streambed, poor habitat quality, organic enrichment and low concentrations of dissolved oxygen, various toxins in runoff, dissolved solids, and low flow conditions (see Table 4.3). Based on recently submitted data, Ohio EPA must determine if dissolved solids are currently impairing aquatic life uses. If it is determined that these impairments continue then these problems should be abated through better treatment of wastewater. The cause of the low flow conditions on Big Run is uncertain and the suspected water withdrawal remains unverified.

Sources of these stressors include stream use by livestock which leads to trampled banks and substantial sediment erosion, ditching of streams which contributes to sediment problems and degrades the structural habitat of the stream, cropland contributing sediment, and urban land uses contributing various toxins and altering stream flow conditions. The sanitary sewer overflow located near Pleasantville (Leitnaker Rd Pump Station) which belongs to the Walnut Creek Sewer District (WCSD) is not expected to discharge because a second sewer line has already been installed to better accommodate the sewage volume and infiltration and inflow (I & I) problems should be completely remedied by the end of 2011. WCSD is also improving its treatment at the plant which should eliminate sewage problems associated with centralized collection and treatment in this area of the watershed. Section 5.2 provides information about each of the sources discussed above.

Figures 8.5 and 8.6 are maps of the two HUC 11 watersheds, 170 and 180, respectively, showing aquatic life use attainment status. One of the two maps included in each figure lists the causes of impairment at sites not fully meeting the biocriteria while the second map lists the sources ascribed to those stressors (i.e., the “causes”). These maps are instrumental in showing where each of the abatement strategies to address these specific stressors and stressor sources should be applied.

Sediment degrading streambed substrate habitats coupled with damaged larger structural habitats such as woody debris, boulders, and pools is responsible for more impairment than any of the other causes. The sources for this include livestock use of the streams, ditching of channels, and cropland runoff.

The next most significant problem is cumulative toxic effects from polluted runoff from urban and other similarly intensive land uses (e.g., commercial, residential). Abatement of these impacts centers on effectively managing storm water for both quality and quantity (see Section 5.1 and also later discussion in the report). In addition, although currently slowed due to circumstances with the economy, commercial and residential land development is very rapid in portions of the watershed closest to the City of Columbus. With the expectation that continued growth is inevitable, recommendations are given on how new development should proceed with regard to storm water management and the protection of sensitive natural resources.

Figures 8.5 and 8.6 show that sediment and habitat related problems are grouped in two general areas. A tributary to Pawpaw Creek (see aerial photo in Figure 8.8) and the Pleasantville tributary are thus impacted and located in the upper portion of the watershed (HUC 14s 170-020 and 170-010) near the towns of Baltimore, Thurston, and Pleasantville in the Fairfield County (Walnut, Pleasant and Liberty townships). In particular, restricting cattle access on the Pleasantville tributary and using alternatives to common cropland drainage techniques around the tributary to Pawpaw Creek would provide substantial relief. The other area is located on tributaries entering the lower sections of Walnut Creek





Figure 8.5 Maps showing status of aquatic life use attainment and causes (above) and sources (below) at sites not fully attaining their use designation in the 170 HUC 11 watershed. Two sites partially attaining their bio-criteria on Sycamore Creek (RMs 4.2 and 2.6) may currently be in full attainment based on data collected in 2009. In such case the Pickerington WWTP would not be considered a source of impairment.






Figure 8.6 Maps showing status of aquatic life use attainment and causes (left) and sources (right) at sites not fully attaining their use designation in the 180 HUC 11 watershed.

roughly between Ashville and Groveport in Walnut and Madison townships in Pickaway County. The site on Turkey Run in Walnut Township showed evidence of recent channelization at the time of the 2005 biological survey (see photo in Figure 8.7). Although not verified, it is likely that ditch maintenance is occurring on this stream which is designated as exceptional warmwater habitat (EWH). Mud Run is also impacted by upstream ditch maintenance (see aerial photo in Figure 8.8).



Figure 8.7 Photos of livestock with access to Mud Run (left) and bank erosion on a ditched section of Turkey Run (right).



Figure 8.8 Aerial photos showing sources of stress to a tributary to Pawpaw Creek (left) in Fairfield County and Mud Run (right) in Pickaway County. The left photo shows the partially impaired site (yellow triangle) as well as a clear illustration of the level of intensity of subsurface drainage use (evidenced by the drier, lighter colored soil above the drainage tiles). Soil map units are also included to illustrate the dominance of loamy soils in the area which, when drained, leads to higher peak discharge. The right photo illustrates drainage ditch maintenance approximately 0.6 miles upstream of a biological survey site that failed to meet any of the biocriteria.

The maps in Figures 8.5 and 8.6 also show where polluted runoff and likely changes to the hydrology of the area, both due to urban land uses, occur. Violet Township in Fairfield County and Madison Township in Franklin County are currently the most developed and have the highest population density (see Figure 2.5) in the entire watershed. As discussed earlier, future development is also likely to occur in this area and to the adjacent townships.

Two sites of particular concern are in the East Branch George Creek at RM 2.4 (Wright Rd., Franklin County) and RM 6.0 (Refugee Rd., Fairfield County). Storm water retrofit opportunities should be given first priority in a management plan that includes aggressive construction site and storm water management, low-impact development designs for future subdivisions, and comprehensive landuse planning.




Figure 8.9 Aerial photo and graphical depiction showing recently urbanized areas (formerly rural) having an adverse impact on water quality on Georges and Sycamore Creeks. The red Xs in both images indicate survey sites that are in non attainment of their aquatic life uses where the X on the left is located on Georges Creek and the right is on Sycamore Creek. The picture on the left is an aerial photo from 2006 and the image on the right is a land classification based on the degree (percent) of imperviousness associated with the respective type of land cover (based on LANDSAT satellite imagery taken in 2001)

## 8.2 Water quality improvement strategy

This section describes actions to eliminate or minimize causes of the beneficial use impairments. The primary focus is technical feasibility and sufficiency of the actions to eliminate the cause. However, economic considerations are made to provide for a viable and realistic strategy. Section 8.3 will discuss already initiated programs and activities consistent with the

recommendations proposed here as well as suggest programs that are best suited to address the various types of nonpoint sources. This section is organized by source of the pollution.

### 8.2.1 Point sources

Effluent from the Pickerington wastewater treatment plant has had relatively high concentrations of total dissolved solids (TDS) and has impaired aquatic life uses on Sycamore Creek. (The City of Pickerington disputes these results and has retained a consultant to resample the area; results of the study have not been submitted to Ohio EPA for review as of February 1, 2010). After review of the study, if it is determined that these impairments continue then these problems should be abated through better treatment of wastewater through a legally enforceable compliance schedule contained in the city's NPDES wastewater discharge permit. Additionally, in response to development pressure in the area and discussions with Ohio EPA the city is progressing with work necessary to upgrade its WWTP to 3.2 MGD.

Other point sources such as sanitary sewer overflows are caused by inadequate capacity of the sewer lines. The remedy is to increase this capacity by replacing existing lines with ones with greater capacity or simply adding sewer lines. Director's Final Findings and Orders (DFFOs) issued to the Walnut Creek Sewer District (WCSD) became effective January 30, 2008, and contain a schedule of compliance for WWTP and sewerage system improvements necessary to eliminate sanitary sewer overflows and sludge loss from the plant. Per these orders SSO events must be eliminated no later than December 31, 2011 and the sewer district must complete the final phase of I/I removal by December 31, 2011. Completion of work necessary in the sewer district's WWTP and sanitary sewer collection system will eliminate the SSO and unpermitted sludge discharge portion of the problem noted in this stream segment. To date, WCSD has installed an additional sewer line which results in greater capacity.

Pollutants such as fecal coliform bacteria and various toxins emanating from municipal separate storm sewers systems (MS4s) would be abated using the similar management and infrastructure as other urban areas with separate sewers but not designated as MS4 entities. The MS4 designation means that those entities must apply for and secure coverage under a NPDES permit (i.e., individual or general) and adhere to the requirements of that permit. See the following web link for information on these permits:  
<http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/storm/index.aspx>

Table 7.4 shows the wasteload allocations for the MS4s in the watershed and lists each entity associated with each of the MS4s in the watershed (see Appendix A for MS4 areas).

### 8.2.2 Livestock access to streams

Livestock with direct access to streams causes pollution problems associated with manure, bank erosion, and loss of habitat; overall this situation has little compatibility with good water quality. For this reason, abatement options are restricted to substantially limiting or, altogether eliminating this access. Livestock with stream access have been allocated a zero load in the TMDL analysis because excluding livestock is necessary to meet standards and can be reasonably accomplished.

Basic requirements are to use fencing as a barrier to streams or to confine livestock (the latter is not being advocated here). However, from a production standpoint maintaining stream access for livestock is attractive since it provides a water source and means for livestock to cool in the

summer heat. Installing fencing and finding alternative watering sources is an added operational expense.

Livestock producers have options available for assistance. The Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) is possibly the best, or at least the most widely available, program that producers can use for financial assistance. EQIP offsets actual costs of installation through cost sharing and also provides additional financial incentives for a set timeframe. Applicable practices that are eligible for compensation (based on the Natural Resource Conservation Service's (NRCS) conservation practices (CPs)) are listed in Table 8.1.

Table 8.2 Natural Resource Conservation Service's (NRCS) conservation practices (CPs) eligible for full cost share assistance to eliminate livestock access to streams.

| Conservation practice (CP) | CP number | Cost per unit               | Unit type   | Comments   |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|-------------|--|
| Fence                      | 382       | range from \$0.51 to \$7.60 | linear foot | Types of fence include barbed wire, confinement, 4,5, and 6 strand electric, woven wire, livestock use exclusion |
| Pond                       | 378       | \$30,438                    | acre        |  |
| Stream crossing            | 578       | \$3.26                      | square foot |  |
| Watering facility          | 614       | range from \$680 to \$2290  | per item    | Items include auto waterer, trough, frost free tank, portable plastic tank, storage tank                         |

### 8.2.3 Ditch maintenance

Ditching drastically simplifies inherently complex stream systems which, diminishes the ability to process pollutants, moderate flow extremes, and support diverse and healthy wildlife communities. Dipping out streambed material, removing and suppressing woody riparian vegetation, and deepening the channel which limits floodplain access are typically done in creating and maintaining drainage ditches. Each of these practices has consequences that degrade the quality of the stream resource.

There are alternatives to these practices that are more expensive to initially construct but yield superior outcomes for water quality, drainage capacity, and possibly ongoing maintenance. Providing additional floodplain function in a channel that is otherwise dug too deeply to access adjacent floodplain areas may be one of the more practical ways of meeting drainage and water quality objectives on small streams (i.e., those that drain less than two to three square miles of watershed).

Ditches excavated to be extra-wide (i.e., wider than needed to accommodate what would otherwise be the minimally acceptable flood event such as a one in two year storm flow) tend to develop small floodplain features. These small floodplain features are believed to reduce the susceptibility of bank erosion and restore some of the stream's natural capacity to process pollutants. There may also be habitat improvements; however, these are believed to be less significant. Obstacles to this approach center on expense. The additional earth work needed to make a wider ditch may increase the total cost by a factor of two or more. Also, some cropland

acreage may need to come out of production to accommodate the wider ditch; however, this is estimated to be a fairly small proportion (perhaps less than two percent).

## 8.2.4 Crop production and field drainage

Crop production is affecting water quality due to sediment delivered to streams from erosion on exposed fields. Subsurface drainage can also be a conduit for sediment delivery if the pipes are compromised (cracked or have a blow-out connection to the soil surface) but more significant are its impacts on the hydrology of the area. Ultimately, subsurface drainage along with the land smoothing and soil compaction, which accompanies years of crop production, leads to more efficient land drainage that increases peak stream discharge. This also reduces storage of water in the soil profile, which causes streams to dry out more frequently and for longer durations.

The impact of sediment on habitat has been discussed earlier in the report; however, stream desiccation also impacts habitat (water is required for aquatic life) as well as the capacity to dilute or otherwise process pollutants. One of the best known and readily available means to offset the impacts of subsurface drainage is to add the ability to control flows coming from the subsurface drainage system. Controlled drainage, also called water table management, accomplishes this when one or more control structures are installed within the drainage system.

Like the conservation practices for excluding livestock from streams, conservation practices to abate sediment delivery from cropland and problems with drainage are eligible for financial and technical assistance through EQIP. The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), administered under the Farm Service Agency (FSA), also provides cost share and incentive payments to landowners who convert cropland to temporary vegetated buffer areas. Table 8.2 lists practices that are recommended to abate sediment delivery to streams as well as mitigate impacts to watershed hydrology.

Table 8.3 Natural Resource Conservation Service's (NRCS) conservation practices eligible for full (100%) cost share assistance to address impacts from crop production and drainage.

| Conservation practice (CP)              | CP number | Cost per unit                 | Unit type | Benefit                           | Comments  |
|---|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Conservation cover                      | 327       | range from \$285 to \$394     | acre      | Reduces surface erosion potential | Various options for the types of grasses used               |
| Cover crop                              | 340       | range from \$29.02 to \$42.41 | acre      | Reduces surface erosion potential | Various options for the types of grasses used               |
| Residue management (no-till/strip-till) | 329       | range from \$15.02 to \$49.34 | acre      | Reduces surface erosion potential | Various options for management approach                     |
| Residue management (mulch-till)         | 345       | \$11.01                       | acre      | Reduces surface erosion potential |   |
| Residue management (ridge-till)         | 346       | range from \$15.02 to \$49.37 | acre      | Reduces surface erosion potential | Various options for management approach                     |
| Grassed waterway                        | 412       | range from \$4,307 to \$6,100 | acre      | Reduces gully erosion potential   | Various options for types of materials/structures installed |

| Conservation practice (CP)                  | CP number   | Cost per unit                 | Unit type  | Benefit                                       | Comments   |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|--|
| Riparian herbaceous cover                   | 390         | range from \$315 to \$419     | acre       | "filters" sediment in sheet flow runoff       | Various options for the types of installation methods used   |
| Riparian forest cover                       | 391         | range from \$337 to \$650     | acre       | "filters" sediment in sheet flow runoff       | Various options for the types of trees and installation methods used                                   |
| Filter strip                                | 393         | range from \$307 to \$411     | acre       | "filters" sediment in sheet flow runoff       | Various options for the types of grasses and installation methods used                                 |
| Sediment basin                              | 350         | \$3,566                       | per item   | removes sediment carried in concentrated flow |  |
| Water and sediment control basin            | 638         | range from \$2,215 to \$2,702 | per item   | removes sediment carried in concentrated flow | Varies based on type of slope it is installed on   |
| Wetland creation                            | 658         | range from \$108 to \$193     | acre       | Treats runoff and improves hydrology          | Done on site not formerly a wetland; varies based on whether tilled cropland or depressional area      |
| Wetland restoration                         | 657         | range from \$108 to \$193     | acre       | Treats runoff and improves hydrology          | Done on site that was formerly a wetland; varies based on whether tilled cropland or depressional area |
| Wetland enhancement                         | 659         | range from \$108 to \$194     | acre       | Treats runoff and improves hydrology          | Done on site that was formerly a wetland; varies based on whether tilled cropland or depressional area |
| Wetland restoration and wetland enhancement | 657 and 659 | \$2.17                        | cubic yard | Treats runoff and improves hydrology          | Done on site that was formerly a wetland; requires earthwork   |
| Drainage water management                   | 554         | \$101                         | per item   | Improves hydrology                            |  |

### 8.2.5 Home septic treatment systems

Ohio Department of Health (ODH) recommends proper siting, design and installation of sewage treatment systems to help ensure the protection of public health and the environment, and protection of the investment a property owner makes in a sewage treatment system. This will also reduce the need for public dollars to provide sewage treatment through public facilities in the future. System designs need to account for site and soil conditions, site limitations, reasonable expected design flows and waste strength to ensure proper system performance.

Proactive and preventive approaches to managing sewage treatment systems that combines public education, local health district involvement, local planning and management factors, and consideration of area risks to sensitive water or ecological resources are needed. Improved coordination and training for local watershed groups and other grass roots organizations (green and community initiatives) will help promote an understanding of the importance of proper

sewage system operation and maintenance to the system owner, and the impact to a community when systems are not maintained.

Local health districts need legal and enforcement tools to ensure that service contracts for mechanical systems are maintained, and that routine inspection and maintenance occurs for all systems. Decentralized management of systems should be supported and encouraged as a public and private sector tool that provides assistance and support to system owners, offers a cost structure that is affordable, and helps ensure that systems in a wide range of density configurations are properly managed.

Implementation of these recommendations and the use of the new Ohio EPA Household Sewage System wastewater discharge permit (see: [http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/permits/GP\\_HouseholdSewageTreatmentPlants.html](http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/permits/GP_HouseholdSewageTreatmentPlants.html)) will help to control bacterial discharge from these small systems in this watershed.

## 8.2.6 Conversion to urban land use

### Storm water management

The most serious threat to water quality and biological integrity, in the Walnut Creek watershed is the rapid conversion to residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Numerous scientific studies show that increasing impervious cover in a watershed (i.e., through development) is commensurate with the degradation of water quality and biological communities (Booth, 2005; Brabec et al., 2002; Roy et al., 2003; Roy et al., 2006; Morgan and Cushman, 2005).

Controlling run off associated with development typically consists of end-of-pipe measures such as storm water detention and retention. These controls abate flooding and reduce erosion, thus providing some water quality protection. However, studies show that water quality degradation occurs in developing watershed despite these controls due to the altered hydrologic regime (Brabec et al., 2002; Booth, 2005).

Onsite storm water retention and infiltration is a way to approximate a more natural watershed hydrology. With this approach, storm water is managed near the area generating the runoff and infiltration is maximized. This contrasts centralized systems that collect runoff over a broad area and provide relatively little opportunity for infiltration and consequently must manage very large volumes. Individual onsite controls operate on a small scale but are distributed to act collectively in managing runoff across a large area. Incentives, utilities and/or market based programs should be explored as a means to achieve more effective and ecologically meaningful storm water management. Parikh et al. (2005) provide an analysis of options for addressing storm water management in an environmentally and economically sustainable manner.

Onsite, or decentralized, storm water management increases infiltration and reduces runoff by decreasing imperviousness through planning, such as that used for Low Impact Development (LID). Low Impact Development is based on maximizing contiguous open space, protecting sensitive areas, namely floodplains and wetlands, and preserving existing vegetation (especially trees). Web based resources for LID include: [www.lowimpactdevelopment.org/](http://www.lowimpactdevelopment.org/). In a Low Impact Development, houses are located closer to one another, roadways are narrower, and bio-retention and infiltration techniques are used. Since LID reduces runoff it can provide cost savings in storm water infrastructure. Other benefits of LID may include a greater than average increase in property values due to improve aesthetics and more contiguous open space.

Watersheds that retain relatively large areas of forest are able to better mitigate the impacts of increasing imperviousness than those with little forest cover (Brabec et al., 2002, Booth, 2005).

The procurement of conservation easements, and the establishment of parkland and nature preserves can help retain some of the existing forest cover as well as facilitate the conversion from open land to forest. Although land preservation alone is not likely to occur at a level necessary to mitigate development impacts, it will augment other measures that are taken (e.g., LID and/or discrete onsite storm water management).

At the smaller, more discrete level of individual residences or businesses, storm water abatement techniques can be used that include diverting drainage from rooftops, driveways, and other impervious surfaces away from a centralized collection system (e.g., outlets to either curb-and-gutter drains or storm water sewer lines) and to permeable areas that can provide infiltration and/or temporary storage. Minimizing the extent of impervious surfaces by limiting their size or substituting them with permeable surfaces will also increase infiltration and detention for a given property. Outreach and education activities are likely to result in some increase in this type of voluntary action taken by watershed residents, however to what extent would be very difficult to predict. Outreach efforts that include landscape design and construction companies may also be beneficial as they can present options for enhanced storm water management to their prospective clients.

The current draft of the Rainwater and Development Guide that is posted on the ODNR website at [ftp://ftp.dnr.state.oh.us/Soil\\_&\\_Water\\_Conservation/rainwater/](ftp://ftp.dnr.state.oh.us/Soil_&_Water_Conservation/rainwater/) provides a great deal of information regarding storm water management. This resource highlights the goals, effectiveness, and limiting conditions for both planning and structural controls. The following topics are discussed:

- Reduction in impervious area
- Low Impact Development
- Conservation Development (similar to LID)
- Setbacks
- Water quality ponds
- Infiltration trenches
- Sand and organic filters
- Grass filters
- Bioretention area

### **Floodplains**

Floodplains abate the impacts of development on stream systems (see Section 5.4). The reduction of the erosive power of storm flows, temporary flood storage, and sediment assimilation all act to mitigate the damage caused by increased runoff volume during flood events. Wetlands also provide storm water retention, increase infiltration and reduce the energy of surface flows (i.e., reduces erosion potential). These important environmental areas must be protected and preserved to the greatest reasonable extent.

Provisions for floodplain filling vary across the Walnut Creekwatershed under county, township and municipality ordinances and zoning codes. Timely and adequate public notification of fill requests (permitting process) and opportunity for public hearings are recommended to ensure that permitting decisions are based on an adequate array of information, scientific as well as socio-economic.

### **Riparian buffers**

Allowing wooded riparian corridors to remain intact as an area develops reduces the impact of development in many ways. Soil and pollutants are filtered out as water flows through the corridor, tree roots stabilize stream banks, the canopy shades the stream regulating in-stream

temperature and reducing algal production, and woody material provides food and habitat for both aquatic and terrestrial life.

Twenty-five feet is a minimum recommended width for riparian buffers. The more width in a buffer; however, the more buffering it can do. The Ohio EPA recommends use of additional minimum stream corridor protection zones similar to those shown in Figure 8.10. Zone widths may vary depending on use of the corridor from one stream segment to the next.




Figure 8.10 Graphic showing recommended management for three designated zones within a hypothetical riparian buffer.

It is very important to maintain and, when possible, restore riparian corridor continuity in a watershed to maximize benefits that such corridors provide. Such protection becomes even more critical for the smaller headwater streams in a watershed. Information regarding the importance of riparian corridors can be found at:

[http://ohiodnr.gov/water/Home/pubs/fs\\_st/stfs01/tabid/4157/Default.aspx](http://ohiodnr.gov/water/Home/pubs/fs_st/stfs01/tabid/4157/Default.aspx) Information regarding the importance of headwater streams can be found at:

<http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wqs/headwaters/index.aspx>.

Research suggests that the effective use of greenways for the protection of surface water quality depends not only on the physical characteristics of the buffer zones and on the diversity of pollutants encountered, but also on the coordinated arrangement of buffer zones across a catchment area.” Buffers along small tributary stream have disproportionately greater benefits than buffers along wider stream carry much larger flow volumes. In essence, the potential to impact stream quality in the immediate vicinity of the buffer decreases as stream size increases.

### 8.3 Programs for implementing abatement strategy

This section discusses organizations, programs and other means of assistance that could be instrumental in implementing the abatement strategy described in Section 8.2. Also discussed

are past and current activities or programs that facilitate abatement of water quality stressors in the watershed. This section is organized based on the sources of impairment.

### 8.3.1 Point sources

#### **National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)**

The NPDES permits program manages pathogens and other pollutants found in discharge from wastewater treatment systems, sanitary sewer overflows and production of biosolids. The City of Pickerington and the Walnut Creek Sewer District WWTPs are working to resolve problems associated with their collection and treatment systems. The Villages of Ashville and Baltimore are also involved with upgrading their WWTPs and sanitary sewer collection systems to eliminate sanitary sewer overflows.

A listing of NPDES permittees in the Walnut Creek watershed is provided in Appendix B of this report. Additional information regarding the permits program is available at: <http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/permits/permits.aspx>. The Ohio EPA will perform audits of MS4 permit holders in this watershed to ensure compliance with MS4 permit conditions.

#### **Compliance Assistance Unit**

This unit, established by Section 104(g) (1) of the Federal Clean Water Act, helps bring wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) facilities into compliance and/or to maintain compliance. The goal is to improve the water quality of streams, rivers, and lakes by assisting WWTPs that need help in meeting their NPDES permit. This unit has provided assistance as necessary to operators at several WWTPs within this watershed. Additional information is available at: [http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/compl\\_assist/compasst.aspx](http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/compl_assist/compasst.aspx).

#### **House Bill 110 Program for small WWTPs**

This program outlines an agreement between county health departments and the Ohio EPA allowing participating health departments to inspect smaller wastewater treatment plants (0 – 25,000 gallons per day). Fairfield, Franklin, Licking and Pickaway counties currently participate in this program. Additional information is available at: [http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/compl\\_assist/hb110.aspx](http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/compl_assist/hb110.aspx).

### 8.3.2 Nonpoint sources

This section discusses programs that are poised to deal stressors coming from home septic system failures, livestock and crop production and ditch maintenance. Table 8.3 provides a summary of such programs or organizations.

#### **Ohio Department of Health (ODH) and county health departments**

The Ohio Department of Health has legal authority for implementation of a regulatory program for pathogen control in streams within this watershed. That program focuses on standards for the siting, design, installation, operation, monitoring, maintenance and abandonment of household sewage treatment systems and small flow on-site sewage treatment systems. Under OAC 3701-29, local health departments are responsible for code enforcement, operational inspections, and nuisance investigations of household sewage treatment systems serving one, two, or three family dwellings. The Ohio Department of Health works with local health departments and provides technical assistance and training.

The county health departments should endeavor to make information regarding home owner's onsite treatment systems as user friendly as possible. Several health department websites

provide easily accessible information regarding various wastewater treatment systems available for use in varying situations.

Additional information regarding this program in the Ohio Department of Health is available at: <http://www.odh.ohio.gov/odhPrograms/eh/sewage/sewage1.aspx>

### **Changes to the sewage treatment systems law and rules**

Amended Substitute House Bill 119 (Am. Sub. HB 119) suspended operation of most portions of ORC Chapter 3718, the sewage law, until July 1, 2009. Programs in use by health departments in this watershed now allow, only as a last resort, use of household sewage treatment systems which discharge wastewater to a stream. In such cases an Ohio EPA NPDES wastewater discharge permit is required. In addition, more attention is now being given to soil characteristics which might limit use of a site for wastewater treatment thus reducing possible movement of pollutants to a stream.

Restricting and, whenever possible, preventing off-lot wastewater discharges will reduce the incidence of bacterial contamination and habitat impacts associated with organic enrichment of streams in this watershed. Routine inspection by health departments of treatment systems having off-site discharges will help ensure that such systems are operating properly.

### **County conservation agencies**

County SWCDs and NRCS staff serves the producers and landowners in their counties regarding conservation planning, technical assistance, and advisement regarding available conservation programs.

Between 2002 and 2008 Fairfield County has facilitated the installation of 45 grassed waterways, 22 water and sediment control basins (WASCOBs), three wetlands, and one stream crossing for livestock all within the Walnut Creek watershed. During a similar time interval Pickaway County staff has facilitated installation of over 20,000 feet of grassed waterway in the watershed.

The Franklin County SWCD holds conservation easements of which 13 acres of are held on Canal Winchester School District including mature riparian corridor (average width of 50') and former agricultural land which was planted with conservation cover crop and left to re-vegetate. The District plans to use grant funding (applications pending) for additional easement purchases.

### **Walnut Creek Watershed Restoration Project**

During the 1997 through 2002 period of time a significant effort was underway in this watershed as numerous agencies collaborated on the Walnut Creek Watershed Restoration Project.

An excerpt of the group's formal goal statement reads, "*The goal of the Walnut Creek River Restoration Project is to significantly improve the quality of the region by implementing agricultural and silvicultural Best Management Practices (BMPs) in conjunction with urban planning.*"

Natural resource concerns identified by this project included:

- Stream bank erosion
- Localized flooding due to stream blockage
- Erosion from cropland and urban development
- Loss of riparian corridor
- Organic enrichment from animal waste

- Siltation of streambed habitat
- Loss of habitat due to channelization
- Excessive levels of pesticides

### **Ditch maintenance authorities**

The majority of ditch work done in Ohio is through petition ditch laws where county engineer's or soil and water conservation district offices typically design, budget, and administer the construction/reconstruction and subsequent maintenance of ditch and other drainage infrastructure (e.g., subsurface drain tile mains and sub-mains). If alternative designs and more environmentally sensitive approaches are to be employed, such approaches must be effectively communicated with these organizations.

According to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Soil and Water Conservation (ODNR-DSWC), current drainage needs far exceed the capacity of state and county agencies to provide required technical assistance and administration. In response to this shortfall, ODNR-DSWC and the Ohio Federation of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (OFSWCDs) convened an advisory group represented by agricultural and environmental interests, as well as several government agencies or organizations that are involved in some way with drainage infrastructure in Ohio. ODNR-DSWC has posted a brochure explaining this on the following weblink:

[http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/Portals/12/programs/rural\\_drainage/docs/Drainage%20Report.pdf](http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/Portals/12/programs/rural_drainage/docs/Drainage%20Report.pdf)

Although few tangible action items have been completed so far, the group intends to improve the efficiency of the petition process while also ensuring greater protection of water quality. ODNR-DSWC has drafted a drainage manual that is to provide the basis for implementing those objectives.

Table 8.4 Programs best suited to address nonpoint sources in the watershed but not including sources related to storm water or urban development.

| Source of impairment                 | Organization or Program  | Authority or resources available to address source of impairment  | Priority areas in the watershed  |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Failed home septic treatment systems | County health departments                                      | Under OAC 3701-29, county health departments must enforce codes regarding the siting, design, installation, operation, monitoring, maintenance, and abandonment of HSTSs. Codes must be no less stringent than state requirements; however, local HDs can adopt and enforce more stringent requirements.  | Each area with recreational use impairments has issues with failing home septic systems. These areas widely distributed. |
|                                      | Ohio Department of Health                                      | Under OAC 3701-29, ODH must enforce codes regarding the siting, design, installation, operation, monitoring, maintenance, and abandonment of HSTSs.   |  |
|                                      | Ohio EPA   | Direct discharge home septic systems must have NPDES coverage handled by the permits program. NPS/319 and other OEPA programs also communicate with health departments regarding water quality data and the HSTS impacts and sometimes work to make funds available through the 319 grant program to address problem areas.   |  |
| Livestock with stream access         | Pollution Abatement Program (Ohio DNR - DSWC and county SWCDs) | Under OAC 1501, ODNR must respond to complaints regarding pollution from agriculture including animal wastes. ODNR and/or the county SWCDs must investigate the situation and approve abatement plans that are deemed necessary. If the landowner does not carry out the plan as specified, the chief of ODNR-DSWC would issue orders, where failure to comply with these orders is a first degree misdemeanor. | 14-digit HUCs: 170-010 (Pleasantville Creek) and 180-030 (Mud Run)   |
|                                      | NRCS and EQIP  | NRCS administers EQIP which provides cost share and incentive payments for certain conservation practices that address livestock exclusion. NRCS also provides technical assistance at landowners/operators requests.   |  |
|                                      | Ohio EPA   | NPS/319 and other OEPA programs communicate with conservation professionals and/or local authorities regarding water quality data and the impacts from livestock wastes and sometimes work to make funds available through the 319 grant program to address problem areas.  |  |
| Cropland and field drainage          | NRCS   | NRCS administers EQIP which provides cost share and incentive payments for certain conservation practices that address cropland BMPs. NRCS is also provides technical assistance at landowners/operators requests.  | 14-digit HUCs: 170-010 (Pleasantville Creek) and 170-020 (Tributary to Pawpaw Creek)                                     |
|                                      | County SWCD  | County SWCDs provide technical assistance at landowners/operators requests regarding resource concerns and conservation practices. SWCDs are also often involved with outreach and promotion of existing or new conservation programs and conservation practices.   |  |

| Source of impairment     | Organization or Program        | Authority or resources available to address source of impairment   | Priority areas in the watershed  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
|                          | Ohio EPA - NPS/319 Programs    | NPS/319 and other OEPA programs communicate with conservation professionals and/or local authorities regarding water quality data and the impacts from livestock wastes and sometimes work to make funds available through the 319 grant program to address problem areas.   |  |
|                          | OSU Extension                  | County extension staff disseminate current science based information to the people in the county. A core mission is make the best information readily available to the public and to promote the use of technically sound and practical management practices.  |  |
| <b>Ditch maintenance</b> | County Engineer or SWCD office | Under ORC 6131 landowners may petition for drainage improvements in which case county engineers must submit a cost estimate to the county commissioners and make recommendations regarding the necessity of the project. Through this process the Engineer's Office is involved with the design of the drainage improvements and can pursue drainage improvements that are more amenable to protecting water quality than what has been typical in the past. | 14-digit HUCs: 170-020 (Tributary to Pawpaw Creek); 180-030 (Mud Run) and 180-050 (Turkey Run) |
|                          | County Commissioners           | Under ORC 6131, County Commissioners make the final decision regarding petitions for publicly administered drainage improvement projects. Commissioners can make decisions that place higher importance on protecting water quality than what has been typical in the past.  |  |
|                          | Ohio DNR - DSWC                | Ohio DNR - DSWC employs both area engineers and ecological engineers who are involved with drainage petition projects as per assistance requests from county SWCD staff. Ohio DNR - DSWC can advise pursuing designs that are amenable to water quality.   |  |
|                          | Ohio EPA -                     | NPS/319 and other OEPA programs communicate with conservation professionals and/or local authorities regarding water quality data and the impacts from ditch maintenance and sometimes work to make funds available through the 319 grant program to address problem areas.  |  |

### 8.3.3 Land conversion and storm water management

Land development occurs as permitted through zoning ordinances as well as various regional plans that focus on major infrastructure such as sewerage, roads and transportation, and utilities. Ohio EPA approves plans regarding waste water collection and treatment through its section 208 program. Storm water management is also regulated by the Ohio EPA for large construction projects and MS4 areas that fall under specific criteria.

As indicated in the 2006 208 Plan, Ohio EPA interacted with counties and municipalities regarding water quality management plans. Several of the counties in which the Walnut Creek watershed is located are referenced in the state 208 plan.

In 2010, Ohio EPA will review and update, as necessary, the water quality management plans required by Sections 303 and 208 of the Clean Water Act. These plans describe and promote efficient and comprehensive programs for controlling water pollution from point and nonpoint sources in a defined geographic area. Information regarding 208 planning as well as the 2006 208 WQM can be accessed at: <http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/mgmtplans/208index.aspx>

#### County regional planning and storm water protections

Three counties in the watershed are expected to undergo substantial growth in the coming decades therefore responsible planning is important. Fairfield, Licking, and Pickaway Counties are projected for the most growth. Table 8.4 shows what the projections are.

Table 8.5 Projected population growth for three fastest growing counties in the watershed.

| County    | Projected population increase by 2030 |         |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|---------|
|           | Number                                | Percent |
| Fairfield | 78,255                                | 64      |
| Licking   | 53,270                                | 37      |
| Pickaway  | 7,250                                 | 14      |

Several county regional planning agencies in the watershed have developed land use plans which include provisions intended to help preserve riparian corridors. Riparian corridor preservation and, when possible, restoration will help streams in this watershed maintain and return to attainment with the aquatic life use designation.

#### Fairfield County

The Fairfield County Development Strategy and Land Use Plan can be viewed at [http://www.co.fairfield.oh.us/rpc/county\\_development\\_strategy\\_land\\_use\\_plan.htm](http://www.co.fairfield.oh.us/rpc/county_development_strategy_land_use_plan.htm). While information available at [http://www.co.fairfield.oh.us/rpc/images/2008\\_AnnualReport.pdf](http://www.co.fairfield.oh.us/rpc/images/2008_AnnualReport.pdf) indicates that the county is working to update its land use plan.

Page 119 in the Fairfield County plan discusses Natural Resource Areas and acknowledges that quality of the watershed can be preserved through planning efforts and public education. A Critical Resource Model discussed in this section of the plan calls for preservation of flood plains, wooded lands, wetlands, flood prone soils, stream buffers (150 feet from the stream centerline), and slopes greater than 25 percent. This plan encompasses various aspects of wastewater and storm water management which, if implemented, will greatly promote attainment of water quality aquatic life and recreational use designations in the county's streams.

### Franklin County

In Franklin County, several documents applicable to water quality management have been developed in recent years. In 1997 the Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission published <http://www.morpc.org/pdf/greenways.pdf> which contains recommendations for stream corridor protection for numerous streams in the area. The Walnut Creek Watershed (described as Little Walnut Creek in the plan) is referenced in the Greenways Plan.

In August, 2007, Franklin County published its draft Storm water Management Manual, which can be viewed at [http://www.morpc.org/pdf/Final\\_Draft\\_Storm\\_water\\_MANUAL\\_Au07.pdf](http://www.morpc.org/pdf/Final_Draft_Storm_water_MANUAL_Au07.pdf). The manual requires establishment of stream corridor protection zones in areas of new development and gives specific guidance on this zone.

### Licking County

The Licking County 208 Water Quality Management Plan (the Plan) can be viewed at [http://www.lcounty.com/Planning/docs/Final\\_2006\\_208\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.lcounty.com/Planning/docs/Final_2006_208_Plan.pdf). The purpose and scope of the Plan is to develop a county-wide waste water treatment plan in partnership with agencies responsible for Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs), townships, the Licking County Health Department and other stakeholders in the county. This Plan is seen as a mechanism to manage growth in the county and support locally controlled efforts such as Comprehensive Planning, Farmland Preservation and Conservation Preservation.

The Plan establishes what areas of the County may be developed over the next 20 years and how areas that are not served by a POTW will be developed. In addition, the Plan addresses impacts from storm water runoff and other non-point source pollutants.

### Pickaway County

Pickaway County does not have, nor are there any immediate plans to create, a county or regional comprehensive plan. The Pickaway County Board of Commissioners has funded township planning initiatives since zoning authority in unincorporated Pickaway County is managed by each township. Except for economic development planning, there is presently little support for county-wide planning.

Pickaway County has reorganized its planning commission and now has a newly-formed comprehensive planning committee. Ohio EPA staff will meet with the planning committee to discuss the benefits of a county-wide plan and clean-water objectives. Ohio EPA recommends that County land use planning agencies interact with townships and municipalities in development of land use/comprehensive plans that include stream corridor protection zones. The Ohio EPA recommends that counties in this watershed continue work necessary to ensure that their comprehensive plans provide stream corridor and stream headwater protection.

### Franklin SWCD storm water program

Franklin SWCD has an Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program (IDDE). In cooperation with the county's health department, the district's program creates "a database of outfalls and other drainage features contributing to open drainage within the target area or municipality." The unincorporated areas of the Walnut Creek Watershed are expected to be completed by 2011.

Franklin SWCD also has an Urban Conservation Program that reviews all development plans for unincorporated portions of the county. The review is to "assure proper sediment and erosion control practices and natural resource protection."

Franklin SWCD's Backyard Conservation Program targets drainage problems, storm water quality-quantity, stream bank erosion and wildlife habitat. Madison and Canal Winchester Schools will install rain gardens in 2008. Native tree and shrub plantings were installed on London and Lancaster Road to address standing water. A rain garden is planned to manage home storm water runoff.

### **Township planning**

Each township has a Zoning Commission. The Township Zoning Commission may develop land use/comprehensive plans for the Township and make a recommendation to the Township Board of Trustees on said plans. Such plans guide development in a township and thus help control pathogen discharge through requiring use of appropriate wastewater and storm water disposal techniques. Such plans may also guide development in a township through requiring riparian corridor protection. Planning for riparian corridors near streams will provide habitat protection, open space for possible bikeways and walking trails, and help maintain floodplains

Some townships within this watershed have a comprehensive plan of some kind. Ohio EPA is aware of the following plans:

#### Violet Township, Fairfield County

Violet Township is the fastest growing township in the watershed. Comprehensive construction site management and post-construction storm water management that preserve existing hydrology are needed to maintain the biological integrity of Sycamore Creek.

The township has developed a Land Use and Transportation Plan for use as the township works with the City of Pickerington to manage significant growth in this area. This plan can be viewed at:

<http://www.violet.oh.us/documents/Violet%20Land%20Use%20Plan633100809311406250.pdf>.

Section 9 Implementation Strategies in the plan indicates that the plan will be reviewed in 2009 and again in 2014 to determine if additional updates are needed or if additional issues need to be addressed. A subwatershed known as Sycamore Creek is located within Violet Township. This subwatershed is categorized by the Ohio EPA as a rapidly developing watershed (RDW).

When the township reviews its plan in 2009 it should continue measures necessary to control sediment and habitat loss within the township. Stream riparian corridor protection is an excellent technique for use in maintaining water quality and habitat in the area.

The township has taken steps to reduce sediment loss through implementation of its Drainage, Erosion and Sediment Control (DESC) Regulations developed through interaction with the Fairfield County Soil and Water Conservation District Office. The DESC Regulations can be viewed at <http://www.violet.oh.us/documents/DESCregulations633100788190468750.pdf>

#### Liberty Township, Fairfield County

The township is in the process of developing a land use plan but little information is available regarding plan status.

#### Etna Township, Licking County

The township created its 1996 Land Use Plan and Recommendations Addendum. This plan is now in the process of being reviewed by the township. Ohio EPA staff provided a brief overview of the Walnut Creek study to township trustees and highlighted the importance of riparian corridor protection as part of the comprehensive planning process.

Benefits of incorporating riparian corridor protection zones in land use/comprehensive plans have been cited in numerous literatures. Benefits include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Reduce flood impacts by absorbing peak flows, slowing the velocity of floodwaters and regulating base flow.
- Stabilize the banks of watercourses to reduce bank erosion and downstream transport of sediments eroded from watercourse banks.
- Reduce pollutants in watercourses during periods of high flows by filtering, settling and transforming pollutants in runoff before they enter watercourses.
- Provide habitat to a wide array of wildlife by maintaining diverse and connected riparian vegetation.
- Provide economic benefits by minimizing encroachment on watercourse channels and the need for costly engineering solutions, such as dams, retention basins and rip rap to protect structures and reduce property damage and threats to the safety of watershed residents. This helps to preserve the character and property values of an area.

### **Planning and storm water protections by municipalities**

Several municipalities in this watershed have developed storm water control plans which include stream corridor protection zones. Each of these plans incorporate protections for Georges Creek and are the following:

- City of Pickerington –  
[http://www.ci.pickerington.oh.us/sections/community/stormwater\\_mgmt.asp](http://www.ci.pickerington.oh.us/sections/community/stormwater_mgmt.asp)
- City of Columbus –  
[http://utilities.columbus.gov/DOSD/PDFs/FULL%20SWDM\\_MARCH\\_06.pdf](http://utilities.columbus.gov/DOSD/PDFs/FULL%20SWDM_MARCH_06.pdf)
- City of Columbus' Southeast Area Plan -  
<http://assets.columbus.gov/development/planning/sedraft.pdf>
- Southeast Area Bixby Road Economic Development Amendment -  
<http://assets.columbus.gov/development/planning/SoutheastAreaPlanBixbyRoad.pdf>

The plans dealing with the southeast area of Columbus indicate that Georges Creek will receive protection through use of a riparian buffer zone that is either the floodway width or 150 feet each side of the creek centerline (total width 300 feet) or whichever is greater. All other streams should consist of the greater width of either the floodway or 50 feet each side of the stream centerline.

The Southeast Plan indicates that a 2000-foot buffer will surround the portion of Pickerington Ponds that lies within the planning area. The Southeast Plan also proposes use of a development technique known as the hamlet or open space subdivision. See Figure 8.11 for the area covered by the Southeast Area Plan and the Bixby Road Economic Development Amendment.

### Village of Canal Winchester

In 2008 this village adopted its Storm water Design Manual which includes a Stream Corridor Protection Policy that will be implemented by the village. The policy will help protect the riparian corridor in this area from future develop thus benefiting water quality.

The village recently completed a street improvement project which incorporated use of pervious pavement in portions of this project to help control storm water runoff. Use of pervious pavement allows water to pass through the pavement and is a means of reducing the storm water runoff rate in contrast with a higher runoff rate that would occur with impervious pavement. Controlling the runoff rate will help reduce flooding and further protect Walnut Creek

from higher runoff rates associated with use of impermeable surfaces. Additional information regarding this project can be found at:

<http://www.canalwinchesterohio.gov/mediacenter/pressrel/071408ColumbusStreetEvent.pdf>

A photograph of this street project and close up of the pavement surface is provided below:




Figure 8.11 Map of the areas included in the Southeast Area Plan (olive color) and the Southeast Area Plan Bixby Road Economic Development Amendment (brown color). Note the location of portions of Georges and East Branch Georges Creek within the development area.



Figure 8.12 Photos showing the use of pervious pavement (tan color) alongside asphalt within the area of the Canal Winchester Street Project. The photo on the right is a close-up of the pervious pavement surface.

#### Village of Groveport

In 2008 this village adopted a Storm water Management Policy which includes Stream Corridor Protection Zones within the village. The policy will help protect the riparian corridor in this area from future develop thus benefiting water quality.

The Ohio EPA recommends that townships and municipalities in this watershed continue work necessary to ensure that their comprehensive plans and zoning provide riparian corridor protection.

#### **Metro Parks land acquisitions**

Recent land acquisition by the Metro Parks Program has provided additional riparian corridor protection in the Walnut Creek Watershed. Purchase of the 170 acre Rawn Dairy Farm in 2007 increases the size of the Pickerington Pond Metro Park. The Rawn property includes acreage through which a portion of Georges Creek flows on the west side of this park. The 486 acre Chestnut Ridge Park is located generally south east of the intersection of Winchester and Amanda Northern Roads midway between the Villages of Lithopolis and Carroll in Fairfield County. Several headwater streams are protected from development as they flow through this park. In 2008 Metro Parks announced that it purchased 485 acres of land for creation of a new metro park. The acreage is adjacent to the Walnut Creek mainstem between Groveport and Canal Winchester and will provide additional riparian corridor protection.

An excerpt from this Metro Parks website

([http://www.metroparks.net/CmsData/Site/Documents/2008/LEVY%20PLANNING\\_RFS.pdf](http://www.metroparks.net/CmsData/Site/Documents/2008/LEVY%20PLANNING_RFS.pdf))

indicates the possibility of additional riparian corridor protection for the Walnut Creek mainstem.

## **8.4 Summary of restoration strategy**

Tables 8.5 through 8.7 summarize the strategy for restoring water quality in the Walnut Creek watershed.

Table 8.6 Inventory of TMDL Action Items Walnut Creek — HUC 05060001-170

| Waterbody  | Cause of Impairment             | Primary Source      | Action Item   | Target & Unit                | 2009 Status           | Likely Source of Funding      | Comments   |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Priority Actions:  |                                 |                     |   |                              |                       |                               |  |
| Pleasantville Creek<br>(RM 2.4 @ Pleasantville Rd)         | Low D.O.<br>Sediment            | SSO                 | Eliminate Leitnaker Road pump station sanitary sewer overflow                           | Steps in orders              | SSO work underway     | Walnut Creek Sewer Dist./OWDA | Orders issued for WWTP upgrade and SSO elimination                               |
|  |                                 | Agriculture         | Implement agricultural BMPs to reduce sediment  | Varies by BMP                | To be pursued         | NRCS-EQIP OEPA-319 Grants     |  |
| Pleasantville Creek<br>(RM 0.5, downstream of WCSD WWTP)   | Sediment<br>Low D.O.<br>Ammonia | Point Source        | Upgrade Walnut Creek WWTP   | Steps in orders              | WWTP upgrade underway | Walnut Creek Sewer Dist./OWDA | Orders issued for WWTP upgrade and SSO elimination                               |
|  |                                 | Livestock in Stream | Install fencing to restrict livestock access to creek. Alternate livestock water supply | 1,600 linear feet of fencing | To be pursued         | NRCS-EQIP OEPA-319 Grants     | Ohio EPA/SWCD staff must discuss this issue in 2009 and then attempt resolution. |
| Tributary to Paw Paw Creek<br>(RM 1.79 @ Cherry Lane Rd)   | Sediment                        | Hydro-modification  | Stream habitat restoration  | Linear feet                  | To be pursued         | NRCS-EQIP OEPA-319 Grants     |  |
|  |                                 | Agriculture         | Agricultural BMPs to reduce sediment  | Varies by BMP                |                       |                               |  |
| Sycamore Creek<br>(RM 12.2 @ Fairlawn Ave.)                | Organic enrichment<br>Low D.O.  | Urban storm water   | NPDES storm water permit audit.   | Audit                        | CDO-DSW to pursue     | Ohio EPA                      | NPDES storm water permit audits to commence in 2009                              |
|  |                                 | Failing HSTS        | Investigation necessary to determine problem source                                     | # of HSTS fixed              | To be pursued         |                               |  |
| Sycamore Creek **<br>(RM 4.2 @ Hill Rd; RM 2.6 @ Busey Rd) | TDS<br>Solids<br>Toxicity       | Point Source        | Upgrade Pickerington WWTP<br><br>Implement TDS control plan                             | Permit compliance            | WWTP upgrade underway | Pickerington Ohio EPA         | NPDES permit compliance schedule   |

| Waterbody                            | Cause of Impairment         | Primary Source         | Action Item   | Target & Unit                  | 2009 Status           | Likely Source of Funding     | Comments  |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Priority Actions:                    |                             |                        |   |                                |                       |                              |   |
| WATERSHED WIDE                       | Pathogens                   | Failing HSTS           | Repair or replace failing HSTS systems  | # of HSTS fixed                | To be pursued         | Local Health Departments     | ODH rule revisions underway and Ohio EPA HSTS General Permits are now in use. |
|                                      |                             | Livestock in Stream    | Install fencing to restrict livestock access to creek. Alternate livestock water supply | Linear feet of fencing         | To be pursued         | OEPA/ODNR                    |   |
| Additional Areas of Concern:         |                             |                        |   |                                |                       |                              |   |
| Walnut Creek                         | Habitat loss Sediment       | Man-made modification  | Habitat restoration and riparian protection   | Structures and acres protected | To be pursued         | OEPA-319 Grants              |   |
| Popular Creek                        | Fish stress                 | Unknown                | Further investigation by Ohio EPA needed  | Study completed                | To be pursued         | Ohio EPA                     |   |
| Paw Paw Creek                        | Organic waste               | SSO                    | Eliminate Mill/Monroe sanitary sewer overflow   | SSO gone                       | In process            | Village of Baltimore         | Minimize I/I into sewer   |
|                                      |                             | Industrial Storm water | Eliminate nuisance discharges from storm sewers   | Storm and process separate     | Enforcement under way | National Fruit and Vegetable |   |
| West Branch Paw Paw Creek            | No capacity                 |                        |   |                                |                       |                              | Assimilative capacity has been reached  |
| Gillette Run                         | Bacteria Nutrients Sediment | Livestock in Stream    | Install fencing to restrict livestock access to creek. Alternate livestock water supply | Linear feet of fencing         | To be pursued         | OEPA/ODNR                    |   |
| Tributary to Walnut Creek @ RM 29.83 | Sediment                    | Unknown                | Further investigation necessary   | Study completed                | To be pursued         | Ohio EPA                     |   |

\*\* Additional data collected in 2009 at stream locations at river miles 4.2 and 3.8 suggests that the applicable biological criteria is now being met. These data are currently under review by the Ohio EPA and appropriate attainment status will be assigned according to the outcome of the review.

Table 8.7 Inventory of TMDL Action Items Walnut Creek — HUC 05060001-180

| Waterbody   | Cause of Impairment   | Primary Source              | Action Item   | Target & Unit                  | 2009 Status       | Likely Source of Funding  | Comments  |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Priority Actions:                                     |                       |                             |   |                                |                   |                           |   |
| East Branch George Creek (@ Refugee Rd and Wright Rd) | Toxicity              | Urban storm water           | NPDES storm water permit audit.   | Audit                          | CDO-DSW to pursue | Ohio EPA                  | NPDES storm water permit audits to commence in 2009                           |
| Big Run (RM 1.6 Hayes Rd.)                            | Flow withdrawal       | Unknown                     | Further investigation necessary   | Study completed                | To be pursued     | Ohio EPA                  |   |
|   | WWTP                  | Point Source                | Inspect WWTP  | Inspection done                | CDO-DSW to pursue | Ohio EPA                  | Possible I/I impact on WWTP   |
| Fix any problems found                                |                       |                             | To be determined  | To be pursued                  | WWTP              |                           |   |
| Mud Run (RM 1.5 Goodman-Teegardin Rd.)                | Sediment Poor Habitat | Flow alteration Agriculture | Implement agricultural BMPs to reduce sediment  | Varies by BMP                  | To be pursued     | NRCS-EQIP OEPA-319 Grants | Ohio EPA and SWCD meet to determine course of action                          |
|   |                       | Livestock in Stream         | Install fencing to restrict livestock access to creek. Alternate livestock water supply | 400 feet of fencing            | To be pursued     |                           |   |
| Turkey Run(RM 0.2 )                                   | Habitat alterations   | Channelization Agriculture  | Habitat restoration and riparian protection   | Structures and acres protected | To be pursued     | OEPA-319 Grants           | Ohio EPA and SWCD meet to determine course of action                          |
| WATERSHED WIDE  | Pathogens             | Failing HSTS                | Repair or replace failing HSTS systems  | # of HSTS fixed                | To be pursued     | Local Health Departments  | ODH rule revisions underway and Ohio EPA HSTS General Permits are now in use. |
|   |                       | Livestock in Stream         | Install fencing to restrict livestock access to creek. Alternate livestock water supply | Linear feet of fencing         | To be pursued     | OEPA/ODNR                 |   |

| Waterbody                    | Cause of Impairment     | Primary Source                                       | Action Item  | Target & Unit                          | 2009 Status  | Likely Source of Funding                               | Comments  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Priority Actions:            |                         |  |  |  |  |  |   |
| Additional Areas of Concern: |                         |  |  |  |  |  |   |
| Walnut Creek                 |                         | Rickenbacker Airport and Intermodal area storm water | Work on and implement plan to prevent water quality degradation from area storm water discharges   | Plan in place and actions implemented  | Ongoing  | Airport Authority<br>Intermodal facilities<br>Ohio EPA | Airport Authority and Ohio EPA have been working on this since 2007. EMH&T doing study.   |
| Georges Creek                |                         | Urban & suburban land use                            | Construction site and comprehensive storm water management needed. Low impact design, conservation development, and other elements of the storm water manuals implemented. | Local ordinances and regional planning | To be pursued  | Jurisdictional division and developers                 | Pickerington and Columbus storm water manuals now in effect for future development. Columbus SE Plan proposed for use. Franklin County Draft storm water manual in place. |
| Tussing Ditch                | Channelization          | Urban, suburban & commercial land use                | Stream restoration and storm water management  | Local ordinances and regional planning | Violet Twp DES Control regulations in effect.<br><br>Other TBP | Ohio EPA, jurisdictional divisions and developers      | Work with appropriate stakeholders for implementation of stream protection strategies. CW storm water manual applicable to future dev.                                    |
| South Rickenbacker Run       |                         | Urban & commercial land use<br><br>Airport runoff    | Develop plan to prevent water quality degradation from airport storm water.<br><br>Periodic monitoring for signs of acutely toxic conditions                               | Plan in place<br><br>Sampling          | To be pursued  | Airport Authority<br>Ohio EPA                          |   |
| Manns Run                    | Sediment Channelization | Channel modification                                 | Implement agricultural BMPs to reduce sediment   | Varies by BMP                          | To be pursued  | SWCD<br>Ohio EPA                                       |   |
|                              |                         |  | Stream restoration   | Linear feet                            |  |  |   |

| Waterbody         | Cause of Impairment | Primary Source | Action Item                               | Target & Unit | 2009 Status   | Likely Source of Funding | Comments                               |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|---|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|--|
| Priority Actions: |                     |                |   |               |               |                          |  |
| Bull Run          |                     |                | Confirm use and attainment with fish data | IBI, MIwb     | To be pursued | Ohio EPA                 |  |
|                   |                     |                | Remove from county maintenance            | Feet removed  | To be pursued | County                   | If drainage adequate for current needs |

## 9 FUTURE EVALUATIONS OF THE PROJECT AREA AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

### 9.1 Current and ongoing monitoring

The effectiveness of actions implemented based on the TMDL recommendations should be validated through ongoing monitoring and evaluation. Information derived from water quality analyses can guide changes to the implementation strategy to more effectively reach the TMDL goals. Additionally, monitoring is required to determine if and when formerly impaired segments meet applicable water quality standards (WQS).

This section of the report provides a general strategy for continued monitoring and evaluation and lists parties who can potentially carry out such work. It highlights past efforts and those planned to be carried out in the future by the Ohio EPA and others. It also outlines a process by which changes to the implementation strategy can be made if needed.

#### Evaluation and analyses

Aquatic life habitat and recreational uses are impaired in the watershed, so monitoring that evaluates the stream system with respect to these uses is a priority to the Ohio EPA. The degree of impairment of aquatic life habitat is exclusively determined through the analysis of biological monitoring data. Recreational use impairment is determined through bacteria counts from water quality samples. Ambient conditions causing impairment include **point sources (home septic treatment systems, sanitary sewer overflows, storm sewers, wastewater treatment plants), and non point sources (livestock, agricultural activity, maintenance of drainage infrastructure, urban/suburban development)**. This report sets target values for these parameters (Chapter 7), which should also be measured through ongoing monitoring.

A serious effort should be made to determine if and to what degree the recommended implementation actions have been carried out. This should occur within an appropriate timeframe following the completion of this TMDL report and occur prior to measuring the biological community, water quality or habitat.

#### Past and ongoing water resource evaluation

##### Monitoring performed by other groups

Since 2003, a stream quality monitoring project has been underway at four locations in Walnut Creek in the Canal Winchester area. This work has been led by Dick Miller, the village's urban forester. This monitoring effort is based on the Ohio Department of Natural Resources Stream Quality Monitoring Assessment Form. Stream conditions and various macroinvertebrates are observed and recorded on the form for use in a visual assessment of stream quality.

Work performed by Mr. Miller is important and should continue as a means to help monitor the Walnut Creek mainstem in an area facing increasing development pressures. Mr. Miller can be reached at <http://www.canalwinchesterohio.gov/departments/pubworks/UrbanFor/Default.aspx> for additional information regarding this project in Canal Winchester.

Additional information regarding this Stream Quality Monitoring Project in Ohio can be found at this website: <http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/tabid/980/Default.aspx>.

#### Recommended Approach for Gathering and Using Available Data

Early communications should take place between the Ohio EPA and any potential collaborators to discuss research interests and objectives. Through this, areas of overlap should be identified and ways to make all parties research efforts more efficient should be discussed. Ultimately important questions can be addressed by working collectively and through pooling resources, knowledge, and data.

## **9.2 Schedule for Ohio EPA monitoring**

In accordance with the Ohio 2008 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report (Ohio EPA, 2008), the next scheduled Ohio EPA evaluation of this watershed is in 2020.

## **9.3 Approach for making needed revisions**

An adaptive management approach will be taken in the Walnut Creek watershed. Adaptive management is recognized as a viable strategy for managing natural resources (Baydack et al., 1999) and this approach is applied on federally-owned lands. An adaptive management approach allows for changes in the management strategy if environmental indicators suggest that the current strategy is inadequate or ineffective.

The recommendations put forth for the Walnut Creek watershed largely center on reducing pathogen discharge into streams and preventing further habitat loss.

If chemical water quality does not show improvement and/or water bodies are still not attaining water quality standards after the implementation plan has been carried out, then a TMDL revision would be initiated. The Ohio EPA would initiate the revision if no other parties wish to do so.

## REFERENCES

- Baydack, R.K., H. Campa, and J.B. Haufler. Eds. 1999. *Practical approaches to the conservation of biological diversity*. Island Press, Washington D.C.
- Booth D.B. 2005. Challenges and prospects for restoring urban streams: a perspective from the Pacific Northwest of North America. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*. 24(3): 724-737.
- Brabec E., Schulte S., and Richards P.L. 2002. Impervious Surfaces and Water Quality: A Review of Current Literature and Its Implications for Watershed Planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*. 16(4): 499-514.
- Dai, T., R.L. Wetzel, T.R.L. Christensen, and E.A. Lewis. 2000. BasinSim 1.0: A Windows-Based Watershed Modeling Package, User's Guide. Virginia Institute of Marine Science and School of Marine Science, College of William & Mary, Gloucester Point, VA.
- Karr, J. R. 1991. Biological integrity: A long-neglected aspect of water resource management. *Ecological Applications* 1(1): 66-84.
- Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission. 2005. Spatial data published on website ([http://www.morpc.org/info\\_center/dataport/gis\\_downloadable.asp](http://www.morpc.org/info_center/dataport/gis_downloadable.asp)).
- Miltner, R.J., D. White, and C. Yoder. 2004. The biotic integrity of streams in urban and suburbanizing landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 69 (2004) 87–100.
- Miner R. and D. Borton. 1991. Considerations in the development and implementation of biocriteria, *Water Quality Standards for the 21st Century*, U.S. EPA, Offc. Science and Technology, Washington, D.C., 115.
- Morgan R.P. and Cushman S.F. 2005. Urbanization effects on stream fish assemblages in Maryland, USA. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*. 24(3): 643-655.
- Natural Resource and Conservation Service (Fairfield County, Ohio). 2000 *Guidelines for Ranking FY2000 EQIP Priority Area Proposals That Have Received EQIP Financial Assistance In Past Fiscal Years*
- Ohio Department of Development Office of Strategic Research. 2003. Published material on website (<http://www.odod.state.oh.us/research/>).
- Ohio EPA (Ohio Environmental Protection Agency). 1987a. Biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Volume I. The role of biological data in water quality assessments. Division of Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment, Surface Water Section, Columbus, OH.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987b. Biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Volume II. Users manual for biological field assessment of Ohio surface waters. Division of Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment, Surface Water Section, Columbus, OH.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987c. Manual of Ohio EPA Surveillance Methods and Quality Assurance Practices. Division of Surface Water, Columbus, OH.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1999. Association Between Nutrients, Habitat, and the Aquatic Biota in Ohio Rivers and Streams. Ohio EPA Technical Bulletin. MAS/1999-1-1. Columbus, OH.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2008. Ohio 2008 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report. State of Ohio. Environmental Protection Agency. Division of Surface Water, Columbus, OH. (<http://epa.ohio.gov/dsw/tmdl/2008IntReport/2008OhioIntegratedReport.aspx>)

Parikh P., Taylor M.A., Hoagland T., Thurston H., and Shuster W. 2005. Application of market mechanisms and incentives to reduce stormwater runoff: and integrated hydrologic, economic a legal approach. *Environmental Science and Policy*. 8: 133-144.

Pettyjohn WA and Henning R, 1979. Preliminary estimate of ground-water recharge rates, related streamflow and water quality in Ohio. Ohio State University Water Resources Centre Project Completion Report No 552, 323pp.

Rankin, E. T. 1989. The qualitative habitat evaluation index (QHEI), rationale, methods, and application. Ecological Assessment Section, Division of Water Quality Planning and Assessment, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Columbus, OH.

Rankin, E. T. 1995. The use of habitat indices in water resource quality assessments, pp. 181-208 in Biological Assessment and Criteria: Tools for Water Resource Planning and Decision Making. Davis, W.S. and Simon, T.P. (eds.), Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, FL.

Roy A.H., Rosemond A.D., Paul M.J., Leigh D.S., and Wallace J.B. 2003. Stream macroinvertebrate response to catchment urbanisation (Georgia, U.S.A.). *Freshwater Biology* 48: 329-346.

Roy A.H., Freeman M.C., Freeman B.J., Wenger S.J., Meyer J.L., Ensign W.E. 2006. Importance of riparian forests in urban catchments contingent on sediment and hydrologic regimes. *Environmental Management*. 37(4): 523-539.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. Census 2000. Population Division, United States Census Bureau.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. Published material on website (<http://www.census.gov/popest/estimates.php>). Population Division, Projections Branch, United States Census Bureau.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2000. Bacterial Indicator Tool Users Guide. EPA-823-B-01-003. Office of Water, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC.

U.S. Geological Survey. 2000. National Land Cover Dataset: Fact Sheet 108-00. (<http://erg.usgs.gov/isb/pubs/factsheets/fs10800.html>). United States Geological Survey.

Yoder, C.O. 1989. The development and use of biological criteria for Ohio surface waters. U.S. EPA, Criteria and Standards Div., *Water Quality Stds. 21st Century*, 1989: 139-146.

Yoder, C. O. 1991. Answering some concerns about biological criteria based on experiences in Ohio, *in* G. H. Flock (ed.) *Water quality standards for the 21st century*. Proceedings of a National Conference, U. S. EPA, Office of Water, Washington, D.C.

Yoder, C.O. and E.T. Rankin. 1995. The role of biological criteria in water quality monitoring, assessment, and regulation. *Environmental Regulation in Ohio: How to Cope with the Regulatory Jungle*. Inst. of Business Law, Santa Monica, CA. 54 pp.