EAST AND WEST FORKS OF SIX MILE CREEK AND SIX MILE CREEK TMDL FOR DISSOLVED LEAD

SUBSEGMENTS 030503 AND 030504

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality Office of Environmental Assessment Environmental Technology Division Engineering Group 2

November 30, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction 4 2. Study Area Description 4 2.1 Calcasieu River Basin 4 2.2 Water Quality Standards (LDEQ, 2000) 4 2.3 Identification of Sources 5 3. TMDL Load Calculations 5 3.1 Load Determination 5 3.2 Load Allocation (LA) 8 3.3 Wasteload Allocation (WLA) 8 3.4 Seasonal Variability 8 3.5 Margin of Safety (MOS) 8 4. Monitoring Plan 8 REFERENCES 10 APPENDICES Appendix A – Hardness Data 11 Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances 13 Appendix C – Basin Map & 2000 305(b) Assessment 15	EXECU	TIVE SUMMARY	3			
2.1 Calcasieu River Basin 4 2.2 Water Quality Standards (LDEQ, 2000) 4 2.3 Identification of Sources 5 3. TMDL Load Calculations 5 3.1 Load Determination 5 3.2 Load Allocation (LA) 8 3.3 Wasteload Allocation (WLA) 8 3.4 Seasonal Variability 8 3.5 Margin of Safety (MOS) 8 4 Monitoring Plan 8 REFERENCES 10 APPENDICES Appendix A – Hardness Data 11 Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances 13	1. Intr	roduction	4			
2.1 Calcasieu River Basin 4 2.2 Water Quality Standards (LDEQ, 2000) 4 2.3 Identification of Sources 5 3. TMDL Load Calculations 5 3.1 Load Determination 5 3.2 Load Allocation (LA) 8 3.3 Wasteload Allocation (WLA) 8 3.4 Seasonal Variability 8 3.5 Margin of Safety (MOS) 8 4 Monitoring Plan 8 REFERENCES 10 APPENDICES Appendix A – Hardness Data 11 Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances 13	2. Stu	dy Area Description	4			
2.2 Water Quality Standards (LDEQ, 2000) 4 2.3 Identification of Sources 5 3. TMDL Load Calculations 5 3.1 Load Determination 5 3.2 Load Allocation (LA) 8 3.3 Wasteload Allocation (WLA) 8 3.4 Seasonal Variability 8 3.5 Margin of Safety (MOS) 8 4 Monitoring Plan 8 REFERENCES 10 APPENDICES Appendix A – Hardness Data 11 Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances 13		Calcasieu River Basin	4			
2.3 Identification of Sources 5 3. TMDL Load Calculations 5 3.1 Load Determination 5 3.2 Load Allocation (LA) 8 3.3 Wasteload Allocation (WLA) 8 3.4 Seasonal Variability 8 3.5 Margin of Safety (MOS) 8 4. Monitoring Plan 8 REFERENCES 10 APPENDICES Appendix A – Hardness Data 11 Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances 13	2.2					
3. TMDL Load Calculations 5 3.1 Load Determination 5 3.2 Load Allocation (LA) 8 3.3 Wasteload Allocation (WLA) 8 3.4 Seasonal Variability 8 3.5 Margin of Safety (MOS) 8 4. Monitoring Plan 8 REFERENCES 10 APPENDICES Appendix A – Hardness Data 11 Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances 13	2.3	Identification of Sources	5			
3.2 Load Allocation (LA)	3. TM	IDL Load Calculations	5			
3.2 Load Allocation (LA)	3.1	Load Determination	5			
3.4 Seasonal Variability 8 3.5 Margin of Safety (MOS) 8 4. Monitoring Plan 8 REFERENCES 10 APPENDICES 11 Appendix A – Hardness Data 11 Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances 13	3.2					
3.5 Margin of Safety (MOS) 8 4. Monitoring Plan 8 REFERENCES 10 APPENDICES Appendix A – Hardness Data 11 Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances 13	3.3	Wasteload Allocation (WLA)	8			
4. Monitoring Plan	3.4	Seasonal Variability	8			
APPENDICES Appendix A – Hardness Data						
APPENDICES Appendix A – Hardness Data	4. Mo	onitoring Plan	8			
Appendix A – Hardness Data	REFERENCES					
Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances	APPEN	NDICES				
Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances	Appendix A – Hardness Data					
Appendix C – Basin Map & 2000 305(b) Assessment	Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances					
	Appendi	Appendix C – Basin Map & 2000 305(b) Assessment				

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act requires states to identify waterbodies that are not meeting water quality standards and to develop total maximum daily pollutant loads for those waterbodies. A total maximum daily load (TMDL) is the amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can assimilate without exceeding the established water quality standard for that pollutant. Through a TMDL, pollutant loads can be distributed or allocated to point sources and nonpoint sources discharging to the waterbody.

The East and West Forks of Six Mile Creek are located in central Louisiana and originate near Fort Polk in Vernon Parish. The Forks join downstream to form Six Mile Creek. The Forks are in Subsegments 030503 and 030504 of the Calcasieu River Basin. The Forks and Six Mile Creek were not listed on any 303(d) list for lead; however, Six Mile Creek was found to be not meeting the criterion for lead during the 2000 305(b) Assessment. It was tested using the "Clean Technique" procedures using samples collected in 2000 and 2001. Between the months of September 2000 and March 2001, five samples were taken from Six Mile Creek downstream from where the Forks join. The sample results showed that lead exceeded the subsegment's water quality criterion for aquatic life. Thus a TMDL has been developed for dissolved lead in the Six Mile Creek system.

For the purpose of TMDL development, the dissolved lead numerical criterion was calculated based on the freshwater chronic value for aquatic life protection using the average hardness value from 1999. The hardness data is from Station 0831 and is shown in Appendix A. This Station is located on Six Mile Creek below the point where the Forks join. Therefore, the TMDL will apply to subsegments 030503 and 030504. The dissolved lead numerical criterion was determined to be $0.136~\mu g/L$. For the purpose of this TMDL, dissolved lead was considered to be a conservative parameter. Using the 7Q10 flow at the lower reach of subsegment 030504 and the calculated lead criterion, a TMDL of 0.028 lb/day was calculated for the Six Mile Creek system (subsegments 030503 and 030504). The TMDL was then allocated to its wasteload allocation, margin of safety, and load allocation components. Since there are no known point sources discharging lead in these subsegments, the wasteload allocation is zero.

1. Introduction

The East and West Forks of Six Mile Creek are located in central Louisiana and originate near Fort Polk in Vernon Parish. The Forks join downstream to form Six Mile Creek. The Forks are in Subsegments 030503 and 030504 of the Calcasieu River Basin. The Forks and Six Mile Creek were not listed on any 303(d) list for lead; however, Six Mile Creek was found to be not meeting the criterion for lead during the 2000 305(b) Assessment. Since this was discovered while TMDLs were being prepared for the Calcasieu and Ouachita Basins, this waterbody was added to the schedule for TMDL development.

Six Mile Creek was tested from September 2000 to March 2001 for lead using the "Clean Technique" procedures. The sample results showed an exceedance of dissolved lead thus requiring a TMDL for this parameter. A TMDL for dissolved lead was developed in accordance with the requirements of Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act. The purpose of a TMDL is to determine the pollutant loading that a waterbody can assimilate without exceeding the water quality standard for that pollutant; the TMDL can also establish the load reduction that is necessary to meet the standard in a waterbody. The TMDL consists of the wasteload allocation (WLA), the load allocation (LA), and a margin of safety (MOS). The wasteload allocation is allocated to point sources, and the load allocation is allocated to nonpoint sources. The margin of safety is a percentage of the TMDL that accounts for the uncertainty associated with the model assumptions, data inadequacies, and future growth.

2. Study Area Description

2.1 Calcasieu River Basin

The East and West Forks of Six Mile Creek are located in central Louisiana and originate near Fort Polk in Vernon Parish. The Forks join downstream to form Six Mile Creek. The Forks and Six Mile Creek are in Subsegments 030503 and 030504 of the Calcasieu River Basin. A map of the Basin and subsegments is shown in Appendix C (LDEQ, 1999). The Calcasieu River Basin lies in southwestern Louisiana and is bordered by the Mermentau River to the east and the Sabine River to the west. The lands within the Calcasieu River Basin are primarily forested and agricultural, although the basin also contains significant amounts of wetlands and the city of Lake Charles. The 1993 Nonpoint Source (NPS) Assessment Report estimated that approximately 51% of the basin is forested, 26% was in agriculture, 12% was in wetlands and 3% was in urban. The remainder of the basin is in water and other types of land use (LDEQ, 1999).

2.2 Water Quality Standards (LDEQ, 2000)

The designated uses for subsegments 030503 and 030504 include primary and secondary contact recreation and propagation of fish and wildlife with the addition of outstanding natural resource water for subsegment 030504. The criteria for protection of aquatic life are based on acute and chronic concentrations in fresh and marine waters and are developed primarily for attainment of the fish and wildlife propagation use.

Criteria for human health are derived for waterbodies used as drinking water supplies and those not used as drinking water supplies. Criteria applied to waterbodies designated as drinking water supplies are developed to protect that water supply for human consumption, including protection against taste and odor effects, to protect it for primary and secondary contact recreation, and to prevent contamination of fish and aquatic life consumed by humans. Criteria for waterbodies not designated as drinking water supplies are developed to protect them for primary and secondary contact recreation and to prevent contamination of fish and aquatic life consumed by humans. The lead criterion for surface waterbodies designated as drinking water supply is 50 µg/L.

Metals criteria are based on dissolved metals concentrations in ambient waters. Hardness values are averaged and used in the calculation of the lead criteria. The lead criterion used in this TMDL was calculated using hardness data from 1999. The calculated criterion and the sample exceedances are shown in Appendix B.

2.3 Identification of Sources

According to the LDEQ discharger database, there are no point sources discharging lead to the Six Mile Creek system. LDEQ has established a group of reference streams located throughout the state which exhibit near-pristine characteristics and have no man-made sources discharging or contributing runoff into them. Six Mile Creek is one of these reference streams. Therefore, LDEQ concludes that natural background loading is the most likely source of lead in the Six Mile Creek system. Since the lead criterion is hardness-dependent and the waterbody had very low hardness, the standard is very low and is easily exceeded at the low detection capabilities of modern laboratory instruments.

3. TMDL Load Calculations

3.1 Load Determination

The aquatic life criterion was used for this TMDL along with the 7Q10 flow for the waterbody. The criterion was calculated from the freshwater chronic criteria equation (Environmental Regulatory Code, Part IX. Water Quality Regulations 2000, pages 139 and 141):

Chronic Dissolved Lead Criterion= $e^{(1.2730[ln(hardness)]-4.7050)}$ X 1.46203-[(ln hardness)(0.145712)]

The average hardness value used in this equation was determined from the 1999 hardness data at Water Quality Station 0831 located on Six Mile Creek. The data is shown in Appendix A.

Dissolved lead was treated as a conservative parameter. The following equation was used to calculate the dissolved lead TMDL. The TMDL calculations are shown below.

Dissolved Lead TMDL, $lb/day = (Lead Criterion, mg/L) \times (Critical Flow, mgd) \times 8.345$

where 8.345 is a conversion factor from mg/L to lb/day.

The sampling events used as the basis for this TMDL were performed to meet the needs of the 2000 305(b) Assessment. The data is adequate for a conservative TMDL based on the assumption that no fate and transport mechanisms were present in the waterbody. Data gathering did not include any flow measurements, any hardness measurements nor any upstream sampling and measurements for background conditions. In the absence of such data, fate and transport modeling and calculation of reductions required from current loads are not possible.

LDEQ has developed this TMDL to be consistent with the State antidegradation policy (LAC 33:IX.1109.A).

Calculation of the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Lead in East and West Forks of Six Mile Creek and Six Mile Creek (Subsegments 030503 and 030504)

Determination of the TMDL:

Average Hardness at LDEQ WQ ambient site #0831 = 7.4 mg/L

Critical flow (7Q10) at the bottom of subsegment 030504 (Note 1) = 38.1 cfs = 24.6 mgd

The dissolved Lead criterion = Freshwater Chronic criterion = $e^{(1.2730[ln(avg\ hardness)]-4.7050)}$ X 1.46203-[(ln avg hardness)(0.145712)]

The dissolved Lead criterion = 0.136 ug/L = 0.0001358 mg/L

TMDL for dissolved Lead = (Lead criterion, mg/L) \times (Critical Flow, mgd) \times 8.345 = 1b/day

TMDL for dissolved Lead = 0.028 lb/day

Margin of Safety = 20% x TMDL=

Determination of the various loads contributing to the TMDL:

TMDL = Load Allocation (LA) + Waste Load Allocation (WLA) + Margin of Safety (MOS)

W.A.calculation:

Waste Load portion of the TMDL= 0.000 lb/day

LA=TMDL-WLA-MOS= 0.022 lb/day

Note 1 - This flow was calculated using the 7Q10 from USGS Station 08014000 and applying drainage area ratios to obtain the 7Q10 at the bottom of the subsegment. The 7Q10 can be found in "Low-Flow on Streams in Louisiana" by Fred N. Lee, March 2000.

USGS Station 08014000 is located on Six Mile Creek near Sugartown, Louisiana.

0.006 lb/day

3.2 Load Allocation (LA)

The load allocation is the TMDL minus the WLA and MOS. The load allocation includes natural background sources.

3.3 Wasteload Allocation (WLA)

The WLA is zero since there are no known point sources discharging lead to the Six Mile Creek system.

3.4 Seasonal Variability

Because ambient monitoring data indicate there is little variability of trace metals levels throughout the year, LDEQ has not defined a critical season.

3.5 Margin of Safety (MOS)

The Clean Water Act requires that TMDLs take into consideration a margin of safety. EPA guidance allows for the use of implicit or explicit expressions of the margin of safety or both. When conservative assumptions are used in the development of the TMDL or conservative factors are used in the calculations, the margin of safety is implicit. When a percentage of the load is factored into the TMDL calculation as a margin of safety, the margin of safety is explicit. For this TMDL an explicit MOS of 20% was used.

4. Monitoring Plan

In accordance with Section 106 of the federal Clean Water Act and under the authority of the Louisiana Environmental Quality Act, the LDEQ has established a comprehensive program for monitoring the quality of the state's surface waters. The LDEQ Surveillance Section collects surface water samples at various locations, utilizing appropriate sampling methods and procedures for ensuring the quality of the data collected. The objectives of the surface water monitoring program are to determine the quality of the state's surface waters, to develop a long-term data base for water quality trend analysis, and to monitor the effectiveness of pollution controls. The data obtained through the surface water monitoring program is used to develop the state's biennial 305(b) report (*Water Quality Inventory*) and the 303(d) list of impaired waters. This information is also utilized in establishing priorities for the LDEQ nonpoint source program.

The LDEQ has implemented a watershed approach to surface water quality monitoring. Through this approach, the entire state is sampled over a five-year cycle with two targeted basins sampled each year. Long-term trend monitoring sites at various locations on the larger rivers and Lake Pontchartrain are sampled throughout the five-year cycle. Sampling is conducted on a monthly basis or more frequently if necessary to yield at least 12 samples per site each year. Sampling sites are located where they are considered to be representative of the waterbody. Under the current monitoring schedule, targeted basins follow the TMDL priorities. In this manner, the first TMDLs will have been implemented by the time the first priority basins will be monitored again in the

second five-year cycle. This will allow the LDEQ to determine whether there has been any improvement in water quality following implementation of the TMDLs. As the monitoring results are evaluated at the end of each year, waterbodies may be added to or removed from the 303(d) list. The sampling schedule for the first five-year cycle is shown below. The Calcasieu River Basin will be sampled again in 2004.

1998 – Mermentau and Vermilion-Teche River Basins

1999 - Calcasieu and Ouachita River Basins

2000 - Barataria and Terrebonne Basins

2001 – Lake Pontchartrain Basin and Pearl River Basin

2002 – Red and Sabine River Basins

(Atchafalaya and Mississippi Rivers will be sampled continuously.)

In addition to ambient water quality sampling in the priority basins, the LDEQ has increased compliance monitoring in those basins. The goal set by LDEQ was to inspect all of those facilities on the list and to sample 1/3 of the minors and 1/3 of the majors. During 1999, compliance inspections were as follows:

Calcasieu Basin: 33 major NPDES facilities, 260 minor facilities.

Ouachita Basin: 348 facilities (total) inspected.

REFERENCES

Lee, Fred N., *Low-Flow On Streams in Louisiana*. March 2000. Prepared for Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Office of Water Resources, Engineering Section 2.

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality. 1999. Nonpoint Source Management Plan, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, http://nonpoint.deq.state.la.us/99manplan/99calcasieu.pdf

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality. 2000. Environmental Regulatory Code, Part IX. Water Quality Regulations.

Appendix A – Hardness Data

East and West Forks of Six Mile Creek, Subsegment 030503, Station 0831

DATE	TIME	DEPTH meters	HARD- NESS mg/l
12/15/1999	1107	0.5	8
11/17/1999	1030	1	5.5
10/20/1999	1215	1	7.2
9/22/1999	1150	1	6.9
8/18/1999	1300	1	
7/21/1999	1142	1	7.2
6/16/1999	1040	1	7.3
5/19/1999	1045	1	6
4/21/1999	805	1	5.5
3/9/1999	1035	1	5.8
2/18/1999	1130	1	14.8
		avg=	7.42

Appendix B – Lead Data and Exceedances

East and West Fork Sixmile Creek, Site 0831, 030503 Clean Techniques Metals(dissolved ug/L)

					Lead			
		Monthly	Pb		Calculated			
Date		Hardness	Calculated		Criteria X		Freshwater	Marine
Collected	Pb	(mg/L)	Criteria	Pb Exc?	CF	Pb Exc?	Lead CF	Lead CF
9/27/2000	0.252	7.42	0.1161	YES	0.1358	YES	1.170	0.951
10/31/2000	0.110	7.42	0.1161	no	0.1358	no	1.170	0.951
12/6/2000	0.141	7.42	0.1161	YES	0.1358	YES	1.170	0.951
2/7/2001	0.147	7.42	0.1161	YES	0.1358	YES	1.170	0.951
3/14/2001	0.447	7.42	0.1161	YES	0.1358	YES	1.170	0.951

East and West Forks of Six Mile Creek and Six Mile Creek TMDL for Dissolved Lead Subsegments 030503 and 030504 Originated: November 30,2001

15

Appendix C – Basin Map & 2000 305(b) Assessment