FINAL REPORT
June 2009
609062901

Total Maximum Daily Load for

Nutrients and Organic Enrichment / Low DO for Coles Creek



South Independent Basin

Jefferson County, Mississippi

Prepared By

Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality
Office of Pollution Control
Standards, Modeling, and TMDL Branch

MDEQ
PO Box 2261
Jackson, MS 39225-2261
(601) 961-5171
www.deq.state.ms.us

Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality

FOREWORD

This report has been prepared in accordance with the schedule contained within the federal consent decree dated December 22, 1998. The report contains one or more Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for water body segments found on Mississippi's 1996 Section 303(d) List of Impaired Water bodies. Because of the accelerated schedule required by the consent decree, many of these TMDLs have been prepared out of sequence with the State's rotating basin approach. The implementation of the TMDLs contained herein will be prioritized within Mississippi's rotating basin approach.

The amount and quality of the data on which this report is based are limited. As additional information becomes available, the TMDLs may be updated. Such additional information may include water quality and quantity data, changes in pollutant loadings, or changes in landuse within the watershed. In some cases, additional water quality data may indicate that no impairment exists.

Conversion Factors

To convert from	To	Multiply by	To convert from	To	Multiply by
$mile^2$	acre	640	acre	ft^2	43560
km^2	acre	247.1	days	seconds	86400
m^3	ft^3	35.3	meters	feet	3.28
ft^3	gallons	7.48	ft^3	gallons	7.48
ft^3	liters	28.3	hectares	acres	2.47
cfs	gal/min	448.8	miles	meters	1609.3
cfs	MGD	0.646	tonnes	tons	1.1
m^3	gallons	264.2	µg/l * cfs	gm/day	2.45
m^3	liters	1000	µg/l * MGD	gm/day	3.79

Fraction	Prefix	Symbol	Multiple	Prefix	Symbol
10^{-1}	deci	d	10	deka	da
10^{-2}	centi	c	10^{2}	hecto	h
10^{-3}	milli	m	10^{3}	kilo	k
10^{-6}	micro	µ	10^{6}	mega	M
10^{-9}	nano	n	10^{9}	giga	G
10^{-12}	pico	p	10^{12}	tera	T
10^{-15}	femto	f	10^{15}	peta	P
10^{-18}	atto	a	10^{18}	exa	E

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES

TABLES

TMDL INFORMATION

Table 1. Listing Information

Name	ID	County	HUC	Evaluated Cause
Coles Creek	MS455E	Jefferson	08060204	Nutrients and Organic Enrichment / Low DO
From confluence of North and South Fork Creeks to the mouth at the Mississippi River				

Table 2. Water Quality Standards

Parameter	Beneficial use	Water Quality Criteria
Nutrients	Aquatic Life Support	Waters shall be free from materials attributable to municipal, industrial, agricultural, or other dischargers producing color, odor, taste, total suspended or dissolved solids, sediment, turbidity, or other conditions, in such degree as to create a nuisance, render the waters injurious to public health, recreation, or to aquatic life and wildlife, or adversely affect the palatability of fish, aesthetic quality, or impair the waters for any designated uses.
Dissolved Oxygen	Aquatic Life Support	DO concentrations shall be maintained at a daily average of not less than 5.0 mg/l with an instantaneous minimum of not less than 4.0 mg/l. Natural conditions are defined as background water quality conditions due only to non-anthropogenic sources. The criteria herein apply specifically with regard to substances attributed to sources (discharges, nonpoint sources, or instream activities) as opposed to natural phenomena. Waters may naturally have characteristics outside the limits established by these criteria. Therefore, naturally occurring conditions that fail to meet criteria should not be interpreted as violations of these criteria.

Table 3. Total Maximum Daily Load for Coles Creek

	WLA lbs/day	LA lbs/day	MOS	TMDL lbs/day
Total Nitrogen	46.42	1,752.3	Implicit	1,798.72
Total Phosphorous	20.99	235.97	Implicit	256.96
TBODu	268.78	323.37	1,876.22	2,468.27

Table 4. Point Source Loads for Coles Creek

Permit	Facility	Flow MGD	TN Load lbs/day	TP Load lbs/day	TBODu lbs/day
MS0025984	Fayette POTW, Northeast*	0.208	19.95	9.02	117.70
MS0026239	Fayette POTW, Southwest*	0.159	15.25	6.90	89.97
MS0027766	Fayette POTW, North*	0.103	9.88	4.47	58.28
MS0022501	Sunnyside Subdivision	0.014	1.34	0.61	2.82
	Total		**46.42**	**20.99**	**268.78**

*HCR facility

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This TMDL is for Coles Creek which was on the Mississippi 2008 Section 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies due to evaluated causes. The segment was listed for causes of organic enrichment / low dissolved oxygen, pesticides, nutrients, and siltation. This TMDL will provide an estimate of the total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) and total ultimate biological oxygen demand (TBODu) allowable in this stream. Other evaluated causes of impairment will be addressed in separate TMDL reports.

Mississippi does not have water quality standards for allowable nutrient concentrations. MDEQ currently has a Nutrient Task Force (NTF) working on the development of criteria for nutrients. An annual concentration of 0.7 mg/l is an applicable target for TN and 0.10 mg/l for TP for water bodies located in Ecoregion 65. MDEQ is presenting these preliminary target values for TMDL development which are subject to revision after the development of numeric nutrient criteria.

The Coles Creek Watershed is located in HUC 08060204. The listed portion of Coles Creek is from the confluence of North and South Fork Creeks to the mouth of the Mississippi River. The location of the watershed for the listed segment is shown in Figure 1.

The Coles Creek watershed mass balance calculations showed that the estimated existing TP concentration indicates a reduction of TP is needed from the non-point sources. According to the STREAM model, the current TBODu load in the water body does not exceed the assimilative capacity of Coles Creek for organic material at the critical conditions. Therefore, no reductions are needed for TBODu. MDEQ believes the estimated existing concentration reductions of nutrients can be accomplished with implementation of best management practices (BMPs).



Figure 1. Coles Creek Watershed

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The identification of water bodies not meeting their designated use and the development of total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for those water bodies are required by Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Water Quality Planning and Management Regulations (40 CFR part 130). The TMDL process is designed to restore and maintain the quality of those impaired water bodies through the establishment of pollutant specific allowable loads. This TMDL has been developed for the 2008 §303(d) listed segment shown in Figure 2.



Figure 2. §303(d) Listed Segments of the Coles Creek

1.2 Listing History

The impaired segment was listed due to evaluating the watershed for potential impairment. There are limited data available in the watershed.

1.3 Applicable Water Body Segment Use

The water use classifications are established by the State of Mississippi in the document *State of Mississippi Water Quality Criteria for Intrastate, Interstate, and Coastal Waters* (MDEQ, 2007). The designated beneficial use for Coles Creek is Fish and Wildlife.

1.4 Applicable Water Body Segment Standard

The water quality standard applicable to the use of the water body and the pollutant of concern is defined in the *State of Mississippi Water Quality Criteria for Intrastate, Interstate, and Coastal Waters* (MDEQ, 2007).

Mississippi's current standards contain a narrative criteria that can be applied to nutrients which states "*Waters shall be free from materials attributable to municipal, industrial, agricultural, or other discharges producing color, odor, taste, total suspended or dissolved solids, sediment, turbidity, or other conditions in such degree as to create a nuisance, render the waters injurious to public health, recreation, or to aquatic life and wildlife, or adversely affect the palatability of fish, aesthetic quality, or impair the waters for any designated use* (MDEQ, 2007)." In the 1999 Protocol for Developing Nutrient TMDLs, EPA suggests several methods for the development of numeric criteria for nutrients (USEPA, 1999). In accordance with the 1999 Protocol, "*The target value for the chosen indicator can be based on: comparison to similar but unimpaired waters; user surveys; empirical data summarized in classification systems; literature values; or professional judgment*." MDEQ believes the most economical and scientifically defensible method for use in Mississippi is a comparison between similar but unimpaired waters within the same region. This method is dependent on adequate data which are being collected in accordance with the current nutrient criteria development plan.

1.5 Nutrient Target Development

Nutrient data were collected quarterly at 99 discrete sampling stations state wide where biological data already existed. These stations were identified and used to represent a range of stream reaches according to biological health status, geographic location (selected to account for ecoregion, bioregion, basin and geologic variability) and streams that potentially receive non-point source pollution from urban, agricultural, and silviculture lands as well as point source pollution from NPDES permitted facilities.

Nutrient concentration data were not normally distributed; therefore, data were log transformed for statistical analyses. Data were evaluated for distinct patterns of various data groupings (stratification) according to natural variability. Only stations that were characterized as "least disturbed" through a defined process in the M-BISQ process (M-BISQ 2003) or stations that resulted in a biological impairment rating of "fully attaining" were used to evaluate natural variability of the data set. Each of these two groups was evaluated separately ("least disturbed sites" and "fully attaining sites). Some stations were used in both sets, in other words, they were considered "least disturbed" and "fully attaining". The number of stations considered "least disturbed" was 30 of 99, and the number of stations considered "fully attaining" was 53 of 99.

Several analysis techniques were used to evaluate nutrient data. Graphical analyses were used as the primary evaluation tool. Specific analyses used included; scatter plots, box plots, Pearson's correlation, and general descriptive statistics.

In general, natural nutrient variability was not apparent based on box plot analyses according to the 4 stratification scenarios. Bioregions were selected as the stratification scheme to use for TMDLs in the Pascagoula Basin. However, this was not appropriate for some water bodies in smaller bioregions. Therefore, MDEQ now uses ecoregions as a stratification scheme for the water bodies in the remainder of the state.

In order to use the data set to determine possible nutrient thresholds, nutrient concentrations were evaluated as to their correlation with biological metrics. That thorough evaluation was completed prior to the Pascagoula River Basin TMDLs. The methodology and approach were verified. The same methodology was applied to the subsequent basins and ecoregions.

For the preliminary target concentration for each ecoregion, the 90th percentile was derived from the mean nutrient value at each site found to be fully supporting of aquatic life support according to the M-BISQ scores.

WATER BODY ASSESSMENT

2.1 Water Quality Data

There are no data available for Coles Creek, segment MS455E.

2.2 Assessment of Point Sources

There are 4 NPDES point sources in the watershed included in the TMDL. Table 5 indicates the existing estimates of loads for these outfalls at the maximum daily load scenario.

Table 5. Loads from Point Sources

Permit	Facility	Flow MGD	TN Load lbs/day	TP Load lbs/day	CBODu lbs/day	NBODu lbs/day	TBODu lbs/day
MS0025984	Fayette POTW, Northeast*	0.208	19.95	9.02	78.06	39.64	117.70
MS0026239	Fayette POTW, Southwest*	0.159	15.25	6.90	59.67	30.30	89.97
MS0027766	Fayette POTW, North*	0.103	9.88	4.47	38.66	19.63	58.28
MS0022501	Sunnyside Subdivision	0.014	1.34	0.61	1.75	1.07	2.82
	Total		**46.42**	**20.99**	**178.14**	**90.63**	**268.78**

*HCR facility

The 3 Fayette POTWs are all hydrograph controlled release systems, or HCRs. They do not discharge when the flow in their receiving stream is less than 10 cfs. The flow given in Table 5 is based on design flow and loadings are based on NPDES permit limits.

2.3 Assessment of Non-Point Sources

Non-point loading of nutrients and organic material in a water body results from the transport of the pollutants into receiving waters by overland surface runoff, groundwater infiltration, and atmospheric deposition. The two primary nutrients of concern are nitrogen and phosphorus. Total nitrogen is a combination of many forms of nitrogen found in the environment. Inorganic nitrogen can be transported in particulate and dissolved phases in surface runoff. Dissolved inorganic nitrogen can be transported in groundwater and may enter a water body from groundwater infiltration. Finally, atmospheric gaseous nitrogen may enter a water body from atmospheric deposition.

Unlike nitrogen, phosphorus is primarily transported in surface runoff when it has been sorbed by eroding sediment. Phosphorus may also be associated with fine-grained particulate matter in the atmosphere and can enter streams as a result of dry fallout and rainfall (USEPA, 1999). However, phosphorus is typically not readily available from the atmosphere or the natural water supply (Davis and Cornwell, 1988). As a result, phosphorus is typically the limiting nutrient in most non-point source dominated rivers and streams, with the exception of watersheds which are dominated by agriculture and have high concentrations of phosphorus contained in the surface runoff due to fertilizers and animal excrement or watersheds with naturally occurring soils which are rich in phosphorus (Thomann and Mueller, 1987).

Watersheds with a large number of failing septic tanks may also deliver significant loadings of phosphorus to a water body. All domestic wastewater contains phosphorus which comes from humans and the use of phosphate containing detergents. Table 9 presents the estimated loads from various land use types in the Coles Creek Basin based on information from USDA ARS Sedimentation Laboratory (Shields, et. al., 2008).

The Coles Creek Basin contains mainly forest but also has different landuse types, including urban, water, scrub/barren, pasture, cropland, and wetlands. The landuse information is based on the National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD). The landuse distribution for the Coles Creek Basin is shown in Table 6 and Figure 3. By multiplying the landuse category size by the estimated nutrient load, the watershed specific estimate can be calculated.



Figure 3. Landuse in the Coles Creek Watershed

2.4 Estimated Existing Load for Total Nitrogen and Total Phosphorus

The average annual flow in the basin was calculated by utilizing the flow vs. area graph shown in Figure 4. All available gages in the Pearl River and South Independent Streams Basins were compared to the watershed size. A very strong correlation between flow and watershed size was developed for the two basins. The equation for the line that best fits the data was then used to estimate the annual average flow for the basin. The TMDL target TN and TP loads were then calculated, using Equation 1 and the results are shown in Table 6.

Figure 4. Drainage Area and Flow in the Pearl River and South Independent Streams Basins



Nutrient Load (lb/day) = Flow (cfs) * 5.394 (conversion factor)* Nutrient Concentration (mg/L) (Equation 1)

Table 6. TMDL Calculations and Watershed Sizes

Water body	**Coles Creek**		Water	Urban	Forest	Scrub/Barren	Pasture	Cropland	Wetland	**Total**
		Acres	1755.14	9187.13	148803.94	30439.18	7443.11	17001.42	20112.72	234742.65
Land Use	**TN kg/mile2**	Percent	0.75	3.91	63.39	12.97	3.17	7.24	8.57	100.00
Forest	111.3	Miles^2 in watershed	2.74	14.35	232.51	47.56	11.63	26.56	31.43	366.79
Pasture	777.2	Flow in cfs based on area	476.38	cfs						
Cropland	5179.9									
Urban	296.4	TN Load kg/mi^2 annual avg	257.40	296.40	111.32	111.32	777.20	5179.90	265.20	
Water	257.4	TP Load kg/mi^2 annual avg	257.40	3.12	62.10	62.10	777.20	2589.90	265.20	
Wetland	265.2									
aquaculture	111.3	TN Load kg/day	1.93	11.66	70.91	14.51	24.76	376.99	22.83	523.60
		TP Load kg/day	1.93	0.12	39.56	8.09	24.76	188.49	22.83	285.80
Land Use	**TP kg/mile2**									
Forest	62.1	TN target concentration	0.70	mg/l						
Pasture	777.2	TP target concentration	0.10	mg/l						
Cropland	2589.9									
Urban	3.1	TN estimated concentration	0.45	mg/l						
Water	257.4	TP estimated concentration	0.25	mg/l						
Wetland	265.2									
aquaculture	62.1	TN target load	1798.72	lbs/day						
		TP target load	256.96	lbs/day						
		TBODu target load	2468.27	lbs/day	based on STREAM model output					
		TN estimated load per day	1154.34	lbs/day						
		TP estimated load per day	630.07	lbs/day						
		TN reduction needed	*NA*							
		TP reduction needed	59.22%							
		TBODu reduction needed	0.0%							

The land use calculations are based on 2004 data. The nutrient estimates are based on USDA ARS. The TMDL targets are based on EPA guidance for calculation of targets when considering all available data.

MODELING PROCEDURE: LINKING THE SOURCES TO THE ENDPOINT

Establishing the relationship between the instream water quality target and the source loading is a critical component of TMDL development. It allows for the evaluation of management options that will achieve the desired source load reductions. The link can be established through a range of techniques, from qualitative assumptions based on sound scientific principles to sophisticated modeling techniques. Ideally, the linkage will be supported by monitoring data that allow the TMDL developer to associate certain water body responses to flow and loading conditions. In this section, the selection of the modeling tools, setup, and model application are discussed.

3.1 Modeling Framework Selection

A mathematical model, STeady Riverine Environmental Assessment Model (STREAM), for DO distribution in freshwater streams was used for developing the TMDL. STREAM is an updated version of the AWFWUL1 model, which had been used by MDEQ for many years. The use of AWFWUL1 is promulgated in the *Wastewater Regulations for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits, Underground Injection Control (UIC) Permits, State Permits, Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations and Water Quality Certification* (MDEQ, 1994). This model has been approved by EPA and has been used extensively at MDEQ. A key reason for using the STREAM model in TMDL development is its ability to assess instream water quality conditions in response to point and non-point source loadings.

STREAM is a steady-state, daily average computer model that utilizes a modified Streeter-Phelps DO sag equation. Instream processes simulated by the model include CBODu decay, nitrification, reaeration, sediment oxygen demand, and respiration and photosynthesis of algae. Figure 6 shows how these processes are related in a typical DO model. Reaction rates for the instream processes are input by the user and corrected for temperature by the model. The model output includes water quality conditions in each computational element for DO, CBODu, and NH_3-N concentrations. The hydrological processes simulated by the model include stream velocity and flow from point sources and spatially distributed inputs.

The model was set up to calculate reaeration within each reach using the Tsivoglou formulation. The Tsivoglou formulation calculates the reaeration rate, K_a (day^{-1} base *e*), within each reach according to Equation 2.

$$\mathbf{K_a = C*S*U} \qquad \textbf{(Eq. 2)}$$

C is the escape coefficient, U is the reach velocity in mile/day, and S is the average reach slope in ft/mile. The value of the escape coefficient is assumed to be 0.11 for streams with flows less than 10 cfs and 0.0597 for stream flows equal to or greater than 10 cfs. Reach velocities were calculated using an equation based on slope. The slope of each reach was estimated with the NHD Plus GIS coverage and input into the model in units of feet/mile.

Figure 5. Instream Processes in a Typical DO Model



3.2 Model Setup

The model for this TMDL includes the §303(d) listed segment of Coles Creek, beginning at the confluence of North and South Fork Creeks. A diagram showing the model setup is shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6. Coles Creek Model Setup (Note: Not to Scale)



The water body was divided into reaches for modeling purposes. Reach divisions were made at locations where there is a significant change in hydrological and water quality characteristics, such as the confluence of a point source or tributary. Within each reach, the modeled segments were divided into computational elements of 0.1 mile. The simulated hydrological and water quality characteristics were calculated and output by the model for each computational element.

The STREAM model was setup to simulate flow and temperature conditions, which were determined to be the critical condition for this TMDL. MDEQ Regulations state that when the flow in a water body is less than 50 cfs, the temperature used in the model is 26°C. The headwater instream DO was assumed to be 85% of saturation at the stream temperature. The instream CBODu decay rate at K_d at 20°C was input as 0.3 day^{-1} (base e) as specified in MDEQ regulations. The model adjusts the K_d rate based on temperature, according to Equation 3.

$$\mathbf{K_{d(T)} = K_{d(20^\circ C)}(1.047)^{T-20}} \qquad \textbf{(Eq. 3)}$$

Where K_d is the CBODu decay rate and T is the assumed instream temperature. The assumptions regarding the instream temperatures, background DO saturation, and CBODu decay rate are required by the *Empirical Stream Model Assumptions for Conventional Pollutants and Conventional Water Quality Models* (MDEQ, 1994). Also based on MDEQ Regulations, the rates for photosynthesis, respiration, and sediment oxygen demand were set to zero because data for these model parameters are not available.

Coles Creek currently has no USGS flow gage. The flow in Coles Creek watershed was modeled at critical conditions based on the 7Q10 calculated using a flow coefficient from the USGS Water-Resources Investigation Report 90-4130 Low-Flow and Flow Duration Characteristics of Mississippi Streams (Telis, 1991).

3.3 Source Representation

Both point and non-point sources were represented in the model. The loads from the NPDES permitted point source was added as a direct input into the appropriate reaches as a flow in MGD and concentration of $CBOD_5$ and ammonia nitrogen in mg/l. Spatially distributed loads, which represent non-point sources of flow, $CBOD_5$, and ammonia-nitrogen were distributed evenly into each computational element of the modeled water body.

Organic material discharged to a stream from an NPDES permitted point source is typically quantified as 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD_5). BOD_5 is a measure of the oxidation of carbonaceous and nitrogenous material over a 5-day incubation period. However, oxidation of nitrogenous material, called nitrification, usually does not take place within the 5-day period because the bacteria that are responsible for nitrification are normally not present in large numbers and have slow reproduction rates (Metcalf and Eddy, 1991). Thus, BOD_5 is generally considered equal to $CBOD_5$. Because permits for point source facilities are written in terms of $CBOD_5$ while TMDLs are typically developed using CBODu, a ratio between the two terms is needed, Equation 4.

$$\mathbf{CBODu = CBOD_5 * Ratio} \qquad \textbf{(Eq. 4)}$$

The CBODu to $CBOD_5$ ratios are given in *Empirical Stream Model Assumptions for Conventional Pollutants and Conventional Water Quality Models* (MDEQ, 1994). These values are recommended for use by MDEQ regulations when actual field data are not available. The value of the ratio depends on the wastewater treatment type.

In order to convert the ammonia nitrogen (NH_3-N) loads to an oxygen demand, a factor of 4.57 pounds of oxygen per pound of ammonia nitrogen (NH_3-N) oxidized to nitrate nitrogen (NO_3-N) was used. Using this factor is a conservative modeling assumption because it assumes that all of the ammonia is converted to nitrate through nitrification. The oxygen demand caused by nitrification of ammonia is equal to the NBODu load. The sum of CBODu and NBODu is equal to the point source load of TBODu. The permitted load of TBODu from the existing point source to be used in the STREAM model is given in Table 7. The model was run with only Sunnyside Subdivision at 7Q10 conditions and again including the HCR facilities at the minimum stream flow for them to discharge, which is 10 cfs.

Table 7. Point Sources, Maximum Permitted Model Inputs

Permit	Facility	Flow MGD	CBODu (lbs/day)	NBODu (lbs/day)	TBODu (lbs/day)
MS0025984	Fayette POTW, Northeast*	0.208	78.06	39.64	117.70
MS0026239	Fayette POTW, Southwest*	0.159	59.67	30.30	89.97
MS0027766	Fayette POTW, North*	0.103	38.66	19.63	58.28
MS0022501	Sunnyside Subdivision	0.014	1.75	1.07	2.82
	Total		**178.14**	**90.63**	**268.78**

*HCR facility

Direct measurements of background concentrations of CBODu were not available for Coles Creek. Because there were no data available, the background concentrations of CBODu and NH_3-N were estimated based on *Empirical Stream Model Assumptions for Conventional Pollutants and Conventional Water Quality Models* (MDEQ, 1994). According to these regulations, the background concentration used in modeling for BOD_5 is 1.33 mg/l and for NH_3-N is 0.1 mg/l. These concentrations were also used as estimates for the CBODu and NH_3-N levels of water entering the water bodies through non-point source flow and tributaries.

Non-point source flows were included in the model to account for water entering due to groundwater infiltration, overland flow, and small, unmeasured tributaries. These flows were estimated based on USGS data for the 7Q10 flow condition in the Coles Creek watershed. The non-point source loads were assumed to be distributed evenly on a river mile basis throughout the modeled reaches.

3.4 Model Calibration

The model used to develop the Coles Creek TMDL was not calibrated due to the limited amount of instream monitoring data collected during critical conditions. Future monitoring is essential to improve the accuracy of the model and the results.

3.5 Model Results

Once the model setup was complete, the model was used to predict water quality conditions in Coles Creek. The model was first run under regulatory load conditions. Under regulatory load conditions, the loads from the NPDES permitted point sources were based on their current location and loads shown in Table 7. The model was run at 7Q10 conditions with only the point source discharge from Sunnyside Subdivision and again including the 3 HCR facilities discharges and adequate stream flow to allow them to discharge.

3.5.1 Regulatory Load Scenario

As shown in the figure, the model predicts that the DO does not go below the standard of 5.0 mg/l using the permit based allowable loads in either the 7Q10 model or the HCR model, thus reductions are not needed to meet the current TMDL. The 7Q10 regulatory load scenario model results are shown in Figure 7 and the HCR regulatory load scenario model results are shown in Figure 8 for the 303(d) listed segment of Coles Creek.



Figure 7. Model Output for DO in Coles Creek, 7Q10 Regulatory Load Scenario



Figure 8. Model Output for DO in Coles Creek, HCR Regulatory Load Scenario

3.5.2 Maximum Load Scenario

The graphs of the 7Q10 regulatory model output and the HCR regulatory model output show that the predicted DO does not fall below the DO standard in Coles Creek during critical conditions. Thus, reductions of the loads of TBODu are not necessary. Calculating the maximum allowable load of TBODu involved increasing the model nonpoint source loads until the modeled DO was above 5.0 mg/l. The increases in nonpoint source loads were made to the 7Q10 regulatory model as it had the lower DO. The maximum load scenario model results are shown in Figure 9 for the 303(d) listed segment of Coles Creek.



Figure 9. Model Output for DO in Coles Creek, Maximum Load Scenario

ALLOCATION

4.1 Wasteload Allocation

The TMDL indicates that reductions are not needed from the point sources. Table 8 gives the wasteload allocation for TBODu. Table 9 gives the wasteload allocation for TN and TP which are 2.6% and 8.2% of the TN and TP TMDLs respectively.

Future permits will be considered in accordance with Mississippi's *Wastewater Regulations for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits, Underground Injection Control (UIC) Permits, State Permits, Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations and Water Quality Certification*(1994).

Table 8. TMDL Loads for TBODu

Permit	Facility	Flow MGD	$CBOD_5$ mg/L	CBODu lbs/day	NH_3-N mg/L	NBODu lbs/day	TBODu lbs/day	% Reduction
MS0025984	Fayette POTW, Northeast	0.208	**30**	**78.06**	**5**	**39.64**	**117.70**	**0**
MS0026239	Fayette POTW, Southwest	0.159	**30**	**59.67**	**5**	**30.30**	**89.97**	**0**
MS0027766	Fayette POTW, North	0.103	**30**	**38.66**	**5**	**19.63**	**58.28**	**0**
MS0022501	Sunnyside Subdivision	0.014	**10**	**1.75**	**2**	**1.07**	**2.82**	**0**
	Total			**178.14**		**90.63**	**268.78**	

Table 9. TMDL Loads for TN and TP

Permit	Facility	Flow MGD	TN (mg/l)	TN Load lbs/day	TP (mg/l)	TP Load lbs/day	% Reduction
MS0025984	Fayette POTW, Northeast	0.208	**11.5**	**19.95**	**5.2**	**9.02**	**0**
MS0026239	Fayette POTW, Southwest	0.159	**11.5**	**15.25**	**5.2**	**6.90**	**0**
MS0027766	Fayette POTW, North	0.103	**11.5**	**9.88**	**5.2**	**4.47**	**0**
MS0022501	Sunnyside Subdivision	0.014	**11.5**	**1.34**	**5.2**	**0.61**	**0**
	Total			**46.42**		**20.99**	

4.2 Load Allocation

Best management practices (BMPs) should be encouraged in the watersheds to reduce potential TBODu, TN, and TP loads from non-point sources. The LA for TN and TP was calculated by subtracting the WLA from the TMDL. The LA for TBODu is shown in Table 10.

For land disturbing activities related to silvaculture, construction, and agriculture, it is recommended that practices, as outlined in "Mississippi's BMPs: Best Management Practices for

Forestry in Mississippi" (MFC, 2000), "Planning and Design Manual for the Control of Erosion, Sediment, and Stormwater" (MDEQ, et. al, 1994), and "Field Office Technical Guide" (NRCS, 2000), be followed, respectively.

Table 10. Load Allocation

	Flow (cfs)	CBODu (mg/L)	CBODu (lbs/day)	NH3-N (mg/L)	NBODu (lbs/day)	TBODu (lbs/day)
Non-point source	**24.47**	**2**	**263.10**	**0.1**	**60.27**	**323.37**

4.3 Incorporation of a Margin of Safety

The margin of safety is a required component of a TMDL and accounts for the uncertainty about the relationship between pollutant loads and the quality of the receiving water body. The two types of MOS development are to implicitly incorporate the MOS using conservative model assumptions or to explicitly specify a portion of the total TMDL as the MOS. The MOS selected for this model is implicit and explicit.

The explicit MOS for this report is the difference between the non-point loads calculated in the maximum load scenario and the background non-point loads from the 7Q10 regulatory model plus the loads from the HCR facilities that were not included in the 7Q10 regulatory model. The background non-point source loads represent an approximation of the loads currently going into Coles Creek at the critical conditions. The maximum non-point source loads are the maximum TBODu loads with a 9.3 increase that allow maintenance of water quality standards. MDEQ has set the MOS as the difference in these loads to account for the uncertainty in the desktop model that was used to develop this TMDL. MDEQ further reduced the MOS by the total load from the HCR facilities as they were not included in the model used to set the maximum non-point source loads. Many assumptions based on regulations and literature values were used. The rate of sediment oxygen demand, for example, was set to zero due to lack of monitoring data. Sediment oxygen demand, however, can be a significant factor in the DO balance of a large water body. The STREAM model is a steady state, daily average model that assumes complete mixing throughout the water column. Due to the uncertainty in the model, MDEQ set a large, explicit MOS, shown in Table 11.
.

Table 11. Calculation of Explicit MOS

	Maximum Non-Point Load	Background Non-Point Load	HCR Load	Margin of Safety
CBODu (lbs/day)	2,005.94	263.10	176.39	1,566.45
NBODu (lbs/day)	459.51	60.27	89.56	309.68
TBODu (lbs/day)	**2,465.45**	**323.37**	**265.96**	**1,876.12**

4.4 Calculation of the TMDL

Equation 1 was used to calculate the TMDL for TP and TN (see Table 6). The target concentration was used with the average flow for the watershed to determine the nutrient TMDLs. The STREAM model was used to calculate the TBODu TMDL. The allocations for TN, TP, and TBODu are given in Table 12. These allocations are established to attain the applicable water quality standards.

Table 12. TMDL Loads

	WLA lbs/day	LA lbs/day	MOS	TMDL lbs/day
Total Nitrogen	**46.42**	**1,752.30**	**Implicit**	**1,798.72**
Total Phosphorous	**20.99**	**235.97**	**Implicit**	**2,56.96**
TBODu	**268.78**	**323.37**	**1,876.12**	**2,468.27**

The nutrient TMDL loads were compared to the estimated existing loads previously calculated. A TN reduction is not indicated by the estimates in Table 6. A 59.2% reduction in TP loading is recommended based on the Land Use Land Cover estimate provided in Table 6. This TP reduction is recommended for the non-point source loads given the low percentage, 8.2%, of the total load attributed to point sources. The same Best Management Practices (BMPs) will control both nutrients. Best management practices are encouraged in this watershed to reduce the nonpoint nutrient loads.

4.5 Seasonality and Critical Condition

This TMDL accounts for seasonal variability by requiring allocations that ensure year-round protection of water quality standards, including during critical conditions.

CONCLUSION

The model results indicate that Coles Creek is meeting water quality standards for dissolved oxygen at the present loading of TBODu. A reduction from the facilities is not necessary to help meet water quality standards. Nutrients were addressed through an estimate of a preliminary TP concentration target and a preliminary TN concentration target.

For the TMDL for TN, no reduction is needed to meet the TN target. For the TMDL for TP, an overall 59.2% reduction is needed to meet the TP target. The implementation of BMP activities should reduce the nutrient loads entering the creek. Best management practices are encouraged in this watershed to reduce the nonpoint nutrient loads.

5.1 Next Steps

MDEQ's Basin Management Approach and Nonpoint Source Program emphasize restoration of impaired waters with developed TMDLs. During the watershed prioritization process to be conducted by the South Indpendent Streams Basin Team, this TMDL will be considered as a basis for implementing possible restoration projects. The basin team is made up of state and federal resource agencies and stakeholder organizations and provides the opportunity for these entities to work with local stakeholders to achieve quantifiable improvements in water quality. Together, basin team members work to understand water quality conditions, determine causes and sources of problems, prioritize watersheds for potential water quality restoration and protection activities, and identify collaboration and leveraging opportunities. The Basin Management Approach and the Nonpoint Source Program work together to facilitate and support these activities.

The Nonpoint Source Program provides financial incentives to eligible parties to implement appropriate restoration and protection projects through the Clean Water Act's Section 319 Nonpoint Source (NPS) Grant Program. This program makes available around $1.6M each grant year for restoration and protections efforts by providing a 60% cost share for eligible projects.

Mississippi Soil and Water Conservation Commission (MSWCC) is the lead agency responsible for abatement of agricultural NPS pollution through training, promotion, and installation of BMPs on agricultural lands. USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) provides technical assistance to MSWCC through its conservation districts located in each county. NRCS assists animal producers in developing nutrient management plans and grazing management plans. MDEQ, MSWCC, NRCS, and other governmental and nongovernmental organizations work closely together to reduce agricultural runoff through the Section 319 NPS Program.

Mississippi Forestry Commission (MFC), in cooperation with the Mississippi Forestry Association (MFA) and Mississippi State University (MSU), have taken a leadership role in the development and promotion of the forestry industry Best Management Practices (BMPs) in Mississippi. MDEQ is designated as the lead agency for implementing an urban polluted runoff control program through its Stormwater Program. Through this program, MDEQ regulates most construction activities. Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOT) is responsible for implementation of erosion and sediment control practices on highway construction.

Due to this TMDL, projects within this watershed will receive a higher score and ranking for funding through the basin team process and Nonpoint Source Program described above.

5.2 Public Participation

This TMDL will be published for a 30-day public notice. During this time, the public will be notified by publication in the statewide newspaper. The public will be given an opportunity to review the TMDLs and submit comments. MDEQ also distributes all TMDLs at the beginning of the public notice to those members of the public who have requested to be included on a TMDL mailing list. Anyone wishing to become a member of the TMDL mailing list should contact Kay Whittington at Kay_Whittington@deq.state.ms.us.

All comments should be directed to Kay_Whittington@deq.state.ms.us or Kay Whittington, MDEQ, PO Box 2261, Jackson, MS 39225. All comments received during the public notice period and at any public hearings become a part of the record of this TMDL and will be considered in the submission of this TMDL to EPA Region 4 for final approval.

REFERENCES

Davis and Cornwell. 1988. *Introduction to Environmental Engineering.* McGraw-Hill.

MDEQ. 2007. *Mississippi's Plan for Nutrient Criteria Development*. Office of Pollution Control.

MDEQ. 2007. *State of Mississippi Water Quality Criteria for Intrastate, Interstate, and Coastal Waters*. Office of Pollution Control.

MDEQ. 1994. *Wastewater Regulations for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits, Underground Injection Control (UIC) Permits, State Permits, Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations and Water Quality Certification.* Office of Pollution Control.

Metcalf and Eddy, Inc. 1991. *Wastewater Engineering: Treatment, Disposal, and Reuse 3rd ed*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

MFC. 2000. *Mississippi's BMPs: Best Management Practices for Forestry in Mississippi*. Publication # 107.

NRCS. 2000. *Field Office Technical Guide Transmittal No. 61*.

Shields, F.D. Jr., Cooper, C.M., Testa, S. III, Ursic, M.E., 2008. *Nutrient Transport in the Yazoo River Basin, Mississippi*. USDA ARS National Sedimentation Labortory, Oxford, Mississippi.

Telis, Pamela A. 1992. *Techniques for Estimating 7-Day, 10-Year Low Flow Characteristics for Ungaged Sites on Water bodys in Mississippi*. U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Investigations Report 91-4130.

Thomann and Mueller. 1987. *Principles of Surface Water Quality Modeling and Control.* New York: Harper Collins.

USEPA. 1997. *Technical Guidance Manual for Developing Total Maximum Daily Loads, Book 2: Streams and Rivers, Part 1: Biochemical Oxygen Demand/Dissolved Oxygen and Nutrients/ Eutrophication*. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, D.C. EPA 823-B-97-002.

USEPA. 1999. *Protocol for Developing Nutrient TMDLs*. EPA 841-B-99-007. Office of Water (4503F), United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington D.C. 135 pp.

USEPA. 2000. Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual Rivers and Streams. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, D.C. EPA-822-B-00-002.