

NEOSHO BASIN TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD

Waterbody: Owl Creek Water Quality Impairment: Fecal Coliform Bacteria

1. INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

Subbasin: Upper Neosho

County: Woodson and Allen

HUC 8: 11070204

HUC 11 (HUC 14s): 040 (010, 020, 030, 040 and 050)

Drainage Area: 203.4 square miles

Main Stem Segments: WQLS: 19 and 21 starting at confluence with the Neosho River in southwestern Allen County and traveling upstream to headwaters in west-central Woodson County (**Figure 1**).

Tributary Segments: WQLS: Bloody Run (25)
Cherry Creek (20)
Plum Creek (22)
Non-WQLS: S. Owl Creek (552)

Designated Uses: Expected Aquatic Life Support and Secondary Contact Recreation for Main Stem Segments 19 and 21

Expected Aquatic Life Support; Secondary Contact Recreation and Food Procurement for Tributary Segment 20. Expected Aquatic Life Support and Secondary Contact Recreation for Tributary Segment 22.

1998 303(d) Listing: Table 1 - Predominant Non-point Source and Point Source Impacts

Impaired Use: Contact Recreation

Water Quality Standard: 2,000 colonies per 100 ml for Secondary (KAR 28-16-28e(c)(7)(C))

2. CURRENT WATER QUALITY CONDITION AND DESIRED ENDPOINT

Level of Support for Designated Use under 1998 303(d): Not Supporting Contact Recreation

Monitoring Sites: Station 610 near Humboldt

Period of Record Used: 1992, 1996 and 2000 for Station 610: Some 2000 and all 2001 Kansas Biological Survey Data (**Figure 2**)

Flow Record: Marmaton River near Marmaton (USGS Station 06917380) matched to Owl Creek watershed for Owl Creek near Humboldt (USGS 07183150).

Long Term Flow Conditions: 10% Exceedance Flows = 63.5 cfs, 95% = 0.9 cfs

Owl Creek Watershed Fecal Coliform Bacteria TMDL HUC and Stream Segment Map




Figure 1




Figure 2

Current Conditions: Since loading capacity varies as a function of the flow present in the stream, this TMDL represents a continuum of desired loads over all flow conditions, rather than fixed at a single value. Sample data for the sampling site were categorized for each of the three defined seasons: Spring (Apr-Jul), Summer-Fall (Aug-Oct) and Winter (Nov-Mar). High flows and runoff equate to lower flow durations; baseflow and point source influences generally occur in the 75-99% range. A Load curve was established for the Secondary Contact Recreation criterion by multiplying the flow values along the curve by the applicable water quality criterion and converting the units to derive a load duration curve of colonies of bacteria per day. This load curves represent the TMDL since any point along the curve represents water quality for the standard at that flow. Historic excursions from the water quality standard are seen as plotted points above the load curve. Water quality standards are met for those points plotting below the load duration curve (**Figure 5**).

Excursions were seen in two of the three defined seasons and are outlined in **Table 1**. Thirteen percent of Spring and 13% of the Winter samples were over the secondary contact criterion. None of the Summer-Fall samples were over the secondary criterion. Overall, 9% of the samples were over the criteria. This would represent a baseline condition of full support of the impaired designated use.

Table 1
NUMBER OF SAMPLES OVER BACTERIA STANDARD OF 2000 BY FLOW AND SEASON

Station	Season	0 to 10%	10 to 25%	25 to 50%	50 to 75%	75 to 90%	90 to 100%	Cum Freq.
Owl Creek near Humboldt (610)	Spring	0	0	0	0	1	0	1/8 = 13%
	Summer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0/7 = 0%
	Winter	1	0	0	0	0	0	1/8 = 13%

Desired Endpoints of Water Quality (Implied Load Capacity) at Site 610 over 2007 - 2011

The ultimate endpoint for this TMDL will be to achieve Kansas Water Quality Standards which fully support Secondary Contact Recreation. The Secondary Contact Recreation standard is measured by a single “not to exceed” criterion of 2,000 colonies per 100 ml. This criterion was used to establish a load duration curve shown in **Figure 5**. It is recognized, however, that the Secondary Contact Recreation criterion will be revised in the future in accordance with national guidance, notably changing the indicator from fecal coliform to *E. coli*. A revised Secondary Contact Recreation TMDL curve will be established in Phase Two of this TMDL to reflect changes in this Standard. For Phase One the endpoint will be to maintain the Secondary Contact Recreation value of 2,000 colonies per 100 ml represented by the load curve shown as the Phase One TMDL figure (**Figure 5**). Monitoring data plotting below the TMDL curve will indicate attainment of the water quality standards.

This endpoint will be reached through the maintenance of current loadings from the various sources in the watershed. Achievement of the endpoint indicates loads are still within the loading capacity of the stream, water quality standards continue to be attained and full support of the designated uses of the stream has been upheld.

3. SOURCE INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT

NPDES: There are two NPDES permitted wastewater dischargers within the watershed (**Figure 3**). These systems are outlined below in **Table 2**.

Table 2

DISCHARGING FACILITY	STREAM REACH	SEGMENT	DESIGN FLOW	TYPE
Yates Center MWTP	S. Owl Creek	552	0.30 mgd	Mech.
Woodson Co. Improvmt Distr.	Plum Creek	22	0.017 mgd	Lagoon

The Woodson County Improvement District relies on a three cell lagoon system with 120 day detention times for treatment of their wastewater. Kansas Implementation Procedures - Waste Water Permitting - indicates this lagoon meets standard design criteria which have been shown to consistently meet or exceed the bacteria standard.

The city of Yates Center is constructing a activated sludge new treatment plant (completion in Fall 2002) with disinfection that will allow that city to meet its permit limits.

The population projection for Yates Center to the year 2020 indicates a slight increase. Projections of future water use and resulting wastewater appear to be within the design flows for of the current system’s treatment capacity. At site 610, excursions from the water quality standards appear to occur under both runoff conditions or higher flows and baseflow conditions. The construction of the new treatment plant at Yates Center should address any future excursions under baseflow conditions. Of significance to point sources are the lack of excursions under low flow in all seasons, especially during winter, therefore point sources can not be seen as a significant cause of water quality violations in the watershed.

Owl Creek Watershed

NPDES Sites and Livestock Waste Management Facilities




Figure 3

Livestock Waste Management Systems: Nine operations are registered, certified or permitted within the watershed. These facilities (swine, dairy or beef) are located either in the upper or lower third of the watershed (Figure 3). One of these facilities is an NPDES permitted, non-discharging beef facility with 3,500 animal units located in the upper third of Owl Creek (segment 21). All permitted livestock facilities have waste management systems designed to minimize runoff entering their operations or detaining runoff emanating from their areas. Such systems are designed to retain the 25 year, 24 hour rainfall/runoff event, as well as an anticipated two weeks of normal wastewater from their operations. Such a rainfall event typically coincides with stream flows which are exceeded less than 1 - 5 percent of the time. Therefore, events of this type, infrequent and of short duration, are not likely to cause chronic impairment of the designated uses of the waters in this watershed. Requirements for maintaining the water level of the waste lagoons a certain distance below the lagoon berms ensures retention of the runoff from these intense, local storm events. In Woodson County, such an event would generate 6.5 inches of rain, yielding 5.3 to 6.1 inches of runoff in a day. Total potential animal units in the watershed for all these facilities is 4,271. The actual number of animal units on site is variable, but typically less than potential numbers.

Owl Creek Watershed

Land Use, Population and Grazing Density




Figure 4

Land Use: Most of the watershed is grassland (64% of the area), cropland (33%), or woodland (4%). The cropland appears to be distributed across the middle third of the watershed. The grazing density estimate is average in the upper and lower ends of the watershed and low in the middle portion of the watershed when compared to densities elsewhere in the Neosho Basin (24-34 animal units/mi²) (**Figure 4**).

On-Site Waste Systems: The watershed's population density is average in the west half and low in the east half of the watershed when compared to densities across the Neosho Basin (5 - 24 person/mi²) (**Figure 4**). The rural population projection for Marion county through 2020 indicates a slight increase. Based on 1990 census data, about 875 households in Woodson County are on septic systems. While failing on-site waste systems can contribute bacteria loadings, their impact on the impaired segments is generally limited, given the small size of the rural population and magnitude of other sources in the watershed.

Background Levels: Some fecal bacteria counts may be associated with environmental background levels, including contributions from wildlife, but it is likely that the density of animals such as deer is fairly dispersed across the watershed resulting in minimal loading to the river below the levels necessary to violate the water quality standards.

4. ALLOCATION OF POLLUTION REDUCTION RESPONSIBILITY

The nature of bacteria loading is too dynamic to assign fixed allocations for wasteloads and non-point loads. Instead, allocation decisions will be made which reflect the expected reduction of bacteria loading under defined flow conditions. These flow conditions will be defined by the presumed ability of point or non-point sources to be the dominant influence on stream water quality. Therefore, the allocation of wasteloads and loads will be made by demarcating the seasonal TMDL curves at a particular flow duration level. Flows lower than that designated flow will represent conditions which are the responsibility of point sources to maintain water quality standards, those flows greater than the designated flow are the responsibility of non-point sources.

Point Sources: Point sources are responsible for maintaining their systems in proper working condition and appropriate capacity to handle anticipated wasteloads of their respective populations. The State and NPDES permits will continue to be issued on 5 year intervals, with inspection and monitoring requirements and conditional limits on the quality of effluent released from these facilities. Ongoing inspections and monitoring of the systems will be made to ensure that minimal contributions have been made by this source.

The city of Yates Center is constructing a new mechanic facility with disinfection to be completed by January 1, 2003. The disinfection aspect of the new facility will address any bacteria permit issue the city may have had in the past.

The Wasteload Allocations will be defined as the product of the 2,000 count bacteria criteria and flows occurring 66-99% of the time (**Figure 5**). Wasteload allocations are established for the low flows conditions which are most susceptible to impact from point source discharges.

Typically, these conditions are deemed to be ten times the combined design flow of the facilities or the 7Q10, whichever is greater. This allocation accounts for future point source loads exerting some impact on the water quality of the stream.

NPDES permitted livestock waste management facilities will also have a Wasteload Allocation of zero, given that these facilities will not discharge to receiving streams throughout the majority of hydrologic conditions, defined by the curve ranging from 5 to 100 percent of the time. Depending on the areal extent of the storm creating a 25 year, 24 hour precipitation event, the associated stream flows would be exceeded less than 1 - 5 percent of the time.

Given the large contributions from both the CAFO bypass and non-point sources, substantial reductions would be necessary. There is a need to maintain zero discharge from CAFOs or state permitted facilities to protect water quality, but under extreme high flow conditions, the ability to retain all the runoff from these feeding areas is hydrologically exceeded. Additionally, the ability of Best Management Practices to reduce non-point source contributions under these conditions to levels where the TMDL might be met is elusive. Fortunately, the frequency of such events is low and their duration short, because of the passing of the high flow crest. Recreation use of the stream is unlikely under these extreme high flow conditions.

Non-Point Sources: Based on the assessment of sources, the distribution of excursions from water quality standards and the relationship of those excursions to runoff conditions, non-point sources are also seen as a significant cause of water quality violations. Background levels are not significant as a cause of the problem. Implementation of non-point source pollution control practices should be taken within one mile of the listed stream segments.

Activities to reduce fecal pollution should be directed toward the smaller, unpermitted livestock operations and rural homesteads and farmsteads along the river. The Load Allocation assigns responsibility for maintaining water quality below the TMDL curve over flow conditions exceeded 66% of the time (greater than 4.9 cfs streamflow) (**Figure 5**). Best Management Practices will be directed toward those activities such that there will be minimal violation of the applicable bacteria criteria at higher flows.

Defined Margin of Safety: Because there will not be a traditional load allocation made for fecal bacteria, the margin of safety will be framed around the desired endpoints of the applicable water quality standards. Therefore, evaluation of achieving the endpoints should use values set 100 counts less than the applicable criteria (1,900 colonies for secondary contact recreation) to mark full support of the recreation designated use of the streams in this watershed. By this definition, the margin of safety is 100 colonies per 100 ml and would be represented by a parallel line lying below the TMDL curve by a distance corresponding to loads associated with 100 colonies per 100 ml.

State Water Plan Implementation Priority: Because the frequency of excursions from the water quality standard is presently less than 10% of samples, this TMDL will be a Medium Priority for implementation.




Figure 5

Unified Watershed Assessment Priority Ranking: This watershed lies within the Upper Neosho Basin (HUC 8: 11070204) with a priority ranking of 19 (High Priority for restoration work).

Priority HUC 11s and Stream Segments: Unless impairment is determined by additional monitoring between 2003- 2007, no priority HUCs or stream segments will be identified.

5. IMPLEMENTATION

Desired Implementation Activities

1. None, unless impairment is determined by additional monitoring between 2003- 2007.

Implementation Programs Guidance

Unless impairment is determined by additional monitoring between 2003- 2007, no direction is needed on implementation programs.

Time frame for Implementation: Conditions will be evaluated based additional on monitoring between 2003- 2007.

Targeted Participants: None, until 2007 evaluation.

Milestone for 2007: The year 2007 marks the midpoint of the ten-year implementation window for the watershed. At that point in time, additional monitoring data from Station 610 will be reexamined to confirm the impaired status of the streams within this watershed. Should the case of impairment be confirmed, source assessment, allocation and implementation activities will ensue.

Delivery Agents: None at this time. Status will be re-evaluated in 2007.

Reasonable Assurances:

Authorities: The following authorities may be used to direct activities in the watershed to reduce pollution.

1. K.S.A. 65-164 and 165 empowers the Secretary of KDHE to regulate the discharge of sewage into the waters of the state.
2. K.S.A. 65-171d empowers the Secretary of KDHE to prevent water pollution and to protect the beneficial uses of the waters of the state through required treatment of sewage and established water quality standards and to require permits by persons having a potential to discharge pollutants into the waters of the state.
3. K.A.R. 28-16-69 to -71 implements water quality protection by KDHE through the establishment and administration of critical water quality management areas on a watershed basis.
4. K.S.A. 2-1915 empowers the State Conservation Commission to develop programs to assist the protection, conservation and management of soil and water resources in the state, including riparian areas.
5. K.S.A. 75-5657 empowers the State Conservation Commission to provide financial assistance for local project work plans developed to control non-point source pollution.
6. K.S.A. 82a-901, *et seq.* empowers the Kansas Water Office to develop a state water plan directing the protection and maintenance of surface water quality for the waters of the state.
7. K.S.A. 82a-951 creates the State Water Plan Fund to finance the implementation of the *Kansas Water Plan*.
8. The *Kansas Water Plan* and the Walnut Basin Plan provide the guidance to state agencies to coordinate programs intent on protecting water quality and to target those programs to geographic areas of the state for high priority in implementation.

Funding: The State Water Plan Fund, annually generates \$16-18 million and is the primary funding mechanism for implementing water quality protection and pollution reduction activities

in the state through the *Kansas Water Plan*. The state water planning process, overseen by the Kansas Water Office, coordinates and directs programs and funding toward watersheds and water resources of highest priority. Typically, the state allocates at least 50% of the fund to programs supporting water quality protection. This watershed and its TMDL is a Medium Priority consideration.

Effectiveness: Improvements in reducing bacteria loading to streams can be accomplished through appropriate management and control systems for livestock waste and on-site waste systems.

6. MONITORING

KDHE will continue to collect bimonthly samples during 2004 at rotational Station 610, over each of the three defined seasons. Based on that sampling, the priority status of 303(d) listing will be evaluated in 2006. Should a case for impaired status develop, the desired endpoints under this TMDL will be refined and direct more intensive sampling may need to be conducted under specified seasonal flow conditions over the period 2007-2011. The manner of evaluation will be consistent with the assessment protocols used to establish the case for impairment in these streams. Following current (1998) Kansas assessment protocols, monitoring will ascertain if less than 10% of samples exceed the applicable criterion at flows under 264 cfs with no samples exceeding the criterion at flows under 49 cfs.

Monitoring of bacteria levels in effluent will be a condition of NPDES and state permits for facilities. This monitoring will continually assess the functionality of the systems in reducing bacteria levels in the effluent released to the streams.

7. FEEDBACK

Public Meetings: Public meetings to discuss TMDLs in the Neosho Basin were held January 9, 2002 in Burlington and March 4, 2002 in Council Grove. An active Internet Web site was established at <http://www.kdhe.state.ks.us/tmdl/> to convey information to the public on the general establishment of TMDLs and specific TMDLs for the Neosho Basin.

Public Hearing: Public Hearings on the TMDLs of the Neosho Basin were held in Burlington and Parsons on June 3, 2002.

Basin Advisory Committee: The Neosho Basin Advisory Committee met to discuss the TMDLs in the basin on October 2, 2001, January 9 and March 4, 2002.

Milestone Evaluation: In 2007, evaluation will be made as to the degree of implementation which has occurred within the watershed and current condition of Owl Creek. Subsequent decisions will be made regarding the implementation approach and follow up of additional implementation in the watershed.

Consideration for 303(d) Delisting: The creek will be evaluated for delisting under Section

303(d), based on the monitoring data over the period 2007-2011. Therefore, the decision for delisting will come about in the preparation of the 2012 303(d) list. Should modifications be made to the applicable water quality criteria during the ten year implementation period, consideration for delisting, desired endpoints of this TMDL and implementation activities may be adjusted accordingly.

Incorporation into Continuing Planning Process, Water Quality Management Plan and the Kansas Water Planning Process: Under the current version of the Continuing Planning Process, the next anticipated revision will come in 2003 which will emphasize implementation of TMDLs. At that time, incorporation of this TMDL will be made into both documents. Recommendations of this TMDL will be considered in *Kansas Water Plan* implementation decisions under the State Water Planning Process for Fiscal Years 2003-2007.