

## **APPENDIX IV**

### **Use Support Data Interpretation and Assessment Methodology**



## APPENDIX IV

### Interpretation of Data

The assessment of water quality presented below involved evaluation of available water quality data to determine a water body's use support rating. In addition, an effort was made to determine likely causes (e.g., sediment or nutrients) and sources (e.g., agriculture, urban runoff, point sources) of pollution for waters that did not support their designated uses (i.e. those found to be either partially or nonsupporting). These data consisted of biological and chemical ratings, reports of citizen complaints, responses to mailings requesting water quality information, land-use reviews of topographic maps, and best professional judgement (see Data Analysis Methodology section for more details). By including best professional judgments (i.e., perceived water quality problems) in deciding the overall water quality ratings and the potential sources of pollution, a much broader, but less precise, picture of water quality conditions in the basin was developed.

Interpretation of these data compiled by DEM should be done cautiously. The methodology used to acquire the numbers must be understood, as does the purpose for which the numbers were generated. The intent of this use-support assessment was to gain an overall picture of the relative contribution made by different categories of pollution within the Catawba River basin. In order to comply with guidance received from EPA to identify likely sources of pollution for all impaired stream mileage, DEM used the data mentioned above.

The data are not intended to provide precise conclusions about pollutant budgets for specific watersheds. Since the assessment methodology is geared toward general conclusions, it is important to not manipulate the data to support policy decisions beyond the accuracy of these data. For example, according to this report, nonpoint source pollution is thought to be the most widespread source of the impairment of water quality. However, this does not mean that there should be no point source control measures. As discussed in previous sections of this chapter, and in Chapter 6, many stream miles in the basin are impacted by point source dischargers, but the degree of impact has not resulted in a partial or nonsupport rating. What is clear from the plan is that all categories of point and nonpoint source pollution have the potential to cause significant water quality degradation if proper controls and practices are not utilized.

This threat to water quality from all types of activities heightens the need for point and nonpoint source pollution control. It is important to not neglect any source (or potential source) of pollution in developing appropriate management and control strategies. Data exist which document water quality problems from every major pollution category that has been considered in this report. Certainly, the potential for further problems remains high as long as the activity in question continues carelessly. Because of this potential, neglecting one pollution source in an overall control strategy can mask the benefits achieved from controlling all other sources.

### Assessment Methodology - Freshwater Bodies

Many types of information were used to make use support assessments and to determine causes and sources of use support impairment. Chemical, physical and biological data as well as wastewater treatment plant self-monitoring data and toxicity data were the primary sources of information used to make use support assessments. Information was also obtained from other agencies, workshops, and pertinent reports.

The most recent water quality chemical data (January 1988 through August 1993) were interpreted for use support utilizing the STAND(ards) program available through the STORET system. The program determines water quality standard violations and computes percentages of the values in

violation based on applicable North Carolina water quality standards. According to EPA guidance, use support determinations based on chemical data are to be made as follows:

**Fully Supporting** - for any one pollutant, criteria exceeded in  $\leq 10\%$  of the measurements,

**Partially Supporting** - for any one pollutant, criteria exceeded in 11- 25% of the measurements, and

**Not Supporting** - for any one pollutant, criteria exceeded in  $> 25\%$  of the measurements.

The following parameters were evaluated in the STAND(ards) program: dissolved oxygen (surface values), temperature, pH, turbidity, fecal coliform bacteria, chlorophyll *a*, ammonia, arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, nickel, mercury, zinc, chloride, fluoride and selenium.

Another valuable source of data used for the report was biological rankings from 1983 through 1992 as determined from benthic macroinvertebrate surveys discussed in section 4.2. The most recent report on these surveys (NCDEHNR, DEM 1991) is available from DEM's Environmental Sciences Branch. Data from North Carolina's Biological Monitoring Ambient Network (BMAN), in addition to special macrobenthic studies were ranked on a five point scale. This scale is based on taxa richness for the three pollution intolerant groups of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera and Trichoptera (EPT).

Collected specimens are identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level. Total species (or taxa) richness values for the EPT groups are calculated and biological classifications assigned to each station (Excellent, Good, Good-fair, Fair or Poor). Higher species richness values are associated with better water quality. For ranking purposes, stations classified as "Poor" with regard to biological data are rated not supporting (NS) and stations classified as "Fair" are rated partially supporting (PS). Stations classified as "Good-Fair" are rated as support-threatened (ST) and those having a Good to Excellent biological classified are rated as supporting their designated uses (S).

Other types of DEM-collected data used to make use support assessments were toxicity data related to discharging facilities, fish tissue and fish community structure data and phytoplankton bloom information. In addition, fish consumption advisories and information from other agencies, workshops held in 1987 and pertinent reports were utilized. In general, stream segments which received a discharge from a facility significantly out of compliance with permit limits or failing their whole effluent toxicity test were rated as support-threatened, unless water quality data indicated otherwise. Streams which had a fish consumption advisory in place were rated as partially supporting. Assessments were made on either a monitored (M) or evaluated (E) basis. A *monitored* basis represents data which are less than five years old. An *evaluated* basis refers to the use of best professional judgment or data older than five years old. Overall ratings were determined for stream segments as follows:

1. *Biological ratings* generally were preferred over any other source of information since they are a direct measurement of aquatic life support.
2. *Chemical ratings* (when biological ratings were unavailable) were preferred over information from older reports or information from workshops.
3. *Workshop "evaluations"* or best professional judgments were preferred over information from older reports.
4. Information from older reports was used when no other information was available.

After overall ratings were assigned, probable sources of pollution (point or nonpoint) for partially supporting and nonsupporting streams were sought. Information on point sources, such as permit compliance records, was reviewed in order to identify major and minor dischargers potentially affecting streams. The Aquatic Toxicology Unit was also consulted to identify facilities known to have toxic effects based on chronic and acute toxicity tests. Information related to nonpoint source

pollution (e.g., agricultural, urban and construction) was obtained from other agencies (federal, state and local), citizens, land-use reviews and best professional judgment.

Causes of use support impairment, such as sedimentation and low dissolved oxygen, were also identified for specific stream segments. For ambient water quality stations, those parameters which exceeded the water quality standard >10% of the time for the review period were included as probable causes. For segments without ambient stations, information from reports, other agencies and best professional judgment were used. In general, facility self-monitoring data and facility aquatic toxicity data were not included in the cause or overall problem parameter column since these data may not reflect instream conditions occurring during the reporting period because they are based on 7Q10 conditions.

Once all monitored and evaluated information was located on water basin maps, remaining "unassessed" streams and segments were evaluated to have the same use-support if they were a direct or indirect tributary to monitored or evaluated segments rated supporting and support-threatened. Partially and nonsupporting segments were not extended. U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5 minute topographic maps (1:26,000 scale) and orthophotoquads were used to determine probable sources for all impaired streams when other sources, such as WWTP compliance data, were insufficient.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that this is essential for ensuring transparency and accountability in the organization's operations.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and tools used to collect and analyze data. It highlights the need for consistent data collection procedures and the use of advanced analytical techniques to derive meaningful insights from the data.

3. The third part of the document focuses on the implementation of data-driven decision-making processes. It discusses how the insights gained from data analysis can be used to inform strategic planning, resource allocation, and operational improvements.

4. The fourth part of the document addresses the challenges and risks associated with data management and analysis. It identifies common pitfalls such as data quality issues, privacy concerns, and the potential for misinterpretation of data, and provides strategies to mitigate these risks.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes by summarizing the key findings and recommendations. It reiterates the importance of a data-driven approach and provides a clear roadmap for the organization to follow in order to maximize the value of its data.