
APPENDIX A

WATERS ASSESSED FOR COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGNATED USES

The attached tables present Georgia's 2008 Integrated 305(b)/303(d) List of Waters. EPD published a public notice on March 30, 2007 soliciting data from any outside sources to be included in the assessment of water quality data for the 2008 305(b)/303(d) List. All available data, including that which was collected by the Department of Natural Resources, were considered and determinations were made for compliance with designated uses. Information as to the specific data sources and an explanation for the various codes used with the 2008 listing assessment are included in the "Data Source Code/Key for Abbreviations" Table that follows this narrative.

Collected data and information were compared against applicable water quality standards to make listing assessment decisions. Substantial changes have been made to the format of Georgia's 2008 305(b)/303(d) List of Waters compared to the presentation provided during earlier listing years. The USEPA has required States to move to a five-part categorization of their waters. The GAEPD adopted the five-part categorization method with the 2008 305(b)/303(d) report. Assessed waters were placed into the five categories as described below:

Category 1 – Data indicate that waters are meeting their designated use(s).

Category 2 – A water body has more than one designated use and data indicate that at least one designated use is being met, but there is insufficient evidence to determine that all uses are being met.

Category 3 – There were insufficient data or other information to make a determination as to whether or not the designated use(s) is being met.

Category 4a – Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met, but TMDL(s) have been completed for the parameter(s) that are causing a water not to meet its use(s).

Category 4b - Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met, but there are actions in place (other than a TMDL) that are predicted to lead to compliance with water quality standards.

Category 4c - Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met, but a pollutant does not cause the impairment.

Category 5 - Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met and TMDL(s) need to be completed for one or more pollutants.

In accordance with Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, the 303(d) list is a list of waters not meeting their uses and for which TMDL(s) have not been completed for the parameter(s) of concern. Once the TMDL is completed, the water may still not be supporting its use; however, it is no longer on the 303(d) list. In the new 5-part categorization method, waters that are assessed as "not supporting" their uses will either be placed in Category 4a, 4b, 4c or 5. Only those waters

in Category 5 make up the federally mandated 303(d) list.

Georgia's 5-part categorized Integrated List of Waters is organized by river basin to aid the public in identifying waters in their local watershed. Water bodies within a river basin are alphabetized and information is provided on the location, data source, designated water use classification, criterion violated, potential cause, estimates of extent affected and the assessment category (1-5). For waters within category 5, an entry in the priority column indicates the proposed year by which a TMDL will be developed for the pollutant of concern. A "Notes" column was also added to the list to provide additional information for some water bodies such listing any TMDLs have been completed.

Another change that occurred with the 2008 List was the merging of the USEPA's assessed waters with GAEPD's assessed waters. The USEPA's list of assessed waters was formerly presented in a separate list in Appendix B in previous editions of the *Water Quality in Georgia* Reports. Beginning with the 2008 List, all waters assessed will be included within the list contained in Appendix A of this report.

In providing the information for the evaluated causes as listed in the tables on the following pages, many potential sources which may have caused the violation of the indicated criterion were considered. These sources are identified as the most likely candidates for affecting a particular stream segment. One potential source may be largely responsible for the criterion violated or the impact may be the result of a combination of sources. The GAEPD is addressing impacts from point and nonpoint sources through a river basin management planning or watershed protection strategy that provides for a holistic approach to addressing identified problems in Georgia's waters.

EPD developed a listing assessment methodology to use in the assessment of State waters. This methodology describes the different types of data that EPD evaluates and explains how the evaluation of the data results in water being placed in one or more of the 5-part categories required by the USEPA for data assessment. A copy of Georgia's 2008 Listing Assessment Methodology is found below.

Georgia's 2008 Integrated 305(b)/303(d) Listing Assessment Methodology

The outline below provides the listing assessment methodology used for the solicitation, review, assessment and consideration in making listing decisions for Georgia's 2008 305(b)/303(d) List of Waters. Each Listing cycle brings new challenges in review and assessment of data. The information that follows is intended as a guide. Where insufficient information or data were available, a best professional judgment approach to making listing decisions was used. The methodology described below is applicable to the 2008 Listing process and will be updated with each biennial List of Waters developed to reflect the most current Listing Guidance provided by the USEPA.

I. Data Solicitation

On March 30, 2007, written notification was accomplished by postal mail or electronic mail to the USEPA, and individuals and/or organizations on the Georgia Environmental Protection Division's (GAEPD's) Watershed Protection Branch's Rules mailing list. The notice provided that the GAEPD was gathering water quality data and information to be used in the assessment for Georgia's draft 2008 305(b)/303(d) List of Waters. Any comments or information were requested by June 30, 2007. The notification included a link to GAEPD's website which includes information as to

the requirements for the submission and acceptance of water quality data for GAEPD's use in 305(b)/303(d) listing assessments.

II. Data Acceptability Requirements

Data submitted from outside sources for 305(b)/303(d) listing assessment purposes were required to comply with Section 391-3-6-.03 of the *Georgia Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control Chapter 391-3-6*. Data used in listing determinations were subject to the Quality Control/Quality Assurance requirements in the Georgia Environmental Protection Division's Quality Assurance Manual and Quality Assurance Project Plan.

III. Data Assessment Period

All available data and information gathered during the calendar years 2005-07 were considered in development of Georgia's 2008 305(b)/303(d) List. In the case of data from core network monitoring sites or where consecutive multiple years of data were available, the assessment considered data from 2002-07. There are instances where GA EPD may choose not to use all years of consecutive data in the assessment of a water body. If there is a case where a local government or group has conducted specific water quality improvement efforts in the watershed of a water body and the data collected before and after the improvement projects provide a clear indication that the project has succeeded in improving water quality, GA EPD may choose only to use data collected after implementation of the water quality improvements. It is the responsibility of the local government or group to submit specific documentation to GA EPD including a description of the improvement project, its location and the date of implementation along with the water quality data supporting the assertion that the project has succeeded.

IV. Data Rounding

Data for a given parameter will be rounded to the same number of significant digits as the criterion for that parameter before the two are compared for the purpose of making listing determinations. Should it be necessary to perform mathematical operations with the data before comparison with the appropriate criterion (such as the calculation of an average of a number of data points), GA EPD will keep extra decimal places throughout the calculations and then round to the appropriate number of decimal places at the end. This practice prevents the propagation of rounding errors throughout the calculation.

V. Placement of Waters into Categories

The U.S. EPA has strongly encouraged States to move to a five-part categorization of their waters. GA EPD committed to adopting the five-part categorization method with the 2008 305(b)/303(d) report. Assessed waters are placed into one or more of five categories as described below:

Category 1 – Data indicate that waters are meeting their designated use(s).

Category 2 – A water has more than one designated use and data indicate that at least one designated use is being met, but there is insufficient evidence to determine that all uses are being met.

Category 3 – There is insufficient data/information to make a determination as to whether or not the designated use(s) is being met.

Category 4a – Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met, but a TMDL(s) has been completed for the parameter(s) that is causing a water not to meet its use(s).

Category 4b - Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met, but there are actions in place (other than a TMDL) that are predicted to lead to compliance with water quality standards.

Category 4c - Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met, but a pollutant does not cause the impairment.

Category 5 - Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met and TMDL(s) needs to be completed for one or more pollutants.

With the movement to the five-category approach, GA EPD will no longer use the “partially supporting” designation. A water body will be assessed as supporting its designated use (Category 1); not supporting its use (Category 4 or 5); or use assessment pending (Category 3). It is possible for a water to be in category 4 and 5 at the same time if it is impaired by more than one pollutant. For instance, if water is impaired due to fecal coliform bacteria and dissolved oxygen and a TMDL has been completed for dissolved oxygen, then the water will be placed in category 4a for dissolved oxygen and category 5 for fecal coliform bacteria.

VI. Listing/Delisting Strategies

The following provides an outline of the Listing/Delisting Strategies employed during the 2008 Listing Assessment. A “preferred minimum data set” is provided for a number of the parameters below. If the quantity of data available is less than the “preferred minimum set” the GA EPD will use best professional judgment to determine if there were sufficient data available to make an assessment of use support or if the water body should be placed in Category 3 until more data are collected. Best Professional Judgment will also be used in cases where data were determined to be suspect or where it did not meet listing review criteria.

A. Fecal Coliform Bacteria: Preferred minimum data set – 4 geometric means (2 collected in winter months and 2 in summer months).

1. Listing –

a. One year of available data (Geometric Mean):

1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting their use designation if one geometric mean out of the data set exceeded water quality criteria.

b. Multiple consecutive years of available data (Geometric Mean):

1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if (a) more than 10% of the geometric means out of the data set exceeded water quality criteria or (b) if 10% of the geometric means exceeded water quality criteria and one or more winter maximum violations occurred in the 30 day data set(s) where the geometric mean met water quality criteria.

c. Single Sample Data: In the absence of sufficient data in a data set to calculate a geometric mean, the USEPA’s Listing Guidance was used to assess bacterial data.

1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if more than 10% of the single samples exceeded the USEPA’s recommended review criteria for bacteria of 400/100ml during the months of May-October, and 4,000/100ml during the months of November-April with the exception of waters classified as “Recreation” where the review criteria was 400/100ml January-December.

2. Delisting –

d. One year of available data:

1. New fecal coliform bacteria data collected during the listing assessment period documenting compliance with water quality criteria in 4 consecutive geometric means and no exceedence of the winter maximum water quality criteria will make this water eligible for delisting for fecal coliform bacteria. Should fewer than 4 geometric means be available for assessment (such as if a monitoring plan calls for less than a full year

of data), GA EPD may consider water eligible for delisting if there are at least two summer geometric means available for assessment.

e. Multiple consecutive years of available data:

1. Fecal coliform bacteria geometric mean data with 10% or less exceedences of the water quality criteria will be eligible for delisting for fecal coliform bacteria.

B. Dissolved Oxygen, pH, Water Temperature: preferred minimum data set - 12 samples in a 12-month period with 1 or 2 samples collected per month.

1. Listing* –

a. One year of available data:

1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if more than 10% of the samples of the data set exceeded water quality criteria

b. Multiple consecutive years of available data:

1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if greater than 10% of the samples of the data set exceeded water quality criteria

* Chapter 391-3-6-.03(7) of the Rules and Regulations for water quality control recognizes that some waters of the State “naturally” will not meet the instream criteria in the Rules and that this situation does not constitute a violation of water quality standards. Many waters in Georgia, specifically areas in South Georgia and near the Coast, have “natural” dissolved oxygen concentrations below the State’s standard dissolved oxygen criteria (daily average of 5.0 mg/l and an instantaneous minimum of 4.0 mg/l). If a water body is found to have greater than a 10% exceedence rate of the standard DO criteria and the water body is located in an area of the State where it is anticipated that the low dissolved oxygen condition is natural, then EPD will place the water in Category 3 until work is completed which establishes the “natural” dissolved oxygen concentration for the water body. The measured dissolved oxygen data will then be compared with the “natural” dissolved oxygen concentration and an assessment will be made as to whether the water body is meeting its use.

2. Delisting –

a. Dissolved Oxygen - One year or multiple consecutive years of available data:

1. New data with 10% or less exceedences of the water quality criteria will be eligible for delisting.
2. For those segments where a dissolved oxygen TMDL has been approved and a natural dissolved oxygen concentration was established, GA EPD will compare the dissolved oxygen data with the natural dissolved oxygen concentration established in the TMDL. If no violations of the natural dissolved oxygen concentration occurred, the segment would be eligible for delisting.

b. Water Temperature, pH - One year or multiple consecutive years of available data:

1. New data with 10% or less exceedences of the water quality criteria will be eligible for delisting.
2. For those segments that have been identified as black water streams through mapping and data assessments and were identified as not having land use or point source issues, waters were not listed for the pH criterion.

C. Metals: preferred minimum data set – 2 samples in a 12 month period (1 winter, 1 summer)

1. Listing –

- a. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if one sample exceeded the acute criteria in a three-year period or if more than one sample in three years exceeded the chronic criteria.

2. Delisting –

- a. New data where no exceedences of the acute criteria occurred and no more than one exceedence of the chronic criteria occurred in three years.

D. Priority Pollutant/Organic Chemicals: preferred minimum data set – 2 samples in a 12 month period (1 winter, 1 summer)

1. Listing –
 - a. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if more than one sample exceeded the criteria in a three-year period.
2. Delisting –
 - a. New data where no more than one exceedence of the criteria occurred in a three-year period.

E. Toxicity:

1. Listing –
 - a. Acute or Chronic toxicity tests conducted on municipal or industrial effluent samples and receiving waters – Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if:
 1. Effluent and/or receiving waters toxicity test(s) predicted in-stream toxicity at critical 7Q10 low stream flow. If multiple effluent tests are available for review during the assessment period and only one test predicted in-stream toxicity at critical 7Q10 low stream flow, GA EPD will use Best Professional Judgment to assess whether the one test indicating toxicity was an anomaly or was representative of the facility's discharge;
2. Delisting –
 - a. New data with passing facility WET test(s) if listing originated based on effluent toxicity test results will be eligible for delisting.
 - b. New data with passing receiving waters acute and/or chronic toxicity test(s) if listing originated based on stream toxicity test results will be eligible for delisting.

F. Fish/Shellfish Guidelines:

1. Listing –
 - a. All Fish Tissue Except Mercury:
 1. Water bodies are determined not to be supporting use designation if the State's fish consumption guidelines document recommends that consumption needs to be limited or if no consumption is recommended.
 - b. Fish Tissue Mercury:
 1. Mercury in fish tissue was assessed and a segment or water body was determined not to be supporting its use designation if the Trophic-Weighted Residue Value (as described in the October 19, 2001 GA EPD "Protocol"), was in excess of the USEPA water quality criterion of 0.3 mg/kg (*Water Quality Criterion for the Protection of Human Health: Methyl mercury*, EPA-823-R-01-001, January 2001), which was adopted as a human health criteria in the Georgia Rules in December 2002. The USEPA criteria represents a national approach to address what mercury levels is protective of human health for fishing waters.
2. Delisting –
 - a. Waters where new fish tissue consumption data indicate there are no consumption restrictions and fish can be consumed in unlimited amounts will be eligible for delisting.
 - b. Waters where new fish tissue data with calculated Trophic-Weighted Residue Values for mercury less than or equal to 0.3 mg/kg wet weight total will be eligible for delisting.

G. Biotic Data (Fish Bioassessments):

1. Listing – Water bodies were assessed for Fish Bioassessments based on Fish Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) data.
 - a. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if the IBI rankings were poor or very poor.
 2. Delisting –
-

-
- a. Water bodies where new Fish IBI rankings of Excellent, Good, or Fair will be eligible for delisting.

H. Biotic Data (Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments):

- 1. Listing – Water bodies were assessed for Benthic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments based on a multi-metric index.
 - a. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if the narrative rankings were “poor” or “very poor”.
 - b. If the narrative ranking was “fair”, then the water was placed in Category 3.
- 2. Delisting –
 - a. Water bodies where new narrative rankings were determined to be “very good” or “good” will be eligible for delisting.

I. Lake-Specific Lake Criteria Data (6 major lakes, monitored annually):

- 1. Listing –
 - a. Chlorophyll a (lake stations): The last five calendar years of chlorophyll a data collected at each site-specific lake criteria station are assessed.
 - 1. If during the five-year assessment period, the average exceeds the site-specific growing season criteria 2 (or more) out of the 5 years, the lake area representative for that station is assessed as not supporting designated uses. If the average exceeds the site-specific growing season criteria for 1 out of 5 years, the water will be placed in Category 3.
 - b. Total Nitrogen (lake stations): The last five calendar years of total nitrogen concentrations collected at each site-specific lake criteria station are assessed.
 - 1. If greater than 10% of the total nitrogen values exceed the site-specific criteria, the lake area representative for that station is assessed as not supporting designated uses.
 - c. Fecal Coliform: as in A.1. Above.
 - d. Dissolved Oxygen, pH, Water Temperature: as in B.1. Above.
 - e. Major Lake Tributary Annual Total Phosphorous Loading Criteria: The last five calendar years of available total phosphorous annual loadings data collected at each site-specific major lake tributary standard station are assessed.
 - 1. If the average of the annual total phosphorous loadings exceeds the site-specific criteria, the site is assessed as not supporting designated uses.
 - f. Major Lake Annual Total Phosphorous Loading Criteria: The last five calendar years of available total phosphorous annual loadings data are assessed.
 - 1. If the average of the annual total phosphorous loadings exceeds the site-specific criteria, the site is assessed as not supporting designated uses.
 - 2. Delisting –
 - a. Chlorophyll a (lake stations): The last five calendar years of chlorophyll a data collected at each site-specific lake standard station are assessed.
 - 1. If during the five-year assessment period, there is no chlorophyll a growing season averages exceeding the site-specific growing season criteria, the lake area representative for that station will be eligible for delisting.
 - b. Total Nitrogen (lake stations): The last five calendar years of total nitrogen concentrations collected at each site-specific lake standard station are assessed.
 - 1. If 10% or less of the total nitrogen values exceed the site-specific criteria, the lake area representative for that station is eligible for delisting.
 - c. Fecal Coliform: as in A.2. Above.
 - d. Dissolved Oxygen, pH, Water Temperature: as in B.2. Above.
 - e. Major Lake Tributary Annual Total Phosphorous Loading Criteria: The last five calendar years of available total phosphorous annual loadings data collected at each site-specific major lake tributary standard station are assessed.
-

-
1. If the average of the annual total phosphorous loadings does not exceed the site-specific criteria, the site is assessed as fully supporting designated uses and is eligible for delisting.
 - f. Major Lake Annual Total Phosphorous Loading Criteria: The last five calendar years of available total phosphorous annual loadings data are assessed.
 1. If the average of the annual total phosphorous loadings does not exceed the site-specific criteria, the site is assessed as fully supporting designated uses and is eligible for delisting.

J. Enterococci Data Collected under the BEACH Act:

1. Listing –

- a. Monthly Samples: An annual geometric mean is calculated for each year using Enterococci data from the Recreational Season (May – October).
 1. If there are five consecutive years of annual geometric means available for assessment, a beach is assessed as not supporting its use designation if more than one annual geometric mean exceeds the criterion (35/100 ml). If there are fewer than five consecutive years of data available for assessment, a beach is assessed as not supporting its use designation if at least one annual geometric mean exceeds the criterion. Currently, the maximum number of annual geometric means for any beach is three.
- b. Weekly Samples: Rolling geometric means are calculated using data from all months (not just the Recreational Season).
 1. Beaches are determined not to be supporting their designated use if more than 10% of the geometric means exceeded the criterion.
- c. Mixture of Monthly and Weekly Samples
 1. If during the last five years, data were collected monthly some years and weekly other years, then GA EPD will assess each data type separately as described above. If both the monthly and weekly data types indicate that a beach is not in compliance with the Enterococci criterion as described above, then the beach is assessed as not supporting its use. If the monthly and weekly data types support different listing decisions, then GA EPD will use its best professional judgment in making the listing determination. Generally, more weight will be placed on the weekly data and on the most recent data set.

2. Delisting –

- a. Monthly Samples: An annual geometric mean was calculated for each year using Enterococci data from the Recreational Season (May – October).
 1. If there were five consecutive years of annual geometric means available for assessment and one or fewer annual geometric means exceeded the criterion, the beach will be eligible for delisting. If there were fewer than five consecutive years of data available for assessment, a beach will be eligible for delisting if none of the annual geometric means exceeded the criterion.
- b. Weekly Samples: Rolling geometric means were calculated using data from all months (not just the Recreational Season).
 1. If 10% or less of the geometric means exceeded the criterion, the beach is eligible for delisting.
- c. Mixture of Monthly and Weekly Samples
 1. If during the last five years, data were collected monthly some years and weekly other years, then GA EPD will assess each data type separately as described above. If both the monthly and weekly data types indicate that a beach is in compliance with the Enterococci criterion as described above, then the beach will be eligible for delisting.

VII. Priorities for Action:

Section 303(d)(1) of the Clean Water Act requires each state to “establish a priority ranking” for the segments it identifies on the 303(d) list (i.e. those waters in Category 5). This ranking is to take into account the severity of the pollution and the uses to be made of such segments. The State is to establish TMDLs in accordance with the priority ranking. States are given considerable flexibility in establishing its ranking system. Georgia has implemented a basin rotation approach when it comes to monitoring waters, establishing TMDLs and permitting. GA EPD has chosen to implement the priority ranking by indicating the year in which the TMDL for each segment on the 303(d) list will be drafted. The establishment date generally follows the basin rotation schedule. There are some cases where GA EPD may choose to draft a TMDL outside of the basin rotation schedule. Factors influencing this decision could include the severity of the pollution and whether development of the TMDL may require additional data collection and complex analysis. TMDLs are typically finalized sometime during the year after they are proposed.

Georgia is anticipating that a State-wide Water Plan will be adopted into law in the near future. Implementation of this Water Plan may require EPD to shift resources for a time; therefore, the development of TMDLs could temporarily slow down. The dates provided in the “priority” column reflect this possibility. EPD will strive to complete TMDLs before the dates in the “priority” column as resources allow. All dates provided are within the 13-year timeframe that is allowed for TMDL development as provided in the US EPA 1997 Interpretative Guidance for the TMDL Program. This guidance states that States should develop schedules for establishing TMDLs expeditiously, generally within 8-13 years of being listed.

Data Source Code/ Key for Abbreviations

State Agencies		Other	
1	= DNR-EPD, Watershed Planning & Monitoring Program	28	= Georgia Power Company
2	= DNR-EPD, Permitting Comp. & Enf. Program (municipal)	29	= Oglethorpe Power Company
3	= DNR-EPD, Permitting Comp. & Enf. Program (industrial)	30	= South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
55	= DNR-EPD, Brunswick Coastal District	32	= Jones Ecological Research Center
56	= DNR-EPD, Hazardous Waste Mgmt. Branch	39	= St. Johns River Water Mgmt. District
58	= DNR, Georgia Parks Recreation & Historic Sites Division	45	= Georgia Ports Authority
59	= DNR-EPD, Ambient Monitoring Unit (Macroinvertebrate Team)	46	= Chattahoochee/Flint RDC
4	= DNR, Wildlife Resources Division	47	= Upper Etowah Adopt-A-Stream
5	= DNR, Coastal Resources Division	48	= Middle Flint RDC
6	= State University of West Georgia	49	= Central Savannah RDC
7	= Gainesville College	52	= Heart of Georgia RDC
8	= Georgia Institute of Technology	54	= Southwire Company
31	= South Carolina DHEC	57	= Ellijay High School
33	= Alabama DEM	61	= Tyson Foods, Inc.
35	= Kennesaw State University		
36	= University of Georgia		
Federal Agencies		Criterion Violated Codes	
9	= U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	As	= Arsenic
10	= U.S. Geological Survey	Bio F	= Biota Impacted (Fish Community)
11	= U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Bio M	= Biota Impacted (Macroinvertebrate Community)
12	= U.S. Forest Service	Cd	= Cadmium
13	= Tennessee Valley Authority	CN	= Cyanide
		Cr	= Chromium
		Cu	= Copper
		1,1-DCE	= 1,1- Dichloroethylene
		DO	= Dissolved Oxygen
		CFB	= Commercial Fishing Ban
		FC	= Fecal Coliform Bacteria
		FCG	= Fish Consumption Guidance
		Hg	= Mercury
		Ni	= Nickel
		Pb	= Lead
		PCE	= Tetrachloroethylene
		SB	= Shellfishing Ban
		Se	= Selenium
		Temp	= Temperature
		TCA	= 1,1,2 - Trichloroethane
		Tox	= Toxicity Indicated
		TWR	= Trophic-Weighted Residue Value of mercury in fish tissue exceeding the EPD human health standard of 0.3 mg/kg
		Zn	= Zinc
Local Agencies		Potential Cause Codes	
14	= Cobb County	CSO	= Combined Sewer Overflow
15	= DeKalb County	I1	= Industrial Facility Point source
16	= Douglas County Water & Sewer Authority	I2	= Industrial Facility Non-point source
17	= Fulton County	MA	= Marina
18	= Gwinnett County	M	= Municipal Facility
19	= City of Clayton	NP	= Nonpoint Source/Unknown Source
20	= City of Gainesville	UR	= Urban Runoff/Urban Effects
21	= City of LaGrange	SB	= Shellfish Ban
22	= Georgia Mountains RDC		
23	= City of Conyers		
34	= City of College Park		
37	= Columbus Water Works		
38	= Columbus Unified Government		
40	= Town of Trion		
41	= Cherokee County		
42	= Clayton County Water Authority		
43	= City of Atlanta		
44	= City of Cartersville		
50	= Chatham County		
51	= City of Savannah		
53	= City of Augusta		
60	= Forsyth County		
Contracted Clean Lakes Studies			
24	= Lake Allatoona (Kennesaw State University)		
25	= Lake Blackshear (Lake Blackshear Watershed Assoc.)		
26	= Lake Lanier (University of Georgia)		
27	= West Point (LaBrange College/Auburn University)		

