
In This Section

- Assessment of Water Quantity
- Assessment of Water Quality

Section 5

Assessments of Water Quantity and Quality

This section provides an evaluation of the current conditions in the Suwannee River basin, in terms of both water quantity (Section 5.1) and water quality (Section 5.2) issues. The assessment results are then combined with the evaluation of environmental stressors from Section 4 to produce a listing of Concerns and Priority Issues in Section 6.

5.1 Assessment of Water Quantity

General information about water quantity issues in the Suwannee basin is taken from the Georgia Environmental Protection Water Availability and Use Report, Coastal Plain River Basins, The Regional Economic Forecast of Population and Employment Comprehensive Study, Volume 1, and updated from other Georgia Environmental Protection Division sources where available.

5.1.1 Municipal and Industrial Water Uses

Water use in the basin is almost exclusively groundwater for municipal and industrial supplies.

Overview of Surface Public Water Systems

Most surface water system plants, in the State of Georgia, are facilities that utilize conventional treatment which includes coagulation, flocculation, sedimentation, filtration, and disinfection. There are a number of small package plants which use the same treatment but on a smaller scale. Intakes located in urban areas with upstream development or in rural areas with large amounts of agriculture upstream have higher amounts of sediments (turbidity) in the rivers, streams and creeks that provide the raw surface water. These waters are prone to sudden erosion and sedimentation problems, also known as flashing, during hard rain storms which increases the amount of sediment (dirt, mud, and sand) in the water. Water with excess sediment or turbidity can clog intakes (also known as muddying) and filters requiring more sophisticated treatment and

higher cost. Many plants have reservoirs to store large amounts of water and to settle out excess sediment (turbidity). Often taste and odor problems come from a natural sources of iron and manganese or algae blooms in shallow surface water. However, algae blooms can also indicate an increase in the level of nutrients in the water. There are no drinking water plants located in this basin and no known potential raw water quality problems.

5.1.2 Recreation

Recreation activities in this basin includes boating, swimming, fishing and picnicking.

5.1.3 Hydropower

There are no hydropower facilities in the Suwannee basin.

5.1.4 Navigation

There is no commercial navigation in the Suwannee basin.

5.1.5 Waste Assimilation Capacity

Water quality, wastewater treatment, and wastewater discharge permitting are addressed in Section 4. However, it should be noted that the guidelines for discharge of treated effluent into the rivers and streams of the Suwannee River basin assume that sufficient surface water flow will be available to assimilate waste and ensure that water quality criteria will be met.

5.1.6 Assessment of Ground Water

At present, sufficient quantities of groundwater remain available for users in the Suwannee basin in Georgia. There are no general policy limits on new groundwater permits throughout the basin, even though most users are withdrawing water from the troubled Floridan aquifer. Agricultural irrigation withdrawals are the main use of groundwater.

Problems have been noted with the Floridan aquifer in the nearby Flint River basin to the west and in the entire coastal area to the east. EPD has had to implement severe policy restrictions on Floridan aquifer users in both these contiguous areas. Such limiting policies are not soon anticipated for the Suwannee river basin, though initial groundwater studies are being planned.

Localized water quantity problems have been noticed in the turf grass irrigation areas of Worth, Turner and Tift counties, and with the groundwater users in the Valdosta area of Lowndes County. During the current drought, many wells have gone dry. There are also general water quality problems with the Floridan aquifer in select areas throughout the southern basin, where the Floridan aquifer is in direct connection, through sinkholes and river beds, with surface water. This has been a factor in the Valdosta area.

5.2 Assessment of Water Quality

This assessment of water quality is generally consistent with Georgia's water quality assessments for CWA Section 305(b) reporting to EPA. It begins with a discussion of (1) water quality standards, (2) monitoring programs, and (3) data analyses to assess compliance with water quality standards and determine use support. Following this introductory material, detailed assessment results by subbasin are presented in Section 5.2.4.

5.2.1 Water Quality Standards

Assessment of water quality requires a baseline for comparison. A statewide baseline is provided by Georgia's water quality standards, which contain water use classifications, numeric standards for chemical concentrations, and narrative requirements for water quality.

Georgia's water use classifications and standards were first established by the Georgia Water Quality Control Board in 1966. The water use classification system was applied to interstate waters in 1972 by EPD. Table 5-1 provides a summary of water use classifications and basic water quality criteria for each water use. Georgia also has general narrative water quality standards, which apply to all waters. These narrative standards are summarized in Table 5-2.

In addition to the basic water quality standards shown above, Congress made changes in the Clean Water Act in 1987 which required each state to adopt numeric limits for toxic substances for the protection of aquatic life and human health. In order to comply with these requirements, in 1989 the Board of Natural Resources adopted 31 numeric standards for protection of aquatic life and 90 numeric standards for the protection of human health. Appendix B provides a complete list of the toxic substance standards that apply to all waters in Georgia. Georgia has adopted all numeric standards for toxic substances promulgated by the USEPA. Georgia is also developing site-specific standards for major lakes where control of nutrient loading is required to prevent problems associated with eutrophication.

Table 5-1. Georgia Water Use Classifications and Instream Water Quality Standards for Each Use

Use Classification	Bacteria (fecal coliform)		Dissolved Oxygen (other than trout streams) ¹		pH	Temperature (other than trout streams) ¹	
	30-Day Geometric Mean ² (MPN/100 ml)	Maximum (MPN./100 ml)	Daily Average (mg/l)	Minimum (mg/l)		Maximum Rise (°F)	Maximum (°F)
Drinking Water requiring treatment	1,000 (Nov-April) 200 (May-Oct)	4,000 (Nov-April)	5.0	4.0	6.0-8.5	5	90
Recreation	200 (Freshwater) 100 (Coastal)	--	5.0	4.0	6.0-8.5	5	90
Fishing Coastal Fishing ³	1,000 (Nov-April) 200 (May-Oct)	4,000 (Nov-April)	5.0	4.0	6.0-8.5	5	90
Wild River	No alteration of natural water quality						
Scenic River	No alteration of natural water quality						

1 Standards for Trout Streams for dissolved oxygen are an average of 6.0 mg/l and a minimum of 5.0 mg/l. No temperature alteration is allowed in Primary Trout Streams and a temperature change of 2EF is allowed in Secondary Trout Streams.

2 Geometric means should be "based on at least four samples collected from a given sampling site over a 30-day period at intervals not less than 24 hours." The geometric mean of a series of N terms is the Nth root of their product. Example: the geometric mean of 2 and 18 is the square root of 36.

3 Standards are same as fishing with the exception of dissolved oxygen which is site specific.

Table 5-2. Georgia Narrative Water Quality Standards for All Waters (Excerpt from Georgia Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control Chapter 391-3-6-.03 - Water Use Classifications and Water Quality Standards)

- (5) General Criteria for All Waters. The following criteria are deemed to be necessary and applicable to all waters of the State:
- (a) All waters shall be free from materials associated with municipal or domestic sewage, industrial waste or any other waste which will settle to form sludge deposits that become putrescent, unsightly or otherwise objectionable.
 - (b) All waters shall be free from oil, scum and floating debris associated with municipal or domestic sewage, industrial waste or other discharges in amounts sufficient to be unsightly or to interfere with legitimate water uses.
 - (c) All waters shall be free from material related to municipal, industrial or other discharges which produce turbidity, color, odor or other objectionable conditions which interfere with legitimate water uses.
 - (d) All waters shall be free from toxic, corrosive, acidic and caustic substances discharged from municipalities, industries or other sources, such as nonpoint sources, in amounts, concentrations or combinations which are harmful to humans, animals or aquatic life.
 - (e) All waters shall be free from turbidity which results in a substantial visual contrast in a waterbody due to man-made activity. The upstream appearance of a body of water shall be observed at a point immediately upstream of a turbidity-causing man-made activity. The upstream appearance shall be compared to a point which is located sufficiently downstream from the activity so as to provide an appropriate mixing zone. For land disturbing activities, proper design, installation and maintenance of best management practices and compliance with issued permits shall constitute compliance with [this] Paragraph...
-

5.2.2 Surface Water Quality Monitoring

EPD's monitoring program integrates physical, chemical, and biological monitoring to provide information for water quality and use attainment assessments and for basin planning. EPD monitors the surface waters of the state to:

- collect baseline and trend data,
- document existing conditions,
- study impacts of specific discharges,
- determine improvements resulting from upgraded water pollution control plants,
- support enforcement actions,
- establish wasteload allocations for new and existing facilities,
- verify water pollution control plant compliance,
- document water use impairment and reasons for problems causing less than full support of designated water uses, and
- develop Total Maximum Daily Loads.

EPD used a variety of monitoring tools to collect information for water quality assessments and basin planning. These tools include trend monitoring, intensive surveys, lake, coastal, biological, fish tissue, toxic substance monitoring, and facility compliance sampling. Each of these is briefly described in the following sections.

Trend Monitoring

Long term monitoring of streams at strategic locations throughout Georgia, trend or ambient monitoring, was initiated by EPD during the late 1960s. This work was and

continues to be accomplished to a large extent through cooperative agreements with federal, state, and local agencies who collect samples from groups of stations at specific, fixed locations throughout the year. The cooperating agencies conduct certain tests in the field and send stream samples to EPD for additional laboratory analyses. Although there have been a number of changes over the years, routine chemical trend monitoring is still accomplished through similar cooperative agreements.

Today EPD contracts with the United States Geological Survey (USGS) for the majority of the trend sampling work. In addition to monthly stream sampling, a portion of the work with the USGS involves continuous monitoring at several locations across the state. EPD associates also collect water and sediment samples for toxic substance analyses, as well as macroinvertebrate samples to characterize the biological community at selected locations as a part of the trend monitoring effort. WRD associates assess fish communities as a part of the monitoring effort. Additional samples used in the assessment were collected by other federal, state and local governments, universities, contracted Clean Lakes projects and utility companies.

Focused Monitoring in the Suwannee River Basin

In 1995, EPD adopted and implemented significant changes to the strategy for trend monitoring in Georgia. The changes were implemented to support the River Basin Management Planning program. The number of fixed stations statewide was reduced in order to focus resources for sampling and analysis in a particular group of basins in any one year in accordance with the basin planning schedule. Sampling focus was placed on the Ochlockonee, Suwannee, Satilla, St. Marys River basins during the 1998.

Figure 5-1 shows the focused monitoring network for the Suwannee River basin used in 1998. During this period statewide trend monitoring was continued at a number of station locations statewide and at continuous monitoring locations. The remainder of the trend monitoring resources were devoted to the Ochlockonee, Suwannee, Satilla, and St. Marys River basins. As a result, more sampling was conducted in the focus river basins. Increasing the resolution of the water quality monitoring improves the opportunity to identify impaired waters, as well as the causes of impairment.

Intensive Surveys

Intensive surveys complement long-term fixed station monitoring to focus on a particular issue or problem over a shorter period of time. Several basic types of intensive surveys are conducted, including model calibration surveys and impact studies. The purpose of a model calibration survey is to collect data to calibrate a mathematical water quality model. Models are used for wasteload allocations and/or TMDLs and as tools for use in making regulatory decisions. Impact studies are conducted when information on the cause-and-effect relationships between pollutant sources and receiving waters is needed. In many cases biological information is collected along with chemical data for use in assessing environmental impacts.

Lake Monitoring

EPD has maintained monitoring programs for Georgia's public access lakes for many years. In the late 1960s, a comprehensive statewide study was conducted to assess fecal coliform levels at public beaches on major lakes in Georgia as the basis for water use classifications and establishment of water quality standards for recreational waters. In 1972, EPD staff participated in the USEPA National Eutrophication Survey, which included 14 lakes in Georgia. A postimpoundment study was conducted for West Point Lake in 1974. Additional lake monitoring continued through the 1970s. The focus of these studies was primarily problem/solution-oriented and served as the basis for regulatory decisions. In the 1990s, EPD conducted Clean Lakes Phase I Diagnostic –




Figure 5-I. Suwannee River Basin Trend Monitoring Network Station Locations

Feasibility studies on several major lakes. The study results were used as the basis for establishing lake-specific water quality standards.

Trophic Condition Monitoring

In 1980-1981, EPD conducted a statewide survey of public access freshwater lakes. The study was funded in part by USEPA Clean Lakes Program funds. The survey objectives were to identify freshwater lakes with public access, assess each lake's trophic condition, and develop a priority listing of lakes as to need for restoration and/or protection. In the course of the survey, data and information were collected on 175 identified lakes in 340 sampling trips. The data collected included depth profiles for dissolved oxygen, temperature, pH, specific conductance, and Secchi disk transparency and chemical analyses for chlorophyll *a*, total phosphorus, nitrogen compounds, and turbidity.

Fish Tissue Monitoring

The DNR conducts fish tissue monitoring for toxic chemicals and issues fish consumption guidelines as needed to protect human health. It is not possible for the DNR to sample fish from every stream and lake in the state. However, high priority has been placed on the 26 major reservoirs which make up more than 90 percent of the total lake acreage. These lakes will continue to be sampled as part of the River Basin Management Planning 5-year rotating schedule to track trends in fish contaminant levels. The DNR has also made sampling fish in rivers and streams down-stream of urban and/or industrial areas a high priority. In addition, DNR will focus attention on areas which are frequented by a large number of anglers.

The program includes testing of fish tissue samples for the substances listed in Table 5-3. Of the 43 constituents tested, only PCBs, chlordane, and mercury have been found in fish at concentrations which could create risk to human health from fish consumption.

Table 5-3. Parameters for Fish Tissue Testing

Antimony	a-BHC	Heptachlor
Arsenic	b-BHC	Heptachlor Epoxide
Beryllium	d-BHC	Toxaphene
Cadmium	g-BHC (Lindane)	PCB-1016
Chromium, Total	Chlordane	PCB-1221
Copper	4,4-DDD	PCB-1232
Lead	4,4-DDE	PCB-1242
Mercury	4,4-DDT	PCB-1248
Nickel	Dieldrin	PCB-1254
Selenium	Endosulfan I	PCB-1260
Silver	Endosulfan II	Methoxychlor
Thallium	Endosulfan Sulfate	HCB
Zinc	Endrin	Mirex
Aldrin	Endrin Aldehyde	Pentachloroanisole
		Chlorpyrifos

The test results have been used to develop consumption guidelines which are updated annually and provided to fishermen when they purchase fishing licenses. This program will continue and will be coordinated as a part of the River Basin Management Planning process in the future.

In 1994, EPD began utilizing a "risk-based" approach to develop fish consumption guidelines for the state's waters. The EPD's guidelines are based on the use of USEPA

potency factors for carcinogenicity and reference doses for noncancer toxicity, whichever is most protective. Inputs used in the derivation of guidelines include a 1×10^{-4} risk level for cancer, a 30 year exposure duration, 70 kg as body weight for an adult, and 70 years as the lifetime duration. A range of possible intakes from a low of 3g/day to a high of 30 g/day is evaluated and one of four different recommendations made: no restriction, limit consumption to 1 meal per week, limit consumption to 1 meal per month, or do not eat.

Toxic Substance Stream Monitoring

EPD has focused resources on the management and control of toxic substances in the state's waters for many years. Toxic substance analyses were conducted on samples from selected trend monitoring stations from 1973-1991. Wherever discharges were found to have toxic impacts or to include toxic pollutants, EPD has incorporated specific limitations on toxic pollutants in NPDES discharge permits.

In 1983 EPD intensified toxic substance stream monitoring efforts. This expanded toxic substance stream monitoring project includes facility effluent, stream, sediment, and fish sampling at specific sites downstream of selected industrial and municipal discharges. From 1983 through 1991, 10 to 20 sites per year were sampled as part of this project. Future work will be conducted as a part of the River Basin Management Planning process.

Facility Compliance Sampling

In addition to surface water quality monitoring, EPD conducts evaluations and compliance sampling inspections of municipal and industrial water pollution control plants. Compliance sampling inspections include the collection of 24-hour composite samples, as well as evaluation of the permittee's sampling and flow monitoring requirements.

More than 280 sampling inspections were conducted by EPD staff statewide in 1998. The results were used, in part, to verify the validity of permittee self-monitoring data and as supporting evidence, as applicable, in enforcement actions. Also, sampling inspections can lead to identification of illegal discharges. In 1998, this work was focused on facilities in the Ochlockonee, Suwannee, Satilla, and St. Marys River basins in support of the basin planning process.

Aquatic Toxicity Testing

In 1982 EPD incorporated aquatic toxicity testing into selected industrial NPDES permits. In January 1995, EPD issued approved NPDES Reasonable Potential Procedures, which further delineated required conditions for conducting whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing for municipal and industrial discharges. All major permitted discharges (flow greater than 1 MGD) are required to have WET tests run with each permit reissuance. Certain minor dischargers are also subject to this requirement if EPD determines that aquatic toxicity is a potential issue.

5.2.3 Data Analysis

Assessment of Use Support - General Procedures

EPD assesses water quality data to determine if water quality standards are met and if the waterbody supports its classified use. If monitoring data shows that standards are not achieved, depending on the frequency with which standards are not met, the waterbody is said to be not supporting or partially supporting the designated use (see box).

Analysis of data for fecal coliform bacteria, metals, toxicity, dissolved oxygen, fish/shellfish consumption advisories, and biotic data

Fecal Coliform Bacteria

Georgia water quality standards establish a fecal coliform criterion of a geometric mean (four samples collected over a 30-day period) of 200 MPN/100 mL for all waters in Georgia during the recreational season of May through October. This is the year-round standard for waters with the water use classification of recreation. For waters classified as drinking water, fishing, or coastal fishing, for the period of November through April, the fecal coliform criterion is a geometric mean (four samples collected over a 30-day period) of 1000 per 100 ml and not to exceed 4000 per 100 ml for any one sample. The goal of fecal coliform sampling in the Suwannee River basin focused monitoring in 1998 was to collect four samples in a thirty day period in each of four quarters. If one geometric was in excess of the standard then the stream segment was placed on the partial support list. If more than one geometric mean was in excess of the standard the stream segment was placed on the not support list.

In some cases the number of samples was not adequate to calculate geometric means. In these cases, the USEPA recommends the use of a review criterion of 400 per 100 ml to evaluate sample results. This bacterial density was used to evaluate data for the months of May through October and the maximum criterion of 4000 per 100 ml was used in assessing the data from the months of November through April. Thus, where geometric mean data was not available, waters were deemed not supporting uses when 26 percent of the samples had fecal coliform bacteria densities greater than the applicable review criteria (400 or 4000 MPN/100 mL) and partially supporting when 11 to 25 percent of the samples were in excess of the review criterion.

Metals

Since data on metals from any one given site are typically infrequent, using the general evaluation technique of 26 percent excursion to indicate nonsupport and 11 to 25 percent excursion to indicate partial support was not meaningful. Streams were placed in the nonsupporting category if multiple excursions of state criteria occurred and the data were based on more than four samples per year. With less frequent sampling, streams with excursions were placed on the partially supporting list. In addition, an asterisk appears beside metals data in those cases where there is a minimal database. Data were collected in the winter and the summer seasons in 1998 for comparison to water quality standards. Clean techniques were used. If one of the samples was in excess of the standard the stream segment was placed on the partial support list. This approach is in accordance with USEPA guidance, which suggests any single excursion of a metals criteria be listed.

Toxicity Testing/Toxic Substances

Data from EPD toxicity testing of water pollution control plant effluents were used to predict toxicity in the receiving waterbody at critical, 7Q10 low flows. Effluent data for metals were used to designate either partial support or nonsupport based on whether instream corroborating metals data were available. When instream metals data were available the stream was determined to be not supporting if a metal concentration exceeded stream standards; when instream data were not available, the stream was listed as partially supporting.

Dissolved Oxygen, pH, Temperature

When available data indicated that these parameters were out of compliance with state standards more than 25 percent of the time, the waters were evaluated as not supporting the designated use. Between 11 percent and 25 percent noncompliance resulted in a partially supporting evaluation.

Fish/Shellfish Consumption Guidelines

A waterbody was included in the not supporting category when an advisory for “no consumption” of fish, a commercial fishing ban, or a shellfishing ban based on actual data was in effect. A waterbody was placed in the partially supporting category if a guideline for restricted consumption of fish had been issued for the waters.

Biotic Data

A “Biota Impacted” designation for “Criterion Violated” indicates that studies showed a modification of the biotic community. Communities used were fish. Studies of fish populations by the DNR Wildlife Resources Division used the Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) to identify affected fish populations. The IBI values were used to classify the population as Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, or Very Poor. Stream segments with fish populations rated as “Poor” or “Very Poor” were included in the partially supporting list.

Appendix E includes lists of all streams and rivers in the basin for which data have been assessed. The lists include information on the location, data source, designated water use classification, criterion violated, potential cause, actions planned to alleviate the problem, and estimates of stream miles affected. The list is further coded to indicate status of each waterbody under several sections of the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA). Different sections of the CWA require states to assess water quality (Section 305(b)), to list waters still requiring TMDLs (Section 303(d)), and to document waters with nonpoint source problems (Section 319).

The assessed waters are described in three categories: waters supporting designated uses, waters partially supporting designated uses, and waters not supporting designated uses. Waters were placed on the partially supporting list if:

- The chemical data (dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature) indicated an excursion of a water quality standard in 11 percent to 25 percent of the samples collected.
- A fish consumption guideline was in place for the waterbody.

The partially supporting list may also include stream reaches based on predicted concentrations of metals at low stream flow (7Q10 flows) in excess of state standards as opposed to actual measurements on a stream sample. Generally, a stream reach was placed on the not supporting list if:

- The chemical data (dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature) indicated an excursion of a water quality standard in greater than 25 percent of the samples collected.
- A fish consumption ban was in place for the waterbody.
- Acute or chronic toxicity tests documented or predicted toxicity at low stream flow (7Q10) due to a municipal or industrial discharge to the waterbody.

Additional specific detail is provided in the following paragraphs (see box) on analysis of data for fecal coliform bacteria, metals, toxicity, dissolved oxygen, fish/shellfish consumption advisories, and biotic data.

5.2.4 Assessment of Water Quality and Use Support

This section provides a summary of the assessment of water quality and support of designated uses for streams and major lakes in the Suwannee River basin. Most of these results were previously summarized in the Georgia 2000 305(b)/303(d) listing (Georgia DNR, 2000). Results are presented by HUC. A geographic summary of assessment results is provided by HUC in Figures 5-2 through 5-5.

Suwannee River Subbasin (HUC 03110201)

Appendix E summarizes the determination of support for designated uses of all assessed rivers and streams within this hydrologic unit (GA DNR, 2000).

Monitoring data was collected from 8 monitoring stations located within this subbasin during 1998. Historically, one trend monitoring station was sampled within this subbasin. The following assessment is based on data from these monitoring stations.

Metals

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in one tributary stream segment due to an exceedance of the water quality standard for cadmium due to nonpoint sources.




Figure 5-2. Assessment of Water Quality Use Support in the Suwannee River Basin, HUC 03110201




Figure 5-3. Assessment of Water Quality Use Support in the Suwannee River Basin, HUC 03110202




Figure 5-4. Assessment of Water Quality Use Support in the Suwannee River Basin, HUC 03110203




Figure 5-5. Assessment of Water Quality Use Support in the Suwannee River Basin, HUC 03110204

Fish Consumption Guidelines

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in two segments of the Suwannee River due to fish consumption guidelines recommended because of mercury residues. The guidelines are for largemouth bass, bullhead catfish and chain pickerel.

Erosion and Sedimentation

The water use classifications of fishing, recreation, and drinking water are potentially threatened in waterbodies by erosion and loading of sediment which can alter stream morphology, impact habitat, and reduce water clarity. Potential sources include urban runoff and development (particularly construction), unpaved rural roads, forestry practices, and agriculture. There are no stream segments listed at this time in this subbasin as not fully supporting designated water uses due to poor fish communities or sedimentation.

Suwannee River Subbasin (HUC 03110202)

Appendix E summarizes the determination of support for designated uses of all assessed rivers and streams within this hydrologic unit (GA DNR, 2000).

Monitoring data was collected from 25 monitoring stations located within this subbasin during 1998. Historically, one trend monitoring station was sampled within this subbasin. The following assessment is based on data from these monitoring stations.

Fecal Coliform Bacteria

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in four tributary stream segments due to exceedances of the water quality standard for fecal coliform bacteria. These may be attributed to a combination of urban runoff, septic systems, sanitary sewer overflows, rural nonpoint sources and/or animal wastes.

Metals and Toxicity

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in two tributary stream segments due to exceedance of metals standards. Mercury standards were exceeded in one stream due to nonpoint sources. In the second stream cadmium, copper, lead, zinc and mercury standards were exceeded due to a municipal water pollution control plant discharge. In addition, aquatic toxicity testing on the municipal water pollution control plant effluent predicted toxicity in the stream at critical, 7Q10 low flows.

Fish Consumption Guidelines

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in two Alapaha River segments and one tributary segment based on fish consumption guidelines due to mercury. The guidelines are for largemouth bass, spotted sucker or bullhead catfish. The water use classification of fishing was also not fully supported in Banks Lake in Lanier County due to mercury. The guidelines are for largemouth bass.

Low Dissolved Oxygen

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in two Alapaha River segments and fourteen tributary segments due to dissolved oxygen concentrations less than standards. Low dissolved oxygen in the tributaries was attributed to nonpoint sources. Dissolved oxygen may be lower in these areas due to natural conditions.

Erosion and Sedimentation

The water use classifications of fishing, recreation, and drinking water are potentially threatened in waterbodies by erosion and loading of sediment which can alter stream morphology, impact habitat, and reduce water clarity. Potential sources include urban runoff and development (particularly construction), unpaved rural roads, forestry practices, and agriculture. There are no stream segments listed at this time in this

subbasin as not fully supporting designated water uses due to poor fish communities or sedimentation.

Suwannee River Subbasin (HUC 03110203)

Appendix E summarizes the determination of support for designated uses of all assessed rivers and streams within this hydrologic unit (GA DNR, 2000).

Monitoring data was collected from 18 monitoring stations located within this subbasin 1998. Historically, five trend monitoring stations were sampled within this subbasin. The following assessment is based on data from these monitoring stations.

Fecal Coliform Bacteria

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in one Withlacoochee River segment and five tributary segments due to exceedances of the water quality standard for fecal coliform bacteria. These may be attributed to a combination of urban runoff, septic systems, sanitary sewer overflows, rural nonpoint sources and/or animal wastes.

Fish Consumption Guidelines

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported four segments of the Withlacoochee River due to fish consumption guidelines recommended because of mercury residues. The guidelines are for largemouth bass and redbreast sunfish.

Low Dissolved Oxygen

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in one Withlacoochee River segment and fourteen tributary segments due to dissolved oxygen concentrations less than standards. Low dissolved oxygen in the tributaries was attributed to nonpoint sources, urban runoff and a water pollution control plant discharge. Dissolved oxygen may be lower in these areas due to natural conditions.

Erosion and Sedimentation

The water use classifications of fishing, recreation, and drinking water are potentially threatened in waterbodies by erosion and loading of sediment which can alter stream morphology, impact habitat, and reduce water clarity. Potential sources include urban runoff and development (particularly construction), unpaved rural roads, forestry practices, and agriculture. There are no stream segments listed at this time in this subbasin as not fully supporting designated water use due to poor fish communities or sedimentation.

Suwannee River Subbasin (HUC 03110204)

Appendix E summarizes the determination of support for designated uses of all assessed rivers and streams within this hydrologic unit (GA DNR, 2000).

Monitoring data was collected from 15 monitoring stations located within this subbasin during 1998 period. Historically, one trend monitoring station was sampled within this subbasin. The following assessment is based on data from these monitoring stations.

Fecal Coliform Bacteria

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in three tributary stream segments due to exceedances of the water quality standard for fecal coliform bacteria. These may be attributed to a combination of urban runoff, septic systems, sanitary sewer overflows, rural nonpoint sources and/or animal wastes.

Low Dissolved Oxygen

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in two Little River segments and ten tributary segments due to dissolved oxygen concentrations less than standards. Low dissolved oxygen in the tributaries was attributed to urban runoff and nonpoint sources. Dissolved oxygen may be lower in these areas due to natural conditions.

Erosion and Sedimentation

The water use classifications of fishing, recreation, and drinking water are potentially threatened in waterbodies by erosion and loading of sediment which can alter stream morphology, impact habitat, and reduce water clarity. Potential sources include urban runoff and development (particularly construction), unpaved rural roads, forestry practices, and agriculture. There are no stream segments listed at this time in this subbasin as not fully supporting designated water uses due to poor fish communities or sedimentation.

References

DRI/McGraw Hill. 1996. The Regional Economic Forecast of Population and Employment Comprehensive Study, Volume 1. Prepared for: Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. DRI/McGraw-Hill, Lexington, MA.

Georgia Environmental Protection Division 1987. Water Availability and Use Report, Coastal Plain River Basins.

1998-2000 Georgia Drought Report. Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division.