

Total Maximum Daily Load Document
SV-108 and SV-301, Choestoea Creek and Tributaries Watershed
(Hydrologic Unit Code 030601020502)
Fecal Coliform Bacteria,
Indicator for Pathogens



August 2012

Prepared for:

Bureau of Water



Technical Document Number 0904-12

Prepared by:

Harvey S. Daniel

Photograph on Title Page

Proximity of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control's water quality Monitoring Station SV-108. Choestoea Creek at County Route S-37-49 in Oconee County, South Carolina. Date of photography: November 22, 2011.

Abstract

§303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and EPA's *Water Quality Planning and Management* Regulations (40 CFR Part 130) require states to develop total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for water bodies that are included on the §303(d) list of impaired waters. A TMDL is the maximum amount of pollutant a waterbody can assimilate while meeting water quality standards for the pollutant of concern. All TMDLs include a waste load allocation (WLA) for all National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)-permitted discharges, a load allocation (LA) for all nonpoint sources, and an explicit and/or implicit margin of safety (MOS). A fecal coliform (FC) TMDL was developed for impaired stations SV-108 and SV-301 within the Choestoea Creek Watershed located in Oconee County, SC. The stations, along the Choestoea Creek and tributaries in Oconee County, SC are included as impaired on the State's final 2010 §303(d) list and draft 2012 §303(d) list due to excessive fecal coliform. At least thirty-eight percent of the samples collected between May 1999 and December 2005 at the impaired monitoring stations exceeded the water quality standards.

Probable sources of fecal contamination include direct loading by livestock, failing septic systems, surrounding wildlife, and other agricultural activities. The load-duration curve methodology was used to calculate existing and TMDL loads for each impaired segment. Existing pollutant loadings and proposed TMDL reductions for critical hydrologic conditions are presented in Table Ab-1. Critical hydrologic conditions were defined as either moist, mid-range, or dry depending on which condition demonstrated the highest load reductions necessary to meet water quality standards. In order to achieve the target load (slightly below water quality standards) for the Choestoea Creek and tributaries, reductions in the existing loads of up to 75% will be necessary at station SV-108, and reductions up to 78% will be necessary at station SV-301. For SCDOT, existing and future NPDES MS4 permittees, compliance with terms and conditions of its NPDES permit is effective implementation of the WLA to the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP) and demonstrates consistency with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL. For existing and future NPDES construction and Industrial stormwater permittees, compliance with terms and conditions of its permit is effective implementation of the WLA. Required load reductions in the LA portion of these TMDLs can be implemented through voluntary measures and are eligible for CWA §319 grants.

The Department recognizes that **adaptive management/implementation** of these TMDLs might be needed to achieve the water quality standard and we are committed towards targeting the load reductions to improve water quality in the Choestoea Creek Watershed. As additional data and/or information become available, it may become necessary to revise and/or modify these TMDLs targets accordingly.

Table Ab-1. Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Choestoea Creek Watershed. Loads are expressed as colony forming units (cfu) per day.

Station	Existing Load (cfu/day)	TMDL (cfu/day)	Margin of Safety (MOS) (cfu/day)	Waste load Allocation (WLA)		Load Allocation (LA)	
				Continuous Source ¹ (cfu/day)	Non-Continuous Sources ^{2,3,4} (% Reduction)	Load Allocation (cfu/day)	% Reduction to Meet LA ³
SV-108	2.96+11	7.85+10	3.92+09	See Note Below	75	7.45+10	75
SV-301	9.08+11	2.06+11	1.03+10	See Note Below	78	1.96+11	78

Table Notes:

1. WLAs are expressed as a daily maximum. There are no existing continuous sources at this time. Future continuous discharges are required to meet the prescribed loading for the pollutant of concern. Future loadings will be developed based upon permitted flow and an allowable permitted maximum concentration of 400cfu/100ml.
2. Percent reduction applies to all NPDES-permitted stormwater discharges, including current and future MS4, construction and industrial discharges covered under permits numbered SCS & SCR. Stormwater discharges are expressed as a percentage reduction due to the uncertain nature of stormwater discharge volumes and recurrence intervals. Stormwater discharges are required to meet percentage reduction or the existing instream standard for pollutant of concern in accordance with their NPDES Permit.
3. Percent reduction applies to existing instream load.
4. By implementing the best management practices that are prescribed in either the SCDOT annual SWMP or the SCDOT MS4 Permit to address fecal coliform, the SCDOT will comply with this TMDL and its applicable WLA to the maximum extent practicable (MEP) as required by its MS4 permit.

Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Watershed Description.....	2
1.3 Water Quality Standard.....	4
2.0 WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT.....	6
3.0 SOURCE ASSESSMENT AND LOAD ALLOCATION.....	7
3.1. Point Sources.....	7
3.1.1. Continuous Point Sources.....	7
3.1.2. Non-Continuous Point Sources.....	7
3.2. Nonpoint Sources.....	9
3.2.1. Wildlife.....	9
3.2.2. Agricultural Activities.....	9
3.2.3. Land Application of Industrial, Domestic Sludge or Treated Wastewater.....	10
3.2.4. Leaking Sanitary Sewers and Illicit Discharges.....	11
3.2.5. Failing Septic Systems.....	11
3.2.6. Urban Runoff.....	11
4.0 LOAD-DURATION CURVE METHOD.....	12
5.0 DEVELOPMENT OF TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD.....	15
5.1 Critical Condition.....	15
5.2 Existing Load.....	15
5.3 Wasteload Allocation.....	16
5.3.1 Continuous Point Sources.....	16
5.3.2 Non Continuous Point Sources.....	16
5.4 Load Allocation.....	17
5.5 Seasonal Variability.....	17
5.6 Margin of Safety.....	17
5.7 TMDL.....	17
6.0 IMPLEMENTATION.....	18
6.1 Implementation Strategies.....	19
6.1.1 Continuous Point Sources.....	19
6.1.2 Non-Continuous Point Sources.....	20
6.1.3 Wildlife.....	21
6.1.4 Agricultural Activities.....	22
6.1.5 Leaking Sanitary Sewers and Illicit Discharges.....	23

6.1.6	Failing Septic Systems.....	23
6.1.7	Urban Runoff.....	24
7.0	RESOURCES FOR POLLUTION MANAGEMENT.....	25
7.1	General for Urban and Suburban Stormwater Mitigation.....	25
7.2	Illicit Discharges.....	26
7.3	Pet Waste.....	26
7.4	Wildlife.....	27
7.5	Septic Systems.....	27
7.6	Field Application of Manure.....	27
7.7	Grazing Management.....	27
7.8	Animal Feeding Operations and Barnyards.....	28
7.9	Federal Agriculture Resources: Program Overviews, Technical Assistance, and Funding.....	28
	REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	30

LIST OF TABLES

Table Ab-1.	Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Choestoea Creek Watershed.....	iii
Table 1.	Choestoea Creek Watershed FC Impaired Waters.....	2
Table 2a.	Land Use in the Whole Choestoea Creek Watershed.....	4
Table 2b.	Developed Area From Reach to Reach in the Choestoea Creek Watershed.....	4
Table 3.	FC WQS Exceedence Summary for Impaired Stations (1999-2005).....	7
Table 4.	Active Animal Feeding Operations With Regulated Structures or Activities within the Choestoea Creek Watershed.....	10
Table 5.	Percent Reduction Necessary to Achieve Target Load by Hydrologic Category.....	16
Table 6.	Percent Reduction Necessary to Achieve Target Load.....	17
Table 7.	Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Choestoea Creek Watershed.....	18

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1a.	Location of Stations SV-108 and SV-301 Impaired with Excessive FC Numbers.....	1
------------	--	---

Figure 1b.	Location of Station Reaches in the Choestoea Creek Watershed.....	2
Figure 2a.	Land Use Diagram for the Entire Choestoea Creek Watershed.....	3
Figure 2b.	Land Use Diagram for Reach 1 (Monitoring Station SV-301) in the Choestoea Creek Watershed.....	5
Figure 2c.	Land Use Diagram for Reach 2 (Monitoring Station SV-108) in the Choestoea Creek Watershed.....	5
Figure 3.	Precipitation and FC Data by Date for Monitoring Station SV-108.....	6
Figure 4.	SCDOT Owned and Maintained Roads in the Choestoea Creek Watershed.....	8
Figure 5.	Load Duration Curve for Choestoea Creek Station SV-108.....	14

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	ADDITIONAL RAIN CHARTS BY STATION
Appendix B	ADDITIONAL LOAD DURATION CURVES BY STATION
Appendix C	EVALUATING THE PROGRESS OF MS4 PROGRAMS
Appendix D	DATA TABLES
Appendix E	SOURCE ASSESSMENT PICTURES

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

FC bacteria are widely used as an indicator of pathogens in surface waters and wastewater. Acute gastrointestinal illnesses affect millions of people in the United States and cause billions of dollars of costs each year (Gaffield et al. 2003). Of these illnesses many are caused by contaminated drinking water. Untreated stormwater runoff has been associated with a number of disease outbreaks, most notably an outbreak in Milwaukee that caused many deaths in 1993.

Though occurring at low levels from natural sources, the concentration of FC bacteria can be elevated in water bodies as the result of pollution. Sources of FC bacteria are usually diffuse or nonpoint in nature and originate from stormwater runoff, failing septic systems, agricultural runoff, leaking sewers among other sources. Occasionally, the source of the pollutant is a point source. Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and EPA's *Water Quality Planning and Management Regulations* (40 CFR Part 130) require states to develop TMDLs for water bodies that are not meeting designated uses under technology-based pollution controls. The TMDL process establishes the allowable loading of pollutants or other quantifiable parameters for a water body based on the relationship between pollution sources and in stream water quality conditions so that states can establish water quality-based controls to reduce pollution and restore and maintain the quality of water resources (USEPA 1991).

The State of South Carolina has placed two (2) monitoring stations in the Choestoea Creek Watershed on South Carolina's final 2010 §303(d) list and draft 2012 §303(d) list for impairment due to FC bacteria. These stations are SV-108 and SV-301, and are identified in Figure 1a and Table 1.

Figure 1a. Location of Stations SV-108 and SV-301 Impaired with Excessive FC Numbers





Table 1. Choestoea Creek Watershed FC Impaired Waters.

Waterbody	Station Number	Description
Choestoea Creek	SV-108	Choestoea Creek at County Route S-37-49 in Oconee County
Norris Creek	SV-301	Norris Creek at County Route S-37-435, 1 mile south of Westminster in Oconee County

1.2 Watershed Description

The Choestoea Creek Watershed consists of the Choestoea Creek and its tributaries, including Norris Creek, and is located in Oconee County, South Carolina. The watershed occupies 14.43 mi² (9236.2 acres) of the Piedmont ecoregion of the state. Choestoea Creek drains into the Hartwell Lake approximately 4.6 miles south of the City of Westminster. There are two (2) impaired sites in the watershed and each will be addressed as its own reach in this document. The location of both reaches is shown in Figure 1b. Reach 1 cover a drainage area 1.98 mi² in size that drains into Norris Creek and its tributaries from the southwestern


Figure 1b. Location of Station Reaches in the Choestoea Creek Watershed



one-third of the incorporated area of Westminster down to impaired station SV-301 in Norris creek. And, Reach 2 cover a drainage area 12.45 mi² in size that drains into Choestoea Creek and its tributaries, including drainage into Norris Creek below impaired station SV-301, from areas west and south of the incorporated area of Westminster down to impaired station SV-108 in Choestoea Creek. The reaches are shown in Figure 1b. There are approximately 28.6 stream miles in the whole watershed and they are all classified as freshwater.

Land use within the entire Choestoea Creek Watershed (all reaches) is predominately forest and other non-cultivated vegetated lands (69.2%), and pastures/hay (19.8%) (Figure 2a, Table 2a). Developed lands (residential, commercial, industrial, or open urban space) only comprise approximately 9.9% of the watershed (Table 2b). At the time of the development of these TMDLs, there are currently five (5) active (AFOs) with regulated structures or activities in the Choestoea Creek Watershed (Table 4). Land use within Reach 1 is predominately forest and other non-cultivated vegetated lands (58.7%), and developed (30.2%) (Figure 2b). There were five (5) active animal feeding operations in this reach. And, land use within Reach 2 is predominately forest and other non-cultivated vegetated lands (70.9%), and pastures/hay (21.2%) (Figure 2c). And, there were five active animal feeding operations in this reach.

Figure 2a. Land Use Diagram for the Entire Choestoea Creek Watershed



**Table 2a. Land Use in the Whole Choestoea Creek Watershed
(derived from National Land Cover Database (NLCD) 2006)**

Land Use	Area (Acres)	Area (Mile ²)	Percent
Forest or Otherwise Vegetated (non-cultivated)	6392.94	9.99	69.2
Pasture/Hay	1828.30	2.86	19.8
Developed (residential, commercial, industrial)	914.93	1.43	9.9
Barren	54.71	0.08	0.6
Wetlands/Open Water	46.26	0.07	0.5
Total	9237.14	14.43	100.0

Table 2b. Developed Area from Reach to Reach in the Choestoea Creek Watershed

Station Reach	Total Drainage Area of Station Reach (sq. miles)	Total Developed Area (sq. miles)	Percent Developed Area (%)
1. From top of watershed to Station SV-301	1.98	0.60	30.3
2. Drainage to Station SV-108	12.45	0.83	6.7
All Station Reaches	14.43	1.43	9.9

1.3 Water Quality Standard

The impaired stream segments of the Choestoea Creek basin are designated as Class Freshwater. Waters of this class are described as:

“Freshwaters (FW) are freshwaters suitable for primary and secondary contact recreation and as a source for drinking water supply after conventional treatment in accordance with the requirements of the Department. Suitable for fishing and the survival and propagation of a balanced indigenous aquatic community of fauna and flora. Suitable also for industrial and agricultural uses.” (R.61-68)

South Carolina’s Water Quality Standard (WQS) for FC in freshwater is:

“Not to exceed a geometric mean of 200/100 mL, based on five consecutive samples during any 30 day period; nor shall more than 10% of the total samples during any 30 day period exceed 400/100 mL.” (R.61-68).

Primary contact recreation is not limited to large streams and lakes. Even streams that are too small to swim in, will allow small children the opportunity to play and immerse their hands and faces. Essentially all perennial streams should therefore be protected from pathogen impairment.

Figure 2b. Land Use Diagram for Reach 1 (Monitoring Station SV-301) in the Choestoea Creek Watershed






Figure 2c. Land Use Diagram for Reach 2 (Monitoring Station SV-108) in the Choestoea Creek Watershed



2.0 WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) conducts monitoring at two (2) locations within the Choestoea Creek Watershed (SCDHEC 2010). Monitoring has been conducted at station SV-108 and station SV-301. Budget reductions implemented by the SCDHEC have impacted the water quality monitoring program. There have been both reductions in sampling frequency and an overall reduction in the number of locations sampled statewide. This has resulted in no sampling at station SV-108 or SV-301 since 2005. Waters in which no more than 10% of the samples collected over a five year period are greater than 400 FC counts or cfu/100 ml are considered to comply with the South Carolina WQS for FC bacteria. Waters with more than 10% of samples greater than 400 cfu/100 ml are considered impaired for FC bacteria and placed on South Carolina's §303(d) list¹. There are two (2) locations that are considered impaired due to FC WQS exceedences. Table 3 provides a summary of number of samples collected, number of exceedences and exceedence percentage. Figure 3 illustrates precipitation and FC by data and date for Monitoring Station SV-108. The graph shows that there is little to no correlation between the amount of precipitation and the temporal FC exceedences of water quality standards. The graph for precipitation and FC by data and date for Monitoring Station SV-301 is shown in Appendix A. That graph also shows that there is little to no correlation between the amount of precipitation and the temporal FC exceedences of water quality standards.

Figure 3. Precipitation and FC Data by Date for Monitoring Station SV-108



¹ The frequency of sampling was fewer than five samples within a 30 day period, therefore the water quality assessment was based on the 10% standard (400/100 mL).

Table 3. FC WQS Exceedence Summary for Impaired Stations (1999-2005)

Station	Waterbody	Number of Samples	Number Samples >400/100mL	% Samples Exceed WQS
SV-108	Choestoea Creek	25	13	52%
SV-301	Norris Creek	24	9	38%

3.0 SOURCE ASSESSMENT AND LOAD ALLOCATION

FC bacteria are used by the State of South Carolina as the indicator for pathogens in surface waters. Pathogens, which are usually difficult to detect, cause disease and make full body contact recreation in lakes and streams a risk to public health. Indicators such as FC bacteria, enterococci, or *E. coli* are easier to measure, have similar sources as pathogens, and persist in surface waters for a similar or longer length of time. These bacteria are not in themselves disease causing, but indicate the potential presence of organisms that may result in sickness.

There are many sources of pathogen pollution in surface waters. In general these sources may be classified as point and nonpoint sources. With the implementation of technology-based controls, pollution from continuous point sources, such as factories and wastewater treatment facilities, has been greatly reduced. These point sources are required by the (CWA) to obtain a NPDES permit. In South Carolina NPDES permits require that dischargers of sanitary wastewater must meet the state standard for FC at the point of discharge. Municipal and private sanitary wastewater treatment facilities may occasionally be sources of pathogen or FC bacteria pollution. However, if these facilities are discharging wastewater that meets their permit limits, they are not causing impairment. If any of these facilities is not meeting its permit limits, enforcement actions/mechanisms are required.

Other non-continuous point sources required to obtain NPDES permits that may be a source of pathogens include MS4s and stormwater discharges from construction or industrial sites. MS4s may require NPDES discharge permits for industrial and construction activities under the NPDES Stormwater regulations. These sources are also required to comply with the state standard for the pollutant(s) of concern. If MS4s and discharges from construction sites meet the percentage reduction or the water quality standard as prescribed in Section 5 of this TMDL document and required in their MS4 permits, they should not be causing or contributing to an instream FC bacteria impairment.

3.1 Point Sources

3.1.1 Continuous Point Sources

There are no continuous point sources within the Choestoea Creek Watershed at the current time. Future NPDES discharges in the referenced watershed are required to implement the WLA and demonstrate consistency with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL.

3.1.2 Non-Continuous Point Sources

Non-continuous point sources include all NPDES-permitted stormwater discharges, including current and future MS4s, construction and industrial discharges covered under permits numbered SCS -and SCR and regulated under SC *Water Pollution Control Permits* Regulation 122.26(b)(14) & (15). All regulated MS4 entities have the potential to contribute FC pollutant loadings in the delineated drainage area used in the development of these TMDLs.

The South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) is currently the only designated MS4 within the Choestoea Creek Watershed. The SCDOT operates under NPDES MS4 Permit SCS040001 and owns and


operates roads within the watershed (Figure 4). However, the Department recognizes that SCDOT is not a traditional MS4 in that it does not possess statutory taxing or has enforcement powers. SCDOT does not regulate land use or zoning, issue building or development permits.

Current Developed land use for the Choestoea Creek Watershed is 9.9%. Based on current Geographic Information System (GIS) information (available at time of TMDL development) there are currently no SCDOT facilities located in the referenced watershed area. And, based on the SCDOT website, there are no highway rest areas in the watershed area.

Other than SCDOT owned and/or operated storm sewer systems, there are currently no permitted sanitary sewer or stormwater systems that discharge in this watershed. Future permitted sanitary sewer or stormwater systems in the referenced watershed will be required to comply with the load reductions prescribed in the WLA and demonstrate consistency with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL.

Industrial facilities that have the potential to cause or contribute to a violation of a water quality standard are covered by the NPDES Storm Water Industrial General Permit (SCR000000). Construction activities are usually covered by the NPDES Storm Water Construction General Permit from the SCDHEC (SCR100000). Where the construction has the potential to affect water quality of a water body with a TMDL, the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the site must address any pollutants of concern and adhere to

Figure 4. SCDOT Owned and Maintained Roads in the Choestoea Creek Watershed



any waste load allocations in the TMDL. Note that there may be other stormwater discharges not covered under permits numbered SCS and SCR that occur in the referenced watershed. These activities are not subject to the WLA portion of the TMDL.

Sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) to surface waters have the potential to severely impact water quality. These untreated sanitary discharges result in violations of the WQS. It is the responsibility of the NPDES wastewater discharger, or collection system operator for non-permitted 'collection only' systems, to ensure that releases do not occur. Unfortunately releases to surface waters from SSOs are not always preventable or reported. Currently no part of the Choestoea Creek Watershed is serviced by a community collection system.

The Department acknowledges that progress with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL by MS4s is expected to take one or more permit iteration. Progress towards achieving the WLA reduction for the TMDL may constitute MS4 compliance with its SWMP, provided the MEP definition is met, even where the numeric percent reduction may not be achieved in the interim.

3.2 Nonpoint Sources

The Department recognizes that there may be wildlife, agricultural activities, grazing animals, septic tanks, and/or other nonpoint source contributors located within unregulated areas (outside the permitted area) of the Choestoea Creek Watershed. Nonpoint sources located in unregulated areas are subject to the load allocation and not the waste load allocation of the TMDL document.

3.2.1 Wildlife

Wildlife (mammals and birds) can be a significant contributor of FC bacteria. Wildlife in this area typically includes deer, squirrels, raccoons, and other mammals as well as a variety of birds. Wildlife wastes are carried into nearby streams by runoff following rainfall or deposited directly in streams. According to a study conducted by the SCDNR in 2008, there are an estimated 15 to 30 deer per square mile within Oconee County (SCDNR 2008). The study estimated deer density based on suitable habitat (forests, croplands, and pastures). The FC production rate for deer has been shown to be 347×10^6 cfu/head-day in a study conducted by Yagow (1999), of which only a portion will enter the Choestoea Creek Watershed. Wildlife may contribute a significant portion of the overall FC load within the watershed.

3.2.2 Agricultural Activities

Agricultural activities that involve livestock or animal wastes are potential sources of FC contamination of surface waters. Fecal matter can enter the waterway via runoff from the land or by direct deposition into the stream. Agricultural activities may represent a significant source in the Choestoea Creek Watershed where agricultural activities constitute a greater portion of the land use.

3.2.2.1 Agricultural Animal Facilities

Owners/operators of most commercial animal growing operations are required by SC Regulation 61-43, *Standards for the Permitting of Agricultural Animal Facilities*, to obtain permits for the handling, storage, treatment (if necessary) and disposal of the manure, litter and dead animals generated at their facilities (SCDHEC 2002). The requirements of R. 61-43 are designed to protect water quality; therefore, we have a reasonable assurance that facilities operating in compliance with this regulation should not contribute to downstream water quality impairments. SC currently does not have any confined animal feeding operations (CAFOs) under NPDES coverage; however, the State does have permitted animal feeding operations (AFOs) covered under R. 61-43. These permitted operations are not allowed to discharge to waters of the State and are covered under 'no discharge' (ND) permits. Discharges from these operations to waters of the State are illegal and are subject to enforcement actions by the SCDHEC.

There are currently five (5) active (AFOs) with regulated structures or activities in the Choestoea Creek Watershed (Table 4). These facilities consist of four (4) poultry operations and one dairy operation and are located within the Choestoea Creek watershed. The four (4) poultry operations are considered according to Section 122.23 of SC Regulation 61-9, *Water Pollution Control Permits*. There may also be land application sites, or sprayfields, associated with these facilities. These facilities are routinely inspected for compliance. Note that it is unknown how many sprayfields are operating simultaneously as land application of facility waste may occur on a rotating basis in accordance with their AFO permit. Permitted agricultural facilities that operate in compliance with their permit are not considered to be sources of impairment.

Table 4. Active Animal Feeding Operations with Regulated Structures or Activities within the Choestoea Creek Watershed.

Downstream Impaired Station	AFO Permit	Facility	Type of Livestock	Number of Permitted Animals
SV-108	ND0072745	B&H Farms	Poultry (Broilers)	80,000
SV-108	ND0073229	Barnett AI/Poultry Facility	Poultry (Broilers)	40,000
SV-108	ND0072991	Choestoea Farms, Inc.	Poultry (Broilers)	180,000
SV-108	ND0014338	Ebenhack Dairy Farm	Dairy	100
SV-108	ND0074349	Wilbanks Poultry Facility	Poultry (Broilers)	82,000

3.2.2.2 Grazing Animals

Livestock, especially cattle, are frequently major contributors of FC bacteria to streams. Cattle on average produce some 1.0E+11 cfu/day per animal of FC bacteria (ASAE 1998). Grazing cattle and other livestock may contaminate streams with FC bacteria indirectly by runoff from pastures or directly by defecating into streams and ponds. Direct loading by cattle or other livestock to surface waters within the Choestoea Creek Watershed is likely to be a significant source of FC. However, the grazing of unconfined livestock (in pastures) is not regulated by the SCDHEC.

The United States Department of Agriculture's National Agricultural Statistics Service reported 15,660 cattle and calves in Oconee County in 2007 (USDA 2009). According to the NLCD 2006, there are 53,062.09 acres of pasture land in Oconee County. This relates to 0.30 cattle per acre of pasture land in Oconee County, assuming an even distribution of cattle across pasture land in the county. There are 1828.30 acres of pasture land in the Choestoea Creek Watershed. This relates to approximately 548 cattle in the watershed, again assuming an even distribution of cattle across pasture land in the county. An estimated 548 cattle and calves within the watershed, combined, produces an average of 5.48E+13 cfu/day of FC bacteria.

3.2.3 Land Application of Industrial, Domestic Sludge or Treated Wastewater

NPDES-permitted industrial and domestic wastewater treatment processes may generate solid waste bi-products, also known as sludge. In some cases, facilities may be permitted to land apply sludge at designated locations and under specific conditions. There are also some NPDES-permitted facilities

authorized to land apply treated effluent at designated locations and under specific conditions. Land application permits for industrial and domestic wastewater facilities may be covered under SC Regulation 61-9, Sections 503, 504, or 505. It is recognized that there may be operating, regulated land application sites located in the Choestoea Creek Watershed. If properly managed, waste is applied at a rate that ensures pollutants will be incorporated into the soil or plants and pollutants will not enter streams. Land applications sites can be a source of fecal coliform bacteria and stream impairment if not properly managed. Similar to AFO land application sites, the permitted land application sites described in this section are not allowed to directly discharge to Choestoea Creek and its tributaries. Direct discharges from land applications sites to surface waters of the State are illegal and are subject to enforcement actions by the SCDHEC.

3.2.4 Leaking Sanitary Sewers and Illicit Discharges

Leaking sewer pipes and illicit sewer connections represent a direct threat to public health since they result in discharge of partially treated or untreated human wastes to the surrounding environment. Quantifying these sources is extremely speculative without direct monitoring of the source because the magnitude is directly proportional to the volume and its proximity to the surface water. Typical values of FC in untreated domestic wastewater range from 10^4 to 10^6 MPN (Most Probable Number)/100mL (Metcalf and Eddy 1991).

Illicit sewer connections into storm drains result in direct discharges of sewage via the storm drainage system outfalls. Monitoring of storm drain outfalls during dry weather is needed to document the presence or absence of sewage in the drainage systems. Besides the SCDOT, there are currently no entities subject to NPDES MS4 permit within or with impact to the Choestoea Creek Watershed.

3.2.5 Failing Septic Systems

Studies demonstrate that wastewater located four feet below properly functioning septic systems contain on average less than one FC bacteria organism per 100 mL (Ayres Associates 1993). Failed or non-conforming septic systems, however, can be a major contributor of FC to Choestoea Creek and tributaries. Wastes from failing septic systems enter surface waters either as direct overland flow or via groundwater. Although loading to streams from failing septic systems is likely to be a continual source, wet weather events can increase the rate of transport of pollutants from failing septic systems because of the wash-off effect from runoff and the increased rate of groundwater recharge.

According to GIS information, sewer lines for the City of Westminster extend into the northeast portion of the Choestoea Creek Watershed. Based on GIS information, 2011 Bing aerial photography of the watershed, and based on the 2010 U.S. population census, there are 712 households within the watershed not served by the City of Westminster sewer system or any other community sewer system. Therefore, assuming one septic tank per household, it is estimated that there are approximately 712 septic tanks within the watershed. At the time of TMDL development, their status in relation to function is unknown.

3.2.6 Urban Runoff

Dogs, cats, and other domesticated pets are the primary source of FC deposited on the urban landscape. There are also 'urban' wildlife, squirrels, raccoons, pigeons, and other birds, all of which contribute to the FC load. Six and one-half percent of the entire Choestoea Creek Watershed is comprised of the incorporated area of the City of Westminster. However, 44.6 percent of Reach 1 in the watershed is comprised of the incorporated area of the city.

Similar to regulated MS4s, potentially designated MS4 entities (as listed in FR 64, 235, p.68837) or other unregulated MS4 communities located in the Choestoea Creek Watershed may have the potential to contribute FC bacteria in stormwater runoff.

4.0 LOAD-DURATION CURVE METHOD

The load-duration curve method was developed as a means of incorporating natural variability, uncertainty, and risk assessment into TMDL development (Bonta and Cleland 2003). The analysis is based on the range of hydrologic conditions for which there are appropriate water quality data. The load-duration curve method uses the cumulative frequency distribution of stream flow and pollutant concentration data to estimate existing and TMDL loads for a water body. Development of the load-duration curve is described in this chapter.

The load-duration curve method depends on an adequate period of record for flow data. The United States Geological Survey (USGS) gage used for collecting “real-time” flow data was the Reedy River gage near Greenville, SC (Gage Number: 02164000). This gage began recording daily flows in 1941 and provides the flow data required to establish flow duration curves for the impaired station.

Flow data for a 14-year period (January 1, 1995 to December 31, 2008) from the USGS Greenville gage was used to establish flow duration curves. The records for this period were complete (i.e., no missing dates). The drainage area of the sampling station was delineated using USGS topographic maps using ArcMap software. The cumulative area drained was calculated and used to estimate flow based on the ratio of the monitoring station drainage area to the downstream USGS gage. For example, the Greenville gage records flow from 48.6 square miles (sq mi). The cumulative drainage area for the Choestoea Creek Watershed at monitoring station SV-108 (at County Route S-37-49 in Oconee County) is approximately 14.43 sq mi, or 29.7% of the area drained at the Greenville gage. Mean daily flow for the SV-108 monitoring location was assumed to be 29.7% of the daily flow at the Greenville gage. Figure 1.a provides an illustration of monitoring and gage locations along with a summary of drainage area statistics used to establish flows at un-gaged monitoring stations.

A flow duration curve was developed by ranking flows from highest to lowest and calculating the probability of occurrence (presented as a percentage or duration interval), where zero corresponds to the highest flow. The duration interval can be used to determine the percentage of time a given flow is achieved or exceeded, based on the period of record. The flow duration curve was divided into five hydrologic condition categories (High Flows, Moist Conditions, Mid-Range, Dry Conditions and Low Flows). Categorizing flow conditions can assist in determining which hydrologic conditions result in the greatest number of exceedences. A high number of exceedences under dry conditions might indicate a point source or illicit connection issue, whereas moist conditions may indicate nonpoint sources. Data within the High Flow and Low Flow categories are generally not used in the development of a TMDL due to their infrequency.

A target load-duration curve was created by calculating the allowable load using daily flow, the FC WQS concentration and a unit conversion factor. The water quality target was set at 380 cfu/100ml for the instantaneous criterion, which is five percent lower than the water quality criteria of 400 cfu/100ml. A five percent explicit Margin of Safety (MOS) was reserved from the water quality criteria in developing target load-duration curves. The load-duration curve for station SV-108 is presented in Figure 5 as an example. The load-duration curve for station SV-301 is presented in Appendix B.


For the load duration curve, the independent variable (X-Axis) represents the percentage of estimated flows greater than value x. The dependent variable (Y-Axis) represent the FC loading at each estimated flow expressed in terms of colony forming units per day (cfu/day). In each defined flow interval, existing and target loadings were calculated by the following equations:

Existing Load = Mid-Point Flow in Each Hydrologic Category x 90th Percentile FC Concentration x Conversion Factor (24465758.4)

Target Load = Mid-Point Flow in Each Hydrologic Category x 380 (WQ criterion minus a 5% MOS) x Conversion Factor (24465758.4)

Percent Reduction = (Existing Load - Target Load) / Existing Load

Figure 5. Load Duration Curve for Choestoea Creek Station SV-108



Instantaneous loads for each of the impaired stations were calculated. Measured FC concentrations from May 1999 through December 2005 were multiplied by measured (or estimated flow based on drainage area) flow on the day of sampling and a unit conversion factor. These data were plotted on the load-duration graph based on the flow duration interval for the day of sampling. Samples above the target line are violations of the WQS while samples below the line are in compliance (Figure 5). Only the instantaneous water quality criterion was targeted because there is insufficient data to evaluate against the 30-day geometric mean.

An existing load was determined for each hydrologic category for the TMDL calculations. The 90th percentile of measured FC concentration within each hydrologic category was multiplied by the flow at each category midpoint (i.e., flow at the 25% duration interval for the Moist Conditions, 50% interval for Mid-Range, and 75% for Dry Condition). Existing loads are plotted on the load-duration curve presented for station SV-108 in Figure 5. These values were compared to the target load (which includes an explicit 5% MOS) at each hydrologic category midpoint to determine the percent load reduction necessary to achieve compliance with the WQS. These TMDLs assume that if the highest percent reduction is achieved then the WQS will be attained under all flow conditions.

5.0 DEVELOPMENT OF TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD

A total maximum daily load (TMDL) for a given pollutant and water body is comprised of the sum of individual waste load allocations (WLAs) for point sources, and load allocations (LAs) for both nonpoint sources and natural background levels. In addition, the TMDL must include a margin of safety (MOS), either implicitly or explicitly, to account for the uncertainty in the relationship between pollutant loads and the quality of the receiving water body. Conceptually, this definition is represented by the equation:

$$TMDL = \sum WLA_s + \sum LA_s + MOS$$

The TMDL is the total amount of pollutant that can be assimilated by the receiving water body while still achieving compliance with WQS. In TMDL development, allowable loadings from all pollutant sources that cumulatively amount to no more than the TMDL must be established and thereby provide the basis to establish water quality-based controls.

For most pollutants, TMDLs are expressed as a mass load (e.g., kilograms per day). For bacteria, however, TMDLs are expressed in terms of number (#), colony forming units (cfu), organism counts (or resulting concentration), or MPN, in accordance with 40 CFR 130.2(l).

5.1 Critical Conditions

These TMDLs are based on the flow recurrence interval between 10% and 90% and excludes extreme high and low flow conditions; flows that are characterized as 'Low' or 'High' in Figure 5 were not included in the analysis. The critical condition for each monitoring station is identified as the flow condition requiring the largest percent reduction, within the 10-90% duration intervals. Critical conditions for the Choestoea Creek Watershed pathogen impaired segments are listed in Table 5. This data indicates that for station SV-108, dry conditions result in larger bacteria loads and is therefore the critical condition for that station. For station SV-301, moist conditions result in larger bacteria loads and is therefore the critical condition for that station.

5.2 Existing Load

An existing load was determined for each hydrologic category for the TMDL calculations as described in Section 4.0 of this TMDL document. The existing load under the critical condition, described in Section 5.1 above was used in the TMDL calculations. Loadings from all sources are included in this value: cattle-in-streams, failing septic systems as well as wildlife. The existing load for stations SV-108 and SV-301 are provided in Appendix C.

Table 5. Percent Reduction Necessary to Achieve Target Load by Hydrologic Category.

Station	Waterbody	Moist Conditions	Mid-Range Flow	Dry Conditions
SV-108	Choestoea Creek	42	54	75
SV-301	Norris Creek	78	NRN	73

Highlighted cells indicate critical condition.

NRN = no reduction needed. Existing load below target load.

5.3 Waste load Allocation

The waste load allocation (WLA) is the portion of the TMDL allocated to NPDES-permitted point sources (USEPA 1991). Note that all illicit dischargers, including SSOs, are illegal and not covered under the WLA of these TMDLs.

5.3.1 Continuous Point Sources

There are currently no permitted domestic dischargers in the Choestoea Creek Watershed. Future continuous discharges are required to meet the prescribed loading for the pollutant of concern based on permitted flow and an allowable permitted maximum concentration of 400cfu/100mL.

5.3.2 Non Continuous Point Sources

Non-continuous point sources include all NPDES-permitted stormwater discharges, including current and future MS4s, construction and industrial stormwater discharges covered under permits numbered SCS & SCR and regulated under SC *Water Pollution Control Permits* Regulation 122.26(b)(14) & (15) (SCDHEC 2010). Illicit discharges, including SSOs, are not covered under any NPDES permit and are subject to enforcement mechanisms. All areas defined as “Urbanized Area” by the US Census are required under the NPDES Phase II Stormwater Regulations to obtain a permit for the discharge of stormwater. Other non-urbanized areas may be required under the NPDES Phase II Stormwater Regulations to obtain a permit for the discharge of stormwater. At the time of the TMDL development, no part of the Choestoea Creek Watershed is classified as urbanized area.

Waste load allocations for stormwater discharges are expressed as a percentage reduction instead of a numeric loading due to the uncertain nature of stormwater discharge volumes and recurrence intervals. All current and future stormwater discharges are required to meet the percentage reduction or the existing instream standard for the pollutant of concern. The percent reduction is based on the maximum percent reduction (critical condition) within any hydrologic category necessary to achieve target conditions. Table 6 presents the reduction needed for the impaired segment. The reduction percentages in these TMDLs also apply to the FC waste load attributable to those areas of the watershed that are covered or will be covered under NPDES MS4 permits.

Compliance by an entity with responsibility for the MS4, with the terms of its individual MS4 permit may fulfill any obligations it has towards implementing these TMDLs. As appropriate information is made available to further define the pollutant contributions for the permitted MS4, an effort can be made to revise these TMDLs. This effort will be initiated as resources permit and if deemed appropriate by the Department. For the Department to revise these TMDLs the following information should be provided, but not limited to:

1. An inventory of service boundaries of the MS4 covered in the MS4 permit, provided as ARCGIS compatible shape files.
2. An inventory of all existing and planned stormwater discharge points, conveyances, and drainage areas for the discharge points, provided as ARCGIS compatible shape files. If drainage areas are not

known, any information that would help estimate the drainage areas should be provided. The percentage of impervious surface within the MS4 area should also be provided.

3. Appropriate and relevant data should be provided to calculate individual pollutant contributions for the MS4 permitted entities. At a minimum, this information should include precipitation, water quality, and flow data for stormwater discharge points.

Compliance with terms and conditions of existing and future NPDES sanitary and stormwater permits (including all construction, industrial and MS4) will effectively implement the WLA and demonstrate consistency with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL. However, the Department recognizes that the SCDOT is not a traditional MS4 in that it does not possess statutory taxing or enforcement powers. The SCDOT does not regulate land use of zoning, issue building or development permits.

Table 6. Percent Reduction Necessary to Achieve Target Load.

Station	Waterbody	% Reduction
SV-108	Choestoea Creek	75
SV-301	Norris Creek	78

5.4 Load Allocation

The Load Allocation applies to the nonpoint sources of FC bacteria and is expressed both as a load and as a percent reduction. The load allocation is calculated as the difference between the target load under the critical condition and the point source WLA. The load allocation is listed in Table 7. There may be other unregulated MS4s located in the Choestoea Creek Watershed that are subject to the LA components of these TMDLs. At such time that the referenced entities, or other future unregulated entities become regulated NPDES MS4 entities and are subject to applicable provisions of SC Regulation 61-68D, they will be required to meet load reductions prescribed in the WLA component of the TMDL. This also applies to future discharges associated with industrial and construction activities that will be subject to SC R. 122.26(b)(14) & (15) (SCDHEC 2010).

5.5 Seasonal Variability

Federal regulations require that TMDLs take into account the seasonal variability in watershed loading. The variability in these TMDLs is accounted for by using a 10-year hydrological and water quality sampling data set.

5.6 Margin of Safety

The margin of safety (MOS) may be explicit and/or implicit. The explicit margin of safety is 5% of the TMDL or 20 counts/100mL of the instantaneous criterion of 400 cfu/100 mL (380 cfu/100mL). Target loads are therefore 95% of the assimilative capacity (TMDL) of the waterbody. The MOS is expressed as the value calculated from the critical condition defined in Section 5.1 and is the difference between the TMDL and the sum of the WLA and LA.

5.7 TMDL

For most pollutants, TMDLs are expressed as a mass load (e.g., kilograms per day). For bacteria, however, TMDLs are expressed in terms of cfu or organism counts (or resulting concentration), in accordance with 40 CFR 130.2(l). Only the instantaneous water quality criterion was targeted for the Choestoea Creek Watershed because there is insufficient data to evaluate against the 30-day geometric mean. The target load is defined as the load (from point and nonpoint sources) minus the MOS that a stream segment can receive while meeting the WQS. The TMDL value is the median target load within the critical condition (i.e., the middle value within the hydrologic category that requires the greatest load reduction) plus WLA and MOS.

While TMDL development was primarily based on instantaneous water quality criterion, terms and conditions of NPDES permits for continuous discharges require facilities to demonstrate compliance with both geometric

mean and instantaneous water quality criteria for FC bacteria in treated effluent. NPDES permits for continuous dischargers require data collection sufficient to monitor for compliance of both criteria at the point of outfall.

Table 7 indicates the percentage reduction or water quality standard required for each subwatershed in the Choestoea Creek Watershed (WQM Station). Note that all future regulated NPDES-permitted stormwater discharges will also be required to meet the prescribed percentage reductions, or the water quality standard. It should be noted that in order to meet the WQS for FC bacteria prescribed load reductions must be targeted from all sources, including NPDES permitted and nonpoint sources.

Based on the available information at this time, the portion of the Choestoea Creek Watershed that drains directly to a regulated MS4 and that which drains through the unregulated MS4 has not been clearly defined within the MS4 jurisdictional area. Loading from both types of sources (regulated and unregulated) typically occurs in response to rainfall events, and discharge volumes as well as recurrence intervals are largely unknown. Therefore, the regulated MS4 is assigned the same percent reduction as the non-regulated sources in the watershed. Compliance with the MS4 permit in regards to this TMDL document is determined at the point of discharge to waters of the state. The regulated MS4 entity is only responsible for implementing the TMDL WLA in accordance with their MS4 permit requirements and is not responsible for reducing loads prescribed as LA in this TMDL document.

Table 7. Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Choestoea Creek Watershed. Loads are expressed as colony forming units (cfu) per day.

Station	Existing Load (cfu/day)	TMDL (cfu/day)	Margin of Safety (MOS) (cfu/day)	Waste load Allocation (WLA)		Load Allocation (LA)	
				Continuous Source ¹ (cfu/day)	Non-Continuous Sources ^{2,3,4} (% Reduction)	Load Allocation (cfu/day)	% Reduction to Meet LA ³
SV-108	2.96+11	7.85+10	3.92+09	See Note Below	75	7.45+10	75
SV-301	9.08+11	2.06+11	1.03+10	See Note Below	78	1.96+11	78

Table Notes:

1. WLAs are expressed as a daily maximum. There are no existing continuous sources at this time. Future continuous discharges are required to meet the prescribed loading for the pollutant of concern. Future loadings will be developed based upon permitted flow and an allowable permitted maximum concentration of 400cfu/100ml.
2. Percent reduction applies to all NPDES-permitted stormwater discharges, including current and future MS4, construction and industrial discharges covered under permits numbered SCS & SCR. Stormwater discharges are expressed as a percentage reduction due to the uncertain nature of stormwater discharge volumes and recurrence intervals. Stormwater discharges are required to meet percentage reduction or the existing instream standard for pollutant of concern in accordance with their NPDES Permit.
3. Percent reduction applies to existing instream load.
4. By implementing the best management practices that are prescribed in either the SCDOT annual SWMP or the SCDOT MS4 Permit to address fecal coliform, the SCDOT will comply with this TMDL and its applicable WLA to the maximum extent practicable (MEP) as required by its MS4 permit.

6.0 IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of both point (WLA) and non-point (LA) source components of the TMDL are necessary to bring about the required reductions in FC bacteria loading to Choestoea Creek and its tributaries in order to achieve water quality standards. Using existing authorities and mechanisms, an implementation plan providing information on how point and non point sources of pollution are being abated or may be abated in order to meet water quality standards is provided. Sections 6.1.1-6.1.7 presented below correspond with sections 3.1.1-3.2.5 of the source assessment presented in the TMDL document. As the implementation strategy progresses, the SCDHEC will continue to monitor the effectiveness of implementation measures and evaluate water quality where deemed appropriate.

Point sources are discernible, confined, and discrete conveyances of pollutants to a water body including but not limited to pipes, outfalls, channels, tunnels, conduits, man-made ditches, etc. The Clean Water Act's primary point source control program is the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Point sources can be broken down into continuous and non-continuous point sources. Some examples of a continuous point source are wastewater treatment facilities (WWTF) and industrial facilities. Non-continuous point sources are related to stormwater and include MS4, construction activities, etc. Current and future NPDES discharges in the referenced watershed are required to comply with the load reductions prescribed in the waste load allocation (WLA).

Nonpoint source pollution originates from multiple sources over a relatively large area. It is diffuse in nature and indistinct from other sources of pollution. It is generally caused by the pickup and transport of pollutants from rainfall moving over and through the ground. Nonpoint sources of pollution may include, but are not limited to: wildlife, agricultural activities, illicit discharges, failing septic systems, and urban runoff. Nonpoint sources located in unregulated portions of the Choestoea Creek Watershed are subject to the load allocation (LA) and not the WLA of the TMDL document.

South Carolina has several tools available for implementing the non-point source components of these TMDLs. The *Implementation Plan for Achieving Total Maximum Daily Load Reductions From Nonpoint Sources for the State of South Carolina* (SCDHEC 1998) document is one example. Another key component for interested parties to control pollution and prevent water quality degradation in the Choestoea Creek Watershed would be the establishment and administration of a program of Best Management Practices (BMPs). Best management practices may be defined as a practice or a combination of practices that have been determined to be the most effective, practical means used in the prevention and/or reduction of pollution.

Interested parties (local stakeholder groups, universities, local governments, etc.) may be eligible to apply for CWA §319 grants to install BMPs that will implement the LA portions of these TMDLs and reduce nonpoint source FC loading to Choestoea Creek and its tributaries. Congress amended the Clean Water Act (CWA) in 1987 to establish the Section 319 Nonpoint Source Management Program. Under Section 319, States receive grant money to support a wide variety of activities including the restoration of impaired waters. TMDL implementation projects are given highest priority for 319 funding. CWA §319 grants are not available for implementation of the WLA components of these TMDLs or within any permitted jurisdictional MS4 area. Additional resources are provided in Section 7.0 of this TMDL document.

The SCDHEC will also work with the existing agencies in the area to provide nonpoint source education in the Choestoea Creek Watershed. Local sources of nonpoint source education and assistance include the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), the Oconee County Soil and Water Conservation Services, the Clemson University Cooperative Extension Service, and the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources.

The Department recognizes that **adaptive management/implementation** of these TMDLs might be needed to achieve the water quality standard and we are committed towards targeting the load reductions to improve water quality in the Choestoea Creek Watershed. As additional data and/or information become available, it may become necessary to revise and/or modify the TMDL target accordingly.

6.1 Implementation Strategies

The strategies presented in this document for implementation of the referenced TMDL are not inclusive and are to be used only as guidance. The strategies are informational suggestions that may lead to the required load reductions being met for the referenced watershed while demonstrating consistency with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL. Application of certain strategies provided within may be voluntary and are not a substitute for actual NPDES permit conditions.

6.1.1 Continuous Point Sources

Continuous point source WLA reductions will be implemented through NPDES permits. Existing and future continuous discharges are required to meet the prescribed loading for the pollutant of concern and demonstrate

consistency with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL. Loadings are developed based upon permitted flow and assume an allowable permitted maximum concentration of 400 cfu/100ml.

6.1.2 Non-Continuous Point Sources

An iterative BMP approach as defined in the general stormwater NPDES MS4 permit is expected to provide significant implementation of the WLA. Permit requirements for implementing WLAs in approved TMDLs will vary across waterbodies, discharges, and pollutant(s) of concern. The allocations within a TMDL can take many different forms – narrative, numeric, specific BMPs – and may be complimented by other special requirements such as monitoring.

The level of monitoring necessary, deployment of structural and non-structural BMPs, evaluation of BMP performance, and optimization or revisions to the existing pollutant reduction goals of the SWMP or any other plan is TMDL and watershed specific. Hence, it is expected that NPDES permit holders evaluate their existing SWMP or other plans in a manner that would effectively address implementation of these TMDLs with an acceptable schedule and activities for their permit compliance. The Department staff (permit writers, TMDL project managers, and compliance staff) is willing to assist in developing or updating the referenced plan as deemed necessary. Please see Appendix C which provides additional information as it relates to evaluating the effectiveness of an MS4 Permit as it related to compliance with approved TMDLs. For SCDOT, existing and future NPDES MS4 permittees, compliance with terms and conditions of its NPDES permit is effective implementation of the WLA to the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP) and demonstrates consistency with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL. For existing and future NPDES construction and Industrial stormwater permittees, compliance with terms and conditions of its permit is effective implementation of the WLA.

The Department acknowledges that progress with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL by MS4s is expected to take one or more permit iteration. Achieving the WLA reduction for the TMDL may constitute MS4 compliance with its SWMP, provided the MEP definition is met, even where the numeric percent reduction may not be achieved in the interim.

Regulated MS4 entities are required to develop a SWMP that includes the following: public education, public involvement, illicit discharge detection & elimination, construction site runoff control, post construction runoff control, and pollution prevention/good housekeeping. These measures are not exhaustive and may include additional criterion depending on the type of NPDES MS4 permit that applies. The following examples are recognized as acceptable stormwater practices and may be applied to unregulated MS4 entities or other interested parties in the development of a stormwater management plan.

An informed and knowledgeable community is crucial to the success of a stormwater management plan (USEPA, 2005). MS4 entities may implement a public education program to distribute educational materials to the community, or conduct equivalent outreach activities about the impacts of stormwater discharges on local waterbodies and the steps that can be taken to reduce stormwater pollution. Some appropriate BMPs may be brochures, educational programs, storm drain stenciling, stormwater hotlines, tributary signage, and alternative information sources such as web sites, bumper stickers, etc (USEPA, 2005).

The public can provide valuable input and assistance to a stormwater management program and they may have the potential to play an active role in both the development and implementation of the stormwater program where deemed appropriate by the entity. There are a variety of practices that can involve public participation such as public meetings/citizens panels, volunteer water quality monitoring, volunteer educators, community clean-ups, citizen watch groups, and “Adopt a Storm Drain” programs which encourage individuals or groups to keep storm drains free of debris and monitor what is entering local waterways through storm drains (USEPA, 2005).

Illicit discharge detection and elimination efforts are also necessary. Discharges from MS4s often include wastes and wastewater from non-stormwater sources. These discharges enter the system through either direct connections or indirect connections. The result is untreated discharges that contribute high levels of pollutants,

including heavy metals, toxics, oil and grease, solvents, nutrients, viruses, and bacteria to receiving waterbodies (USEPA, 2005). Pollutant levels from these illicit discharges have been shown in EPA studies to be high enough to significantly degrade receiving water quality and threaten aquatic, wildlife, and human health. MS4 entities may have a storm sewer system map which shows the location of all outfalls and to which waters of the US they discharge for instance. If not already in place, an ordinance prohibiting non-stormwater discharges into a MS4 with appropriate enforcement procedures may also be developed. Entities may also have a plan for detecting and addressing non-stormwater discharges. The plan may include locating problem areas through infrared photography, finding the sources through dye testing, removal/correction of illicit connections, and documenting the actions taken to illustrate that progress is being made to eliminate illicit connections and discharges.

A program might also be developed to reduce pollutants in stormwater runoff to the MS4 area from construction activities. An ordinance or other regulatory mechanism may exist requiring the implementation of proper erosion and sediment controls on applicable construction sites. Site plans should be reviewed for projects that consider potential water quality impacts. It is recommended that site inspections should be conducted and control measures enforced where applicable. A procedure might also exist for considering information submitted by the public (USEPA, 2005). For information on specific BMPs please refer to the SCDHEC Stormwater Management BMP Handbook online at: http://www.scdhec.com/environment/ocrm/pubs/docs/SW/BMP_Handbook/Erosion_prevention.pdf

Post-construction stormwater management in areas undergoing new development or redevelopment is recommended because runoff from these areas has been shown to significantly affect receiving waterbodies. Many studies indicate that prior planning and design for the minimization of pollutants in post-construction stormwater discharges is the most cost-effective approach to stormwater quality management (USEPA, 2005). Strategies might be developed to include a combination of structural and/or non-structural BMPs. An ordinance or other regulatory mechanism may also exist requiring the implementation of post-construction runoff controls and ensuring their long term-operation and maintenance. Examples of non-structural BMPs are planning procedures and site-based BMPs (minimization of imperviousness and maximization of open space). Structural BMPs may include but are not limited to stormwater retention/detention BMPs, infiltration BMPs (dry wells, porous pavement, etc.), and vegetative BMPs (grassy swales, filter strips, rain gardens, artificial wetlands, etc.).

Pollution prevention/good housekeeping is also a key element of stormwater management programs. Generally this requires the MS4 entity to examine and alter their programs or activities to ensure reductions in pollution are occurring. It is recommended that a plan be developed to prevent or reduce pollutant runoff from municipal operations into the storm sewer system and it is encouraged to include employee training on how to incorporate and document pollution prevention/good housekeeping techniques. To minimize duplication of effort and conserve resources, the MS4 operator can use training materials that are available from EPA or relevant organizations (USEPA, 2005).

MS4 communities are encouraged to utilize partnerships when developing and implementing a stormwater management program. Watershed associations, educational organizations, and state, county, and city governments are all examples of possible partners with resources that can be shared. For additional information on partnerships contact the SCDHEC Watershed Manager for the waterbody of concern online at: <http://www.scdhec.gov/environment/water/shed/contact.htm> For additional information on stormwater discharges associated with MS4 entities please see the SCDHEC's NPDES web page online at <http://www.scdhec.gov/environment/water/swnpdes.htm> as well as the USEPA NPDES website online at http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/home.cfm?program_id=6 for information pertaining to the National Menu of BMPs, Urban BMP Performance Tool, Outreach Documents, etc.

6.1.3 Wildlife

Suggested forms of implementation for wildlife will vary widely due to geographic location and species. There are many forms of acceptable wildlife BMPs in practice and development at the present time. For example, contiguous forested areas could be set up and managed to keep wildlife from bedding down and defecating

near surface waters. This management practice relies on concentrating wildlife away from water bodies to minimize their impact to pollutant loading. Additionally, contributions from wildlife could be reduced in protected areas by developing a management plan which would allow hunting access during certain seasons. Although this strategy might not work in all situations, it would decrease FC loading from wildlife in areas where wildlife may be a significant contributor to the overall watershed.

Deterrents may also be used to keep wildlife away from docks and lawns in close proximity to surface waters. Non-toxic spray deterrents, decoys, eagles, kites, noisemakers, scarecrows, and plastic owls are a sample of what is currently available. Many waterfowl species are deterred by foreign objects on lawns and the planting of a shrub buffer along greenways adjacent to impoundments may also be effective.

In addition, homeowners and the hunting community should be educated on the impacts of feeding wildlife or planting wildlife food plots in close proximity to surface waters. Please check local and federal laws before applying deterrents or harassing wildlife. Additional information may be obtained from the "Managing Pet and Wildlife Waste to Prevent Contamination of Drinking Water" bulletin provided by USEPA (2001).

6.1.4 Agricultural Activities

Suggested forms of implementation for agricultural activities will vary based on the activity of concern. Agricultural BMPs can be vegetative, structural or management oriented. When selecting BMPs, it is important to keep in mind that nonpoint source pollution occurs when a pollutant becomes available, is detached and then transported to nearby receiving waters. Therefore, for BMPs to be effective, the transport mechanism of the pollutant, fecal coliform, needs to be identified. For livestock in the referenced watershed, installing fencing along the streams within the watershed and providing an alternative water source where livestock are present would eliminate direct contact with the streams. Numerous livestock and hobby farms were present in the Choestoea Creek Watershed at the time a source assessment was conducted (Figures E-1 through E-3). If fencing is not feasible, it has been shown that installing water troughs within a pasture area reduced the amount of time livestock spent drinking directly from streams by 92% (ASABE 1997). An indirect result of this was a 77% reduction in stream bank erosion by providing an alternative to accessing the stream directly for water supply.

For row crop farms in the referenced watershed, many common practices exist to reduce FC contributions. Unstabilized soil directly adjacent to surface waters can contribute to FC loading during periods of runoff after rain events. Agricultural field borders and filter strips (vegetative buffers) can provide erosion control around the border of planted crop fields. These borders can provide food for wildlife, may possibly be harvested (grass and legume), and also provide an area where farmers can turn around their equipment (SCDNR, 1997). A study conducted in 1998 by the American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE 1998) has shown that a vegetative buffer measuring 6.1 meters in width can reduce fecal runoff concentrations from 2.0E+7 to an immeasurable amount once filtered through the buffer. A buffer of this width was also shown to reduce phosphorous and nitrogen concentrations by 75%.

The agricultural BMPs listed above are a sample of the many accepted practices that are currently available. Many other techniques such as conservation tillage, responsible pest management, and precision agriculture also exist and may contribute to an improvement in overall water quality in the Choestoea Creek Watershed. Education should be provided to local farmers on these methods as well as acceptable manure spreading and holding (stacking sheds) practices.

For additional information on accepted agricultural BMPs you can obtain a copy of the "Farming for Clean Water in South Carolina" handbook by contacting Clemson University Cooperative Extension Service at (864) 656-1550. In addition, Clemson Extension Service offers a 'Farm-A-Syst' package to farmers. Farm-A-Syst allows the farmer to evaluate practices on their property and determine the nonpoint source impact they may be having. It recommends best management practices (BMPs) to correct nonpoint source problems on the farm. You can access Farm-A-Syst by going onto the Clemson Extension Service website: <http://www.clemson.edu/waterquality/FARM.HTM>.

NRCS provides financial and technical assistance to help South Carolina landowners address natural resource concerns, promote environmental quality, and protect wildlife habitat on property they own or control. The cost-share funds are available through the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP). EQIP helps farmers improve production while protecting environmental quality by addressing such concerns as soil erosion and productivity, grazing management, water quality, animal waste, and forestry concerns. EQIP also assists eligible small-scale farmers who have historically not participated in or ranked high enough to be funded in previous sign ups. Please visit www.sc.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/ for more information, including eligibility requirements.

Also available through NRCS, the Grassland Reserve Program (GRP) is a voluntary program offering landowners the opportunity to protect, restore and enhance grasslands on their property. NRCS and the Farm Service Agency (FSA) coordinate implementation of the GRP, which helps landowners restore and protect grassland, rangeland, pastureland, shrubland and certain other lands and provides assistance for rehabilitating grasslands. The program will conserve vulnerable grasslands from conversion to cropland or other uses and conserve valuable grasslands by helping maintain viable grazing operations. A grazing management plan is required for participants. NRCS has further information on their website for the GRP as well as additional programs such as the Conservation Reserve Program, Conservation Security Program, Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program, etc. You can visit the NRCS website by going to: www.sc.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/.

6.1.5 Leaking Sanitary Sewers and Illicit Discharges

Leaking sanitary sewers and illicit discharges, although illegal and subject to enforcement, may be occurring in regulated or unregulated portions of the Choestoea Creek Watershed at any time. Due to the high concentration of pollutant loading that is generally associated with these discharges, their detection may provide a substantial improvement in overall water quality in the watershed. Detection methods may include, but are not limited to: dye testing, air pressure testing, static pressure testing, and infrared photography.

The SCDHEC recognizes illicit discharge detection and elimination activities are conducted by regulated MS4 entities as pursuant to compliance with existing MS4 permits. Note that these activities are designed to detect and eliminate illicit discharges that may contain FC bacteria. It is the intent of the SCDHEC to work with the MS4 entities to recognize FC load reductions as they are achieved. The SCDHEC acknowledges that these efforts to reduce illicit discharges and SSOs are ongoing and some reduction may already be accountable (i.e., load reductions occurring during TMDL development process). Thus, the implementation process is an iterative and adaptive process. Regular communication between all implementation stakeholders will result in successful remediation of controllable sources over time. As designated uses are restored, the SCDHEC will recognize efforts of implementers where their efforts can be directly linked to restoration.

6.1.6 Failing Septic Systems

A septic system, also known as an onsite wastewater system, is defined as failing when it is not treating or disposing of sewage in an effective manner. The most common reason for failure is improper maintenance by homeowners. Untreated sewage water contains disease-causing bacteria and viruses, as well as unhealthy amounts of nitrate and other chemicals. Failed septic systems can allow untreated sewage to seep into wells, groundwater, and surface water bodies, where people get their drinking water and recreate. Pumping a septic tank is probably the single most important thing that can be done to protect the system. If the buildup of solids in the tanks becomes too high and solids move to the drainfield, this could clog and strain the system to the point where a new drainfield will be needed.

The SCDHEC's Office of Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) has created a toolkit for homeowners and local governments which includes tips for maintaining septic systems. These septic system Do's and Don't's are as follows:

Do's:

- Conserve water to reduce the amount of wastewater that must be treated and disposed of by your system. Doing laundry over several days will put less stress on your system.
- Repair any leaking faucets or toilets. To detect toilet leaks, add several drops of food dye to the toilet tank and see if dye ends up in the bowl.
- Divert down spouts and other surface water away from your drainfield. Excessive water keeps the soil from adequately cleansing the wastewater.
- Have your septic tank inspected yearly and pumped regularly by a licensed septic tank contractor.

Don'ts:

- Don't drive over your drainfield or compact the soil in any way.
- Don't dig in your drainfield or build anything over it, and don't cover it with a hard surface such as concrete or asphalt.
- Don't plant anything over or near the drainfield except grass. Roots from nearby trees and shrubs may clog and damage the drain lines.
- Don't use your toilet as a trash can or poison your system and the groundwater by pouring harmful chemicals and cleansers down the drain. Harsh chemicals can kill the bacteria that help purify your wastewater.

For additional information on how septic systems work, how to properly plan and maintain a septic system, or to link to the OCRM toolkit mentioned above, please visit the SCDHEC Environmental Health Onsite Wastewater page at the following link: http://www.scdhec.gov/health/envhlth/onsite_wastewater/septic_tank.htm

6.1.7 Urban Runoff

Urban runoff is surface runoff of rainwater created by urbanization outside of regulated areas which may pick up and carry pollutants to receiving waters. Pavement, compacted areas, roofs, reduced tree canopy and open space increase runoff volumes that rapidly flow into receiving waters. This increase in volume and velocity of runoff often causes stream bank erosion, channel incision and sediment deposition in stream channels. In addition, runoff from these developed areas can increase stream temperatures that along with the increase in flow rate and pollutant loads negatively affect water quality and aquatic life (USEPA 2005). This runoff can pick up FC bacteria along the way. Many strategies currently exist to reduce FC loading from urban runoff and the USEPA nonpoint source pollution website provides extensive resources on this subject which can be accessed online at: <http://www.epa.gov/nps/urban.html>.

Some examples of urban nonpoint source BMPs are street sweeping, stormwater wetlands, pet waste receptacles (equipped with waste bags), and educational signs which can be installed adjacent to receiving waters in the watershed such as parks, common areas, apartment complexes, trails, etc. Low impact development (LID) may also be effective. LID is an approach to land development (or re-development) that works with nature to manage stormwater as close to its source as possible. LID employs principles such as preserving and recreating natural landscape features, minimizing effective imperviousness to create functional and appealing site drainage that treats stormwater as a resource rather than a waste product. There are many practices that have been used to adhere to these principles such as bioretention facilities, rain gardens, vegetated rooftops, rain barrels, and permeable pavements (USEPA, 2009).

Some additional urban BMPs that can be adopted in public parks are doggy doileys and pooch patches. Doggy doileys are disposal units, which act like septic systems for pet waste, and are installed in the ground where decomposition can occur (USEPA, 2001). This requires that pet owners place the waste into the disposal units. During a source assessment, numerous dogs were noticed unattended in the referenced watershed (Figures E-4 and E-5 in Appendix E). Although the Choestoea Creek Watershed is predominantly rural in nature, many of the urban runoff practices discussed in this section can be applied to individual

households in the watershed. Education should be provided to individual homeowners in the referenced watershed on the contributions to FC loading from pet waste. Education to homeowners in the watershed on the fate of substances poured into storm drain inlets should also be provided. For additional information on urban runoff please see the SCDHEC Nonpoint Source Runoff Pollution homepage at <http://www.scdhec.gov/environment/water/npspage.htm>.

Clemson Extension's Home-A-Syst handbook can also help homeowners reduce sources of NPS pollution on their property. This document guides homeowners through a self-assessment of their property and can be accessed online at: <http://www.clemson.edu/waterquality/HOMASYS.HTM>

7.0 RESOURCES FOR POLLUTION MANAGEMENT

This section provides a listing of available resources to aid in the mitigation and control of pollutants. There are examples from across the nation, most of which are easily accessible on the world wide web.

7.1 General for Urban and Suburban Stormwater Mitigation

- National Management Measures to Control Nonpoint Source Pollution from Urban Areas – Draft. 2002. EPA842-B-02-003. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/urbanmm/index.html>
- Stormwater Management Volume Two: Stormwater Technical Manual. Massachusetts Department of Environmental Management. 1997. Available at: <http://www.mass.gov/dep/brp/stormwtr/stormpub.htm>
- Fact Sheets for the six minimum control measures for storm sewers regulated under Phase I or Phase II. Available at: http://cfpub1.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/swfinal.cfm?program_id=6
- A Current Assessment of Urban Best Management Practices. 1992. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Washington, DC
- Controlling Urban Runoff: A Practical Manual for Planning and Designing Urban BMPs. 1987. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Washington, DC
- 2004 Stormwater Quality Manual. Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection 2004. Available at: <http://dep.state.ct.us/wtr/stormwater/strmwtrman.htm>
- Stormwater Treatment BMP New Technology Report. California Department of Transportation. 2004. SW-04-069-.04.02 Available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/stormwater/special/newsetup/_pdfs/new_technology/CTSW-RT-04-069.pdf
- Moonlight Beach Urban Runoff Treatment facility: Using Ultraviolet Disinfection to Reduce Bacteria Counts. Rasmus, J. and K. Weldon. 2003. StormWater, May/June 2003. Available at http://www.forester.net/sw_0305_moonlight.html
- Operation, Maintenance, and Management of Stormwater Management Systems. Livingston, Shaver, Skupien, and Horner. August 1997. Watershed Management Institute. Call: (850) 926-5310.

- Model Ordinances to Protect Local Resources – Stormwater Control Operation and Maintenance. USEPA Webpage: <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/ordinance/stormwater.htm>
- Stormwater O & M Fact Sheet Preventive Maintenance. USEPA 1999. 832-F-99-004. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/owm/mtb/prevmain.pdf>
- The MassHighway Stormwater Handbook. Massachusetts Highway Department. 2004. Available at: <http://166.90.180.162/mhd/downloads/projDev/swbook.pdf>
- University of New Hampshire Stormwater Center: Dedicated to the protection of water resources through effective stormwater management. Available at: <http://www.unh.edu/erg/cstev/index.htm#>
- EPA's Stormwater website: <http://www.epa.gov/region1/topics/water/stormwater.html>

7.2 Illicit Discharges

- Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Manual - A Handbook for Municipalities. 2003. New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission. Available at: http://www.neiwpc.org/PDF_Docs/iddmanual.pdf
- Model Ordinances to Protect Local Resources – Illicit Discharges. USEPA webpage: <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/ordinance/discharges.htm>

7.3 Pet Waste

- National Management Measure to Control Non Point Source Pollution from Urban Areas – Draft. USEPA 2002. EPA 842-B-02-2003. Available from: <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/urbanmm/index.html>
- Septic Systems for Dogs? Nonpoint Source News-Notes 63. Pet Waste: Dealing with a Real Problem in Suburbia. Kemper, J. 2000. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. Available from: http://www.state.nj.us/dep/watershedmgt/pet_waste_fredk.htm
- Stormwater Manager's Resource Center. Schueler, T., Center for Watershed Protection, Inc. <http://www.stormwatercenter.net>
- Guidance Specifying Management Measures for Sources of Nonpoint Pollution in Coastal Waters. U.S. EPA, Office of Water 1993. Washington, DC.
- National Menu of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Phase II. USEPA. 2002. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/npdes/menuofbmps/menu.htm>
- Welcome to NVRC'S Four Mile Run Program. NVRC 2001. Available at: <http://www.novaregion.org/fourmilerun.htm>
- Boston's ordinance on dog waste. City of Boston Municipal Codes, Chapter XVI. 16-1.10A Dog Fouling. Available at: http://www.amlegal.com/boston_ma/
- Pet Waste and Water Quality. Hill, J.A., and D. Johnson. 1994. University of Wisconsin Extension Service. <http://cecommerce.uwex.edu/pdfs/GWQ006.PDF>
- Long Island Sound Study. Pet Waste Poster. EPA. Available at: <http://www.longislandsoundstudy.net/pubs/misc/pet.html>

- Source Water Protection Practices Bulletin: Managing Pet and Wildlife Waste to Prevent Contamination of Drinking Water. USEPA. 2001. EPA 916-F-01-027. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/protect/pdfs/petwaste.pdf>

7.4 Wildlife

- An example of a bylaw prohibiting the feeding of wildlife: Prohibiting Feeding of Wildlife. Town of Bourne Bylaws Section 3.4.3. Available at: http://www.townofbourne.com/Town%20Offices/Bylaws/chapter_3.htm
- Integrated Management of Urban Canadian Geese. M Underhill. 1999. Conference Proceedings, Waterfowl Information Network.
- Urban Canadian Geese in Missouri. Missouri Conservationist Online. Available at: <http://www.conservation.state.mo.us/conmag/2004/02/20.htm>

7.5 Septic Systems

- National Management Measures to Control Nonpoint Source Pollution from Urban Areas – Draft. Chapter 6. New and Existing Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems. USEPA 2002. EPA842-B-02-003. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/urbanmm/index.html>
- Septic Systems. USEPA Webpage: <http://cfpub.epa.gov/owm/septic/home.cfm>

7.6 Field Application of Manure

- Conservation Standard Practice-Irrigation Water Management. Number 449. United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2003. Available at: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/Standards/nhcp.html>
- Conservation Standard Practice-Filter Strip. Number 393. USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2003. Available at: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/Standards/nhcp.html>
- Buffer Strips: Common Sense Conservation. USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service. No Date. Website. Available at: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/feature/buffers/>
- Conservation Standard Practice-Riparian Forest Buffer. Number 391. USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service. 2003. Available at: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/Standards/nhcp.html>
- Conservation Standard Practice-Riparian Herbaceous Cover. Number 390 USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service. 2003. Available at: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/Standards/nhcp.html>

7.7 Grazing Management

- Conservation Standard Practice-Stream Crossing. Number 578. USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service. 2003. Available at: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/Standards/nhcp.html>

- Guidance Specifying Management Measures for Nonpoint Source Pollution in Coastal Waters. Chapter 2. Management Measures for Agricultural Sources. Grazing Management. USEPA. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/MMGI/Chapter2/ch2-2e.html>

7.8 Animal Feeding Operations and Barnyards

- National Management Measures to Control Nonpoint Source Pollution from Agriculture. USEPA 2003. Report: EPA 841-B-03-004. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/agmm/index.html>
- Livestock Manure Storage. Software designed to assess the threat to ground and surface water from manure storage facilities. USEPA. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/seahome/manure.html>
- National Engineering Handbook Part 651. Agricultural Waste Management Field Handbook. NRCS. Available At: <http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/awm/awmfh.html>
- Animal Waste Management. NRCS website: <http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/awm/>
- Animal Waste Management Software. A tool for estimating waste production and storage requirements. Available at: <http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/awm/awm.html>
- Manure Management Planner. Software for creating manure management plans. Available at: <http://www.agry.purdue.edu/mmp/>
- Animal Feeding Operations Virtual Information Center. USEPA website: <http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/afo/virtualcenter.cfm>

7.9 Federal Agriculture Resources: Program Overviews, Technical Assistance, and Funding

- USDA-NRCS assists landowners with planning for the conservation of soil, water, and natural resources. Local, state, and federal agencies and policymakers also rely on NRCS expertise. Cost shares and financial incentives are available in some cases. Most work is done with local partners. The NRCS is the largest funding source for agricultural improvements. To find out about potential funding, see: <http://www.ma.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/>. To pursue obtaining funding, contact a local NRCS coordinator. Contact information is available at: http://www.ma.nrcs.usda.gov/contact/employee_directory.html
- NRCS provides a wealth of information and BMP fact sheets tailored to agricultural and conservation practices through the NRCS Electronic Field Office Technical Guide at: http://efotg.nrcs.usda.gov/efotg_locator.aspx?map=SC
- The 2002 USDA Farm Bill (<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/farmbill/2002/>) provides a variety of programs related to conservation. Information can be found at: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/farmbill/2002/products.html>. The following programs can be linked to from the USDA Farm Bill website:
 - Conservation Security Program (CSP): <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/csp/>
 - Conservation Reserve Program (CRP): <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/crp/>
 - Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP): <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/wrp/>
 - Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP): <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/eqip/>

- Grassland Reserve Program (GRP): <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/GRP/>
 - Conservation of Private Grazing Land Program (CPGL):
<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/cpgl/>
 - Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP): <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/whip/>
 - Farm and Ranch Land Protection Program (FRPP): <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/frpp/>
 - Resource Conservation and Development Program (RC&D):
<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/rcd/>
- CORE4 Conservation Practices. The common sense approach to natural resource conservation. USDA-NRCS (1999). This manual is intended to help USDA-NRCS personnel and other conservation and nonpoint source management professionals implement effective programs using four core conservation practices: conservation tillage, nutrient management, pest management, and conservation buffers, available at: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/ECS/agronomy/core4.pdf>
 - County soil survey maps are available from NRCS at: <http://soils.usda.gov>
 - Guidance Specifying Management Measures for Sources of Nonpoint Pollution in Coastal Waters. U.S. EPA, Office of Water (1993). Developed for use by State Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Programs, Chapter 2 of this document covers erosion control, animal feeding operation management, grazing practices, and management of nutrients, pesticides, and irrigation water, available at: <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/MMGI/Chapter2/index.html>.
 - Farm-A-Syst is a partnership between government agencies and private business that enables landowners to prevent pollution on farms, ranches, and in homes using confidential environmental assessments, available at: <http://www.uwex.edu/farmasyst/>
 - State Environmental Laws Affecting South Carolina Agriculture: A comprehensive assessment of regulatory issues related to South Carolina agriculture has been compiled by the National Association of State Departments, available at: <http://www.nasdaq.org/nasdaq/nasdaq/Foundation/state/states.htm>
 - Waterborne Pathogens in Agricultural Wastewater. Rosen, B. H., 2000. USDA, NRCS, Watershed Science Institute. Available at:
ftp://ftp-fc.sc.egov.usda.gov/WSI/pdffiles/Pathogens_in_Agricultural_Watersheds.pdf


REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Society of Agricultural Engineers (ASAE). 1998. ASAE Standards, 45th edition. D384.1 DEC93. Manure production and characteristics St. Joseph, Mich.
- American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE). 1997. Off-Stream Water Sources for Grazing Cattle as a Stream Bank Stabilization and Water Quality BMP. *Transactions of the ASAE*, Vol. 40(3): 595-604
- American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE). 1998. Vegetative Filter Strip Removal of Cattle Manure Constituents in Runoff. *Transactions of the ASAE*, Vol. 41(5): 1375-1381
- Ayres Associates 1993. Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems Research in Florida. The Capacity of Fine Sandy Soil for Septic Tank Effluent Treatment: A Field Investigation at an In-Situ Lysimeter Facility in Florida.
- Bonta, J.V. and B. Cleland. 2003. Incorporating Natural Variability, Uncertainty, and Risk into Water Quality Evaluations Using Duration Curves. *Journal of American Water Resource Association* 39(12):1481-1496
- Gaffield, S. J., R. L. Goo, L.A. Richards, and R. J. Jackson. 2003. Public Health Effects of Inadequately Managed Stormwater in Runoff. *American Journal of Public Health* 93(9): 1527-1533. September 2003.
- Metcalf and Eddy 1991. Wastewater Engineering: Treatment, Disposal, Reuse. Third Edition.
- National Land Cover Data (NLCD) Set. 2006. Fry, J., Xian, G., Jin, S., Dewitz, J., Homer, C., Yang, L., Barnes, C., Herold, N., and Wickham, J., 2011. Completion of the 2006 National Land Cover Database for the Conterminous United States, PE&RS, Vol. 77(9):858-864.
- SCDHEC. 1998. Implementation Plan for Achieving Total Maximum Daily Load Reductions from Nonpoint Sources for the State of South Carolina.
- SCDHEC. 2008. *Water Classifications and Standards* (Regulation 61-68). Bureau of Water. Columbia, SC
- SCDHEC. 2002. *Standards for the Permitting of Agricultural Animal Facilities* (Regulation 61-43). Bureau of Water. Columbia, SC
- SCDHEC. 2010. *Water Pollution Control Permits* (Regulation 61-9) Office of Environmental Quality Control, Columbia, SC.
- SCDHEC. 2010. Watershed Water Quality Assessment: Savannah Basin. Technical Report No. 02F-10, 4th edition.
- SCDNR. 1997. Farming for Clean Water in South Carolina.
- SCDNR. 2008. Deer Density Map. <http://www.dnr.sc.gov/wildlife/deer/deermap.html>
- Stormwater Program (Phase II); Municipal Sewer Systems and Construction Sites, 64 Federal Register 235 (8 December 1999), pp. 68837
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). 2007. National Agriculture Statistics Service. 2006 Cattle statistics by county. Available at http://www.nass.usda.gov/Statistics_by_State/South_Carolina/Publications/County_Estimates/index.asp
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1983. Final Report of the Nationwide Urban Runoff Program, Vol 1. Water Planning Division, US Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1991. Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions: The TMDL Process. Office of Water, EPA 440/4-91-001.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2001. Protocol for Developing Pathogen TMDLs. First Edition. Office of Water, EPA 841-R-00-002.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2001 Managing Pet and Wildlife Waste to Prevent Contamination of Drinking Water. EPA 916-F-01-027
http://www.epa.gov/safewater/sourcewater/pubs/fs_swpp_petwaste.pdf
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2005. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Available at http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/home.cfm?program_id=6
- US Geological Survey. 2007. Water-Resources Real-time Data South Carolina Water Year. United States Geological Survey. Available at <http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nw>
- Water Quality Planning and Management*, Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations, Pt. 130.2(i). 2006 ed.
- Yagow, G. 1999. Unpublished monitoring data. Mountain Run TMDL Study. Submitted to Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. Richmond, Virginia.


**APPENDIX A
ADDITIONAL RAIN CHARTS BY STATION**

Precipitation and FC Data by Date for Monitoring Station 301



**APPENDIX B
ADDITIONAL LOAD-DURATION CURVES BY STATION**

Load Duration Curve for Norris Creek Station SV-301



Appendix C

EVALUATING THE PROGRESS OF MS4 PROGRAMS

Evaluating the Progress of MS4 Programs: Meeting the Goals of TMDLs and Attaining Water Quality Standards

Bureau of Water

August 2008

Described below are potential approaches that may be used by MS4 permit holders. These are recommendations and examples only, as the SCDHEC-BOW recognizes that other approaches may be utilized or employed to meet compliance goals.

1. Calculate pollutant load reduction for each best management practice (BMP) deployed:
 - Retrofitting stormwater outlets
 - Creation of green space
 - LID activities (e.g., creation of porous pavements)
 - Creations of riparian buffers
 - Stream bank restoration
 - Scoop the poop program (how many pounds of poop were scooped/collected)
 - Street sweeping program (amount of materials collected etc.)
 - Construction & post-construction site runoff controls
2. Description & documentation of programs directed towards reducing pollutant loading
 - Document tangible efforts made to reduce impacts to urban runoff
 - Track type and number of structural BMPs installed
 - Parking lot maintenance program for pollutant load reduction
 - Identification and elimination of illicit discharges
 - Zoning changes and ordinances designed to reduce pollutant loading
 - Modeling of activities & programs for reducing pollutant reductions
3. Description & documentation of social indicators, outreach, and education programs
 - Number/Type of training & education activities conducted and survey results
 - Activities conducted to increase awareness and knowledge – residents, business owners. What changes have been made based on these efforts? Any measured behavior or knowledge changes?
 - Participation in stream and/or lake clean-up events or activities
 - Number of environmental action pledges
4. Water quality monitoring: A direct and effective way to evaluate the effectiveness of stormwater management plan activities.
 - Use of data collected from existing monitoring activities (e.g., SCDHEC data for ambient monitoring program available through STORET; water supply intake testing; voluntary watershed group's monitoring, etc)
 - Establish a monitoring program for permitted outfalls and/or waterbodies within MS4 areas as deemed

necessary– use a certified lab

- Monitoring should focus on water quality parameters and locations that would both link pollutant sources and BMPs being implemented

5. Links:

- Evaluating the Effectiveness of Municipal Stormwater Programs. September 2007. EPA 833-F-07-010
- The BMP database - <http://www.bmpdatabase.org/BMPPerformance.htm> (this link is specifically to the BMP performance page, and lot more)
- EPA's STORET data warehouse - http://www.epa.gov/storet/dw_home.html
- EPARegion 5: STEPL – Spreadsheet tool for estimating pollutant loads <http://it.tetrattech-ffx.com/stepl/>
- Measurable goals guidance for Phase II Small MS4 - <http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/measurablegoals/index.cfm>
- Environmental indicators for sotrmwater program- <http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/measurablegoals/part5.cfm>
- National menu of stormwater best management practices (BMPs) - <http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/menuofbmps/index.cfm>
- SCDHEC – BOW: 319 grant program has attempted to calculate the load reductions for the following BMPs:
 - Septic tank repair or replacement
 - Removing livestock from streams (cattle, horses, mules)
 - Livestock fencing
 - Waste Storage Facilities (aka stacking sheds)
 - Strip cropping
 - Prescribed grazing
 - Critical Area Planting
 - Runoff Management System
 - Waste Management System
 - Solids Separation Basin
 - Riparian Buffers

Appendix D

DATA TABLES

Fecal Coliform WQS Exceedence Summary for Impaired Station SV-108 by Date

Date	FC (cfu/day)
11/18/99	280
12/21/99	670
1/17/00	350
2/24/00	320
4/13/00	650
5/11/00	790
6/15/00	1200
7/27/00	1600
8/10/00	1500

Date	FC (cfu/day)
9/19/00	760
10/17/00	530
11/28/00	140
12/21/00	430
1/19/05	170
2/2/05	65
3/3/05	23
4/26/05	210
5/24/05	330

Date	FC (cfu/day)
6/28/05	7900
7/19/05	540
8/29/05	1000
9/15/05	280
10/17/05	230
11/1/05	620
12/5/05	6000

___ WQS Exceeded

90th Percentile FC Concentrations (#/100 mL)

Hydro Category Range	High Flow 0-10	Moist Cond. 10-40	Mid Range 40-60	Dry Flow 60-90	Low Flow 90-100	Samples
SV-108	7710	656	829	1510	530	25

Mid Point Hydrologic Category Flow (cfs)

Hydro Categ (Mid-Point)	High Flow (5)	Moist Cond. (25)	Mid Range (50)	Dry (75)	Low Flow (95)
SV-108	59.19	21.08	13.36	8.02	3.36

Existing Load (#/day)

Hydro Categ (Mid-Point)	High Flow (5)	Moist Cond. (25)	Mid Range (50)	Dry (75)	Low Flow (95)
SV-108	1.12E+13	3.38E+11	2.71E+11	2.96E+11	5.01E+10

Target Load (#/day)

Hydro Categ (Mid-Point)	High Flow (5)	Moist Cond. (25)	Mid Range (50)	Dry (75)	Low Flow (95)
SV-108	5.50E+11	1.96E+11	1.24E+11	7.45E+10	3.59E+10

Load Reduction Necessary (#/day)

Hydro Categ (Mid-Point)	High Flow (5)	Moist Cond. (25)	Mid Range (50)	Dry (75)	Low Flow (95)
SV-108	N/A	1.42E+11	1.47E+11	2.21E+11	N/A

% Load Reduction Necessary

Hydro Categ (Mid-Point)	High Flow (5)	Moist Cond. (25)	Mid Range (50)	Dry (75)	Low Flow (95)
SV-108	N/A	42	54	75	N/A

Fecal Coliform WQS Exceedence Summary for Impaired Station SV-301 by Date

Date	FC (cfu/day)
5/26/99	200
6/14/99	180
7/19/99	1400
8/10/99	240
9/29/99	780
10/12/99	1400
5/11/00	210
6/15/00	350

Date	FC (cfu/day)
7/27/00	440
8/10/00	1800
9/19/00	320
10/17/00	8200
1/19/05	2600
2/2/05	20
3/3/05	30
4/26/05	270

Date	FC (cfu/day)
5/24/05	400
6/28/05	6000
7/19/05	360
8/29/05	210
9/15/05	60
10/17/05	110
11/1/05	370
2/5/05	6400

___ WQS Exceeded

90th Percentile FC Concentrations (#/100 mL)

Hydro Category Range	High Flow 0-10	Moist Cond. 10-40	Mid Range 40-60	Dry Flow 60-90	Low Flow 90-100	Samples
SV-301	6360	1760	210	1400	7404	24

Mid Point Hydrologic Category Flow (cfs)

Hydro Categ (Mid-Point)	High Flow (5)	Moist Cond. (25)	Mid Range (50)	Dry (75)	Low Flow (95)
SV-301	59.19	21.08	13.36	8.02	3.86

Existing Load (#/day)

Hydro Categ (Mid-Point)	High Flow (5)	Moist Cond. (25)	Mid Range (50)	Dry (75)	Low Flow (95)
SV-301	9.21E+12	9.08E+11	6.86E+10	2.75E+11	6.99E+11

Target Load (#/day)

Hydro Categ (Mid-Point)	High Flow (5)	Moist Cond. (25)	Mid Range (50)	Dry (75)	Low Flow (95)
SV-301	5.50E+11	1.96E+11	1.24E+11	7.45E+10	3.59E+10

Load Reduction Necessary (#/day)

Hydro Categ (Mid-Point)	High Flow (5)	Moist Cond. (25)	Mid Range (50)	Dry (75)	Low Flow (95)
SV-301	N/A	7.12E+11	NRN	2.01E+11	N/A

% Load Reduction Necessary

Hydro Categ (Mid-Point)	High Flow (5)	Moist Cond. (25)	Mid Range (50)	Dry (75)	Low Flow (95)
SV-301	N/A	78	NRN	73	N/A

NRN = no reduction needed. Existing load below target load.

Appendix E

SOURCE ASSESSMENT PICTURES

Figure E-1

Goats in pasture (location: 34.615949 N, -83.071443 W) near the intersection of S. Retreat Road and Westmoreland Road in Oconee County (Date of Photograph: November 22, 2011).




Figure E-2

Horse in pasture (location: 34.644743 N, -83.119937 W) on Weldon Road in Oconee County (Date of Photograph: November 22, 2011).




Figure E-3

Goats in pasture (location: 34.638424 N, -83.099662 W) on Brock Road in Oconee County (Date of Photograph: November 22, 2011).




Figure E-4

Unrestrained dog (location: 34.615843 N, -83.071224 W) near the intersection of S. Retreat Road and Westmoreland Road in Oconee County (Date of Photograph: November 22, 2011).





Figure E-5

Unrestrained dog (location: 34.646713 N, -83.071727 W) on Sam Reeder Drive near the City of Westminster in Oconee County (Date of Photograph: November 22, 2011).



Responsiveness Summary Choestoea Creek TMDL Document

Comments Received

In response to the June 6, 2012 public notice for the TMDL document, comments were received from Upstate Forever, Greenville, SC. Below, given in red type, are the comments received from Upstate Forever. And, following the comments is the Department's response to each comment.

Comment #1: Section 1.2, Watershed Description

Section 1.2 (page 3, 2nd paragraph): A sentence in this paragraph refers the reader to "forty-nine (49) active animal feeding operations" on Table 3; however, Table 3, which is on page 7, is actually a summary list of exceedences for impaired stations. The Department should include the correct Table 3 as referenced in this section. This omission is further obfuscated by a statement in section 3.2.2.1 ("there are currently five (5) active (AFOs) with regulated structures or activities in the Choestoea Creek Watershed") and refers the reader to Table 4 on page 10. If the Department means there were previously forty-nine active AFOs but now only five active AFO's, the Department should clarify this distinction.

Response to Comment #1:

The 2nd paragraph on page 3 of the document will be changed to report to five (5) active animal feeding operations, and will refer to Table 4. The larger number refer to permitted manure application sites; however, not all of the permitted application sites may be active at the time of this TMDL.

The following sentence was changed to reflect the appropriate number of AFO sites: "At the time of the development of these TMDLs, there are currently five (5) active (AFOs) with regulated structures or activities in the Choestoea Creek Watershed (Table 4)".

Comment #2: Section 4.0, Load-Duration Curve Method

Section 4.0 (page 12, 3rd paragraph): The last sentence of this paragraph refers to Figure 3 as "an illustration of monitoring and gage locations along with a summary of drainage area statistics." However, Figure 3, which is on page 6, shows precipitation and FC data by date for Station SV-108 instead. Please add a figure showing monitoring and gage locations.

Response to Comment #2:

Instead of Figure 3, the reference should be to Figure 1.a. This will be corrected. Figure 1.a does show the location of the water quality monitoring station. A figure showing the location of the stream flow gage station is not provided since the pertinent flow gage information necessary to compute the load-duration curve is given in the paragraph, and in the preceding paragraph (i.e., the name and number of the flow gage; the location of the flow gage; and, the watershed drainage area for the flow gage).

The following sentence was changed to reflect the appropriate reference: "Figure 1.a provides an illustration of monitoring and gage locations along with a summary of drainage area statistics used to establish flows at un-gaged monitoring stations".

Comment #3: Section 6.0, Implementation

Section 6.0 (page 19, 5th paragraph): As part of the implementation strategies, the TMDL states the Department will work with "the Clarendon County Soil and Water Conservation District," which should be replaced with "the Oconee County Soil and Water Conservation District".

Response to Comment #3:

Actually, the comment goes to the 6th paragraph of Section 6.0 on page 19 of the TMDL document. 'Clarendon County' will be changed to 'Oconee County.'

The following sentence was changed to reflect the appropriate reference: "Local sources of nonpoint source education and assistance include the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), the Oconee County Soil and Water Conservation Services, the Clemson University Cooperative Extension Service, and the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources".