

AQUA-1: Water Quality in the South

[Ben West](#)

Region 4, US Environmental Protection Agency

What are the history, status, and likely future of water quality in southern watersheds?

1 Key Findings

- Significant water quality impairment, forest loss, and wetland loss have occurred in the South since the time of European settlement; however, water quality has generally improved since the passage of the Clean Water Act in 1972.
- Based on a national watershed characterization program, approximately 30 percent of the South has relatively good water quality, 36 percent has moderate water quality problems, and 15 percent has more serious water quality problems; approximately 19 percent of the South, primarily in western Texas, does not have sufficient information to provide a characterization of the status of water quality.
- The leading causes (pollutants) of water quality impairment in the South from 1988 to 1998 were siltation (sedimentation), pathogens (bacteria), and nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorous).
- The leading sources of water quality impairment in the South from 1988 to 1998 were agriculture and urbanization; silviculture ranked 10th out of the 11 major sources of impairment during this time.
- Approximately 70 percent of all pollution came from nonpoint sources.
- Southern forests are a vital factor in maintaining and improving water quality in the South. Forested watersheds have consistently been shown to have lower sediment and nutrient yields with better aquatic biological conditions than non-forested watersheds.
- The primary factor affecting the future of water quality in the South is control of nonpoint-source pollution from agriculture and urbanization, primarily urban sprawl.
- The future of water quality in the South is highly dependent on the success of future mandates and programs such as the Clean Water Action Plan, Unified Watershed Assessment restoration priorities, as well as citizen involvement in watershed protection, including public education and voluntary initiatives. .
- Agencies responsible for monitoring water quality in the South should develop standard assessment and reporting criteria for determining the causes and sources of impairment and describing the level of confidence in the classification.

2 Introduction

Approximately 935,000 miles of rivers and streams flow across the South. These waterways are important in defining the landscape and in providing habitat for many of the South's plants and animals. They also have significant economic values that are of great importance but are often overlooked. Rivers, lakes, estuaries, and wetlands provide flood protection and support industry. Recreation activities such as fishing, boating, and rafting generate jobs, economic benefits, and tax revenue to the region. In addition much of the South's drinking water is obtained from surface water sources.

As the South continues to enjoy strong economic growth, increasing demands and threats are placed upon our river systems. These threats directly affect the natural and historical heritage of our rivers, and, ultimately, public health and quality of life. Threats are varied and include pollution and impacts from many sources including residential development, construction, municipal and industrial stormwater runoff, agricultural runoff (containing sediments, pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers), deforestation, impoundments, channel alteration, and introduction of exotic species.

In recognition of these threats, there is a growing public awareness of the importance of aquatic resources and the need to manage land to protect, maintain, and restore water quality. All Southern States have adopted a watershed-based approach to controlling water pollution and improving water quality. A watershed is an area of land in which water flows across the land surface and drains into a particular marsh, stream, river, or lake. Watersheds can vary in size from a few acres to thousands of acres (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2001a). A watershed management approach accounts for a watershed's unique needs and recognizes that water quality is a function of not just one stream, but rather the entire watershed.

This Chapter provides an overview of the history, status, regulatory controls, and likely future of water quality in southern watersheds. The relative impacts of land uses on water quality over time are evaluated, as are the ways in which point and nonpoint sources of pollution have influenced water quality. The original intent of this Chapter was to describe water quality only in forested watersheds. However, in order to address the range of topics described above and to respond to specific public comments about this Chapter, all watersheds are included in this evaluation. The result is a more comprehensive overview of water quality in the South. A discussion of the role of forests in protecting water quality in the South is also included. ([Section 5.3.1](#)).

3 Methods

Information presented is limited to published literature, other regulatory reports, and personal interviews conducted with water-quality experts in the South. The status of water quality was examined and reported at various scales across the South, including the whole region, individual States, ecological regions, and individual watersheds.

There are numerous linkages and areas of overlap between this Chapter and other Chapters in this Assessment. To avoid redundancy and enhance integration with other Assessment questions, the reader is referred to other Chapters where information is presented in greater detail.

4 Data Sources

1.1 Spatial Data

The United States is divided and subdivided into successively smaller hydrologic units. Four levels are recognized: regions, subregions, accounting units, and cataloguing units. These hydrologic units are arranged within each other, from the smallest (cataloging units) to the largest (regions). Each hydrologic unit is identified by a unique hydrologic unit code (HUC) consisting of two to eight digits based on the four levels of classification (U.S Geological Survey 2001a).

Individual watersheds were delineated using the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) cataloguing unit classification system, or 8-digit HUC, in which the last digit represents the smallest consistent watershed size throughout the South. Watershed information was summarized for all watersheds that are wholly or partially located in the 13-State study area. Using this system, the South is divided into 672 watersheds. The average size of these watersheds at this scale is approximately 810,000 acres.

Ecological regions were delineated at the ecological province, following the National Hierarchical Framework of Ecological Units (ECOMAP 1993). There are 11 ecological provinces in the South. A complete description of the ecological provinces in the South is included in [Chapter HLTH-1](#).

1.2 Land-Use Data

The primary source of land-use data, particularly forest cover, for this Chapter was the Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) plot-level data assembled for this Assessment (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 2001). Information contained in the FIA database is derived from a series of permanent plots across the South and is typically reported at the State and County level. A complete discussion of the FIA Eastwide database is provided by Hansen and others (1992).

The most current survey data from each State were aggregated across the South to create a “current survey” for the South (representing the 1990’s). Information on the most recent survey for each State is included in [Chapter HLTH-1](#). Individual plots were assigned an 8-digit HUC and aggregated at the watershed level. Land uses from the FIA database representing forested land were selected and summarized by individual watershed to determine the percentage of forest in each watershed. That percentage was calculated by dividing the forest area by the total watershed area.

1.3 Water-Quality Data

The following sources of water quality data were used to compile this Chapter:

- Literature surveys.
- Interviews with University of Georgia (UGA) staff.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) National Water Quality Inventories, in Reports to Congress.
- USEPA Index of Watershed Indicators.
- Unified Watershed Assessment data from each of the 13 Southern States.
- USGS National Water Quality Assessment Program Studies.

5 Results

5.1 History of Water-Quality Conditions in the South

This section is confined to key points about the history of water quality in the South. A discussion of the history of southern forests and land-use change in the South is included in [Chapter SOCIO-1](#) and in the [History Background Paper](#).

Little information is available on water quality in the South prior to the twentieth century. Erosion resulting from Native American transportation and agricultural practices has been characterized as minimal (Binkley and Brown 1993, Sedjo 1991). Causes of erosion during this period included fires, mass soil movement, natural stream erosion, and animal trails. For example, migration of buffalo was correlated with an increase in stream turbidity (Trimble 1974).

Early descriptions repeatedly characterized streams as “clear” and “dark” as opposed to the brown or red color that now dominates southern streams (Jackson 2001, Trimble 1974). Early explorers described a “shiny” substance in streams, which may have indicated the presence of mica (Trimble 1974). Mica is no longer abundant in the majority of streams in the Southeast, presumably due to man-made erosion of upland soils into streams. The average soil loss in the North Carolina Piedmont was less than 1/10th of an inch per 1,000 years prior to European settlement. Current rates of soil loss from clean cultivated land are 80 to 300 inches per 1,000 years (Trimble 1974).

Settlement by Europeans resulted in large-scale ecological changes that continue to affect water quality (Trimble 1974). Throughout the early settlement period, water quality declined as land cover shifted from mature forests to agricultural fields (Trimble 1974). Sedimentation and erosion were the primary causes of water-quality impairment. It has been estimated that an average of 5.9 inches (15 centimeters) of soil have been lost in the Southeast due to erosion since

the time of European settlement (Binkley and Brown 1993). Cotton, tobacco, and small plots of corn dominated agricultural crops through 1860. Cotton plantations were the primary source of water-quality impairment during this period (Trimble 1974).

The period between 1860 and 1920 was the most destructive in the South with regard to water quality due to widespread clearing of forests for fuel, timber, wood products, and crops (Trimble 1974). Forest clearing without erosion control measures resulted in increased sedimentation and severe water-quality impairment (Mac and others 1998). Logging activities peaked in 1909 and remained high until 1920. By 1920, only a small area of virgin forest remained. After the Civil War, agriculture continued to be the most important land use in the South. Increased soil erosion rates due to inadequate conservation practices and increased use of fertilizers accelerated the degradation of water quality (Trimble 1974). Southern rivers filled with sediments from upland soils.

Comprehensive water-resource research was largely initiated during this period. The first watershed experiment, called the “Wagon Wheel Gap study,” was conducted in 1909. This Colorado study focused on the effects of deforestation on the volume and timing of streamflow, soil erosion, and sediment loading (Megahan and Hornbeck 2000).

Between 1920 and 1972, people migrated to cities as industry became the dominant force in the United States economy. Less wood was used for fuel and roads, resulting in a decrease in the demand for wood (Sedjo 1991). Due to this decreased demand, logging and land-clearing activities were significantly reduced. Therefore, adverse effects on water quality from these activities also declined.

The effect of agricultural land-use practices became evident in the 1930’s with the onset of the Great Depression (Mac and others 1998). Losses of fertile soil due to the intensity and types of agriculture practices, as well as drought conditions, resulted in the “Dust Bowl” of the 1930’s and the abandonment of farmland (Meyer 1995). Soil erosion during this time period adversely affected water quality, primarily due to sedimentation of rivers and streams.

Draining of wetlands, which serve as filters for surface water runoff, was another contributing factor to water-quality impairment. Between 1950 and 1970, 11 million acres of wetlands were lost in the United States (Meyer 1995). A complete discussion of the history of forested wetlands in the South is provided in [Chapter AQUA-2](#). Flooding was also a problem during this period, and the Flood Control Act of 1936 brought about the modification of major rivers, such as the Mississippi. River channels were widened and dredged to facilitate navigation. These practices had devastating effects on many aquatic species, by removing or covering benthic habitat. A complete discussion of aquatic species and habitats is included in [Chapter AQUA-5](#).

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, water-borne disease occurred in urban centers as populations came into contact with waterbodies contaminated with sewage. Diseases such as cholera were transmitted through inadequate disposal of human waste, and typhoid fever outbreaks occurred as cities began to develop (Chase 1952, Cowdrey 1996). As a result, sanitary engineering (later called environmental engineering) developed technologies to reduce

water-borne illnesses by treating sewage prior to discharging it into waterbodies (Chase 1952). Industrialization in the South also created water quality problems during this period. The petrochemical, paper, and automotive industries are a few of the industries that impacted water quality by discharging industrial wastes directly into waterbodies (Cowdrey 1996).

Pesticide use increased dramatically after World War II. Over-spraying resulted in numerous instances of harmful levels of pesticides in soil and water. Toxic compounds such as dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) were used without restrictions. In 1956, Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* highlighted the effects of DDT, which include contamination of water supplies and thinning of predatory bird eggshells. In 1972, the use of DDT was banned (Cowdrey 1996).

As a better understanding of the interdependence of water quality and land-use practices was developed; and legislation at local, regional, and national levels was passed to address the management and preservation of natural resources. According to the USEPA, only a third of the Nation's waters were safe for fishing and swimming in 1972 (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2001b). In response to the situation, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, or Clean Water Act (CWA), was passed in 1972. This Act significantly changed the way the Federal Government and individual States regulated and reported on water quality. In addition, State and local mandates were developed to regulate sources and causes of water-quality impairment on a local level. Land-disturbance activities and urban development are subject to regulations and guidelines at the State and local level via sedimentation and erosion-control management plans, zoning, permits, and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs). The CWA and other laws and regulations that affect water quality in the United States are summarized and discussed in detail in [Chapter SOCIO-3](#), primarily as they relate to silvicultural practices.

Subsequent to the passage of the CWA, a comprehensive analysis of water quality in rivers was conducted (Smith and others 1987). This study utilized data from the National Stream Quality Accounting Network (NASQAN) and the National Water Quality Surveillance System (NWQSS). In general, results of this study indicated that point-source pollution had decreased on a national scale, and nonpoint-source pollution had increased since passing of the CWA (Smith and others 1987). A complete discussion of point and nonpoint sources of pollution is included in [Section 5.2.1.3](#).

In the South, decreases in bacteria associated with municipal wastewater discharges were noted, especially in parts of the Gulf of Mexico, central Mississippi, and Arkansas. However, localized increases in bacteria were noted in association with point-source livestock waste discharges. A dramatic increase in suspended sediment, nutrients, phosphorous, and nitrate was observed due to increased fertilizer applications, other agricultural practices, and high soil erosion rates. In addition, atmospheric deposition was positively correlated with increases in nitrate concentrations, especially in forested basins. In contrast, a decrease in phosphorous concentrations was noted in the Upper Mississippi Valley. An increase in contaminants such as metals was observed primarily due to fossil fuel combustion, metal manufacturing, pesticides, and herbicides. However, a widespread decrease in lead concentrations was observed due to a

67-percent drop in leaded gasoline consumption (Smith and others 1987).

5.2 Current Status of Water Quality in the South

Concerns about water quality in the South have engendered proactive research, monitoring, and control programs. In addition, public and private stakeholders are supporting the development of comprehensive watershed assessments and related studies. The goal of these programs and studies is to assess and improve water quality in the United States, including the South. Two primary programs that have been developed to report information on the current status of water quality: (1) National Water Quality Inventories, and (2) USEPA Index of Watershed Indicators (IWI) Program. The National Water Quality Inventories provide information at the regional and State level, and the IWI Program provides information about water quality in individual watersheds (USGS 8-digit HUC). These and other regional assessment programs such as the USGS National Water Quality Assessment Program and Southern Appalachian Assessment are summarized in this section.

5.2.1 National Water Quality Inventories

To assess progress toward the goals of the CWA, States, Tribes, and other jurisdictions adopt water-quality standards, which must be approved by the USEPA. Water-quality standards have three elements, which are described below (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2000a):

1. **Designated Uses:** All waters of the United States are required by law to be designated for “beneficial uses.” Examples include drinking water supply, contact recreation (swimming), and support of warm-and cold-water fisheries. States are responsible for assigning designations and can designate multiple uses for the same waterbody.
2. **Criteria:** Scientists establish criteria necessary to protect the designated uses. Criteria can include chemical-specific thresholds that protect fish and humans from adverse health effects as well as biological and habitat conditions.
3. **Antidegradation policy:** The antidegradation policy is intended to prevent waters from deteriorating from their current conditions. Therefore, States cannot change a waterbody’s designated use(s) to lower water-quality standards without extensive justification

The status of the Nation’s waters is determined by assessing the degree to which the States’ water-quality standards are met (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1994). States, Tribes, and other jurisdictions are required and/or encouraged, under Section 305(b) of the CWA, to submit a report to the USEPA on the status of their waterbodies. For purposes of this section, discussion is limited to State 305(b) reports and does not include reports from tribes or other jurisdictions. States are required to submit updated 305(b) reports once every 2 years. According to Section 305(b) of the CWA, reports should include the following:

- A description of water quality for all navigable waters in the State.

- An analysis of the extent to which all navigable waters in the State provide for the protection and propagation of shellfish, fish, and wildlife, and allow recreational activities in and on the water.
- An analysis of the extent to which the elimination of the pollutants has been or will be achieved to meet water-quality standards.
- Recommendations of actions needed to achieve the water-quality standard.
- An estimate of the extent of environmental impact and the economic and social costs and benefits associated with achieving the water-quality standard, and the date by which the water-quality standard will be achieved.
- A description of the nature and extent of nonpoint sources of pollutants and recommendations of programs to control these sources, including costs to implement such controls.

The CWA requires States to assess the degree to which waters meet adopted water-quality standards. In order to meet this requirement, States examine two types of data: monitored data and evaluated data. Monitored data supply quantitative information including field measurements that are not more than 5 years old, such as biological, habitat, toxicity, and/or physical/chemical conditions in waterbodies, sediments, and fish tissues. Evaluated data are quantitative and/or qualitative information frequently used to fill data gaps. Evaluated data include field measurements that are more than 5 years old, estimates generated using land use and source information, predictive models, and surveys of fish and game biologists (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2000a). An example of this process follows: The degree to which the Georgia Water Quality standard for streams classified as “fishable” must be assessed. The standard is that “fishable” streams must contain less than 1,000 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 ml of water for the months of November through April (Georgia Water Quality Control Act 391-3-6.03). If monitored or evaluated data indicate that fecal coliform exceeds this standard, the fishable use criterion is not supported.

Depending on the degree to which designated uses are supported, States place assessed waters into the following categories (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2000a):

1. **Fully Supporting Overall Use:** A waterbody that meets all of the established criteria for designated beneficial uses.
2. **Threatened Overall Use:** A waterbody that fully supports all of its designated beneficial uses but is in danger of not fully supporting one or more of the uses.
3. **Partially Supporting Overall Use:** A waterbody that does not meet all of the established criteria for one or more of its designated beneficial uses.
4. **Not Supporting Overall Use:** A waterbody that does not meet any of the established

criteria for one or more of its designated beneficial uses.

5. **Not Attainable:** A waterbody for which one or more designated beneficial uses is not achievable due to natural conditions or human activity that cannot be reversed without imposing widespread economic and social impacts. This category is derived by a State-conducted use-attainability study.

Impaired waters are defined as any waterbody that is classified as partially supporting or not supporting overall use. Impaired waterbodies are summed, and the State reports the amount of “Total Impaired” waters.

The USEPA compiles the information in State 305(b) reports and submits a summary report entitled “National Water Quality Inventory Report to Congress.” These reports are the principal vehicle for informing Congress and the public about general water-quality conditions in the United States. Discussions and data for this Chapter are based on the information included in the National Water Quality Inventory Reports to Congress (National 305(b) Reports).

5.2.1.1 General Trends in Water Quality (1988-1998)

The National 305(b) Reports from 1988 to 1998 were evaluated to identify recent trends in water quality in the South (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998a, 2000a). These reports include summaries of water quality for rivers and streams, lakes, reservoirs, ponds, tidal estuaries, shoreline waters, coral reefs, wetlands, and groundwater in individual States. In this Chapter, only water quality of rivers and streams in the South is reported. The National 305(b) Reports do not describe the health of all rivers and streams in the South because the States have not comprehensively assessed all their waters. Due to funding and monitoring constraints, States only assess a subset of total waters. Therefore, the health of only those portions of rivers and streams assessed and reported in individual-State water-quality inventories are summarized in this Chapter.

Southern States assessed a total of approximately 149,260 river miles in 1988 and approximately 231,600 river miles in 1998 (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1990, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2000a). The term “river miles” is used interchangeably with “river and stream miles” in this Chapter. Assessed river miles increased by 55 percent over this 10-year period. The 231,600 assessed river miles in 1998 represent approximately 25 percent of the South’s total river and stream miles, which is consistent with the percent assessed nationwide in 1998. This amount is considerable because only approximately 470,000 river miles in the South are perennial waters (flow year-round). The remaining 463,000 river miles are intermittent or ephemeral, which means they are dry for some or most of the year.

As described previously, each State reports the assessed river miles as fully supporting, partially supporting, or not supporting overall use. The last two categories represent impaired river miles. From 1988 to 1998, 9 of the 13 Southern States reported an increase in impaired river miles. The percentage of river miles that were impaired rose from 26 to 45 during the 10-year

period. In 1998, Southern States reported that 55 percent of the 231,600 assessed river miles fully support all of their uses. This percentage is slightly lower than the nationwide percentage in 1998 (65 percent). Of the fully supporting river miles, 10 percent (approximately 23,700 river miles) were considered threatened. These threatened waters may need special attention and additional monitoring to prevent further deterioration. Some form of pollution or habitat degradation impairs the remaining 45 percent (103,441 river miles) of the assessed river miles.

The designation of river miles as being impaired is a complicated process that varies among reporting cycles and States. In many cases, States do not use directly comparable criteria and monitoring strategies to measure their water quality. Therefore, States with strict criteria for defining healthy waters are more likely to report that a high percentage of their waters are not fully supporting designated uses. Similarly, States with comprehensive monitoring programs are more likely to identify more water-quality problems. Because of these issues, it is likely that the increase in impaired miles from 1988 to 1998 is related to the overall increase in assessed river miles. As a result, one cannot assume that water quality is worse now than in 1988 just because an individual State reports a higher number or percentage of impaired waters. A more thorough discussion of the data limitations of the 305(b) reports is included in [Section 5.2.1.4](#).

5.2.1.2 Leading Causes of Impairment (1988-1998)

Each State identifies causes and sources of impairment of rivers and streams in order to determine where improvements are needed, and to assess the effectiveness of current water-quality programs and protection policies. Causes of impairment are pollutants, practices, or processes that result in numeric or narrative support criteria being exceeded. Specific causes of impairment may include chemical contaminants (such as polychlorinated biphenyls, dioxin, and metals), physical conditions (such as temperature), and biological conditions (such as aquatic weeds) (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1998a). A waterbody may be affected by multiple causes. Descriptions of the common causes of pollution included in the National 305(b) Reports are provided in [Table 1](#). The leading causes of pollution in southern rivers and streams from 1988 to 1998 were siltation (sedimentation), pathogens (bacteria), nutrients, and organic enrichment.

5.2.1.3 5.2.1.3 Leading Sources of Impairment (1988-1998)

Once the cause of impairment is identified, the States report the estimated source of the impairment. There are two broad categories of sources of pollution: (1) point-source pollution and (2) nonpoint-source pollution. The fundamental difference between these two categories is the manner in which the pollutant reaches the waterbody, which is often directly related to land use. The current statutory definition of a point source is as follows (Water Quality Act, Sec. 502-514, U.S. Congress, 1987):

The term “point source” means any discernible, confined, and discrete conveyance, including, but not limited to any pipe, ditch, channel, tunnel, conduit, well discrete fissure, container, rolling stock, concentrated animal

feeding operation, or vessel or floating craft, from which pollutants are or may be discharged. This term does not include agricultural storm water discharges and return flows from irrigated agriculture.

Research conducted in the late 1970's indicated that over half of all water pollution was due to nonpoint sources (Neary and others 1989). Therefore, the CWA was amended in 1987 to place more emphasis on proactive approaches for controlling nonpoint-source pollution (Novotny and Olem 1994). Nonpoint-source pollution generally results from land runoff, precipitation, atmospheric deposition, drainage, or seepage. Descriptions of the common point and nonpoint sources of pollution identified in the National 305(b) Reports are provided in [Table 2](#). As is the case with causes of impairment, a river mile or waterbody may be affected by multiple sources.

A source of pollution is often the land-use practice that generates a reported cause of impairment; therefore, causes and sources of impairment are inter-linked. One particular cause may originate from multiple sources. For example, sedimentation can originate from agricultural practices, urban stormwater runoff, and/or road construction sites. Similarly, one particular source may generate multiple causes or pollutants. For example, silvicultural practices can generate sedimentation, nutrient loading, and pesticide inputs. The interconnection between causes and sources is summarized in [Table 3](#).

The leading point and nonpoint sources of impairment for rivers and streams in the South from 1988 to 1998 are depicted in [Figure 1](#). The relative contributions of point and nonpoint sources of pollution in rivers and streams in each of the Southern States are shown in [Figure 2](#). During this time, nonpoint sources contributed annually almost 70 percent of the total pollution to impaired rivers and streams. In the South, as well as nationwide, agricultural activities, such as crop production and animal operations, were the most widespread sources of pollution in assessed rivers and streams. Agriculture accounted for almost half of the total pollution, greater than all point-source discharges combined. After agriculture, the States reported that municipal treatment plants, storm sewers/urban runoff, and hydrologic/habitat modification were the most common sources of impairment during this 10-year timeframe. Silviculture ranked 10th out of the 11 major sources of impairment during this time. Each of the leading sources of impairment is grouped into major land-use practices, and the impacts of these practices are discussed in [Section 5.3](#).

The leading sources of impairment for rivers and streams in individual Southern States from 1988 to 1998 are shown in [Figure 3](#) and reported in [Table 4](#). With the exception of Georgia and Texas, agricultural activities were the leading sources of pollution in each State during this time. Storm sewer discharges and urban runoff were the largest sources of pollutants in Georgia, and municipal discharges were the largest source of pollutants in Texas. The designation of river miles as being impaired by a specific source is a complicated process that varies among reporting cycles and States. Data limitations of the 305(b) reports are discussed more thoroughly in the following section.

5.2.1.4 Limitations of the National 305(b) Reports

The National 305(b) Reports provide snapshots of water quality, as assessed by individual States. The reports are not recommended for determining statistically significant trends concerning our Nation's water resources (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1992). Some other limitations on use of these reports that have been identified include:

- Inconsistent data reporting over time (Society of American Foresters 2000).
- Variability between States regarding the compilation of reports (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1994, Society of American Foresters 2000).
- Insufficient water-quality data to make accurate designations in assessed waters (Society of American Foresters 2000).
- Conditions in assessed waters cannot always be extrapolated to estimate conditions in nonassessed waters; information provided by States generally reflects monitoring and evaluation efforts that have been focused within problem areas of individual waters (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1994).
- In some instances in the past, impaired waters were overestimated by States to qualify for greater Federal funding to address potential impairment problems, as opposed to actual impairments (Society of American Foresters 2000).

Based on these limitations, reliance on data from these reports for statistical numeric trends over time or for specific comparisons between States is not recommended. However, despite these limitations, this information represents the most comprehensive set of current water-quality data available for the South. These reports were used in this Chapter to identify general trends over time and the major causes and sources of impairment to rivers and streams in the South. For each individual State, the most significant information from [Figure 3](#) and [Table 4](#) is the relative contribution of each source.

5.2.2 Index of Watershed Indicators (IWI)

The USEPA introduced the IWI program in October 1997 to increase public awareness about the health of the Nation's watersheds. The primary objectives of the IWI program are to:

- Develop a consistent, descriptive technique for characterizing the condition and vulnerability of individual watersheds across the Nation.
- Make this information available in a way that informs and inspires Americans to learn more about their water resources, what affects those resources, and how to protect and restore them.
- Help water-quality-management professionals make better decisions on strategies and priorities for environmental programs.
- Establish a national baseline on the condition and vulnerability of aquatic resources that

could be used over time to help measure progress toward the goal that all watersheds be healthy and productive.

In order to achieve these objectives, 15 individual indicators of condition and vulnerability of aquatic systems in each of the 2,262 watersheds in the 50 States and Puerto Rico were developed and used to rank each watershed (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2001c). These 15 indicators are listed and discussed in *The Index of Watershed Indicators* (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1997). Watersheds are delineated using the USGS 8-digit HUC classification system, as described in [Section 4.1](#). Federal and State agencies, stakeholders, and other organizations contribute to the information gathered for the IWI. After making an assessment of condition, vulnerability, and data sufficiency, the condition of the watershed is scored and assigned one of the following general categories: (1) better water quality, (2) water quality with less serious problems, (3) water quality with more serious problems, and (4) insufficient data (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2001c).

The most recent IWI information (September 1999) was compiled to provide a current characterization of water quality in individual watersheds in the South. [Figure 4](#) provides a graphic representation of this information. [Table 5](#) summarizes this information at the State-level. Based on these data, 188 individual watersheds (USGS 8-digit HUCS) are characterized as having relatively good water quality, which represent 30 percent of the land area in the South. Two hundred and forty one individual watersheds (36 percent of the land area) are characterized as having moderate water-quality problems, and 115 individual watersheds (15 percent of the land area) are classified as having more serious water-quality problems. One hundred twenty eight individual watersheds (19 percent of the land area) do not have enough information to provide an overall characterization ([Figure 4](#)).

The majority of more serious water-quality problems are located in Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Oklahoma. Watersheds characterized by less serious water-quality problems are scattered throughout the region, with concentrations in Georgia, South Carolina, and southern Florida. States with higher percentages of better water quality include Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, and Arkansas. Significant areas of Texas, particularly watersheds in the western portion of the State, do not have enough information to provide an adequate characterization of water quality ([Table 5](#)).

[Table 6](#) presents the same information as [Table 5](#), except the IWI information is aggregated by ecological province. A complete description of the ecological provinces in the South is included in [Chapter HLTH-1](#). The best water quality is generally found in the Central Appalachian Broadleaf Forest and the Ozark Broadleaf Forest. Ecological provinces with more serious water-quality problems include the Lower Mississippi Riverine Forest and the Outer Coastal Plain Mixed Forest.

Through the “Surf Your Watershed” Internet feature on the USEPA web page (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2001a), the public can access information about a watershed of interest as well as view the IWI data for that watershed. IWI represents a focused, long-term

reporting tool that may assist in pinpointing specific problems in a watershed, and in providing improved assessment of current watershed conditions and future trends (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2001c).

5.2.3 Other Water Quality Assessment Programs

5.2.3.1 National Water Quality Assessment Program (NAWQA)

USGS established the NAWQA program in 1991 to assess and provide past, present, and future water-quality conditions in 60 river basins and aquifers nationwide. The NAWQA program is a long-term comparative study of the relationship between human impact and natural factors and the resulting water quality condition within an area. NAWQA studies focus on region-specific factors that affect aquatic habitat.

The assessed areas, referred to as “study units,” account for 60 to 70 percent of the Nation's water use, and cover about one-half of the land area of the United States (U.S. Geological Survey 2001b). Assessments were initiated in 20 study units in 1991, 20 in 1993, and 20 in 1997, and data were collected by Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as universities and environmental groups. The 16 NAWQA study units for the South are presented in [Table 7](#). Due to the number of individual basin reports, specific findings for each study unit are not summarized in this report; however, some key findings from several of the basin studies are discussed in individual sections below as they relate to the effects of various land uses on water quality. Additional information on each of the southern study units, including specific reports and key study findings, can be accessed via the USGS Internet site at: <http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/nawqamap.html>.

5.2.3.1 5.2.3.2 Southern Appalachian Assessment

A recent study conducted in the Southern Appalachians indicates that overall water quality has improved slightly since passage of the CWA (Southern Appalachian Man and the Biosphere 1996). The Southern Appalachians include an area of approximately 37.4 million acres of mountains, foothills, and valleys stretching from northern Virginia and eastern West Virginia to northwestern South Carolina, northern Georgia, and northern Alabama. Other key findings included in this study were:

- Population growth and landscape alterations have resulted in water-quality degradation.
- The Tennessee River and Alabama River Basins are the most significantly impacted watersheds in the Southern Appalachians.
- Acidity of some streams in the area is increasing.
- Mining, urbanization, and dams have the largest effects on regional hydrology.
- Two-thirds of the reported localized water-quality impacts were a result of nonpoint-source pollution, including agricultural runoff, stormwater discharge, and landfill and

mining leachate.

- Mining impacts on water quality occur in the Tennessee River Basin and southwestern Virginia.

5.3 Land Use Impacts on Water Quality

5.3.1 Role of Forests in Protecting Water Quality

According to Sedell and others (2000), 80 percent of the freshwater resources in the United States originate in forests. Therefore, having healthy forests is critical to having clean water. The quality of water draining forested watersheds is typically the highest in the country (Binkley and Brown 1993, Clark and others 2000). Undisturbed forests or woodlands generally provide the best protection of land and water from sedimentation and other pollutants. The tree canopy and litter layer dissipate the energy contained in raindrops. Also, a continuous litter layer maintains a porous soil surface and high water infiltration rates; consequently overland flow is minimized in the forest. Forests slow stormwater runoff and provide watershed stability and critical habitat for fish and wildlife (Sedell and others 2000).

The body of literature that examines the role of forests, as compared to other land uses, in protecting water quality is significant. This section summarizes some of the key findings from various studies throughout the Nation and the South, related to sediment yield, nutrient yield, and biological conditions in forested versus nonforested watersheds. A number of these reports have been completed as part of the NAWQA program described in Section 5.2.3.1.

Patric and others (1984) and Yoho (1980) compiled the range of sediment yields from several small watershed studies throughout the Nation and the South, respectively. Both of these reviews concluded that forested lands produced a small fraction of the sediment yielded by more intensive land uses. Periodic timber harvesting activities occurred in many of the forested watersheds. Even with a wide diversity of forest types, geology, climate, and physiography, forested watersheds yielded far less sediment than areas where nonforest land uses occurred (Patric and others 1984). In the Upper Mississippi River Basin, sediment yield increased 150-fold from the forested headwaters to downstream areas dominated by other land uses, including agriculture (Mack 1967). Runoff and annual sediment yields were greatest from agricultural lands compared to pine plantations and mature pine-hardwoods in small watersheds in northern Mississippi (Ursic and Dendy 1963).

Faye and others (1980) compared erosion and suspended sediment yields in nine watersheds in the Upper Chattahoochee River Basin, Georgia, and reported the greatest suspended sediment yields from urban areas, compared with forested and agricultural lands. In a land-use study in Virginia, Jones and Holmes (1985) compared the effects of urban, agricultural, and forested land uses (silvicultural activities) on water resources. They concluded that forestry practices contributed little sediment; agriculture was an important source, and urban development contributed the most sediment (as well as other pollutants).

In a nationwide review of watershed characteristics and stream nutrient levels, Omernik (1977) found that streams draining agricultural watersheds had, on average, considerably higher nutrient concentrations than those draining forested watersheds. Nutrient concentrations were generally proportional to the percent of land in agriculture and inversely proportional to the percent of land in forest (Omernik 1977).

Spruill and others (1998) conducted a water-quality assessment of the four river basins in the Albemarle-Pamlico Drainage Basin – the Chowan, Roanoke, Tar, and Neuse. Highest nitrogen and phosphorous yields occurred in the highly agricultural and urbanized Neuse Basin, and lowest nutrient yields occurred in streams of the forested Chowan Basin. In a study of the Upper Tennessee River, Hampson and others (2000) found that sampling stations in forested watersheds had the lowest concentrations of total nitrogen, whereas stations in agricultural areas had the highest. Concentrations of nitrogen in urban and mixed land-use areas were significantly greater than in forested watersheds but were somewhat less than nitrogen concentrations in agricultural watersheds. As with total nitrogen, the lowest phosphorous concentrations were detected at sites in predominantly forested watersheds, whereas sites in urban and agricultural areas had the highest phosphorous concentrations (Hampson and others 2000).

In an assessment of biological indicators of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) River Basin, streams with forested land use had the best biological condition as shown by the Index of Biotic Integrity (Frick and others 1998). Lenat and Crawford (1994) conducted a study on the effects of land use on aquatic biota in three small catchment basins (forested, agricultural, and urban) in the Piedmont of North Carolina. Biological measurements showed large and consistent between-stream differences in the different watersheds. Invertebrate taxa richness criteria and biotic index criteria indicated good water quality, fair water quality, and poor water quality classifications in the forested, agricultural, and urban catchments, respectively (Lenat and Crawford 1994). For the purposes of this report, a GIS analysis was conducted to determine if a positive relationship could be demonstrated between water quality and forest cover for watersheds. The three general IWI categories, “better water quality”, “less serious water-quality problems” and “more serious water-quality problems”, were compared with percent forest cover for each of the southern watersheds. Percent forest cover was derived from the USFS Forest Inventory and Analysis data for each State and aggregated by watershed. However, because of the scale of the analysis (size of the watersheds) and other limitations in the use of the water-quality data at this scale, regional trends relating forest cover and water quality were not identified.

In addition, water-quality impairment based on IWI classification accounts for multiple factors and conditions that may have a greater impact on water quality than forest cover alone. Recent studies have concluded that the effects of human actions on nutrient loads may be disproportionately greater than the actual amount of anthropogenic cover in a watershed. Hession and others (1996) found that 80 percent of lake phosphorous load was attributable to agriculture, which accounted for only 25 percent of the watershed area. Nutrient export from agriculture was determined to be disproportionately greater than its area within a watershed.

Although urban and suburban land use accounts for only 5 percent of the ACF River Basin, it has the most significant effect on streamwater quality (Frick and others 1998).

The scale of any watershed analysis is critical to determining specific relationships between land uses and water quality. Effects of land uses, including silvicultural practices, on water quality and aquatic biota are best studied and summarized at much smaller scales. This level of analysis was not possible for this report.

5.3.2 Specific Land Uses Affecting Water Quality in the South

Based on a nationwide study of streams draining forested land, Patric and others (1984) concluded that land use has more influence on average sediment concentration in watersheds than does any other single factor. Land uses (practices) that are major sources of water-quality impairment in the South, and the pollutants that they may generate, are discussed in this Section. [Figure 1](#) displays the leading point and nonpoint sources of pollution from 1988 to 1998. [Figure 3](#) displays this information by State. Primary land-use practices (or types) affecting water-quality impairment in the South, can be grouped into five broad categories: agriculture, urbanization, resource extraction, hydromodification, and silviculture. At the local and regional level, land-use practices can dramatically affect soil condition and water quality, as well as water supply. Factors that affect land-use change include economic growth, population density, social development, political structure, attitudes and values, and technology (Turner and others 1993). Five major land-use categories are discussed in the subsections that follow.

5.3.2.1 Agriculture

From 1988 to 1998, agriculture was identified as the primary source of water quality impairment in the South. It accounted for a majority of the pollution impacting rivers and streams in the South ([Figure 1](#)). An annual average of approximately 44,326 miles of rivers and streams was impacted by agricultural activities during this period. Until the 1950's, the growth of agricultural land use generally kept pace with population increases (Novotny and Olem 1994). The majority of farming was conducted on small family farms without excessive use of chemicals. Since then, farming has shifted from family farms to larger corporate enterprises. Concurrently, farming began to rely on chemical fertilizers to increase plant yields, and on pesticides for insect and weed control. In general, as environmental awareness has increased, modern-day agricultural practices have begun to incorporate techniques that reduce potential environmental impacts.

Despite these advances, agricultural practices continue to be the primary source of water-quality impairment in the South (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2000a). For example, in North Carolina construction activities typically cause the highest erosion rates, but agriculture is the most common source of sediment problems because of the large amount of agricultural land use (Lenat and Crawford 1994). Agricultural activities such as field tillage, pesticide and fertilizer applications, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and feedlot operations are sources of significant nonpoint-source pollution (Neary and others 2000). Major pollutants associated with

agriculture include sedimentation, nitrogen and phosphorous loading, changes in soil salinity, and introduction of pesticides, other toxins, bacteria, and pathogens. Agricultural practices are more likely to contribute certain pollutants than other land-use practices. Agricultural land cover is considered one of the principal sources of excess loads of nitrogen and phosphorous in receiving waters (Parry 1998).

Concentrated animal operations (CAOs) are a major agricultural practice that contributes significant amounts of pollutants to rivers and estuaries in the South (Burkholder and others 1997, Mallin 2000). For example, North Carolina experienced a rapid increase in CAOs between 1980 and 1990. The CAOs were exempt from land zoning laws and mandatory inspection programs. The waste lagoons were not required to have impermeable liners and some were even constructed below the water table (Burkholder and others 1997). During heavy rainfall events, the waste lagoons overflowed resulting in an increase in biochemical oxygen demand, fecal coliform and nutrients, and a decrease in dissolved oxygen possibly resulting in fish kills (Burkholder and others 1997). Typical agricultural practices and associated pollutants are summarized in [Table 8](#) (Novotny and Olem 1994).

5.3.2.2 Urbanization

Urbanization is defined as land-use conversion caused by increased population density and activities associated with the creation of infrastructure to support populations, primarily within cities. Features of urbanization addressed in this Chapter include construction of homes and other buildings, infrastructure development such as municipal wastewater treatment plants and storm sewer systems, construction of industrial plants, urban sprawl, and creation of extended transportation routes, including mass transit.

Urban areas account for a small percentage of land in the South, but their effects on water resources have been severe. Urbanization represents the second overall leading source of impairment to water quality. Urbanization not only affects local rivers; it also contributes to water-quality impacts far downstream. According to National 305(b) Reports from 1988 to 1998, 5 of the 11 leading sources of water-quality impairment in the South were due to urbanization ([Figure 1](#)). These include both point and nonpoint sources of runoff in the categories of: (1) municipal (wastewater treatment plants), (2) storm-sewer/urban runoff, (3) industrial discharges, (4) land disposal (landfills), and (5) construction activities. These five sources impacted an annual average of approximately 36,248 miles of rivers and streams during this time.

In the first half of the 20th century, deterioration of water quality due to urbanization was primarily associated with point sources from industrial and commercial operations and treated and untreated domestic sewage. Point sources continue to contribute to water-quality impairment. It was not until 1970 that urban nonpoint sources of pollution were also recognized as contributing a significant portion of water-quality impacts. The following point and nonpoint sources of water-quality impairment are considered to be a result of urbanization:

Point Sources of Pollution

- Treated sewage discharges,
- Industrial discharges.
- Storm sewer outflows in urban centers, including pollutants such as car oil, detergents and other household and commercial solvents and chemicals.
- Spills or releases such as petroleum tankers and railcars.
- Unpermitted discharges from industrial or municipal sources.

Nonpoint Sources of Pollution

- Runoff (sedimentation and erosion) from construction activities.
- Runoff from roads and road construction.
- Sediment and contaminant transport from other impervious surfaces such as parking lots.
- Runoff from the application of pesticides and fertilizers.
- Runoff and leachate from landfills and septic tank systems.
- Leaking underground storage tanks and other improperly contained hazardous material storage tanks.
- Combined sewer overflows.

Other impacts to water quality due to urbanization include reduced flow in rivers and streams caused by increased demand for water resources such as drinking water and extensive land-use changes due to urban sprawl.

5.3.2.3 Hydromodification

Hydromodification is the alteration of the flow of water, which changes water depth, stream velocity, and amount of discharge (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2000a). Throughout the history of modern civilization, sources of water have been modified to exploit available resources. As populations have increased, modification of nearby streams, rivers, wetland areas, and lakes has increased accordingly. Traditionally, activities such as the draining of wetlands for agricultural purposes and the development of urban centers along rivers and streams have been encouraged and considered to be signs of progress and economic growth (Mac and others 1998). Hydromodification has been one of the leading causes of water-quality impairment in the South from 1988 to 1998. Hydromodification, including channelization, impacted an annual average

of approximately 10,490 river miles during this time ([Figure 1](#)) and was the third leading source of water quality impairment, behind agriculture and urbanization. Hydromodification includes the following activities (specific literature citations for water quality impacts are included):

- **Dredging:** The excavation of bottom sediment to increase water depth and subsequent disposal of dredged material (Burke and Engler 1978, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers 1989).
- **Channelization:** The alteration of stream morphology for human beneficial uses, such as flood control and irrigation (Crance and Masser 1996, Mac and others 1998).
- **Damming/Flow regulation:** A barrier preventing and regulating the flow of water for the purpose of flood control, power generation, and water resources (Federal Interagency Restoration Working Group 1998, Mac and others 1998).
- **Drainage of wetlands and swamps:** The act of removing water from wetlands by altering the land for purposes such as conversion to farmland and urban development (see [Chapter AQUA-2](#)).

5.3.2.4 Resource Extraction

Resource extraction, as reported in the National 305(b) Reports, includes mining, petroleum drilling, and runoff from mine tailing sites (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2000a). It was one of the top five sources of water-quality impairment in the South from 1988 to 1998 ([Figure 1](#)). The most common minerals extracted by mining are coal and metallic ores (Novotny and Olem 1994). Nonpoint sources of pollution associated with resource extraction include mineral and sediment discharges from inactive mining operations, sedimentation and erosion runoff from roads, old tailings, and spoil pile leaching of contaminants. In addition, acid mine drainage can severely impact water quality by altering pH levels of rivers and streams.

A National Stream Survey by the USEPA reported that 10 percent of the streams in the Northern Appalachians were acidic due to acid mine drainage during spring baseflow (Mac and others 1998). Active mines are considered point sources of pollution, and a discharge permit is required for their operation. Nonpoint pollution sources such as erosion and sedimentation are associated with almost every abandoned surface mine (Novotny and Olem 1994). Although mining is not as widespread as agriculture, water-quality impairment is often severe.

5.3.2.5 Silviculture

Silviculture is “the art and science of controlling the establishment, growth, composition, health, and quality of forests and woodlands to meet the diverse needs and values of landowners and society on a sustainable basis” (Society of American Foresters 1994). It includes the application of scientific agricultural practices to grow trees for use as lumber or other products. The majority of forested land in the South has been subject to historical silvicultural activities of some type or extent. According to the National 305(b) Reports, silvicultural activities impacted

annually an average of approximately 3,639 miles of rivers and streams in the South from 1988 to 1998 ([Figure 1](#)). Table 1 in [Chapter AQUA-3](#) provides a breakout of this information by State.

Silviculture ranks low among water-impairing land-use activities in the South. Nevertheless, impacts from silvicultural activities can be considerable if BMPs are not applied. The major potential nonpoint-source pollutant resulting from silvicultural activities is sediment from roads and skid trails. Other minor nonpoint-source impacts on water quality include short-term increases in peak flows during storms, short-term increases in base flows, short-term increases in nutrient concentrations (primarily nitrogen and phosphorous), short-term increases in herbicides/fertilizers and derivative products, and thermal pollution (increased stream temperature). Elevated levels of organics and nutrients may result from leaching of disturbed or exposed soils. Fertilizer applications may alter stream chemistry in managed forests, depending on the type of fertilizer used and how it is applied (Society of American Foresters 2000). In comparison, pollutant loads from properly managed areas are considered negligible (Novotny and Olem 1994). [Chapter AQUA-3](#) provides a complete discussion of the potential effects of silvicultural activities on water quality.

5.4 The Likely Future of Water Quality in the South

The population of the United States is expected to reach nearly 400 million people by the year 2050, and Texas and Florida are among the States with the fastest growing populations in the country (U.S. Census Bureau 1997). Suburbs and rural areas are expanding. As a result, the needs for recreation, timber, clean water, and other forest benefits are also increasing. Although the current trend is generally toward improved water quality in the United States, uncontrolled land-use practices may alter this trend. Loss of wildlife and vegetation, erosion of soils, and nonpoint-source pollution of groundwater and surface water will result in a trend of degrading water quality. According to the study *Status and Trends of the Nation's Biological Resources*, "there are enough scientifically documented declines of species abundances and extinctions of aquatic species that are direct results of human activity to indicate that present water-use and development practices cannot continue" (Mac and others 1998). It should also be noted that although this Chapter did not focus on estuarine and coastal resources, a number of studies indicate that due to population increases, water quality in coastal regions is likely to significantly degrade in a number of areas, including the South (Mallin and others 2000, Dame and others 2000). Understanding cumulative downstream impacts is essential to assessing the likely future of water quality, especially in these coastal regions.

The likely future of water quality in the South depends on the success of future mandates, specific programs, and initiatives to promote water quality improvements. Some of the major programs are described in the following Sections.

5.4.1 Clean Water Action Plan (CWAP)

In 1998, President Clinton announced a new clean water initiative to speed the restoration of the Nation's waterways. This initiative, called the Clean Water Action Plan (CWAP), aims to achieve

clean water by strengthening public health protection, targeting community-based watershed protection efforts, and providing communities with new resources to control polluted runoff. The intended purpose of CWAP is a reemphasis of the original goal of the CWA, which was to achieve “fishable and swimmable water for every American” (Clean Water Action Plan 2001). The CWAP builds on existing programs and proposes new efforts that support partnerships between Federal, State, and local levels. These efforts include financial assistance and incentives to aid in the restoration of aquatic systems within watersheds. Four areas identified as imperative to the success of CWAP include: (1) a watershed approach, (2) strong Federal and State standards, (3) natural resource stewardship, and (4) informed citizens and officials.

5.4.2 Unified Watershed Assessment (UWA)

One of the key objectives of CWAP was to encourage States and Tribes to work together with the public to identify watersheds that do not meet water-quality and other natural resource goals and watersheds that are in the most critical need of restoration and protection. This objective would be accomplished through the conduct of Unified Watershed Assessments (UWAs). UWAs represent some of the first coordinated efforts to develop common priorities to restore and protect water quality. The designation of these watersheds would use common criteria within one of four categories, as described below (Clean Water Action Plan 2001).

- **Watersheds in Need of Restoration:** These watersheds do not meet clean water goals, and are considered priorities for restoration. States and Tribes have developed subcategories to further prioritize watersheds in need of restoration based on the degree of vulnerability or threat to water quality conditions. These include: (1) *Highest restoration priority*--those watersheds determined by States to be most in need of restoration, and (2) *Other restoration needed*--the remaining watersheds in need of restoration.
- **Watersheds Meeting Goals, Including Those Needing Actions to Sustain Water Quality:** These watersheds meet clean water and other natural resource goals and standards and support healthy aquatic systems.
- **Watersheds with Pristine/Sensitive Aquatic System Conditions on Land Administered by Federal, State, or Tribal Governments:** These watersheds contain pristine water quality, other sensitive aquatic system conditions, and drinking water sources that are located on land administered by Federal, State, or Tribal governments. These areas include currently designated and potential candidate Wilderness Areas, Outstanding Natural Resource Waters, and Wild and Scenic Rivers.
- **Watersheds with Insufficient Data to Make an Assessment:** These watersheds lack significant information or the critical data elements needed to make a reasonable assessment.

Once prioritized, each State and Tribe must develop restoration action strategies, a long-term

schedule, and a description of the information used to base priority decisions through their UWA. States that share a watershed, such as in the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River basin in Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, are encouraged to exchange information and work closely to reach common goals (Natural Resource Conservation Service 2001).

The UWA designations for individual watersheds (8-digit HUCs) in the South were compiled to identify the specific watershed restoration and protection priorities based on certain factors such as water quality. [Figure 5](#) provides a graphic representation of this information. [Table 9](#) summarizes this information at the State level. The information that is presented in [Figure 5](#) is similar to that shown in [Figure 4](#) (IWI data), but UWA data focuses on restoration priorities of watersheds established by individual States.

Based on the results of the UWA characterization, 391 individual watersheds, which represent approximately 59 percent of the land area in the South, have been categorized as in need of some level of restoration. Of these, 148 watersheds (25 percent of the land area) are designated as the “Highest Restoration Priority,” and 243 watersheds (34 percent of the land area) are classified as “Other Restoration Needed.” One hundred ninety four individual watersheds (29 percent of the land area) are classified as “Meeting Standards” and 2 individual watersheds (less than 1 percent of the land area) are considered “Very High Quality.” The two “Very High Quality” watersheds are in Mississippi and North Carolina. For 85 individual watersheds (12 percent of the land area) information is insufficient for overall characterization ([Figure 5](#)). Georgia has the highest percentage of watershed acreage designated as having the “Highest Restoration Priority,” (22 individual watersheds) followed by Louisiana and Virginia ([Table 9](#)).

[Table 10](#) presents the same information as [Table 9](#), except the UWA information is aggregated by ecological province. A complete description of the ecological provinces in the South is included in [Chapter HLTH-1](#). The ecological province with the fewest watersheds, the Everglades, has the most need for restoration. Approximately 73 percent of the Everglades Province, which consists of some 5.25 million acres, is in the most critical need of restoration. Watersheds in the Central Appalachian Province have also been targeted for significant restoration efforts. The Outer Coast Province, which is the largest ecological province in the South, contains the highest percentage of watershed acreage categorized as “Meeting Standards” or “Very High Quality”.

5.4.3 Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Program

The TMDL program is identified in Section 303(d) of the CWA. It requires that States, “...determine the total maximum daily loads that would be necessary to bring those waters up to water quality minimums, and allocate those loads among sources in discharge permits and state water quality plans” (33 U.S.C.A. § 1313(d)). USEPA defines a TMDL as “a calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can receive and still meet water quality standards, and an allocation of that amount to the pollutant’s sources” (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2000b). Included in this amount or “pollution budget” is a margin of safety to ensure that waterbodies can be used for the state designated purposes, such as swimming,

recreation, and fishing.

USEPA delegated authority to States to develop and enforce TMDLs and to promote effective nonpoint-source controls (Boyd 2000). The USEPA will reassume authority if individual States fail to develop or enforce TMDLs. State regulatory agencies are also required to determine the steps needed to improve or restore the quality of impaired waters. The development and implementation process for TMDLs is designed to promote stakeholder consensus in technical evaluation and development of management strategies for the identified water-quality problems. The establishment of TMDLs for specific watersheds or subwatersheds is the primary approach to watershed restoration efforts identified as part of the UWA process.

5.4.4 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Program

Congress amended the CWA in 1987 to include a two-phase national program addressing stormwater discharges. Under the initial NPDES Phase 1 program, separate municipal storm sewer systems (MS4s) serving 100,000 or more people, and operators of construction activities disturbing 5 or more acres, must obtain an NPDES stormwater permit (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2001d). The NPDES Phase 2 program was finalized in 1999, and is scheduled for full implementation by 2003. The new requirements were established to protect water resources from stormwater runoff in regulated MS4s serving populations less than 100,000 and construction sites that disturb from 1 to 5 acres (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2001d).

5.4.5 Incentives and Stewardship Programs

A number of stewardship programs have been established to promote good land-use practices, proactive thinking on the part of companies and private landowners with regards to multiresource management, and financial incentives for participation. Specific to forestry activities, the American Forest and Paper Association (AF&PA) recently began a stewardship initiative to incorporate the protection of natural resources. Under the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) program, water-quality improvement is specifically targeted by implementation of BMPs, approved State water-quality programs, and adherence to State and Federal water protection laws and regulations.

The USDA Forest Service initiated a Forest Stewardship Program, similar to the SFI program, that provides educational and technical assistance to landowners interested in active management of their forests for multiple resource benefits. Another program, the Stewardship Incentive Program (SIP), provides cost-share support for nonindustrial private forest landowners to help them develop and implement Forest Stewardship Plans. Funding through SIP is based on landowner adherence to the plan for a minimum of 10 years. Technical and planning assistance by natural resource professionals is available through the program.

5.4.6 Source Water Assessment Program

The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Amendments of 1996 require States to develop and implement Source Water Assessment Programs (SWAP). These programs are intended to address existing and potential threats to public drinking water quality. Assessments will include drinking water sources and potential threats to drinking water quality for metropolitan areas, towns, schools, and restaurants. Currently, the USEPA has approved 52 SWAPs, which must be implemented by States within 3 years of USEPA approval (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2001e).

5.4.7 Fishable Waters Act

The Fishable Waters Act (FWA) of 2000 is a proposed amendment to the CWA introduced to Congress by the Clinton Administration. The objective of this Act is to meet fishable and swimmable goals of the CWA. The FWA was drafted in collaboration with the Fishable Waters Coalition with the objective of restoring the physical and biological integrity of 4 million acres of public waters for fishing and recreation (Izaak Walton League of America 2001). If passed by Congress, the FWA would be a program under the CWA that would allow States to use funds in their Fisheries Habitat Account toward FWA conservation programs.

6 Discussion and Conclusions

Although water quality has improved since the passage of the CWA, water-quality impairment is still an important concern in the South. Several watersheds and waterbodies have been identified as needing improvement and/or as being impaired for designated uses. There are too many instances of insufficient data regarding the current conditions of rivers and streams in the South. It is important to understand the difficulties in identifying causes and, in particular, sources of pollution in impaired waters. Many of the monitoring and data reporting limitations have been described in previous sections. However, USEPA and the individual States are working to develop better, more consistent methods for determining the causes and sources of impairment and describing the level of confidence in the classification.

The information included in this Chapter on the status of water quality has been presented at various scales: regional, State, ecological region, and individual watershed (8-digit HUC). The leading pollutants in rivers and streams in the South are sedimentation and pathogens (bacteria). Nonpoint-source pollution continues to degrade the overwhelming majority of rivers and streams. The primary nonpoint sources of water-quality impairment identified in the South are agriculture and urbanization. Agriculture and urbanization impact water quality by eliminating natural vegetation and replacing it with impervious surfaces or creating more readily erodible surfaces.

Therefore, preservation and restoration of forest cover are crucial to maintaining water quality in the South. Forest cover, riparian habitat, and streambank management are vital to maintaining and increasing water quality. Although the relationship is often hard to analyze statistically, loss of these habitats has had significant effects on water quality. A positive

relationship between increasing forest cover and better water quality could not be identified due to problems with geographic scale and the nature of the water quality data. In almost all instances, designation of the causes or sources of a particular water-quality impairment occurs within individual river miles. Land use, as a source of pollution, clearly plays a more significant role in degrading water quality at a local level.

Understanding land-use impacts and implementation of effective management practices is the key to maintenance and improvement of water quality in the South. Sustainable land-use practices are needed to maintain and improve water quality. Assessment and management issues must be addressed at regional, State, and local levels to understand the complex and interdependent relationships among natural resources and land uses. Management at the regional level is vital since impacts from land-use changes are widespread and occur in different combinations and rates in different areas. As a greater understanding of cumulative downstream effects is gained, effective implementation of regional land-use and watershed management programs may aid in minimizing potential water-quality impacts (Bolstad and Swank 1997).

Progress is being made to restore degraded rivers and to protect those that are still intact. The general public is becoming increasingly aware of water-quality issues. Across the South, local communities and organizations are working with State and Federal agencies to find ways to protect our rivers without adversely impacting continued economic growth. Improved public outreach and education are needed, particularly concerning nonpoint-source pollution management, wastewater operation and maintenance, and general water quality and resource management. Future trends in water quality in the South include a variety of proactive mandates, management approaches, increased awareness and implementation of BMPs, and the use of more effective and accurate technological tools.

7 Needs for Additional Research

As increasing land-use demands affect water quality in the South, additional research and activities have been identified that would enhance the effectiveness of management programs, thereby improving water quality. The overall goal for water-quality management is to “protect our water sources, including groundwater, from contamination and overuse, and commit to maintaining or continuing to restore degraded aquatic systems, riparian forests, and natural resources” (Mac and others 1998). Recommendations and additional research needs necessary to accomplish this goal are:

- Research and develop standard assessment and reporting criteria among States for the 305(b) Reports to Congress.
- Develop watershed assessment methods that consider costs and benefits of land use at large watershed and regional scales.
- Develop and integrate standardized tools for water-quality assessment, including

modeling, use and interpretation of satellite imagery, and remote sensing.

- Develop methods to identify priority natural areas for protection and restoration as part of land management planning efforts.
- Investigate whole ecosystem impacts in restoration efforts.
- Research and incorporate downstream cumulative impacts in watershed assessment and management.
- Examine the effects historical disturbances have on current water quality.
- Investigate the long-term effects of BMPs and forest harvesting activities on sediment production.
- Research urbanization effects on forest ecosystem function and structure.

8 Acknowledgments

Special thanks to the staff of Parsons Engineering Science, Inc., who aided in the completion of this Chapter, including Corie Rockett, Nathan Craig, Leigh Ann Valletti, Elizabeth Perez-Lefkowitz, Steven Bach, and Alyse Getty. In addition, this work would not have proceeded without the assistance and encouragement of the following colleagues: (1) University of Georgia faculty and staff, including Rhett Jackson, Tim Harrington, Bruce Bongarten, Bruce Beck, and Todd Rasmussen, and (2) several USEPA employees, including Serdar Ertep, Heinz Mueller, David Melgaard, and Jim Harrison.

9 Literature Cited

- Binkley, D.; Brown, T. 1993. Management impacts on water quality of forests and rangelands. In: United States Department of Agriculture, General Technical Report RM-239.
- Bolstad, P.V.; Swank, W.T. 1997. Cumulative impacts of landuse on water quality in a southern appalachian watershed. In: Journal of the American Water Resources Association. 33(3): 519-533.
- Boyd, J. 2000. The new face of the Clean Water Act: A Critical Review of the USEPA's Proposed TMDL Rules. Discussion Paper: 00-12. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future. 35 p. http://www.rff.org/CFDOCS/disc_papers/PDF_files/0012.pdf. (March 2001).
- Burk, S.A.; Engler, R.M. 1978. Water quality impacts of an aquatic dredged material disposal (laboratory investigation) synthesis report. Tech. Rep. DS-78-4. NTIS No. AS-A059 735. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station. 35 p.
- Burkholder, J.M.; Mallin, M.; Glasgow, H.B.; Larsen, L.M.; McIver, M.R.; Shank, G.C.; Deamer-

Melia, N.; Briley, D.S.; Springer, J.; Touchette, B.W.; Hannon, E.K. 1997. Impacts to a coastal river and estuary from rupture of a large swine waste holding lagoon. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 26(6): 1451-1466.

Chase, E.S. 1952. Progress in sanitary engineering in the United States. In: *Pure and wholesome: A collection of papers on water and waste treatment at the turn of the century*. New York: American Society of Civil Engineers. c1982: 7-17. Paper Number 2608.

Clark, G.M.; Mueller, D.K.; Mast, M.A. 2000. Nutrient concentrations and yields in undeveloped basins of the United States. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 36(4):849-860.

Clawson, R.G.; Lockaby, B.G.; Rummer, R.B. 1999. Harvest influences on floodwater properties in a forested floodplain. In: *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 36(6):1081-1088.

Cowdrey, A.E. 1996. *This land, this South*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky. 232 p.

Crance, J.; Masser, M. 1996. *Streams: a national heritage worth preserving*. ANR-911, U.S. National Biological Service, Southeastern Biological Science Center, Auburn Field Station, Auburn University. Reprinted August, 1996.
<http://www.aces.edu/departement/extcomm/publications/anr/ANR-911/anr911main.html> (March 2001).

Clean Water Action Plan . 2001. Restoring and protecting America's waters.
<http://www.cleanwater.gov>. (March 2001).

Dame, R.; Alber, M.; Allen, D.; Mallin, M.; Montague, C.; Lewttus, A.; Chalmers, A; Gardner, R.; Gilman, C.; Kjerfve, B.; Pinckney, J.; Smith, N. 2000. Estuaries of the South Atlantic coast of North America: their geographical signatures. *Estuaries*, 23(6): 793-819.

ECOMAP. 1993. National hierarchical framework of ecological units. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 20 p.

Faye, R.E., W.P. Carey, J.K. Stamer, and R.L. Kleckner. 1980. Erosion, sediment discharge, and channel morphology in the upper Chattahoochee River basin, Georgia. U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1107, Washington, DC.

Federal Interagency Stream Restoration Working Group. 1998. *Stream corridor restoration: principles, processes, and practices*. By the Federal Interagency Stream Restoration Working Group (FISRWG) (15 Federal agencies of the U.S. Government). GPO Item No. 0120-A, SuDocs No. A 57.6/2:EN 3/PT.653. ISBN-0-934213-59-3.. October 1998.

Frick, E.A., D.J. Hippe, G.R. Buell, C.A. Couch, E.H. Hopkins, D.J. Wangsness, and J.W. Garrett. 1998. *Water quality in the Appalachian-Chattahoochee-Flint River Basin, 1992-1995*. U.S.

Geological Survey Circular 1164, Washington, DC. 38 p.

Hampson, P.S., M.W. Treece, Jr., G.C. Johnson, S.A. Ahlstedt, and J.F. Connell. 2000. Water quality in the upper Tennessee River Basin, Tennessee, North Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia, 1994-1998. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1205, Washington, DC. 32 p.

Hansen, M.H.; Frieswyk, T.; Glover, J.; Kelly, J. 1992 The Eastwide forest inventory database: users manual. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-151. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station. 48 p.

Hession, W.C., D.E. Storm, C.T. Haan, S.L. Burks, and M.D. Matlock. 1996. A watershed-level ecological risk assessment methodology. *Water Resources Bulletin* 32(5): 1039-1054.

Izaak Walton League of America. 2001. Conservation Issue Update, Fishable Waters Act. <http://www.iwla.org/conserv/CIU/fwa.html> (March 2001).

Jackson, R.C. 2001. A quick overview of silvicultural water quality issues in the Southeast. Warnell School of Forest Resources prepared for Parsons Engineering Science, Inc. February, 2001 and personal communication January 31, 2001.

Jones, R.C., and B.H. Holmes. 1985. Effects of land use practices on water resources in Virginia. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Water Resources Research Center, Bulletin 144, Blacksburg, VA.

Lenat, D.R., and J.K. Crawford. 1994. Effects of land use on water quality and aquatic biota of three North Carolina Piedmont streams. *Hydrobiologia*, 294: 185-199.

Mac, M.J.; Opler, P.A.; Puckett Haeker, C.E.; Doran, P.D. 1998. Status and trends of the Nation's biological resources. 2 vols. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA. 964 p.

Mack, F.J. 1967. Sedimentation in the upper Mississippi Basin. pp. 95-102. In: *Soil and America's Future*, Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting, Soil Conservation Society of America, Des Moines, IA.

Mallin, M.A. 2000. Impacts of industrial animal production on rivers and estuaries. *American Scientist*, 88: 2-13.

Mallin, M.A.; Burkholder, J.M.; Cahoon, L.B.; Posey, M.H. 2000. North and South Carolina coasts. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 41(1): 56-75.

McCleese, W. 1992. National hydrology workshop: watersheds in the nineties. In: *Proceedings of the 1992 National Hydrology Workshop: 1992 April 27-May 1; Phoenix, AZ*. United States Department of Agriculture - Forest Service. Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. General Technical Report: RM-GTR-279. 6 p.

Megahan, W.F.; Hornbeck, J. 2000. Lessons learned in watershed management: a retrospective view. In: Land stewardship in the 21st century: The contributions of watershed management: Synthesis Papers; 2000 March 13-16; Tuscon, AZ. RMRS-P-13. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station: 177-188.

Meyer, W.B. 1995. Past and present land use and cover in the USA. Consequences: The nature and implications of environmental change. 1(1): (page numbers not provided). <http://www.gcrio.org/consequences/spring95/Land.html>. (March 2001).

Neary, D.; Swank, W.; Riekerk, H. 1989. An overview of nonpoint source pollution in the southern United States. In: D.D. Hook and R. Lea, eds. Proceedings of the symposium: The forested wetlands of the southern United States. 1988 July 12-14; Orlando, Fl: 1-7. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station. 1989. Asheville, NC. Gen. Tech. Rep. SE-50: 168. 89.p.

Neary and Others 2000

Novotny, V.; Olem, H. 1994. Water quality: prevention, identification and management of diffuse pollution, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold. 1054 p.

Natural Resources Conservation Service . 2001. Clean Water – the Road Ahead. <http://www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov/cleanwater/action/overview.html>. (March 2001).

Omernik, J.M. 1977. Nonpoint source--stream nutrient level relationships: a nationwide study. EPA-600/3-77-105. Corvallis, Oregon: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 151 p.

Parry, R. 1998. Agricultural phosphorous and water quality: a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency perspective. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 27: 258-261.

Patric, J.H., J.O. Evans, and J.D. Helvey. 1984. Summary of sediment yield data from forested land in the United States. *Journal of Forestry*, 82:101-104

Sedell, J.; Sharpe, M.; Dravnieks, D.; Copenhagen, M.; Furniss, M. 2000. Water and the Forest Service. FS-660, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 26 p.

Sedjo, R.A. 1991. Forest resources: resilient and serviceable. In: Frederick, K.D. and Sedjo, R.A., eds. America's Renewable Resources: Historical Trends and Current Challenges. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future: 81-117.

Smith, R.A.; Alexander, R.B.; Wolman, M.G. 1987. Water Quality Trends in the Nation's Rivers. *Science, New Series*, Vol.235, Issue 4796. 1607-1615.

Society of American Foresters. 1994. Silviculture terminology. Prepared by the Silviculture Instructors Subgroup Silviculture Working Group (D2) Society of American Foresters, Terminology Committee. Copyright: Curators of the University of Missouri, School of Natural

Resources, University of Missouri-Columbia. [Not paged].

http://www.snr.missouri.edu/silviculture/silviculture_terminology.htm. (March 2001).

Society of American Foresters. 2000. A review of waterbodies listed as impaired by silvicultural operations. SAF-00-03. Washington, DC: Society of American Foresters. 13 p. In cooperation with: the National Association of State Foresters. 13 p.

Southern Appalachian Man and the Biosphere. 1996. The Southern Appalachian assessment aquatic technical report. Report 2 of 5. Atlanta: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Region.

Spruill, T.B., D.A. Harned, P.M. Ruhl, J.L. Eimers, G. McMahon, K.E. Smith, D.R. Galeone, and M.D. Woodside. 1998. Water quality in the Albemarle-Pamlico drainage Basin, North Carolina and Virginia, 1992-1995. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1157, Washington, DC. 36 p.

Trimble, S. 1974. Man-induced soil erosion on the Southern Piedmont, 1700-1970. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, Department of Geography. 162 p. In cooperation with: Soil Conservation Society of America.

Turner, B.L.; Moss, R.H.; Skole, D. L. eds. 1993. Relating land use and global land-cover change: a proposal for an IGBP-HDP core project. Report from the IGBP-HDP Working Group on Land-Use/Land-Cover Change. Joint publication of the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme. Report No.24 and the Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change Programme. Report Series No.5. Stockholm: Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences.

United States Army Corps of Engineers. 1989. Environmental effects of dredging: technical notes. EEDP-01-16. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station, Environmental Laboratory. 8 p.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2001. Plot-level data for Southern States [Database]. Forest Inventory and Analysis datasets assembled for the Southern Forest Resource Assessment. <http://www.srs.fs.fed.us/sustain/data/fia/ewplot/index.htm>. (January 2001).

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1990. National water quality inventory: 1988 report to Congress. EPA 440-4-90-003. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 187 p.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1992. National water quality inventory: 1990 report to Congress. EPA 503/9-92/006. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 174 p.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1994. National water quality inventory: 1992 report to Congress. EPA 841-R-94-001. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 328 p.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1996. National water quality inventory: 1994 report to Congress. EPA 841-R-95-005. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 497 p.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1997. The index of watershed indicators. September 1997. EPA-841-R-97-010.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1998a. National water quality inventory: 1996 report to Congress. EPA 841-R-97-008. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 521 p.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1998b. Unified watershed assessments: clean water action plan: Restoring and protecting America's waters. <http://www.epa.gov/owow/uwa>. Individual State UWA 1998 data, downloaded January 2001.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1999. Index of watershed indicators: national maps, factsheets, and data documentation and download. <http://www.epa.gov/iwi/national/index.html>. Overall watershed characterization data, Sept. 1999 release, downloaded January 2001.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2000a. National water quality inventory: 1998 report to Congress. EPA 841-R-00-001. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 413 p.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2000b. Final TMDL rule: fulfilling the goals of the Clean Water Act [Factsheet]. EPA 841-F-00-008. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. [Not paged]. <http://www.epa.gov/owow/tmdl/finalrule/factsheet1.html>. (March 2001).

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2001a. Surf your watershed. <http://www.epa.gov/surf3>. (March 2001).

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2001b. Clean Water Act. <http://www.epa.gov/owow/cwa/history.htm>. (March 2001).

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2001c. Understanding the IWI. http://www.epa.gov/iwi/help/help_e.html. (March 2001).

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2001d. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program. <http://www.epa.gov/npdes/>(March 2001).

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2001e. Source water assessment program. <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/protect/swap.html>. (March 2001).

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2001f. Water quality criteria and standards plan--priorities for the future. <http://www.epa.gov/OST/standards/planfs.html> (March 2001).

U.S. Geological Survey. 2001a. Hydrologic Unit Maps – What are hydrologic units? <http://water.usgs.gov/GIS/huc.html>. (March 2001).

U.S. Geological Survey. 2001b. National Water-Quality Assessment (NAWQA) program. <http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/>. (March 2001).

Ursic, S.J. and F.E. Dendy. 1963. Sediment yields from small watersheds under various land uses and forest covers. Presented at the Second Federal Interagency Conference Sedimentation, January 28-February 1, 1963, Jackson, MS. Southern Research Station, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Asheville, NC.

Yoho, N.S. 1980. Forest management and sediment production in the South—a review. *Southern Journal of Applied Forestry*, 4:27-36.

Tables and Figures

Table 1--Common causes of pollution summarized from National Water Quality Inventory Reports

Cause of impairment	Description of cause
Nutrients	Nitrates found in sewage and fertilizers and phosphates found in detergents and fertilizers.
Siltation (sedimentation)	Wash off plowed fields, construction and logging sites, urban areas, strip-mined land, and eroded stream banks.
Pathogens (bacteria)	Inadequately treated sewage, storm water drains, septic systems, runoff from livestock pens, and boats that dump sewage.
Organic material	Sewage, leaves and grass clippings, and runoff from livestock feedlots and pastures.
Metals	Industrial discharges, runoff from city streets, mining activities, and leachate from landfills.
Pesticides and herbicides	Runoff from croplands, lawns, and termite control.
Habitat modification	Grazing, farming, channelization, dam construction, and dredging.

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1994

[Return to first reference in text](#)

Table 2--Common sources of pollution summarized from National Water Quality Inventory Reports

Source of impairment	Description of source
Point sources	
Industrial	Pulp and paper mills, chemical manufacturers, steel plants, textile manufacturers, food processing plants.
Municipal	Publicly owned sewage treatment plants that may receive indirect discharges from industrial facilities or businesses.
Combined sewers	Single facilities that treat both stormwater and sanitary sewage, which may become overloaded during storm events and discharge untreated wastes into surface waters.
Storm sewers/urban runoff ^a	Runoff from impervious surfaces including streets, buildings, lawns, and other paved areas that enters a sewer, pipe, or ditch before discharge into surface waters.
Land disposal ^a	Leachate or discharge from septic tanks, landfills and hazardous waste sites.
Nonpoint sources	
Agriculture	Crop production, pastures, rangeland, feedlots, other animal holding areas.
Silviculture	Forest management, tree harvesting, logging road construction.
Construction	Land development, road construction.
Resource extraction	Mining, petroleum-drilling, runoff from mine tailing sites.
Natural	Non man-induced impacts, such as floods, hurricanes, leachate from naturally occurring metals, and wildlife.

^a Storm sewers/urban runoff and land disposal include both point and nonpoint sources.

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1998a

[Return to first reference in text](#)

Table 3--Interrelationship between common sources and causes of pollution

Source of impairment	Siltation (sediment)	Pathogens (bacteria)	Nutrients ^a	Organic enrichment	Pesticides	Metals	Habitat modification
Point sources							
Municipal		X	X	X		X	
Storm sewers/urban runoff ^b	X				X	X	
Industrial	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Land disposal ^b		X	X	X		X	
Nonpoint sources							
Agriculture	X	X	X	X	X		X
Resource extraction	X					X	X
Hydrologic/habitat modification	X						X
Construction	X						
Silviculture	X		X	X	X		X
Channelization	X		X	X	X		X
Natural	X	X	X	X		X	X

^a Nutrients include nitrogen and phosphorous.

^b Storm sewers/urban runoff and land disposal include both point and nonpoint sources.

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2000a

[Return to first reference in text](#)

Table 4--Leading sources of impairment of rivers and streams in Southern States from 1988 to 1998

Source of impairment ^a	AL	AR	FL	GA	KY	LA	MS	NC	OK	SC	TN	TX	VA
-----Annual average impaired miles ^{b,c} -----													
Point sources													
Municipal	642	318	575	468	1,149	3,335	1,076	296	0	974	1,994	1,522	211
Storm sewers/runoff ^d	260	48	1,775	1,162	599	1,880	605	898	513	1,251	1,995	375	472
Industrial	321	184	476	99	217	2,432	952	496	21	804	1,023	1,078	143
Land disposal ^d	87	41	1,364	2	731	1,847	340	260	515	158	270	78	53
Total	1,310	591	4,190	1,731	2,696	9,494	2,973	1,950	1,049	3,186	5,282	3,054	879
Nonpoint sources													
Agriculture	969	2,662	2,033	24	1,447	3,816	19,408	4,647	4,000	1,540	4,874	428	1,106
Hydrologic/habitat Modification	288	28	1,244	44	186	2,022	488	349	1,339	98	3,640	27	36
Resource extraction	459	248	688	7	1,107	1,875	503	114	1,126	29	1,269	0	221
Channelization	0	0	0	0	59	605	157	0	407	0	3,514	8	0
Construction	123	40	1,372	0	37	691	65	572	179	96	1,178	0	0
Silviculture	166	185	563	2	78	984	1,459	206	120	193	188	0	278
Natural	70	0	0	271	2	691	994	0	62	172	376	331	281
Total	2,075	3,162	5,901	348	2,915	10,683	23,074	5,888	7,233	2,129	15,038	793	1,922

^a Table does not include all sources of impairment for all years, only major sources; impaired miles can be affected by multiple sources.

^b An impaired river mile is a river mile that is classified as partially supporting overall use or not supporting overall use.

^c Annual average impaired miles from 1988 to 1998 is defined as the total impaired miles for each source divided by the number of National 305(b) Reports during this time (6); for example, in Alabama, municipal sources contributed annually, on average, to the impairment of 642 river miles from 1988 to 1998.

^d Storm sewers/runoff and land disposal include both point and nonpoint sources.

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998a, 2000a

[Return to first reference in text](#)

[Return to second reference in text](#)

Table 5--Overall watershed characterization in Southern States using Index of Watershed Indicators data

State	Total number of watersheds	Better water quality	Less serious water quality	More serious water quality	Insufficient data
	<i>--Number of watersheds (acres)--</i>	<i>-----Number of watersheds (percent of acres) -----</i>			
Alabama	53 (33,090,082)	22 (50.54)	19 (25.12)	5 (10.00)	7 (14.34)
Arkansas	59 (33,924,530)	27 (50.98)	20 (28.70)	7 (10.38)	5 (9.94)
Florida	54 (35,401,487)	16 (24.76)	16 (57.70)	9 (16.24)	4 (1.30)
Georgia	53 (37,512,562)	16 (14.98)	28 (66.47)	4 (6.52)	5 (12.03)
Kentucky	47 (25,747,680)	15 (36.57)	23 (53.11)	8 (9.94)	1 (0.34)
Louisiana	58 (29,554,483)	5 (5.07)	19 (35.25)	29 (50.79)	5 (8.89)
Mississippi	56 (30,461,735)	8 (8.37)	20 (42.15)	25 (45.11)	3 (4.37)
North Carolina	57 (31,387,170)	32 (59.76)	16 (26.86)	6 (9.75)	3 (3.63)
Oklahoma	70 (44,743,486)	8 (11.64)	37 (58.40)	17 (24.47)	8 (5.49)
South Carolina	36 (19,759,604)	8 (13.09)	18 (62.07)	9 (24.81)	1 (0.02)
Tennessee	62 (26,992,715)	29 (43.91)	20 (33.16)	8 (15.98)	5 (6.96)
Texas	206 (168,984,378)	48 (28.64)	47 (19.15)	22 (7.05)	89 (45.15)
Virginia	54 (25,615,321)	26 (59.92)	23 (33.76)	0 (0)	5 (6.32)

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1997 and 1999

[Return to first reference in text](#)

[Return to second reference in text](#)

[Return to third reference in text](#)

Table 6--Watershed characterization of ecological provinces in the South using Index of Watershed Indicators data

Ecological Province ^a	Total number of watersheds	Better water quality	Less serious water quality	More serious water quality	Insufficient data
	<i>-- Number of watersheds (acres) --</i>	<i>-----Number of watersheds (percent of acres) -----</i>			
E Broadlf Ocean (221)	41 (12,011,675)	17 (40.43)	17 (42.78)	2 (9.02)	5 (7.77)
Cntr Appalachian (M221)	52 (20,960,016)	23 (55.19)	23 (39.37)	4 (1.52)	2 (3.92)
E Broadlf Contl (222)	76 (41,470,850)	29 (42.33)	30 (41.86)	14 (12.79)	3 (3.01)
Ozark Broadlf (M222)	15 (4,136,528)	8 (52.34)	4 (22.38)	2 (14.39)	1 (10.89)
Southeast Mixed (231)	199 (112,330,643)	65 (35.11)	73 (39.22)	43 (17.56)	18 (8.12)
Ouachita Mixed (M231)	18 (7,153,279)	8 (38.65)	5 (24.37)	4 (30.98)	1 (6.00)
Outr Coast Mixed (232)	216 (126,888,978)	54 (24.02)	93 (45.90)	48 (21.51)	21 (8.57)
Lowr MS Riverine (234)	87 (27,494,018)	17 (27.39)	31 (36.60)	36 (31.89)	3 (4.12)
Prairie Park Tmp (M251)	12 (2,571,329)	2 (2.29)	9 (75.21)	1 (22.50)	0 (0)
Prairie Park Sbtr (255)	113 (55,793,413)	35 (37.52)	49 (39.69)	16 (16.18)	13 (6.61)
Everglades (411)	6 (5,253,389)	0 (0)	4 (91.07)	1 (7.18)	1 (1.75)

^a Bailey's ecological provinces, represented by three digit codes; leading "M" indicates mountainous topography

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1997 and 1999

[Return to first reference in text](#)

Table 7--National Water Quality Assessment Program study units in the South

Study year	Study unit	States
1991	Potomac River Basin	Virginia
1991	Albemarle-Pamlico Drainage	North Carolina, Virginia
1991	Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River Basin	Alabama, Florida, Georgia
1991	Georgia-Florida Coastal Plain	Georgia, Florida
1991	Ozark Plateaus	Arkansas, Oklahoma
1991	Trinity River Basin	Texas
1991	Rio Grande Valley	Texas
1994	South Central Texas	Texas
1994	Mississippi Embayment	Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee
1994	Southern Florida	Florida
1994	Kanawha-New River Basin	Virginia, North Carolina
1994	Upper Tennessee River Basin	Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia
1994	Santee Basin and Coastal Drainages	South Carolina, North Carolina
1997	Lower Tennessee River Basin	Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia
1997	Acadian-Pontchartrain	Louisiana, Mississippi
1997	Mobile River and Tributaries	Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia

Source: U.S. Geological Survey 2001b

[Return to first reference in text](#)

Table 8--Agricultural land-use practices and associated pollutants

Agricultural land-use practices	Pollutants (Causes)
Nonirrigated cropland	Sedimentation, nutrients, pesticides, streambank destabilization, removal of riparian vegetation
Irrigated crop production	Sedimentation, nutrients, pesticides, traces of certain metals, salts, bacteria, viruses.
Rangeland	Bacteria, nutrients, sedimentation, pesticides, streambank destabilization, flow alteration, removal of riparian vegetation, increases in water temperature, reductions in dissolved oxygen concentrations.
Pasture land	Bacteria, nutrients, sedimentation, pesticides, streambank destabilization, flow alteration, removal of riparian vegetation, increases in water temperature, reductions in dissolved oxygen concentrations.
Feedlots	Bacteria, viruses, nutrients, sedimentation, organic material, salts and metals.
Animal holding areas	Bacteria, viruses, nutrients, sedimentation, organic material, salts and metals.
Animal operations	Bacteria, viruses, nutrients, sedimentation, organic material, salts and metals.

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1998a; Novotny 1994

[Return to first reference in text](#)

Table 9--Overall watershed characterization in Southern States using Unified Watershed Assessment criteria

State	Total number of watersheds	Very high quality	Meeting standards	Other restoration needed	Highest restoration priority	Insufficient data
	<i>--Number of watersheds (acres)--</i>			<i>----- Number of watersheds (percent of acres) -----</i>		
Alabama	53 (33,090,082)	0 (0)	34 (59.21)	2 (0.33)	12 (30.58)	5 (9.88)
Arkansas	59 (33,924,530)	0 (0)	20 (42.76)	22 (31.69)	13 (23.76)	4 (1.78)
Florida	54 (35,401,487)	0 (0)	35 (51.02)	7 (15.11)	12 (33.87)	0 (0)
Georgia	53 (37,512,562)	0 (0)	27 (44.69)	4 (4.43)	22 (50.88)	0 (0)
Kentucky	47 (25,747,680)	0 (0)	6 (12.61)	20 (32.60)	13 (31.72)	8 (23.07)
Louisiana	58 (29,554,483)	0 (0)	0 (0)	27 (46.70)	21 (47.77)	10 (5.54)
Mississippi	56 (30,461,735)	1 (2.72)	14 (19.92)	11 (6.27)	9 (26.57)	21 (44.51)
North Carolina	57 (31,387,170)	1 (1.29)	15 (29.80)	27 (45.73)	14 (23.18)	0 (0)
Oklahoma	70 (44,743,486)	0 (0)	9 (7.47)	48 (77.49)	9 (8.30)	4 (6.74)
South Carolina	36 (19,759,604)	0 (0)	7 (13.43)	21 (60.55)	8 (26.02)	0 (0)
Tennessee	62 (26,992,715)	0 (0)	11 (28.92)	34 (51.91)	17 (19.17)	0 (0)
Texas	206 (168,984,378)	0 (0)	58 (31.05)	76 (33.30)	26 (12.91)	46 (22.74)
Virginia	54 (25,615,321)	0 (0)	6 (14.82)	23 (39.08)	24 (46.11)	1 (0)

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1998b

[Return to first reference in text](#)

[Return to second reference in text](#)

[Return to third reference in text](#)

Table 10--Watershed characterization of ecological provinces in the South using Unified Watershed Assessment criteria


Ecological Province ^a	Total number of watersheds	Very high quality	Meeting standards	Other restoration needed	Highest restoration priority	Insufficient data
	<i>--Number of watersheds (acres)--</i>	<i>-----Number of watersheds (percent of acres) -----</i>				
E Broadlf Ocean (221)	41 (12,011,675)	0 (0)	8 (18.11)	16 (40.13)	12 (27.45)	5 (14.31)
Cntr Appalachian (M221)	52 (20,960,016)	0 (0)	6 (14.08)	19 (24.69)	25 (59.82)	2 (1.41)
E Broadlf Contl (222)	76 (41,470,850)	0 (0)	18 (22.58)	36 (37.93)	17 (30.03)	5 (9.47)
Ozark Broadlf (M222)	15 (4,136,528)	0 (0)	5 (35.03)	6 (21.32)	4 (43.64)	0 (0)
Southeast Mixed (231)	199 (112,330,643)	0 (0)	51 (23.23)	68 (32.47)	59 (34.40)	21 (9.89)
Ouachita Mixed (M231)	18 (7,153,279)	0 (0)	8 (25.31)	7 (45.16)	2 (20.41)	1 (9.12)
Outr Coast Mixed (232)	216 (126,888,978)	2 (0.97)	82 (42.92)	62 (24.45)	54 (25.91)	16 (5.75)
Lowr MS Riverine (234)	87 (27,494,018)	0 (0)	10 (18.88)	39 (32.81)	21 (35.20)	17 (13.11)
Prairie Park Tmp (M251)	12 (2,571,329)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (82.18)	3 (17.82)	0 (0)
Prairie Park Sbtr (255)	113 (55,793,413)	0 (0)	13 (9.05)	59 (52.49)	27 (25.80)	14 (12.66)
Everglades (411)	6 (5,253,389)	0 (0)	2 (26.94)	1 (0.14)	3 (72.93)	0 (0)

^a Bailey's ecological provinces, represented by three digit codes; leading "M" indicates mountainous topography

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1998b

[Return to first reference in text](#)

Figure 1—Annual average contribution of point and nonpoint sources of pollution to impaired river miles from 1988 to 1998 in the South. Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998a, 2000a.



[Return to first reference in text](#)

[Return to second reference in text](#)

[Return to third reference in text](#)


[Return to fourth reference in text](#)

[Return to fifth reference in text](#)

[Return to sixth reference in text](#)


[Return to seventh reference in text](#)


Figure 2--Relative percent contribution of point and nonpoint sources of pollution to impaired river miles from 1988 to 1998. Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998a, 2000a.




[Return to first reference in text](#)

Figure 3--Leading sources of impairment of rivers and streams for Southern States from 1988 to 1998. Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998a, 2000a.








[Return to first reference in text](#)

[Return to second reference in text](#)

[Return to third reference in text](#)

Figure 4--Overall characterization of water quality in Southern watersheds.
Source: Index of Watershed Indicators data (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1999).




Note: Percentages represent percent of total land area as delineated by watershed boundaries

[Return to first reference in text](#)

[Return to second reference in text](#)

[Return to third reference in text](#)

Figure 5--Characterization of water quality and restoration priorities of Southern watersheds. Source: Unified Watershed Assessment data (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1998b).



Note: Percentages represent percent of total land area as delineated by watershed boundaries

[Return to first reference in text](#)

[Return to second reference in text](#)

[Return to third reference in text](#)