

Use Support Ratings for all Monitored Waters In the Little River & Chestnut Creek Watersheds

1All designated uses are monitored and supporting1bDesignated use was impaired, other management strategy in place and no standards violations for the parameter of interest (POI)1ncDWQ have made field determination that parameter in exceedance is due to natural conditions1rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status1tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for parameter of interest2Some designated uses are monitored and supporting none are impaired Overall only2bDesignated use was impaired other management strategy in place and no standards violations Overall only2rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status overall only2tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for POI Overall only3aInstream/monitoring data are inconclusive (DI)3bNo Data available for assessment3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3n4Designated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4ccDesignated use impaired powed TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or under TMDL development4crRecreation use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4ctDesignated use impaired on instream monitoring data -no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing <t< th=""><th>Draft 2010 IR Category</th><th>INTEGRATED REPORTING CATEGORIES FOR INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT UNIT/USE SUPPORT CATEGORY/ PARAMETER ASSESSMENTS. A SINGLE AU CAN HAVE MULTIPLE ASSESSMENTS DEPENDING ON DATA AVAILABLE AND CLASSIFIED USES.</th></t<>	Draft 2010 IR Category	INTEGRATED REPORTING CATEGORIES FOR INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT UNIT/USE SUPPORT CATEGORY/ PARAMETER ASSESSMENTS. A SINGLE AU CAN HAVE MULTIPLE ASSESSMENTS DEPENDING ON DATA AVAILABLE AND CLASSIFIED USES.
1bDesignated use was impaired, other management strategy in place and no standards violations for the parameter of interest (POI)1ncDWQ have made field determination that parameter in exceedance is due to natural conditions1rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status1tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for parameter of interest2Some designated uses are monitored and supporting none are impaired Overall only2bDesignated use was impaired other management strategy in place and no standards violations Overall only2rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status overall only2tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for POI Overall only3aInstream/monitoring data are inconclusive (DI)3bNo Data available for assessment3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft3n4No Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4cDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4cShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4cDesignated use impaired on instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded <t< td=""><td>1</td><td>All designated uses are monitored and supporting</td></t<>	1	All designated uses are monitored and supporting
IncDWQ have made field determination that parameter in exceedance is due to natural conditions1rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status1tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for parameter of interest2Some designated uses are monitored and supporting none are impaired Overall only2bDesignated use was impaired other management strategy in place and no standards violations Overall only2rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status overall only2tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for POI Overall only3aInstream/monitoring data are inconclusive (DI)3bNo Data available for assessment3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a ont available determine need to collect-draft3tNo Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4cDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4dcDesignated use impaired on instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data - no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL de	1b	Designated use was impaired, other management strategy in place and no standards violations for the parameter of interest (POI)
1rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status1tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for parameter of interest2Some designated uses are monitored and supporting none are impaired Overall only2bDesignated use was impaired other management strategy in place and no standards violations Overall only2rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status overall only2tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for POI Overall only3aInstream/monitoring data are inconclusive (DI)3bNo Data available for assessment3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a exceeds thermine need to collect-draft3n4No Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data - no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL	1nc	DWQ have made field determination that parameter in exceedance is due to natural conditions
1tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for parameter of interest2Some designated uses are monitored and supporting none are impaired Overall only2bDesignated use was impaired other management strategy in place and no standards violations Overall only2rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status overall only2tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for POI Overall only3aInstream/monitoring data are inconclusive (DI)3bNo Data available for assessment3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3n4No Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data - no longer used4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data - no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL	1r	Assessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status
2Some designated uses are monitored and supporting none are impaired Overall only2bDesignated use was impaired other management strategy in place and no standards violations Overall only2rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status overall only2tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for POI Overall only3aInstream/monitoring data are inconclusive (DI)3bNo Data available for assessment3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3n4No Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL4tDesignated use impaired approved TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	1t	No criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for parameter of interest
2bDesignated use was impaired other management strategy in place and no standards violations Overall only2rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status overall only2tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for POI Overall only3aInstream/monitoring data are inconclusive (DI)3bNo Data available for assessment3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds EL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3tNo Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired approved TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	2	Some designated uses are monitored and supporting none are impaired Overall only
2rAssessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status overall only2tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for POI Overall only3aInstream/monitoring data are inconclusive (DI)3bNo Data available for assessment3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft3n2Chlorophyll a exceeds EL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3n4No Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired on instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data - no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired approved TMDL5Designated use impaired but watershed is in restoration effort status	2b	Designated use was impaired other management strategy in place and no standards violations Overall only
2tNo criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for POI Overall only3aInstream/monitoring data are inconclusive (DI)3bNo Data available for assessment3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft3n2Chlorophyll a exceeds EL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3tNo Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4ctDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data - no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired approved TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	2r	Assessed as supporting watershed is in restoration effort status overall only
3aInstream/monitoring data are inconclusive (DI)3bNo Data available for assessment3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft3n2Chlorophyll a exceeds EL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3rtNo Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4ctDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL4tDesignated use impaired approved TMDL5Designated use impaired approved TMDL5Assessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	2t	No criteria exceeded but approved TMDL for POI Overall only
3bNo Data available for assessment3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft3n2Chlorophyll a exceeds EL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3tNo Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired by something other than pollutant4crRecreation use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4ctDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5Assessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	3а	Instream/monitoring data are inconclusive (DI)
3cNo data or information to make assessment3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft3n2Chlorophyll a exceeds EL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3tNo Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired by something other than pollutant4crRecreation use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4ctDesignated use impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired approved TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	3b	No Data available for assessment
3n1Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft3n2Chlorophyll a exceeds EL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3tNo Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired by something other than pollutant4crRecreation use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	3c	No data or information to make assessment
3n2Chlorophyll a exceeds EL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3tNo Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired by something other than pollutant4crRecreation use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	3n1	Chlorophyll a exceeds TL value and SAC is met-draft
3n3Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3tNo Data available for assessment –AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired by something other than pollutant4crRecreation use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	3n2	Chlorophyll a exceeds EL value and SAC is not met first priority for further monitoring-draft
3n4Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft3tNo Data available for assessment –AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired by something other than pollutant4crRecreation use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired approved TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	3n3	Chlorophyll a exceeds threshold value and SAC is not met first second priority for further monitoring-draft
3tNo Data available for assessment -AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired by something other than pollutant4crRecreation use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	3n4	Chlorophyll a not available determine need to collect-draft
4bDesignated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment4cDesignated use impaired by something other than pollutant4crRecreation use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired approved TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	3t	No Data available for assessment –AU is in a watershed with an approved TMDL
4cDesignated use impaired by something other than pollutant4crRecreation use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	4b	Designated use impaired other management strategy expected to address impairment
4crRecreation use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired approved TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	4c	Designated use impaired by something other than pollutant
4csShellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired approved TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	4cr	Recreation use impaired no instream monitoring data or screening criteria exceeded
4ctDesignated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development4sImpaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing4tDesignated use impaired approved TMDL5Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL5rAssessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	4cs	Shellfish harvesting impaired no instream monitoring data- no longer used
4s Impaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing 4t Designated use impaired approved TMDL 5 Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL 5r Assessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	4ct	Designated use impaired but water is subject to approved TMDL or under TMDL development
4t Designated use impaired approved TMDL 5 Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL 5r Assessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	4s	Impaired Aquatic Life with approved TMDL for Aquatic Life POI or category 5 listing
5 Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL 5r Assessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	4t	Designated use impaired approved TMDL
5r Assessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status	5	Designated use impaired because of biological or ambient water quality standards violations and needing a TMDL
	5r	Assessed as impaired watershed is in restoration effort status

NC 2010 Integrated Report

	All 13,	,123 Waters in N	C are in Category 5-303	3(d) Lis [.]	t for Mercury due to statewide f	ish consumption adv	/ice for sev	eral fish	spe	cies
AU_	Numbe	er AU_N	lame	AU_D	escription	LengthA	rea AU_U	Inits C	lassi	ification
Ca	egory	Parameter			Reason for Rating	Use Category	Colle	ection Ye	ear	303(d)year
Ne	w Rive	er Basin			Liti	tle River-New Rive	r Watersł	ned O	5050	000104
0	10-9-	-7	Bledsoe Creek		From source to Little River		5.9	FW Mi	les	C;Tr
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity Bentho	DS	Good-Fair Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2008		
⊙	10-9-	-10	Brush Creek		From source to Little River		27.8	FW Mi	les	C;Tr
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity Bentho	DS	Good Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2007		
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity FishCo	om	Good Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2008		
Ο	10-9-	-12	Crab Creek		From source to Little River		7.8	FW Mi	les	C;Tr
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity Bentho	DS	Good-Fair Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2007		
	5	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity FishCo	om	Fair Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2008		2010
•	10-6-	-(2)	Elk Creek (North Carolina Portion)		From U.S. Hwy. 221 to New F	River	7.4	FW Mi	les	C:+
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity Bentho	DS	Good Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2008		
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity FishCo	om	Good Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2008		
⊙	10-9-	-9	Glade Creek		From source to Little River		8.3	FW Mi	les	C;Tr
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity Bentho	DS	Excellent Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2008		
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity FishCo	om	Good Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2008		
•	10-9-	-10-2	Laurel Branch (Lau Creek)	urel	From source to Brush Creek		5.2	FW Mi	les	C;Tr
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity Bentho	DS	Not Impaired Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2008		
•	10-9-	-(6)	Little River		From dam at Sparta Lake to I Crossroads)	NC 18 (Blevins	17.5	FW Mi	les	С
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity Bentho	DS	Excellent Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2008		
	1	Fecal Coliform	(recreation)		No Criteria Exceeded	Recreation	2	2008		
	1	Water Quality	Standards Aquatic Life	fe	No Criteria Exceeded	Aquatic Life	2	2008		
•	10-9-	-(11.5)	Little River (North Carolina Portion)	า	From NC 18 (Blevins Crossroa River (state line)	ads) to New	3.6	FW Mi	les	C;HQW
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity Bentho	DS	Excellent Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2003		
•	10-9-	-(1)a	Little River (Sparta Lake)	а	From source to Sparta Lake a Creek	it Pine Swamp	11.6	FW Mi	les	C;Tr
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity Bentho	DS	Excellent Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2008		
	1	Ecological/biolo	ogical Integrity FishCo	om	Good Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2	2008		

NC 2010 Integrated Report

	All 13	3,123 Waters in	NC are in Category 5-303	(d) List for Mercury due to statewi	de fish consumption a	dvice for several fish spec	cies
AU_	_Numb	er AU_	Name	AU_Description	Length	nArea AU_Units Classi	fication
Ca	tegory	Parameter		Reason for Rating	Use Category	Collection Year	303(d)year
Ne	ew Riv	er Basin			Little River-New Riv	ver Watershed 05050	000104
•	10-9	-11	Moccasin Creek	From source to Little Rive	r	4.4 FW Miles	С
	1	Ecological/bio	logical Integrity Bentho	s Good Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2006	
0	10-9	-5	Pine Swamp Creel	k From source to Little Rive	r	5.2 FW Miles	C;Tr
	1	Ecological/bio	logical Integrity Bentho	s Good Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2008	
	1	Ecological/bio	logical Integrity FishCo	m Good Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2008	
0	10-9	-12ut8ut4	UT CRAB CR	Source to CRAB CR		0.7 FW Miles	
	1	Ecological/bio	logical Integrity Bentho	s Not Impaired Bioclassificat	ion Aquatic Life	2008	
•	10-9	-12ut8	UT UT CRAB CR	Source to UT CRAB CR		4.5 FW Miles	
	1	Ecological/bio	logical Integrity Bentho	s Not Impaired Bioclassificat	ion Aquatic Life	2007	
•	10-9	-4	Waterfalls Creek	From source to Little Rive	r	4.3 FW Miles	C;Tr
	1	Ecological/bio	logical Integrity Bentho	s Excellent Bioclassification	Aquatic Life	2006	
0	10-9	-9-1	Wolf Branch	From source to Glade Cre	ek	2.8 FW Miles	C;Tr
	1	Ecological/bio	logical Integrity Bentho	s Not Impaired Bioclassificat	ion Aquatic Life	2006	

APPENDIX 3-B

BIOLOGICAL (BENTHIC & FISH) SAMPLE SITE DATA SHEETS

Station ID**	Waterbody	Assessment Unit #	DESCRIPTION	COUNTY	SITE LOCATION	SAMPLE RESULTS
KB35	Elk Cr.	10-6-(2)	From U.S. Hwy. 221 to New River	Alleghany	SR 1344	08 - Good 03 - Good
KB37	Little R.	10-9-(1)a	From source to Sparta Lake at Pine Swamp Creek	Alleghany	SR 1128	08 - Excellent 03 - Good
KB38	Little R.	10-9-(6)	From dam at Sparta Lake to NC 18 (Blevins Crossroads)	Alleghany	SR 1424	08 - Excellent 03 - Excellent
KB100	Little R.	10-9-(6)	From dam at Sparta Lake to NC 18 (Blevins Crossroads)	Alleghany	NC 18	08 - Excellent 03 - Excellent
KB41	Brush Cr.	10-9-10	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1422	07 - Good 03 - Excellent
KB47*	Brush Cr.	10-9-10	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1444	06 - Excellent
KB42	Laurel Br.	10-9-10-2	From source to Brush Creek	Alleghany	SR 1105	08 - Not Impaired 03 - Good
KB73*	Moccasin Cr.	10-9-11	From source to Little River	Alleghany	NC 18	06 - Good
KB49	Crab Cr.	10-9-12	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1450	07 - Good-Fair 03 - Good
KB132*	Ut. Ut. Crab Cr.	10-9-12ut8	Source to Ut. Crab Creek	Alleghany	NC 18	07 - Not Impaired
KB133*	Ut. Ut. Crab Cr.	10-9-12ut8	Source to Ut. Crab Creek	Alleghany	Ab. Ut. Crab Cr.	07 - Not Impaired
KB128*	Ut. Crab Cr.	10-9-12ut8ut4	Source to Crab Cr.	Alleghany	400 meters S. of state line	07 - Not Impaired
KB97*	Waterfalls Cr.	10-9-4	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1132	06 - Excellent
KB36	Pine Swamp Cr.	10-9-5	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1128	08 - Good 03 - Good-Fair
KB82*	Pine Swamp Cr.	10-9-5	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1126	06 - Excellent
KB101	Bledsoe Cr.	10-9-7	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1172	08 - Excellent 03 - Good
KB40*	Bledsoe Cr.	10-9-7	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1171	06 - Good-Fair
KB46*	Bledsoe Cr.	10-9-7	From source to Little River	Alleghany	US 21	06 - Not Impaired
KB104	Glade Cr.	10-9-9	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1422	08 - Excellent 03 - Good
KB98*	Wolf Br.	10-9-9-1	From source to Glade Cr.	Alleghany	SR 1117	06 - Not Impaired
Fish Com	munity Sample Site	S				
KF17*	Brush Cr.	10-9-10	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1433	08 - Good
KF18*	Crab Cr.	10-9-12	From source to Little River	Alleghany	NC 18	08 - Fair
KF3	Elk Cr.	10-6-(2)	From U.S. Hwy. 221 to New River	Alleghany	SR 1341	08 - Good 98 - Good
KF4	Glade Cr.	10-9-9	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1422	08 - Good 98 - Good
KF7	Little R.	10-9-(1)a	From source to Sparta Lake at Pine Swamp Creek	Alleghany	SR 1128	08 - Good 98 - Good-Fair
KF19*	Pine Swamp Cr.	10-9-5	From source to Little River	Alleghany	SR 1128	08 - Good

* New station location; therefore, no data from the previous cycle.

Waterbo	dy	Locatio	on	Statio	on ID		Date	Bioclassification
NEW	R	SR 13	SR 1345		34	30	8/19/08	Excellent
County	Subbasin	8 digit HUC	Latitudo	Longitur		Numbor	Lov	
	3 Subbasiii	05050001	36 552222	_81 1833	22	10b	Ne	w River Plateau
ALLEGHANT	5	03030001	30.332222	-01.1000	55	100	INC.	W NIVEL Flateau
Stream Classifica	ation E	Drainage Area (mi2)	Elev	vation (ft)	Stre	am Width	(m)	Stream Depth (m)
C; ORW		823		2335		125		0.4
	Foi	rested/Wetland	Urban	I	Agricu	lture	O	ther (describe)
Visible Landuse	(%)	40	10		50			0
Upstream NPI	DES Discharge	ers (>1MGD or <1M	GD and withir	n 1 mile)	N	PDES Nur	nber	Volume (MGD)
Town of Boone, Jimm	y Smith WWTP					NC00206	21	4.82
United Chemi-Con, Inc	с.					NC00000	19	1.018
Water Quality Param Temperature (°C) Dissolved Oxygen (mg Specific Conductance pH (s.u.) Water Clarity	eters g/L) (μS/cm)	26.1 75 8.0 clear				Site Pho	tograph	
Habitat Assessment	Scores (max)		Street and					
Channel Modification	(5)	4			- Andrew			
Instream Habitat (20)		18		Construction of the	and the			
Bottom Substrate (15))	13		- the	Trans		The second second second	and the second
Pool Variety (10)		6					- Carlos and Carlos	
Riffle Habitat (16)		3	and the second	and the second	1000			and the second
Left Bank Stability (7)		7	and	and the second		and the second s	the second	
Right Bank Stability (7	')	7	and the second second					
Light Penetration (10)		0	2	the state				and the state of t
Left Riparian Score (5)	3		e de la compañía de la	and the g		and the second	
Right Riparian Score ((5)	0		·				
Total Habitat Score (100)	61	Substra	ate miz	x of gravel	, sand; son	ne boulder, cobbl	e, bedrock

Sample Date	Sample ID	ST	EPT	BI	EPT BI	Bioclassification
08/19/08	10535	105	50	4.58	3.42	Excellent
08/21/03	9236	86	51	3.61	3.13	Excellent
08/19/98	7721	73	37	4.40	3.53	Good
07/26/93	6278	102	47	4.70	3.61	Excellent
07/11/90	5376	99	49	4.88	3.52	Good

Taxonomic Analysis

Despite having 11 prior sampling events, there were still several EPT taxa reported for the first time at the site in 2008, including: Acroneuria evoluta, Apatania, Protoptila, Mystacides, Oecetis avara, and Triaenodes perna/helo. Also collected for the first time at the site was the midge Cricotopus nostocicola; there are only nine other records for the species in the BAU database.

Data Analysis

The site is 4.6 northwest of Sparta. The site receives water from the North Fork and South Fork New River catchments along with smaller catchments in Virginia.

The site has undergone yearly summer benthic sampling from 1983 through 1990, then once each five years beginning in 1993. The site has received ratings of either Good or Excellent following each sampling event. EPT Richness range from 37 to 51; NCBI values from 3.61 to 5.53. EPT richness in 2008 is near the highest value for the site; NCBI value is near the middle of the range. Overall the benthic community at the site has generally been stable since 1983.

Waterbody			<u> </u>	Date Station ID			В	Bioclassification				
ELK CR			S	05/07	7/08	KF3	3	Good				
County	Sub	basin	8 digit HUC	Latitude	Long	itude		AU Numbe	ər	Le	evel IV E	coregion
ALLEGHANY		3	05050001	36.5575	-81.21	69444		10-6-(2)		Ν	lew River	⁻ Plateau
Stroom Classifica	tion	Drai	nago Aroa (mi2)	Flovatio	n (ft)	Stro	am Wid	dth (m)	٨٧٥	rago Donth	(m)	Poforonco Sito
C:+			17 4	247	0	51166	10		AVE		(111)	No
0,1				2.17	•		10			0.1		110
		For	ested/Wetland	Rural Re	sidential		Ag	riculture		C	ther (des	scribe)
Visible Landuse	(%)		80	Ę	5			15			0	
Unstroom NBDES Di	cohore	10rc (>1		and within 1 r	mile)			NDDES	Numbo	-	Ve	lume (MCD)
Opstream NPDES DI	schart	Jers (>	None		nne)			NPDES			<u>vo</u>	
								_		-		
Water Quality Param	neters			5.3 (dig 9	SAMA THREE A	TIM TOP FR		S	ite Phote	ograph	1/200	MARK ARE
Temperature (°C)			11.9		X. E	14-5	ter and	1A.	1./23	Sound State	1 4	ALC BULL
Dissolved Oxygen (m	g/L)		9.6		NUM	1103		MP IN	the P	- YEAR	Sent la	NEAS E
Specific Conductance	e (µS/cr	n)	50		2624		121	141		北北市		
pH (s.u.)			5.8			PHUZ II		1 11		CAUD	18.1	SC P-17
		Slio	htlv-moderately	-					the second		and the second second	
Water Clarity		eng	turbid		the the	44.8	-	7429 BE	a trans	-		
Habitat Assessment	Score	s (max)			-		61-					
Channel Medification	(5)	5 (max)	E	Contraction of the					-			The store
Instream Hebitet (20)	(၁)		5	1 10	Contraction of the second	-		7	-2	-	E all and	
Bottom Substrate (15	`		20		-			5				A PROPERTY OF THE OWNER
Bollom Substrate (15)		12		-		. 1		10 m m	THE COLUMN		and the second second
Pool Vallety (10) Diffle Habitat (16)			10		1000	and the second second						The street
Left Bank Stability (7)			3					State (All Bar	-			
Right Bank Stability (7)	7)		3						2 18: 2 m	ALL ALLON		
Light Penetration (10)	()		5					and a second	Lova S	Green -		
Left Riparian Score (5	5)		5	<u>e</u>					AN AL			
Right Rinarian Score	(5)		5				0.726	1000	100 C			
Total Habitat Score	(J) (100)		84	Sub	strate	Cobble	boulde	r bedrock a	and silts a	and sands in	the pool	s
	(100)					,		, , .				-
Sample Date)	_	Sample I	D	Spe	cies Tota	ıl		NCIBI		Bio	classification
05/07/08		_	2008-31			20			48			Good
06/30/98			98-60			17			48			G000
Most Abundant Sp	ncine		Central Stoneroll	or		Exotic	Snoc	ioe	Whitetail	Shiner, Saf	fron Shin	er, Rock Bass,
Most Abundant Sp	CICS						- opec	165	Redbrea	st Sunfish, a	nd Small	mouth Bass
			Coine	Canaucha Minne		a a a t Cumf	iah Cr	aanaida Day	ter end	Annalashia (Dorton I	And Mattled
Species Change Sin	ce Las	t Cycle	Sculpin.	Canawna Minno	ow, Reading	east Sunn	isn, Gre	eenside Dar	ter, and	чррагастіа і	Janer. L	osses Mollied
Data Analysis												
Watershed drains r	northwe	estern A	lleghany County;	no municipalitie	es within t	he waters	hed; tri	butary to the	e New Ri	ver. Habita	t unsta	ble banks along
both shorelines; fairly	open c	anopy;	riffles, bedrock sh	ielves, veins, a	nd pools;	better hab	oitat do	wnstream th	nan upstr	eam from th	e bridge;	beaver dam
upstream from the bri	age. 2	008 C	entral Stoneroller	accounted for	41% of al	i the fish o		a in 2008; ł	high perc	entage of Or	nnivores-	+Herbivores,
doubled; 21 species k	nown f	rom the	site, includina 11	species of cvn	prinids. 4 e	ndemic si	pecies	(Kanawha F	Rosyface	Shiner. Kan	awha Mir	nnow, Kanawha
Darter, and Appalachi	ia Darte	er), and	5 nonindigenous	species; and M	lottled Sci	Ipin was i	represe	ented by onl	y 1 fish i	1998 and v	vas abse	nt in 2008.



Substrate



Sample Date	Sample ID	ST	EPT	BI	EPT BI	Bioclassification
08/19/08	10536		30		3.14	Good
08/18/03	9219		34		3.52	Good
08/20/98	7723		34		3.36	Good
07/26/93	6286		36		3.48	Excellent

Taxonomic Analysis

Total Habitat Score (100)

The site has been sampled on four occassions. The 30 EPT taxa collected in 2008 is the lowest number for the site.

84

Several taxa were recorded for the first time in 2008, including: *Caenis* (rare in the sample); *Stenacron interpunctatum* (common); and *Apatania* (rare). Neither *Glossosoma* nor *Ceratopsyche morosa* were collected in 2008; both taxa were reported from the first three sampling events at the site.

Data Analysis

The site is 0.4 stream-miles above the confluence with New River and within 0.2 miles of the Virginia border.

The drop in the number of EPT taxa collected between 2003 and 2008 may be indicative of impacts to the benthic community, though that is offset by the decrease in the EPT BI value. As in 2003, periphyton was noted on the boulders and cobbles, which indicates some nutrient enrichment at the site.



Sample Date	Sample ID	ST	EPT	BI	EPT BI	Bioclassification
08/19/08	10534	102	42	3.74	3.27	Excellent
04/05/06	9828	103	42*	4.05*	2.32	Excellent
08/18/03	9218	75	36	4.03	3.53	Good
08/20/98	7724	72	37	3.94	3.18	Good
07/26/93	6303	84	45	3.32	2.53	Excellent

* values corrected for seasonality

Taxonomic Analysis

The number of EPT taxa collected in 2008 is significantly higher than in 1998 and 2003, though still lower than in 1993. There are a few notable differences in the EPT taxa present between 1993 and the following years. Two ephemerellids, *Drunella conestee* and *Serratella serratoides*, were both abundant in the 1993 sample but have not been recorded from any sampling event since. Also, *Drunella cornutella* was abundant in 1993, rare in 1998, and absent in each following sampling event. *Serratella deficiens* was also abundant in 1993 and absent from each summer sampling event since, though it was common in the spring sample collected in 2006.

Data Analysis

The site is 2.7 miles SSW of Sparta, and is the site most upstream of the three basinwide sites on Little River.

The increase in EPT Richness and lower NCBI values in 2008 compared to the prior summer sampling events in 1998 and 2003 suggests better recent water quality. Those changes have improved the classification of the site from Good 1998 and 2003 to Excellent in 2008. However, both EPT Richness and NCBI values have not returned to the standards set in 1993.

Waterboo	dy		Location			Date	9	Station ID			ioclassi	fication
LITTLE R			SR 1128			05/06/08 KF7			Good			
County	Subba	asin	8 digit HUC	Latitude	Long	itude		AU Numbe	er	L	evel IV E	coregion
ALLEGHANY	3		05050001	36.46777778	-81.132	277778		10-9-(1)a		1	New Rive	r Plateau
Stream Classifica	tion	Drair	nage Area (mi2) Elevatio	n (ft)	Strea	m Wic	ith (m)	Av	erage Depth	(m)	Reference Site
C;Tr			14.1	2870	C		10			0.3		Yes
	-	For	ested/Wetland	Urt	ban		Agi	riculture		С	Other (de	scribe)
Visible Landuse	(%)		90	()			0			10	
Upstream NPDES Dischargers (>1MGD or <1MGD and within 1 mile)								NPDES	Numb	er	Vo	olume (MGD)
None ,												

Water Quality Parameters

Total Habitat Score (100)

Temperature (°C) Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) Specific Conductance (µS/cm pH (s.u.)	n)	9.9 10.3 35 5.5	
Water Clarity	Clea	ar	
Habitat Assessment Scores	s (max)		State of the second
Channel Modification (5)		5	
Instream Habitat (20)		19	
Bottom Substrate (15)		10	
Pool Variety (10)		6	
Riffle Habitat (16)		16	The second second
Left Bank Stability (7)		7	
Right Bank Stability (7)		6	
Light Penetration (10)		8	-30
Left Riparian Score (5)		5	1.1.1
Right Riparian Score (5)		3	

85



Site Photograph

Substrate

Cobble and silt

Sample Date	Sample ID	Species Total	NCIBI	Bioclassification		
05/06/08	2008-28	16	50	Good		
07/01/98	98-61 15		44	Good-Fair		
Most Abundant Species	Redlip Shiner and Rosyside Da	ce Exotic Spec	Highback Chub, Redbreast Sunfish,	Highback Chub, Redlip Shiner, Brown Trout, Redbreast Sunfish, and Tessellated Darter		
Species Change Since Last Cycle	Gains Highback Chub, Mountain Redbelly Dace, and Longnose Dace. Losses Tonguetied Minnow Rainbow Trout.					
Data Analysis	-					

Watershed -- drains southern Alleghany County; no municipalities within the watershed. Habitat -- snags and undercuts; silts along the margins and atop the rocks; cobble riffles and runs; wide riparian zone on the left, but narrow along the right bank; site is a popular fishing spot. 2008 -- diversity of Rock Bass+Smallmouth Bass+Trout and Intolerant species were slightly lower than expected; percentage of tolerant fish (White Sucker, Creek Chub, and Redbreast Sunfish) was slightly greater than expected for a mountain stream; lowest pH of any fish community site in the basin in 2008. 1998 & 2008 -- 18 species known from the site, including 3 endemic species (Tonguetied Minnow, Kanawha Darter, and Appalachia Darter) and 6 nonindigenous species; ~ 6 times more fish collected in 2008 than in 1998 (1,444 vs. 224); Mountain Redbelly Dace constituted 9% of the fauna in 2008, but absent in 1998; and species present in 1998, but absent in 2008 were represented by 1 or 3 fish each.



Sample Date	Sample ID	ST	EPT	BI	EPT BI	Bioclassification
08/18/08	10530	111	47	3.90	3.00	Excellent
08/21/03	9232	104	49	4.11	3.23	Excellent
08/20/98	7726	80	41	3.94	2.95	Excellent
07/26/93	6277	98	48	3.98	2.92	Excellent

Taxonomic Analysis

Several taxa were recorded for the first time from the site in 2008, including: Rhithrogena, Anthopotamus distinctus, Paragnetina ichusa/media, Apatania, Ceratopsyche walkeri, and Hydropsyche scalaris.

Data Analysis

The site is 2.2 miles ENE of Sparta, which is entirely included in the catchment above the site.

NCBI values have been very similar between the four most recent sampling events at the site, as have EPT Richness values with the exception of 1998. The site has rated as Excellent following each sampling event since 1993 at the site, though a spring sampling event in 1989 resulted in classification of Fair. Improvements to the Sparta WWTP (permit NC0026913; discharge 0.6 million gallons per day) occurred in 1990 and apparently improved water quality at the site.

Waterboo	Locatio	Statio		Date		Bioclassification				
LITTLE	R	NC 1	8		KB1	00	30	8/18/08		Excellent
County	8 digit HUC	Lat	itude	Longitud	e AU	Number		Level IV Ecoregion		
ALLEGHANY	3	05050001	36.5	43056	-81.02138	9 10	0-9-(6)		Ne	w River Plateau
Stream Classifica	ition	Drainage Area (mi2)	Elev	ation (ft)	Stre	am Width	ı (m)		Stream Depth (m)
С		99			2410		30			0.4
	F	prested/Wetland		Urban		Agricu	lture		Of	ther (describe)
Visible Landuse	(%)	50		0		50				0
Upstream NPI	DES Discharg	jers (>1MGD or <1M	GD ar	nd withir	n 1 mile)	N	PDES Nur	nber		Volume (MGD)
none										
Water Quality Param	eters				254		Site Pho	otograph		
Temperature (°C)		23.4			the second			1		Mr. S. P. S. S. S.
Dissolved Oxygen (mg	g/L)	8.9						al		Cardwall A
Specific Conductance	(µS/cm)	46			Stern 6				There	
pH (s.u.)		7.2		and the second s		21.4				
Water Clarity		clear		1.11	5				Z	
Habitat Assessment	Scores (max)								
Channel Modification ((5)	5		-	- Friend		and the second			and the second second
Instream Habitat (20)	× /	12			and	- transferrer	aline a		-	
Bottom Substrate (15)		13		and the same of	The state of the	-			P. Star	
Pool Variety (10)		6		The second	1 100-134	a la	P.M.			and the solithing of the

	the second se	
		CARLES AND A CONTRACT OF THE REAL OF
5		
12		the second of
13	and the second second	the state of the state
6	The second second second	and the time
12		and the second s
7	and the second second	AND THE REAL OF
7		
0		All and a second se
5	and the second	
0	and a start of the	
67	Substrate	mostly bedrock and boulder

Sample Date	Sample ID	ST	EPT	BI	EPT BI	Bioclassification
08/18/08	10531	129	59	3.96	2.80	Excellent
08/20/03	9233	89	47	3.96	3.40	Excellent
08/20/98	7727	84	46	3.53	2.72	Excellent
07/27/93	6288	89	49	3.73	2.84	Excellent
07/11/90	5377	93	44	4.36	3.15	Excellent

Taxonomic Analysis

The 59 EPT taxa from 2008 was the most ever recorded for the site, which has been sampled a total of nine times; the previous high for a summer sample was 49, last attained in 1993. The site has received a classification of Excellent following each sampling event except for August 1986, when it received a rating of Good. Several EPT taxa are reported for the first time in 2008: *Heterocloeon anoka, Heterocloeon curiosum, Maccaffertium exiguum, Anthopotamus distinctus, Micrasema bennetti, Hydropsyche venularis, Hydroptila,* an unamed species of *Nectopsyche*, and *Neophylax fuscus*.

Data Analysis

The site is 2.6 stream-miles upstream of the Virginia border and six miles ENE of the town of Sparta, which is entirely included in the catchment above the site. This is the furthest downstream of the three basinwide sites on Little River. Cattle were present in a pasture on the west side and had unhindered access to the river at the reach sampled.

EPT Richness for the seven summer sampling events at the site prior to 2008 has been rather stable, with a range of 44 to 49 taxa collected, making the 59 EPT taxa recorded for 2008 anomalous. NCBI values have ranged from 3.53 (in 1998) to 4.50 (in 1986 and 1988), putting the 2008 value of 3.96 near the middle of the range.

; some sand, cobble, gravel, silt

Waterbo	dy			Location		Date	e Station ID Bioclassification			
PINE SWAI	мр с	R	Ş	SR 1128		05/06/08	KF19)	Goo	d
County	Subr	basin	8 digit HUC	Latitude	Long	itude	AU Number	·	Level IV Ecoregion	
ALLEGHANY	,	5	05050001	30.4759215	-81.11	00911	10-9-5		New River	Plateau
Stream Classifica	tion	Drai	nage Area (mi2	Elevatio	on (ft)	Stream W	idth (m)	Average Depth	ı (m)	Reference Site
C;Tr			5.3	2760	0	7		0.4		No
		For	ested/Wetland	Rural Re	sidential	A	griculture	(Other (des	cribe)
Visible Landuse	(%)		50	3	0		20		0	
Upstream NPDES Di	scharg	ers (>1	MGD or <1MG) and within 1 n	nile)		NPDES	Number	Vol	ume (MGD)
	Senarg	010 (* 1	None		inic)			-	101	
Water Quality Param	eters						Sit	e Photograph		
Temperature (°C)			12.4			H-V-	Contraction of the	and the second by		SALA DEPA
Dissolved Oxygen (m	g/L)		10.0				- Andr		1000	
Specific Conductance	e (µS/cn	n)	29	100			a state of the		1.34	
pH (s.u.)			6.1				free new (M			
Water Clarity			Clear	-				- 4A		
Habitat Assessment	Scores	s (max)								18- 250 V
Channel Modification	(5)		5		A. No			- Aller and a second se	7. 19. 19. 19	A REAL
Instream Habitat (20)	(-)		20	Trans.			A DALET		-	and the second second
Bottom Substrate (15)		13	Ser liese			Contraction of the local distance	An and a second		
Pool Variety (10)			8	Service of the servic				1 Distantion		
Riffle Habitat (16)			16					the plant of	-	
Left Bank Stability (7)			6	S. 49	Sec. 1	and the second	al and		-	and the second
Right Bank Stability (7	7)		6		1					
Light Penetration (10)			8	- 100	215	and the second	THE FEE	The second	- Carlo	
Left Riparian Score (5	5)		4	- 57	100	and the second second	Contraction of	1000	in the	1000
Right Riparian Score	(5)		5							
Total Habitat Score ((100)		91	Subs	strate	Cobble, bould	er, and angula	r bedrock		
Sample Date)		Sample	ID	Spe	cies Total		NCIBI	Bioc	lassification
05/06/08			2008-2	29		16		52		Good
Most Abundant Spe	ecies		Mountain Redb Dace	elly Dace and Ro	osyside	Exotic Spe	cies R D	lighback Chub, Red Rock Bass, Redbrea Parter	dlip Shiner, ast Sunfish	Brown Trout, , and Tessellated
Species Change Sin	ce Last	Cycle	N/A							
Data Analysis		-								
This is the first fish on	mmunit	veamr	lo colloctod at t	nic cito Matore	had dra	inc couthorn Al	loghany Coun	ty: no municipalitio	a within the	waterehod:

This is the first fish community sample collected at this site. **Watershed** -- drains southern Alleghany County; no municipalities within the watershed; tributary to the Little River, site is ~ 60 ft. upstream from the creek's confluence with the river. **Habitat** -- runs, riffles, plunge pools, undercuts, and overhangs; riparian zone of multifloral rose then pasture along the left banks. **2008** -- percentage of tolerant fish (Creek Chub, White Sucker and Redbreast Sunfish) was slightly greater than expected for a mountain stream; one endemic species (Kanawha Darter) was present; and the lowest conductivity of any fish site, along with Brush Creek, in the basin in 2008.



	5	
Instream Habitat (20)	18	
Bottom Substrate (15)	12	
Pool Variety (10)	6	
Riffle Habitat (16)	16	
Left Bank Stability (7)	6	
Right Bank Stability (7)	6	
Light Penetration (10)	9	
Left Riparian Score (5)	3	
Right Riparian Score (5)	2	
Total Habitat Score (100)	83	

Sample Date Sample ID ST EPT EPT BI Bioclassification BI 08/19/08 10533 34 2.72 Good 04/04/06 9827 41* 2.69 Excellent -------08/18/03 9217 26 Good-Fair 3.63 -------08/20/98 7725 34 3.52 Good --------07/27/93 6290 ---33 ____ 3.45 Good

mix of cobble, boulder, bedrock; some gravel, sand

Substrate

* value corrected for seasonality

Taxonomic Analysis

A few taxa were collected for the first time in 2008: *Baetisca*, which was rare in the sample; *Chimarra* and *Dolophilodes*, two philopotamid genera, which were common and abundant respectively.

Data Analysis

The site is about two miles south of Sparta and just upstream of the confluence with Little River.

The number of EPT taxa collected in 2008 returned to the previous high of 34 (in 1998) for a summer sampling event at the site. The EPT BI in 2008 was significantly lower than for any prior summer sampling event. There is currently very little evidence for water-quality impacts to the stream at the site.



Sample Date	Sample ID	ST	EPT	BI	EPT BI	Bioclassification
08/18/08	10532		42		3.75	Excellent
04/05/06	9831		25*		3.32	Good-Fair
08/20/03	9231		30		3.39	Good
08/19/98	7722		21		4.67	Good-Fair
07/26/93	6287		33		3.31	Good

* value corrected for seasonality

Taxonomic Analysis

The 42 EPT taxa collected in 2008 greatly surpasses the previous high of 33 collected in 1993. Several taxa were reported for the first time from the site in 2008 (all rare in the sample), including: *Plauditus cestus, Baetisca berneri, Leucrocuta, Tricorythodes, Ceratopsyche morosa,* and *Rhyacophila carolina*. There were also a few taxa present in 2008 that had not been recorded from the site since the sampling event in 1993: *Sevratella serratoides*, which was abundant in 1993 and common in 2008; *Heptagenia marginalis*, abundant in 1993 and rare in 2008; *Tallaperla,* rare in 1993 and common in 2008; *Heptagenia marginalis*, abundant in 1993 and rare in 2008; *Tallaperla,* rare in 1993 and common in 2008.

Data Analysis

The site is in the town of Sparta and 0.8 stream-miles above the confluence with Little River.

Despite the location within the town of Sparta, the suboptimum habitat, and a silty cover of *aufwuchs* over the cobbles and boulders, the site attained a classification of Excellent in 2008. Less surprising is the relatively high EPT BI score for a mountain sample not associated with a discharger.

Waterbo	dy			Location		Date)	Station	ID	В	lioclassi	fication
GLADE	CR		:	SR 1422		05/06/	/08	KF4	ŀ	Good		bd
County	Subba	sin	8 digit HUC	Latitude	Long	itude	AU Number			L	Level IV Ecoregion	
ALLEGHANY	3		05050001	36.49972222	-81.036	638889	10-9-9			New River Plateau		
Stream Classifica	tion	Drair	nage Area (mi2) Elevatio	n (ft)	Stream Width (m) A		Ave	verage Depth (m)		Reference Site	
C;Tr			13.6	2520)		7			0.5		Yes
	_	For	ested/Wetland	Urt	an		Agı	riculture		c	Other (de	scribe)
Visible Landuse	(%)		50	()			50			0	
Upstream NPDES Dischargers (>1MGD or <1MGD and within 1 mile)								NPDES	Numb	er	Vo	olume (MGD)
None												

Water Quality Parameters

Temperature (°C)	16.2
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	9.2
Specific Conductance (µS/cm)	32
pH (s.u.)	5.9
Water Clarity Slightly	/ turbid
Habitat Assessment Scores (max)	
Channel Modification (5)	5
Instream Habitat (20)	15
Bottom Substrate (15)	5
Pool Variety (10)	6
Riffle Habitat (16)	15
Left Bank Stability (7)	4
Right Bank Stability (7)	4



Site Photograph

Substrate

5 5

4

68

Sand, silt, and bedrock

Sample Date	Sample ID	Species Total	NCIBI	Bioclassification				
05/06/08	2008-30	20	52	Good				
07/01/98	98-62	19	50	Good				
Most Abundant Species	Redlip Shiner and Mountain Red Dace	dbelly Exotic Sp	Highback Chub, Re Shiner, Brown Trou Tessellated Darter	edlip Shiner, Tennessee t, Black Crappie, and				
Species Change Since Last Cycle	Gains Tonguetied Minnow, Highback Chub, Black Crappie, and Appalachia Darter. Losses Bigmouth Chub and Kanawha Rosyface Shiner.							

Data Analysis

Light Penetration (10)

Left Riparian Score (5) Right Riparian Score (5)

Total Habitat Score (100)

Watershed -- drains east central Alleghany County; no municipalities within the watershed; tributary to the Little River, site is ~ 0.3 miles above the creek's confluence with the river. Habitat -- runs, bedrock riffles, fairly open canopy; sands and silts in the pools; bottom substrate showed evidence of excessive sedimentation from upstream landuse practices. 2008 -- Redlip Shiner and Mountain Redbelly Dace, both common along the silty banks, accounted for almost 60% of the fish collected; percentage of Omnivores+Herbivores was slightly elevated and indicative of nonpoint source nutrient inputs; Rock Bass and Smallmouth Bass were absent. 1998 & 2008 -- ~6 times more fish collected in 2008 than in 1998 (1,862 vs. 297), Redlip Shiner increased almost 16 fold and Mountain Redbelly Dace increased 20 fold; 23 species known from the site, including 14 species of cyprinids, 6 endemic species (Tonguetied Minnow, Bigmouth Chub, Kanawha Rosyface Shiner, Kanawha Minnow, Kanawha Darter, and Appalachia Darter), and 7 nonindigenous species; and species present in 1998, but absent in 2008 were represented by 2 or 4 fish each.

Waterbody				Location		Date	Date Station ID Bioclassification			ification	
BRUSH	CR		S	SR 1433		05/05/08	KF17	7	Go	od	
County	Subb	asın	8 digit HUC	Latitude	Long	litude	AU Numbe	r	Level IV	I IV Ecoregion	
ALLEGHANY	3	i	05050001	36.4858811	-81.00	49272	10-9-10		New Rive	er Plateau	
Stream Classifica	ition	Drai	nage Area (mi2)	Elevatio	on (ft)	Stream W	idth (m)	Average Depth (m) Reference Sit			
C;Tr			18.1	257	0	10		0.4		No	
		For	ested/Wetland	Ur	ban	A	griculture		Other (de	escribe)	
Visible Landuse	(%)		30		0 70 0						
Upstream NPDES Di	ischarge	ers (>1	MGD or <1MG) and within 1	mile)		NPDES	Number	v	olume (MGD)	
			None								
Water Quality Param	neters						Si	te Photograph			
Temperature (°C)			17.7	的问题。	1.181		YEARK	ALL ALL			
Dissolved Oxygen (m	a/L)		9.0			Chine A		AN 12			
Specific Conductance	e (uS/cm	1)	29					- UM	a line	777	
pH (s.u.)	(20,011	.,	6.2			AV.	Contraction of the	CONTRACT OF A	-AT		
r (***)					IF RZ	MASSAC	A	110	1.1111	Addition of the	
Water Clarity			Clear	and the second second	TE			and states	22,011	A state with a state with	
	l			States 1	中国。	an official states		A STATE	Contraction of the second	the fillen and the	
Habitat Assessment	Scores	(max)				No. IL COL	State Bern	1	and a state		
Channel Modification	(5)		5							and the second	
Instream Habitat (20)			19	. Starburg	Super St. de			- 25		and the second second	
Bottom Substrate (15)		13	1	e onese				ALC: NOT	E SOMARK	
Pool Variety (10)			6		-						
Riffle Habitat (16)			16	11427	-2010						
Left Bank Stability (7)			5								
Right Bank Stability (7	7)		5	Constraint of the						and the second sec	
Light Penetration (10))		2							114	
Left Riparian Score (5	5)		2			100 00 00		5	100	and the second second	
Right Riparian Score	(5)		2	_							
Total Habitat Score ((100)		75	Sub	strate	Cobble, grave	l, and soft silts	s along the bank	S		
Sample Date	e		Sample	ID	Spe	cies Total		NCIBI	Bie	oclassification	
05/05/08			2008-2	.7		19		52		Good	
Most Abundant Spe	ecies		Mountain Redb	elly Dace		Exotic Spe	cies E	Highback Chub, Brown Trout, and	Redlip Shine	er, Rainbow Trout, d Darter	
Species Change Sin	ce l set	Cycle	N/A								
Data Analveie	ue Lasi	Sycie									
This is the first fish co	mmunit	v samr	ole collected at th	nis site. Waters	hed dra	ins the souther	stern corner o	of Alleghany Col	intv: no mur	nicipalities within its	

watershed; tributary to the Little River. **Habitat** -- runs, riffles, and swiftly flowing chutes; side snag pools; minimal canopy and riparian zones along both banks. **2008** -- Mountain Redbelly Dace and Bluehead Chub accounted for 39% of all the fish collected; moderate percentage of Omnivores+Herbivores, indicative of nonpoint source nutrients and an open canopy; percentage of tolerant fish (White Sucker and Creek Chub) was slightly greater than expected for a mountain stream; three endemic species (Kanawha Minnow, Kanawha Darter, and Appalachia Darter) were present; and the lowest conductivity of any fish site, along with Pine Swamp Creek, in the basin in 2008.

Waterbod	у	Locati	on	Station	ID	Date	Bioclassification
BRUSH	CR	SR 14	122	KB4 [,]	1 10	0/02/07	Good
County	Subbasin	8 digit HUC	Latitude	Longitude	AU Number	Le	evel IV Ecoregion
ALLEGHANY	3	05050001	36.516111	-81.012500	10-9-10	N	lew River Plateau
Stream Classificat	ion	Drainage Area (mi2	2) Elev	ation (ft)	Stream Width	(m)	Stream Depth (m)
C;Tr	-	32		2500	8		0.1
	Fo	prested/Wetland	Urban	-	Agriculture		Other (describe)
Visible Landuse (%)	30	10		60		0
Upstream NPD	ES Discharg	ers (>1MGD or <1M	IGD and withir	1 mile)	NPDES Nur	nber	Volume (MGD)
none							
Water Quality Parame Temperature (°C) Dissolved Oxygen (mg/ Specific Conductance (pH (s.u.) Water Clarity Habitat Assessment S Channel Modification (5 Instream Habitat (20)	ters L) μS/cm) Geores (max)	11.9 9.4 38 6.2 clear			Site Pho	otograph	
Bottom Substrate (15) Pool Variety (10) Riffle Habitat (16) Left Bank Stability (7) Right Bank Stability (7) Light Penetration (10) Left Riparian Score (5) Right Riparian Score (5) Total Habitat Score (1 Sample Date) 00)	8 6 14 3 3 7 1 2 69 Sample ID	Substra	ate mix o EPT	f cobble, sand; son	me boulder, gra	vel, silt, bedrock Bioclassification

Sample Date Sample ID		ST	EPT	BI	EPT BI	Bioclassification	
10/02/07	10345	88	36*	4.87*	3.46	Good	
08/20/03	9230	83	42	3.94	3.34	Excellent	
08/20/98	7728	62	36	4.04	3.56	Good	
07/27/93	6289	96	40	4.73	3.38	Good	

* values corrected for seasonality

Taxonomic Analysis

Sampling for this site was last done in October of 2007; all other sampling events occurred in July or August. There were four EPT taxa present (rare in the sample) in October that were not present in the summer samples; of those only one taxon (*Isoperla lata*) shows a seasonal distribution in North Carolina mountain stream sites (it has not been recorded from summer mountain samples). EPT Richness was decremented by one to compensate for the seasonality of the species.

There are five EPT taxa that have been identified from each of the three summer samples and not present in the October sample. Of those, four taxa show a moderate to strong seasonal distribution for mountain stream sites with peak occurrence in the summer and much reduced occurrence in the fall: Serratella serratiodes (common in 2003); Epeorus vitreus (abundant in 2003); Micrasema wataga (common in 2003); and Neophylax oligius (abundant in 2003). The four taxa have low tolerance values, ranging from 1.2 to 2.6.

Data Analysis

The site is about six miles east of Sparta, 2.9 miles NW of the closest point on the Blue Ridge Parkway, and 5.2 stream-miles above the confluence with Little River.

Seasonal effects are evident when comparing taxa from the October sample from 2007 with samples from summer in prior years. Reduced EPT richness and a higher NCBI value in 2007 compared to 2003 may be due to seasonal effects and not a decline in water quality between the two years.

Waterbo	Waterbody				Station	ID		Date	Bioclassification	
LAUREL	. BR	SR 1	SR 1105			2	0	3/18/08	Not Impaired	
County ALLEGHANY	Subba 3	sin 8 digit HUC 05050001	Lati 36.42	itude 20833	Longitude -81.008333	AU N 10-5	lumber 9-10-2	Le	evel IV Ecoregion	
Stream Classifica	Drainage Area (m	a (mi2) Elev		vation (ft)	Strea	tream Width (m)		Stream Depth (m)		
C;Tr	C;Tr				2705				0.2	
	_	Forested/Wetland		Urban	I	Agricult	ure	c	Other (describe)	
Visible Landuse	(%)	40		0		40			20 (road)	
Upstream NPI	DES Disc	hargers (>1MGD or <1	MGD an	d withir	n 1 mile)	NP	DES Nur	nber	Volume (MGD)	
Water Quality Param	eters						Site Pho	otograph		
Temperature (°C) Dissolved Oxygen (mg	g/L)	16.0 8.6					1			



Sample Date Sample ID		ST EPT		BI EPT BI		Bioclassification	
08/18/08	10529		26		3.51	Not Impaired	
04/04/06	9824	100	36*	4.58*	2.73	Good	
08/18/03	9216	66	33	4.12	3.53	Good	
08/21/98	7729	49	28	3.72	2.91	Good	
09/03/92	6008		14		4.21	Fair	

* values corrected for seasonality

Taxonomic Analysis

No unambiguously new taxa were collected in 2008 at the site. The EPT collection method was used in 2008 rather than the Full-Scale method used for the three prior sampling events, complicating comparison of 2008 taxonomic results with those prior events.

Data Analysis

The site is about 8.6 miles southeast of Sparta in southeast Alleghany County, and 0.3 stream-miles from the confluence with Brush Creek.

Current BAU criteria do not allow for classification of stream sites with drainage areas under 3.0 square miles except in unusual circumstances (such as for Little Peak Creek at SR 1595/Ashe County).

Due to the small size of the stream it was decided for the latest sampling effort to use EPT rather than Full-Scale collection methods (as was used for the prior three sampling events at the site); part of the reason for the decrease in EPT Richness between 2008 and the prior summer sampling event in 2003 is certainly due to the differenct collection methods used. The EPT BI is better for comparison of conditions when those two sampling methods are used; there is no evidence of change in water quality between 2003 and 2008 using that metric.

Waterbody				Location		Date	Station ID	Bioclassification			
CRAB	CR			NC 18		05/05/08	KF18		Fair		
County	Subt	asin	8 digit HUC	Latitude	Longi	tude	AU Number	l eve	el IV Ecoregion		
ALLEGHANY		3	05050001	36.5495584	-81.00	23167	10-9-12	Nev	v River Plateau		
Stream Classifica	ation	Drai	nage Area (mi2)	Elevatio	on (ft)	Stream Wi	dth (m)	Average Depth (m) Reference Site		
C;Tr			11.2	245	0	8		0.4	No		
		For	ested/Wetland	Rural Re	sidential	Ac	riculture	Oth	er (describe)		
Visible Landuse	(%)	1.01	60	10			30		0		
	. ,										
Upstream NPDES Di	ischarg	ers (>1	MGD or <1MGD	and within 1 r	nile)		NPDES NI	ımber	Volume (MGD)		
			None								
Water Quality Param	neters			_			Site	Photograph			
Temperature (°C)			16.1	41534		ale.					
Dissolved Oxygen (m	g/L)		9.7			1 E	S. A. P. State		KIL		
Specific Conductance	50			A BANK	- A HUSE	the strength of	Mir attended				
pH (s.u.)			6.7	16.00	1 the	ALY BUD	11111	and the second	the second second second		
	1				the last	the state of the	The second	Marine and Carton	Service services		
Water Clarity			Clear	10	121	Service or		Entra and	L'ART BALL		
				Master.		2	a sea of		NOT MARKED IN		
Habitat Assessment	Scores	(max)			1000				现的 计相同 1		
Channel Modification	(5)		5			and the second		and the second s			
Instream Habitat (20)			19					Contraction of the second			
Bottom Substrate (15)		12			1377 5		A DE DE			
Pool Variety (10)			10	1		A		Service States	200		
Riffle Habitat (16)			16	-		A DESCRIPTION OF A	ANU	A CONTRACTOR	E.L.		
Left Bank Stability (7)			4	14.50			C and a				
Right Bank Stability (7)		4			and the second s	Tor Mail	AND PROVIDENT			
Light Penetration (10))		2	1000		- 6.4.	a start and	ALC: NOT THE	and the second		
Left Riparian Score (5	5)		1		100	- HAN	A CA				
Right Riparian Score	(5)		4								
Total Habitat Score	(100)		77	Sub	strate	Slick bedrock,	boulders, silts o	n the substrate			
Sample Date	e		Sample	ID	Spe	cies Total	N	СІВІ	Bioclassification		
05/05/08			2008-2	6		14	:	38	Fair		
Most Abundant Sp	ecies		Mountain Redbe Stoneroller	elly Dace and C	entral	Exotic Spec	ties Rec	dlip Shiner, Saffron S I Tessellated Darter	Shiner, Rainbow Trout,		
Species Change Sin	ce Last	Cycle	N/A								
Data Analysis											
This is the first fish of	mmunit	Veem	la collected at th	io oito Motoro	had drai	no the northeas	torn corner of A	lloghopy County: no	municipalities within the		

This is the first fish community sample collected at this site. **Watershed** -- drains the northeastern corner of Alleghany County; no municipalities within the watershed; site is ~ 1.5 miles upstream of the creek's confluence with the Little River. **Habitat** -- runs and riffles; side undercuts, bedrock pools; minimal riparian zone along the right shoreline and minimal canopy. **2008** -- more fish were collected at this site (n = 2,368) than at any other site in the basin in 2008; Central Stoneroller, Mountain Redbelly Dace, and Bluehead Chub constituted 65% of all the fish collected; high percentage of Omnivores+Herbivores, indicative of nonpoint source nutrients and an open canopy; diversity metrics lower than expected -- total, cyprinid, Rock Bass+Smallmouth Bass+Trout, and Intolerant diversities; and two endemic species (Kanawha Darter and Appalachia Darter) were present.

APPENDIX 3-C

Ambient Monitoring Systems Station Data Sheets

Station ID	WATERBODY	AU#	Location	Impaired (By Parameter)	Impacted (By Parameter)
K7900000	New R.	10	SR 1345 at Amelia	Copper (22.2%) Iron (44.4%) Zinc (22.2%)	Fecal Coliform (7.1%)
K9600000	Little R.	10-9-(6)	SR 1426 near Edwards Crossroads	Copper (11.1%) Iron (11.1%) Zinc (11.1%) Fecal Coliform (10.7%)	

Ambient Monitoring System Station Summaries

NCDENR, Division of Water Quality

Basinwide Assessment Report

Location: NEW RIV AT SR 1345 AT AMELIA

Station #:	K7900000		Hydrologic Unit Code:	05050001
Latitude:	36.55190	Longitude: -81.18172	Stream class:	C ORW
Agency:	NCAMBNT		NC stream index:	10

Time period: 02/01/2005 to 12/08/2009

	#	#		Results not meeting EL			Percentiles						
	results	ND	EL	#	%	%Conf	Min	10th	25th	50th	75th	90th	Max
Field													
D.O. (mg/L)	57	0	<4	0	0		5.2	7.8	8.4	9.5	11.4	13.7	15.4
	57	0	<5	0	0		5.2	7.8	8.4	9.5	11.4	13.7	15.4
pH (SU)	58	0	<6	0	0		6.7	7.1	7.4	7.7	8.1	8.4	9.1
	58	0	>9	1	1.7		6.7	7.1	7.4	7.7	8.1	8.4	9.1
Spec. conductance (umhos/cm at 25°C)	57	0	N/A				42	55	61	66	73	77	94
Water Temperature (°C)	58	0	>29	0	0		0.7	3.8	7.8	15.7	22.9	26.4	27.7
Other													
TSS (mg/L)	19	9	N/A				2.5	2.5	6.2	6.2	18	171	280
Turbidity (NTU)	58	1	>50	4	6.9		1	1.4	1.9	4.1	11.8	31.1	450
Nutrients (mg/L)													
NH3 as N	57	45	N/A				0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.1
NO2 + NO3 as N	57	1	N/A				0.05	0.24	0.36	0.55	0.73	0.8	0.87
TKN as N	57	24	N/A				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.28	0.53	2.8
Total Phosphorus	57	8	N/A				0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.1	0.96
Metals (ug/L)													
Aluminum, total (Al)	9	0	N/A				60	60	83	320	7975	16000	16000
Arsenic, total (As)	9	9	>10	0	0		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cadmium, total (Cd)	9	9	>2	0	0		1	1	2	2	2	2	2
Chromium, total (Cr)	9	8	>50	0	0		17	17	25	25	25	25	25
Copper, total (Cu)	9	6	>7	2	22.2		2	2	2	2	9	15	15
Iron, total (Fe)	9	0	>1000	4	44.4		220	220	240	520	10550	20000	20000
Lead, total (Pb)	9	8	>25	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	13	13
Mercury, total (Hg)	8	8	>0.012	0	0		0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Nickel, total (Ni)	9	7	>88	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	13	13
Zinc, total (Zn)	9	5	>50	2	22.2		10	10	10	10	41	73	73

Fecal Coliform Screening(#/100mL)

24.9

```
# results: Geomean: # > 400: % > 400: % Conf:
```

4

7.1

New River Basin: Little River & Chestnut Creek Watersheds (HUC 0505000104 & 0505000106)

Key:

56

result: number of observations

ND: number of observations reported to be below detection level (non-detect) EL: Evaluation Level; applicable numeric or narrative water quality standard or action level

Results not meeting EL: number and percentages of observations not meeting evaluation level

%Conf : States the percent statistical confidence that the actual percentage of exceedances is at least 10% (20% for Fecal Coliform)

2 Stations with less than 10 results for a given parameter were not evaluated for statistical confidence

Ambient Monitoring System Station Summaries

NCDENR, Division of Water Quality

Basinwide Assessment Report

Location:	LITTLE RIV AT SR 1426 NR EDWARDS CROSSROADS											
Station #:	K9600000		Hydrologic Unit Code:	05050001								
Latitude:	36.52465	Longitude: -81.069	Stream class:	С								
Agency:	NCAMBNT		NC stream index:	10-9-(6)								

Time period: 02/01/2005 to 12/08/2009

	#	#		Results not meeting EL			Pe						
	results	ND	EL	#	%	%Conf	Min	10th	25th	50th	75th	90th	Max
Field													
D.O. (mg/L)	58	0	<4	0	0		5.9	7.9	8.5	9.9	11.7	13.3	15.1
	58	0	<5	0	0		5.9	7.9	8.5	9.9	11.7	13.3	15.1
pH (SU)	58	0	<6	0	0		6.4	7.2	7.4	7.8	8	8.4	9.4
	58	0	>9	1	1.7		6.4	7.2	7.4	7.8	8	8.4	9.4
Spec. conductance (umhos/cm at 25°C)	57	0	N/A				35	42	47	50	54	61	86
Water Temperature (°C)	58	0	>29	0	0		0.6	4.4	8.4	14.5	20.2	23.7	26.4
Other													
TSS (mg/L)	18	8	N/A				2.5	2.5	3.1	6.2	6.2	72.7	178
Turbidity (NTU)	58	6	>50	2	3.4		1	1	1.5	2.3	4	15.2	110
Nutrients (mg/L)													
NH3 as N	1	1	N/A				0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
NO2 + NO3 as N	1	0	N/A				0.65	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.65
TKN as N	1	1	N/A				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Total Phosphorus	1	0	N/A				0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Metals (ug/L)													
Aluminum, total (Al)	9	0	N/A				51	51	66	120	240	18000	18000
Arsenic, total (As)	9	9	>10	0	0		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cadmium, total (Cd)	9	9	>2	0	0		1	1	2	2	2	2	2
Chromium, total (Cr)	9	9	>50	0	0		10	10	25	25	25	25	25
Copper, total (Cu)	9	8	>7	1	11.1		2	2	2	2	2	17	17
Iron, total (Fe)	9	0	>1000	1	11.1		89	89	190	200	340	19000	19000
Lead, total (Pb)	9	8	>25	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	15	15
Mercury, total (Hg)	8	8	>0.012	0	0		0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Nickel, total (Ni)	9	8	>88	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	25	25
Zinc, total (Zn)	9	8	>50	1	11.1		10	10	10	10	10	80	80

Fecal Coliform Screening(#/100mL)

85.1

results: Geomean: # > 400: % > 400: % Conf:

6

10.7

<u>Key:</u>

result: number of observations

56

ND: number of observations reported to be below detection level (non-detect)

EL: Evaluation Level; applicable numeric or narrative water quality standard or action level

Results not meeting EL: number and percentages of observations not meeting evaluation level

%Conf : States the percent statistical confidence that the actual percentage of exceedances is at least 10% (20% for Fecal Coliform)

Stations with less than 10 results for a given parameter were not evaluated for statistical confidence

APPENDIX 3-D

12-DIGIT SUBWATERSHED MAPS



New River Basin: Little River & Chestnut Creek Watersheds (HUC 0505000104 & 0505000106)









APPENDICES New River Basin: Little River & Chestnut Creek Watersheds (HUC 0505000104 & 0505000106)

