Watershed Restoration Action Strategy for the Lower East Fork White Watershed



Prepared for

Indiana Department of Environmental Management
Office of Water Quality
Watershed Management Section

Prepared by

WITTMAN HYDRO PLANNING ASSOCIATES, INC.

320 WEST 8TH STREET, SUITE 201 BLOOMINGTON, IN 47404

PHONE: 812-333-9399 FAX: 812-333-9399 *www.wittmanhydro.com*

Table of Contents

FOREWORD

The Lower East Fork White Watershed Restoration Action Strategy (WRAS) is intended to be a living document designed to assist restoration and protection efforts of stakeholders in their sub-watersheds. As a "living document" information contained within the WRAS will need to be revised and updated periodically.

The WRAS is divided into two parts: Part I, Characterization and Responsibilities and Part II, Concerns and Recommendations.

The first draft of the Lower East Fork White WRAS was released for public review during the spring of 2002. A 60-day public comment period followed the public meetings at which this WRAS document was introduced. This final version of the WRAS includes public comments received during the 60-day comment period. For comments to be included in the final version, they were required to be written and submitted to WHPA, Inc. (the firm contracted to produce this WRAS) during the comment period.

Wittman Hydro Planning Associates, Inc.
320 West Eighth Street
Showers Plaza, Suite 201
Bloomington, IN 47404

812-333-9399

inquiry@wittmanhydro.com

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overall goal and purpose of Part I of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy (WRAS) is to provide a reference point and map to assist local citizens with improving water quality. The major water quality concerns and recommended management strategies will be addressed in Part II: Concerns and Recommendations of the WRAS.

This Strategy broadly covers the entire watershed; therefore, it is intended to be an overall strategy and does not dictate management and activities at the stream site or segment level. Water quality management decisions and activities for individual portions of the watershed are most effective and efficient when managed through sub-watershed plans. However, these sub-watershed plans must also consider the impact on the watershed as a whole.

This Strategy is intended to be a fluid document in order to respond to the changing and dynamic quality of our environment. Therefore, this Strategy will require revision when updated information becomes available. Additionally, the reader may notice that some of the information in this Strategy is provided in duplicate. This is a result of the interconnectedness of the issues discussed and an assumption made by the authors that many readers may only be interested in a few sections of this Strategy.

Overview of the Lower East Fork White Watershed

The East Fork of the White River begins in Columbus, Indiana and meanders 200 miles before joining the West Fork of the White River near Petersburg to complete the remaining 50 miles to the Wabash River. The division between the Upper and the Lower East Fork White River occurs where the Muscatatuck River discharges into the East Fork, just upstream of Sparksville, Indiana. The East Fork often narrows as it fights its way south and west through unglaciated, rocky terrain and becomes more meandering as it nears the Wabash River. This is in marked contrast with the West Fork which flows through the glaciated section of Indiana accounting for a more broad and less rugged valley. The river traveler is treated to a great many sandbars, picturesque islands and interesting wildlife, not to mention the good fishing available (IDNR 1999).

Current Status of Water Quality in the Lower East Fork White Watershed

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act requires states to identify waters that do not meet, or are not expected to meet, applicable water quality standards. The Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for Indiana provides a basis for understanding the current status of water quality in the Lower East Fork White Watershed. The waterbodies listed in Table 0-1 are on Indiana's 1998 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list submitted to and approved by EPA (IDEM 1998). The 2002 draft 303(d) list has been completed and the final list will be released in October 2002. The draft 2002 list is not included in this document, but is available from IDEM's Office of Water Quality (http://www.state.in.us/idem/water/planbr/wqs/303d.html).

Water Quality Goal

The overall water quality goal for the Lower East Fork White Watershed is that all waterbodies meet the applicable water quality standards for their designated uses as determined by the State of Indiana, under the provisions of the Clean Water Act.

Part I, Chapter 1: Characterization and Responsibilities

1. Introduction

The Clean Water Action Plan was developed by federal agencies in 1998 to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the Clean Water Act and to "help revitalize the nation's commitment to our valuable water resources." The Plan proposed that "states and tribes should work with public agencies and private-sector organizations and citizens to develop, based on the initial schedule for the first two years, Watershed Restoration Action Strategies, for watersheds most in need of restoration" (USEPA 1998). A WRAS is essentially a large-scale coordination plan for an eight-digit hydrologic unit watershed. Each year, more assessments and data may become available. This will require amendments to the WRAS, which must be flexible and broad enough to accommodate change. The WRAS will also foster greater cooperation among State and Federal agencies, which should result in more effective use of personnel and resources.

The WRAS provides an opportunity to assemble, in one place, projects and monitoring that have been completed or are on-going within a watershed. It also allows agencies and stakeholders to compare watershed goals and provides a guide for future work within a watershed.

The WRAS for the Lower East Fork White watershed contains two parts. Part I provides a characterization of water quality in the watershed and agency responsibilities. Part II provides a discussion of resource concerns and recommended strategies.

1.1 Purpose of This Document

The overall goal and purpose of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy Part I is to provide a reference point and roadmap to assist with improving water quality. Part I is a compilation of information, facts, and local concerns in this watershed. It will serve as a reference document for watershed groups and others involved in the assessment and planning of watershed restoration activities.

Part I of the Strategy is intended to be a fluid document in order to respond to the changing and dynamic quality of our environment. Therefore, it will require revision when updated information becomes available.

1.2 Guide to the Use of This Document

Chapter 1: Introduction - This Chapter provides a non-technical description of the purpose of Part 1 of the Strategy. This Chapter also provides an overview of stakeholder groups in the Lower East Fork White watershed.

Chapter 2: General Watershed Description - Some of the specific topics covered in this chapter include:

- An overview of the watershed
- Hydrology of the watershed
- A summary of land use within the watershed
- Natural resources in the watershed
- Population statistics
- Major water uses in the watershed
- Water quality classifications and standards

Chapter 3: Causes and Sources of Water Pollution - This Chapter describes a number of important causes of water quality impacts including biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), toxic substances, nutrients, *E. coli* bacteria and others. This Chapter also describes both point and nonpoint sources of pollution.

Chapter 4: Water Quality and Use Support Ratings - This Chapter describes the various types of water quality monitoring conducted by IDEM. It summarizes water quality in the watershed based on Office of Water Quality data, and presents a summary of use support ratings for those surface waters that have been monitored or evaluated.

Chapter 5: State and Federal Water Quality Programs - Chapter 5 summarizes the existing State and Federal point and nonpoint source pollution control programs available to address water quality problems. These programs are management tools available for addressing the priority water quality concerns and issues that are discussed in Part II of the Strategy. Chapter 5 also describes the concept of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). TMDLs represent management strategies aimed at controlling point and nonpoint source pollutants. IDEM's TMDL Strategy will also be discussed.

1.3 Stakeholder Groups in the Watershed

The Lower East Fork White watershed contains several stakeholder groups that have different missions (Appendix C). Many of these groups have a long history of conservation work in the Lower East Fork White watershed. The following discussions briefly describe some of the watershed groups.

Natural Resources Conservation Service

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), under the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), provides leadership in a partnership effort to help people conserve, maintain, and improve our natural resources and environment. The NRCS offers landowners financial, technical, and educational assistance to implement conservation practices on privately owned land. Using this help, farmers, ranchers, and forest landowners apply practices that reduce soil erosion, improve water quality, and enhance crop land, forest land, wetlands, grazing lands, and wildlife habitat. Incentives offered by USDA promote sustainable agricultural and forestry practices, which protect and conserve valuable farm and forest land for future generations. USDA assistance also helps individuals and communities restore natural resources after floods, fires, or other natural disasters.

Soil and Water Conservation Districts

Local Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD) assist land users and residents in the protection and improvement of the local environment. SWCDs can provide technical and financial assistance to local watershed conservation groups.

Central Indiana Land Trust, Inc.

The Central Indiana Land Trust (CILTI) is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) corporation formed in 1990. CILTI maintains that development must be balanced with adequate greenspace. It operates in a regional capacity throughout central Indiana, and actively seeks to protect a broad array of natural areas from small urban greenspaces to pristine nature preserves of high biological integrity.

Dubois and Pike Counties USDA-NRCS

In Pike County two tributaries to the White River are currently under a 319 water quality improvement grant. The Conger and Little Conger Creeks will be covered by this grant from July 2001 until June 2003. The grant concentrates on the Core Four Practices of conservation tillage, weed and pest management, crop nutrient management, and conservation buffers.

Four Rivers Resource Conservation & Development

The Four Rivers RC&D serves Daviess, Dubois, Gibson, Greene, Knox, Martin, Pike, Posey, Vanderburg, and Warrick counties. Its mission is to empower the people of the Four Rivers RC&D Area in the wise enhancement of economical, cultural, and natural resources to improve their quality of life. Four Rivers, Hoosier Heartland, and Sycamore Trails RC&D's, in partnership with seventeen SWCDs, are working together to assist with water quality issues on the Eel and Lower White River Watersheds. An IDEM-319 grant provides a coordinator and cost-share for practice application under the CORE4 program. The Southwest Indiana Brine Coalition, under Four Rivers RC&D administration, has received an IDEM-319 grant for funding a coordinator position to remediate brine, which is a waste product of oil production that frequently leaks from pipes and holding ponds onto the land. Other projects include technical assistance for farmers developing waste management plans and environmental

education.

Hoosier Heartland Resource Conservation and Development

The vision of the Hoosier Heartland Resource Conservation and Development is "to realize sustained economic and social prosperity while conserving our natural resources for future generations." Projects include the Backyard Tree Farm Program, Building with Nature, Urban Erosion Control seminars, Woodland Owners Clinics, and a Youth Farm Stand and outreach project.

Hoosier River Watch

Hoosier Riverwatch is a state-sponsored water quality monitoring initiative. The program was started in 1994 to increase public awareness of water quality issues and concerns by training volunteers to monitor stream water quality. Hoosier Riverwatch collaborates with agencies and volunteers to:

- Increase public involvement in water quality issues through hands-on training of volunteers in stream monitoring and cleanup activities.
- Educate local communities about the relationship between land use and water quality.
- Provide water quality information to citizens and governmental agencies working to protect Indiana's rivers and streams.

Indiana Karst Conservancy

The Indiana Karst Conservancy is a non-profit organization dedicated to the preservation and conservation of Indiana's unique karst features. The IKC was formed by concerned individuals when it was apparent that no similar group was actively protecting such features for their inherent geological, biological, and archaeological importance. The purposes of the IKC are the management, protection, and acquisition of the karst areas in Indiana. The IKC also supports research and promotes education related to karst and its appropriate use.

Lincoln Hills Resource Conservation & Development

RC&D is a unique process that helps people protect and develop their economic, natural, and social resources in ways that improve their area's economy, environment, and quality of life. Local RC&D Councils provide a way for people to plan and implement projects that will make their communities a better place to live. Lincoln Hills RC&D serves Crawford, Perry, Harrison, Spencer, and Washington counties. Their vision is to have a favorable economic climate in harmony with all resources for a higher quality of life. The Fish and Wildlife Resource Committee promotes wildlife food plots by distributing donated seed to landowners. They recently purchased a Warm Season Grasses No Till Drill that can be rented by landowners to improve wildlife habitat by planting warm season grasses that can be used as buffer strips that also protect the land.

Lost River Conservation Assoc.

The primary goal of the Lost River Conservation Association always has been, and remains, the permanent protection of Indiana's Lost River Karst System. We are concerned about the various sources of pollution: air, land, and water. We believe it is essential that solutions to pollution be identified and implemented. We favor pursuing advances in pollution remediation, including full scale composting of organic wastes. We actively promote public awareness and education in an effort to protect the unique features, ground and surface water quality, wetlands, and overall biology of Indiana's Lost River Karst System.

Tri-County Nutrient Management Committee

The Washington, Lawrence, and Orange County SWCD's organized to form the Tri-County Nutrient Management Committee (TCNMC) to apply for a 319 grant from IDEM to address nutrient management in the watersheds of the Blue River, Lost River, Muscatatuck River, and East Fork White River. The grant was received and allowed the committee to hire a nutrient management specialist to work with livestock producers, educating them on the need for proper management of animal waste. The TCNMC has completed two demonstration projects and will host several more in the summer of 2002. The committee is working to get a

second grant to continue the work with the livestock producers.

Orange Co. SWCD

The Orange County Soil and Water District was recently awarded a Clean Water Indiana, Lake and River Enhancement Grant to apply conservation practices in the Lost River karst region of the county. The overall goal of the project is to improve the water quality of Lost River by demonstrating conservation practices that limit the movement of soil and nutrients into the fragile underground system of the Lost River Drainage.

Orange County USDA-NRCS

The Upper Lost River Conservation Priority (CPA) is a cost share program through the Natural Resources Conservation Service that uses Best Management Practices (BMP's) to address soil erosion, water quality, and nutrient management in Orange County.

Part I, Chapter 2: General Watershed Description

This Chapter provides a general description of the Lower East Fork White Watershed and includes the following:

Section 2.1 Lower East Fork White Watershed Overview

Section 2.2 Land Cover, Population, and Growth Trends

Section 2.3 Agricultural Activities in the Lower East Fork White Watershed

Section 2.4 Significant Natural Areas in the Lower East Fork White Watershed

Section 2.5 Surface Water Use Designations and Classifications

Section 2.6 US Geological Survey Water Use Information for the Lower East Fork White Watershed

Section 2.7 Superfund Sites in the Lower East Fork White Watershed

2.1 Lower East Fork White Watershed Overview

The Lower East Fork White watershed is an 8 digit (05120208) hydrologic unit code (HUC) watershed located in south-central Indiana (Figure 2-1). The watershed encompasses approximately 2055 square miles in 13 different counties and approximately 1236 miles of perennial streams (USEPA 2002a). It is subdivided into 124 subbasins represented on the map by 14 digit HUCs (Figure 2-2). Nearly 60% of the watershed is classified as forested and about one-third is agricultural. The majority of the soils in the watershed have high to very high erosion potential (Figure 2-3).

The East Fork of the White River begins in Columbus, Indiana and meanders 200 miles before joining the West Fork of the White River near Petersburg to complete the remaining 50 miles to the Wabash River. The division between the Upper and the Lower East Fork White River occurs where the Muscatatuck River discharges into the East Fork, just upstream of Sparksville, Indiana. The East Fork often narrows as it fights its way south and west through unglaciated, rocky terrain and becomes more meandering as it nears the Wabash River. This is in marked contrast with the West Fork which flows through the glaciated section of Indiana accounting for a more broad and less rugged valley. The river traveler is treated to a great many sandbars, picturesque islands and interesting wildlife, not to mention the good fishing available (IDNR 1999).

The Lower East Fork White Watershed is located primarily in the Interior Plateau ecoregion, which is characterized by open hills, irregular plains, and tablelands. Oak-hickory forest dominates, with some areas of bluestem prairie and cedar glades, and a diverse fish fauna is present. The southwestern corner of the watershed is located in the Interior River Lowland ecoregion, which is made up of wide, flat-bottomed terraced valleys and dissected glacial till plains. Less than half of this area is in cropland and about a quarter is in pasture (US EPA 1999).

2.2 Land Cover, Population, and Growth Trends

2.2.1 General Land Cover

Native vegetation in the Lower East Fork White watershed is an upland mixed hardwood forest in varied stages of succession. The U.S. Geological Survey - Biological Resources Division and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are overseeing the National Gap Analysis Program (GAP). In Indiana, Indiana State University and Indiana University are carrying out the Indiana GAP Project which involves an analysis of current vegetative land cover through remote sensing (ISU 2001). This analysis provides vegetative land cover data in 30 by 30-meter grids (Figure 2-4). The following is a summary of vegetative cover in the watershed determined from the GAP image:

2.1% Urban (impervious, low and high density)

37.8% Agricultural vegetation (row crop and pasture)
56.9% Forest vegetation (shrubland, woodland, forest)
1.8% Wetland vegetation (Palustrine: forest, shrubland, herbaceous)
1.4% Open Water

2.2.2 Population

The 1990 total population in the thirteen counties that have land portions in the watershed was 514,953 (IRBC 1998). Table 2-1 shows a break down of population by county and estimated population projections. It should be noted that these numbers do not reflect the actual population living in the Lower East Fork White watershed. For example, only a portion of Monroe and Bartholomew counties are within the land area of the Lower East Fork White watershed (Figure 2-1). A better estimate of the population within the Lower East Fork White watershed may be the 1995 U.S. Geological Survey Water Use Reports, which show a total population in the watershed of 169,490 in 1995 (Table 2-7).

The U.S. Census and the Indiana Business Research Center also provide information about the population in cities and towns (IBRC 1997). Table 2-2 contains population estimates for various cities and towns located within the watershed.

2.3 Agricultural Activities in the Lower East Fork White Watershed

Agriculture is the dominant land use in the Lower East Fork White Watershed. Section 2.2.1 shows that 37.8 percent of land cover in the watershed is agricultural vegetation. This section provides an overview of the agricultural activities in the watershed.

2.3.1 Livestock Operations

Livestock production within the watershed encompasses several species, and the overall composition changes from county to county. Hogs and cattle are produced in almost every county. Dubois and Jackson counties are the top producers of layers and Daviess and Dubois counties are the top producers of turkeys in the state. See Table 2-3 for livestock inventory numbers. Some animals are raised in open lots or pastures and some are raised in confined feeding lots or buildings.

Confined feeding is the raising of animals for food, fur or recreation in lots, pens, ponds, sheds or buildings, where they are confined, fed and maintained for at least 45 days during any year, and where there is no ground cover or vegetation present over at least half of the animals' confinement area. Livestock markets and sale barns are generally excluded (IDEM 1999a).

Indiana law defines a confined feeding operation as any livestock operation engaged in the confined feeding of at least 300 cattle, or 600 swine or sheep, or 30,000 fowl, such as chickens, ducks and other poultry. The IDEM regulates these confined feeding operations, as well as smaller livestock operations which have violated water pollution rules or laws, under IC 13-18-10.

As of October 1999, there were 262 livestock producers operating under the Confined Feeding Rules in the thirteen counties of the watershed (IDEM 1999). Table 2-3 shows livestock numbers from the USDA Agricultural Census "inventory" animals in each county (USDA 1997).

2.3.2 Crop Production

The soils of the Lower East Fork White watershed are good for crop production. Table 2-4 lists the acres of the major crops produced in 1997 throughout the thirteen counties in the watershed. For 1997, total acres of corn for grain edged out total acres of soybeans for beans as the number one crop produced in the thirteen counties. Corn and soybeans are clearly the primary crops produced in the watershed on the basis of total acres.

2.4 Significant Natural Areas in the Lower East Fork White Watershed

In 1993, the Indiana Natural Resources Commission (NRC) adopted its "Outstanding Rivers" List for Indiana. This listing is referenced in the standards for utility line crossings within floodways, formerly governed by IC 14-28-2 and now controlled by

310 IAC 6-1-16 through 310 IAC 6-1-18. Except where incorporated into a statute or rule, the "Outstanding Rivers List" is intended to provide guidance rather than to have regulatory application (NRC 1997). To help identify the rivers and streams which have particular environmental or aesthetic interest, a special listing has been prepared by IDNR's Division of Outdoor Recreation. This listing is a corrected and condensed version of a list compiled by American Rivers and dated October 1990. The NRC has adopted the IDNR listing as an official recognition of the resource values of these waters. A river included in the "Outstanding Rivers List" qualifies under one or more of 22 categories. Table 2-5 presents the rivers in the Lower East Fork White watershed which are on the "Outstanding Rivers List" and their significance.

State Parks, Forests, Nature Preserves, and Recreation Areas

Table 2-6 lists a number of parks, forests, nature preserves and other recreational areas within the counties included in the Lower East Fork White Watershed. Since all the special areas in these counties are listed, some of the areas may be located outside of the Lower East Fork White Watershed.

2.5 Surface Water Use Designations and Classifications

The following uses are designated by the Indiana Water Pollution Control Board (327 IAC 2-1-3 [327 IAC 2-1.5-5 for the Great Lakes system]):

- Surface waters of the state are designated for full-body contact recreation.
- All waters, except limited use waters, will be capable of supporting a well-balanced, warm water aquatic community and, where natural temperatures will permit, will be capable of supporting put-and-take trout fishing. All waters capable of supporting the natural reproduction of trout as of February 17, 1977, shall be so maintained.
- All waters, which are used for public or industrial water supply, must meet the standards for those uses at the point where water is withdrawn.
- All waters, which are used for agricultural purposes, must meet minimum surface water quality standards.
- All waters in which naturally poor physical characteristics (including lack of sufficient flow), naturally poor or reversible man-induced conditions, which came into existence prior to January 1, 1983, and having been established by use attainability analysis, public comment period, and hearing may qualify to be classified for limited use and must be evaluated for restoration and upgrading at each triennial review of this rule.
- All waters, which provide unusual aquatic habitat, which are an integral feature of an area of exceptional natural beauty or character, or which support unique assemblages of aquatic organisms may be classified for exceptional use (or designated as outstanding state resource waters in the Great Lakes system).

All waters of the state, at all times and at all places, including the mixing zone, shall meet the minimum conditions of being free from substances, materials, floating debris, oil, or scum attributable to municipal, industrial, agricultural, and other land use practices, or other discharges (327 IAC 2-1-6 [327 IAC 2-1.5-8 for the Great Lakes system]):

- that will settle to form putrescent or otherwise objectionable deposits,
- that are in amounts sufficient to be unsightly or deleterious,
- that produce color, visible oil sheen, odor, or other conditions in such degree as to create a nuisance,
- which are in amounts sufficient to be acutely toxic to, or to otherwise severely injure or kill aquatic life, other animals, plants, or humans, or
- which are in concentrations or combinations that will cause or contribute to the growth of aquatic plants or algae to such degree as to create a nuisance, be unsightly, or otherwise impair designated uses.

2.5.1 Surface Water Classifications in the Lower East Fork White Watershed

The statewide classifications discussed in Section 2.5 apply to all stream segments in the Lower East Fork White Watershed with the exceptions of:

* Ackerman Branch and Mill Creek in Dubois County to the confluence of Mill Creek and Little Creek.

* Plasterers Creek in Martin County from the Loogootee STP downstream to the confluence with Friends Creek.

which are both designated for limited use, and

* Lost River and all surface and underground tributaries upstream from the Orangeville Rise (T2N, R1W, Section 6) and the Rise of Lost River (T2N, R1W, Section 7) and the mainstem of the Lost River from the Orangeville Rise downstream to its confluence with the East Fork of White River

which is designated for exceptional use by the Indiana Water Pollution Control Board in 327 IAC 2-1-11 (1997).

2.6 US Geological Survey Water Use Information for the Lower East Fork White Watershed

The U.S. Geological Survey's (USGS) National Water-Use Information Program is responsible for compiling and disseminating the nation's water-use data. The USGS works in cooperation with local, State, and Federal environmental agencies to collect water-use information at a site-specific level. USGS also compiles the data from hundreds of thousands of sites to produce water-use information aggregated up to the county, state, and national levels. Every five years, data at the state and hydrologic region level are compiled into a national water-use data system. Table 2-7 shows the USGS Water-Use information for the Lower East Fork White Watershed for 1995 (USGS 2001).

2.7 Superfund Sites in the Lower East Fork White Watershed

Superfund is a program administered by the EPA to locate, investigate, and clean up the worst hazardous waste sites throughout the United States. Before the Superfund Program was established in 1980, hazardous wastes were often left in the open, where they seeped into the ground, flowed into rivers and lakes, and contaminated soil and groundwater. Consequently, where these practices were intensive or continuous, there were uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste sites. These sites include abandoned warehouses, manufacturing facilities, processing plants, and landfills (USEPA 2002b).

There is one Superfund (CERCLA) site listed in the Lower East Fork White Watershed:

- Bennett Stone Quarry (Bennett's Dump) - Bloomington, IN

The Record of Decision gives a detailed description of the site, including the media and contaminants involved. This is included in Appendix E.

Part I, Chapter 3: Causes and Sources of Water Pollution

A number of substances including nutrients, bacteria, oxygen-demanding wastes, metals, and toxic substances, cause water pollution. Sources of these pollution-causing substances are divided into two broad categories: point sources and nonpoint sources. Point sources are typically piped discharges from wastewater treatment plants, large urban and industrial stormwater systems, and other facilities. Nonpoint sources can include atmospheric deposition, groundwater inputs, and runoff from urban areas, agricultural lands and others. Chapter 3 includes the following:

Section 3.1 Causes of Pollution

Section 3.2 Point Sources of Pollution

Section 3.3 Nonpoint Sources of Pollution

3.1 Causes of Pollution

'Causes of pollution' refers to the substances which enter surface waters from point and nonpoint sources and result in water quality degradation and impairment. Major causes of water quality impairment include biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), nutrients, pesticides, toxicants (such as heavy metals, polychlorinated biphenyls [PCBs], chlorine, pH, ammonia, and cyanide), and *E. coli* bacteria. Table 3-1 provides a general overview of causes of impairment and the activities that may lead to their introduction into surface waters. Each of these causes is discussed in the following sections.

3.1.1 *E. coli* Bacteria

E. coli bacteria are associated with the intestinal tract of warm-blooded animals. They are widely used as an indicator of the potential presence of waterborne disease-causing (pathogenic) bacteria, protozoa, and viruses because they are easier and less costly to detect than the actual pathogenic organisms. The presence of waterborne disease-causing organisms can lead to outbreaks of such diseases as typhoid fever, dysentery, cholera, and cryptosporidiosis. The detection and identification of specific bacteria, viruses, and protozoa (such as *Giardia*, *Cryptosporidium*, and *Shigella*), require special sampling protocols and very sophisticated laboratory techniques which are not commonly available.

E. coli water quality standards have been established in order to ensure safe use of waters for water supplies and recreation. 327 IAC 2-1-6 Section 6(d) (327 IAC 2-1.5-8(e)(2) for Great Lakes system) states that *E. coli* bacteria, using membrane filter count (MF), shall not exceed 125 per 100 milliliters as a geometric mean based on not less than five samples equally spaced over a 30 day period nor exceed 235 per 100 milliliters in any one sample in a 30 day period.

E. coli bacteria may enter surface waters from nonpoint source runoff, but they also come from improperly treated discharges of domestic wastewater. Common potential sources of *E. coli* bacteria include leaking or failing septic systems, direct septic discharge, leaking sewer lines or pump station overflows, runoff from livestock operations, urban stormwater and wildlife. *E. coli* bacteria in treatment plant effluent are controlled through disinfection methods including chlorination (often followed by dechlorination), ozonation or ultraviolet light radiation.

There is one waterbody in the Lower East Fork White Watershed that appears on Indiana's 303(d) list for impairment due to *E. coli* contamination. It is currently scheduled for TMDL development from 2002 to 2004.

3.1.2 Toxic Substances

327 IAC 2-1-9(45) (327 IAC 2-1.5-2(84) for Great Lakes system) defines toxic substances as substances which are or may become harmful to plant or animal life or to food chains when present in sufficient concentrations or combinations. Toxic substances include, but are not limited to, those pollutants identified as toxic under Section 307 (a)(1) of the Clean Water Act. Standards for individual toxic substances are listed in 327 IAC 2-1-6 (327 IAC 2-1.5-8 for Great Lakes system). Toxic substances frequently encountered include chlorine, ammonia, organics (hydrocarbons and pesticides), heavy metals and pH. These materials are toxic to different organisms in varying amounts, and the effects may be evident immediately or may only be manifested after long-term exposure or accumulation in living tissue.

Whole effluent toxicity testing is required for major NPDES dischargers (discharge over 1 million gallons per day or population greater than 10,000). This test shows whether the effluent from a treatment plant is toxic, but it does not identify the specific cause of toxicity. If the effluent is found to be toxic, further testing is done to determine the specific cause. This follow-up testing is called a toxicity reduction evaluation. Other testing, or monitoring, done to detect aquatic toxicity problems include fish tissue analyses, chemical water quality sampling and assessment of fish community and bottom-dwelling organisms such as aquatic insect larvae. These monitoring programs are discussed in Chapter 4.

Each of the substances below can be toxic in sufficient quantity or concentration.

Metals

Municipal and industrial dischargers and urban runoff are the main sources of metal contamination in surface water. Indiana has stream standards for many heavy metals, but the most common ones in municipal permits are cadmium, chromium, copper, nickel, lead, mercury, and zinc. These standards are listed in 327 IAC 2-1-6 (327 IAC 2-1.5-8 for Great Lakes system). Point source discharges of metals are controlled through the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit process. Mass balance models are employed to determine allowable concentrations for a permit limit. Municipalities with significant industrial users discharging wastes to their treatment facilities limit the heavy metals from these industries through a pretreatment program. Source reduction and wastewater recycling at waste water treatment plants (WWTP) also reduces the amount of metals being discharged to a stream. Nonpoint sources of metal pollution are controlled through best management practices.

In Indiana, as well as many other areas of the country, mercury contamination in fish has caused the need to post widespread fish consumption advisories. The source of the mercury is unclear; however, atmospheric sources are suspected and are currently being studied.

There are five waterbodies in the Lower East Fork White Watershed that appear on Indiana's 303(d) list for impairment due to mercury contamination. They are currently scheduled for TMDL development from 2012 to 2014.

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) were first created in 1881 and began to be commercially manufactured around 1929. Because of their fire-resistant and insulating properties, PCBs were widely used in transformers, capacitors, and in hydraulic and heat transfer systems. In addition, PCBs were used in products such as plasticizers, rubber, ink, and wax. In 1966, PCBs were first detected in wildlife, and were soon found to be ubiquitous in the environment (Bunce 1994). PCBs entered the environment through unregulated disposal of products such as waste oils, transformers, capacitors, sealants, paints, and carbonless copy paper. In 1977, production of PCBs in North America was halted. The PCB contamination present in our surface waters and environment today is the result of historical waste disposal practices.

There are two segments of the Lower East Fork White River, as well as three tributaries, that appear on Indiana's 303(d) list for impairment due to PCB contamination. They are currently scheduled for TMDL development from 2012 to 2014.

Ammonia (NH_3)

Point source dischargers are one of the major sources of ammonia. In addition, discharge of untreated septic effluent, decaying organisms which may come from nonpoint source runoff and bacterial decomposition of animal waste also contribute to the level of ammonia in a waterbody. Standards for ammonia are listed in 327 IAC 2-1-6 (327 IAC 2-1.5-8 for Great Lakes system).

There are no waterbodies in the Lower East Fork White Watershed that appear on Indiana's 303(d) list for impairment due to ammonia contamination.

Pesticides

Pesticides include a broad array of chemicals used to control plant growth (herbicides), insects (insecticides), fungi (fungicides), and other organisms. Pesticides enter surface waters primarily through nonpoint source runoff from agricultural lands and urban areas. While some pesticides undergo biological degradation by soil and water bacteria, others are very resistant to degradation. Such nonbiodegradable compounds may become "fixed" or bound to clay particles and organic matter in the soil, making them less available. However, many pesticides are not permanently fixed by the soil. Instead they collect on plant surfaces and enter the food chain, eventually accumulating in wildlife such as fish and birds. Many pesticides have been found to negatively affect both humans and wildlife by damaging the nervous, endocrine, and reproductive systems or causing cancer (Kormondy 1996).

Pesticide contamination is due not only to current nonpoint sources of pesticides, but also to legacy pesticides, or those pesticides that are no longer being used but are still persistent in the environment. Thus, measurements of pesticide pollution may not be accurate estimates of the amount of pesticides currently being discharged into surface waters, but rather reflections of both past and present pesticide use.

There are no waterbodies in the Lower East Fork White Watershed that appear on Indiana's 303(d) list for impairment due to pesticide contamination.

Cyanide

Cyanide is used in several manufacturing processes, including metal finishing and glass manufacturing, and consequently it may enter surface waters through industrial runoff. Cyanide ties up the hemoglobin sites that bind oxygen to red blood cells, resulting in oxygen deprivation. This condition is known as cyanosis and is characterized by a blue skin color. Cyanide also causes chronic effects on the thyroid and central nervous system (Davis & Cornwell 1998). Most water quality monitoring programs measure total cyanide. This may overestimate the threat posed by cyanide contamination however, as total cyanide is a waste product of wastewater treatment plants. The parameter of concern to human health is free cyanide, which is included in measurements of total cyanide but different methods must be used to measure it separately.

There are no waterbodies in the Lower East Fork White Watershed that appear on Indiana's 303(d) list for impairment due to cyanide contamination.

3.1.3 Oxygen-Consuming Wastes

Oxygen-consuming wastes include decomposing organic matter or chemicals, which reduce dissolved oxygen in water through chemical reactions, creating what is known as biochemical oxygen demand (BOD). Raw domestic wastewater contains high concentrations of oxygen-consuming wastes that need to be removed from the wastewater before it can be discharged into a waterway. Maintaining a sufficient level of dissolved oxygen in the water is critical to most forms of aquatic life.

The concentration of dissolved oxygen in a water body is one indicator of the general health of an aquatic ecosystem. 327 IAC 2-1 Section 6(b)(3) states that concentrations of dissolved oxygen shall average at least five milligrams per liter per calendar day and shall not be less than four milligrams per liter at any time. Salmonid waters which support cold water fish have a higher dissolved oxygen requirement. In these waters, dissolved oxygen concentrations shall not be less than six milligrams per liter at any time and shall not be less than seven milligrams per liter in areas where spawning and imprinting occur during the season in which they occur. Dissolved oxygen concentrations in the open waters of Lake Michigan shall not be less than seven milligrams per liter at any time (327 IAC 2-1.5-8(d)(1)).

Dissolved oxygen concentrations are affected by a number of factors. Higher dissolved oxygen is produced by turbulent actions, such as waves, which mix air and water. Lower water temperature also generally allows for retention of higher dissolved oxygen concentrations. Low dissolved oxygen levels tend to occur more often in warmer, slow-moving waters. In general, the lowest dissolved oxygen concentrations occur during the warmest summer months and particularly during low flow periods.

Sources of dissolved oxygen depletion include wastewater treatment plant effluent, the decomposition of organic matter (such as leaves, dead plants and animals) and organic waste matter that is washed or discharged into the water. Sewage from human and household wastes is high in organic waste matter. Bacterial decomposition can rapidly deplete dissolved oxygen levels unless these wastes are adequately treated at a wastewater treatment plant. In addition, excess nutrients in a water body may lead to an over-abundance of algae and reduce dissolved oxygen in the water through algal respiration and decomposition of dead algae. Also, some chemicals may react with and bind up dissolved oxygen. Industrial discharges with oxygen-consuming wasteflow may be resilient instream and continue to use oxygen for a long distance downstream.

There are no waterbodies in the Lower East Fork White Watershed that appear on Indiana's 303(d) list for impairment due to oxygen-consuming wastes.

3.1.4 Nutrients

The term "nutrients" in this Strategy refers to two major plant nutrients: phosphorus and nitrogen. These are common components of fertilizers, animal and human wastes, vegetation, and some industrial processes. Nutrients in surface waters come from both point and nonpoint sources. Nutrients are beneficial to aquatic life in small amounts. However, in over-abundance and under favorable conditions, they can stimulate algal blooms and excessive plant growth in quiet waters or low flow conditions. The algal blooms and excessive plant growth often reduce the dissolved oxygen content of surface waters through plant respiration

and decomposition of dead algae and other plants. This is accentuated in hot weather and low flow conditions because of the reduced capacity of the water to retain dissolved oxygen.

There are no waterbodies in the Lower East Fork White Watershed that appear on Indiana's 303(d) list for impairment due to nutrient contamination.

3.2 Point Sources of Pollution

As discussed previously, sources of water pollution are divided into two broad categories: point sources and nonpoint sources. This section focuses on point sources. Section 3.2.1 defines point sources and Section 3.2.2 discusses point sources in the Lower East Fork White Watershed.

3.2.1 Defining Point Sources

Point sources refer to discharges that enter surface waters through a pipe, ditch or other well-defined point of discharge. The term applies to wastewater and stormwater discharges from a variety of sources. Wastewater point source discharges include municipal (city and county) and industrial wastewater treatment plants and small domestic wastewater treatment systems that may serve schools, commercial offices, residential subdivisions and individual homes. Stormwater point source discharges include stormwater collection systems for medium and large municipalities which serve populations greater than 100,000 and stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity as defined in the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR 122.26(a)(14)). The primary pollutants associated with point source discharges are oxygen-demanding wastes, nutrients, sediment, color and toxic substances including chlorine, ammonia and metals.

Point source dischargers in Indiana must apply for and obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the state. Discharge permits are issued under the NPDES program, which is delegated to Indiana by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). See Chapter 5 for a description of the NPDES program and permitting strategies.

3.2.2 Point Source Discharges in the Lower East Fork White Watershed

As of June 1999, there were 169 active NPDES permits within the Lower East Fork White watershed (Table 3-3, Figure 3-1). Of the 169 active NPDES permits, 8 are for major discharges (see Table 5-1 for a definition of a major discharge).

Another point source covered by NPDES permits is combined sewer overflows (CSO). A combined sewer system is a wastewater collection system that conveys sanitary wastewater (domestic, commercial and industrial wastewater) and stormwater through a single pipe system to a Publicly Owned Treatment Works. A CSO is the discharge from a combined sewer system at a point prior to the Publicly Owned Treatment Works. CSOs are point sources subject to NPDES permit requirements including both technology-based and water quality-based requirements of the Clean Water Act. Table 3-2 shows the CSOs in the Lower East Fork White watershed.

In addition to the NPDES permitted dischargers in the watershed, there may be many unpermitted, illegal discharges to the Lower East Fork White watershed system. Illegal discharges of residential wastewater (septic tank effluent) to streams and ditches from straight pipe discharges and old inadequate systems are a problem within the watershed.

3.3 Nonpoint Sources of Pollution

Nonpoint source pollution refers to runoff that enters surface waters through stormwater runoff, contaminated ground water, snowmelt or atmospheric deposition. There are many types of land use activities that can serve as sources of nonpoint source pollution including land development, construction, mining operations, crop production, animal feeding lots, timber harvesting, failing septic systems, landfills, roads and paved areas. Stormwater from large urban areas (greater than 100,000 people) and from certain industrial and construction sites is technically considered a point source since NPDES permits are required for discharges of stormwater from these areas.

Sediment and nutrients are major pollution-causing substances associated with nonpoint source pollution. Others include *E. coli* bacteria, heavy metals, pesticides, oil and grease, and any other substance that may be washed off the ground or removed from the atmosphere and carried into surface waters. Unlike point source pollution, nonpoint pollution sources are diffuse in nature and occur at random time intervals depending on rainfall events. Below is a brief description of major areas of nonpoint sources of pollution in the Lower East Fork White watershed.

3.3.1 Agriculture

There are a number of activities associated with agriculture that can serve as potential sources of water pollution. Land clearing and tilling make soils susceptible to erosion, which can then cause stream sedimentation. Pesticides and fertilizers (including synthetic fertilizers and animal wastes) can be washed from fields or improperly designed storage or disposal sites. Construction of drainage ditches on poorly drained soils enhances the movement of oxygen-consuming wastes, sediment and soluble nutrients into groundwater and surface waters.

Concentrated animal operations can be a significant source of nutrients, biochemical oxygen demand and *E. coli* bacteria if wastes are not properly managed. Impacts can result from over-application of wastes to fields, from leaking lagoons and from flows of lagoon liquids to surface waters due to improper waste lagoon management. Also there are potential concerns associated with nitrate nitrogen movement through the soil from poorly constructed lagoons and from wastes applied to the soil surface.

Grassed waterways, conservation tillage, and no-till practices are several common practices used by many farmers to minimize soil loss. Maintaining a vegetated buffer between fields and streams is another excellent way to minimize sediment and nutrient loads to streams.

3.3.2 Urban/Residential

Runoff from urbanized areas, as a rule, is more localized and can often be more severe in magnitude than agricultural runoff. Any type of land-disturbing activity such as land clearing or excavation can result in soil loss and sedimentation. The rate and volume of runoff in urban areas is much greater due both to the high concentration of impervious surface areas and to storm drainage systems that rapidly transport stormwater to nearby surface waters. This increase in volume and rate of runoff can result in streambank erosion and sedimentation in surface waters.

Urban drainage systems, including curb and guttered roadways, also allow urban pollutants to reach surface waters quickly and with little or no filtering. Pollutants include lawn care pesticides and fertilizers, automobile fluids, lawn and household wastes, road salts, and *E. coli* bacteria (from animals and failing septic systems). Household hazardous wastes have the potential to severely contaminate the water if disposed of improperly by pouring down the drain or on the ground. The diversity of these pollutants makes it very challenging to attribute water quality degradation to any one pollutant.

Replacement of natural vegetation with pavement and removal of buffers reduces the ability of the watershed to filter pollutants before they enter surface waters. The chronic introduction of these pollutants and increased flow and velocity into streams results in degraded waters. Many waters adjacent to urban areas are rated as biologically poor. This degradation also exists in lakes, which have been heavily influenced by adjacent urban development.

The population figures discussed in Section 2.3.2 are good indicators of where urban development and potential urban water quality impacts are likely to occur. Concentrated areas where urban development is high may lead to further water quality problems associated with the addition of impervious surfaces next to surface waters.

3.3.3 Onsite Wastewater Disposal

Septic systems contain all of the wastewater from a household or business. A complete septic system consists of a septic tank and an absorption field to receive effluent from the septic tank. The septic tank removes some wastes, but the soil absorption field provides further absorption and treatment. Septic systems can be a safe and effective method for treating wastewater if they are sized, sited, and maintained properly. However, if the tank or absorption field malfunction or are improperly placed, constructed or maintained, nearby wells and surface waters may become contaminated.

Some of the potential problems from malfunctioning septic systems include:

- Polluted groundwater: Pollutants in septic effluent include bacteria, nutrients, toxic substances, and oxygen-consuming wastes. Nearby wells can become contaminated by failing septic systems.

- Polluted surface water: Groundwater often carries the pollutants mentioned above into surface waters, where they can cause serious harm to aquatic ecosystems. Leaking septic tanks can also leak into surface waters through or over the soil. In addition, some septic tanks may directly discharge to surface waters.

- Risks to human health: Septic system malfunctions can endanger human health when they contaminate nearby wells,

drinking water supplies, and fishing and swimming areas.

Pollutants associated with onsite wastewater disposal may also be discharged directly to surface waters through direct pipe connections between the septic system and surface waters (straight pipe discharge). However, 327 IAC 5-1-1.5 specifically states that "point source discharge of sewage treated or untreated, from a dwelling or its associated residential sewage disposal system, to the waters of the state is prohibited".

3.3.4 Construction

Construction activities that involve excavation, grading or filling can result in significant erosion and, consequently, sedimentation in streams, if not properly controlled. Sedimentation from developing urban areas can be a major source of pollution due to the cumulative number of acres disturbed in a watershed. Construction of single family homes in rural areas can also be a source of sedimentation when homes are placed in or near stream corridors.

As a pollution source, construction activities are typically temporary, but the impacts on water quality can be severe and long-lasting. Construction activities tend to be concentrated in the more rapidly developing areas of the watershed.

3.3.5 Degraded Wetlands

Healthy wetlands and riparian areas perform valuable water quality-related functions by filtering water and trapping sediments and pollutants. The ability of wetland and riparian areas to remove NPS pollutants from surface water runoff is determined by plant species composition, geochemistry and hydrogeomorphic characteristics. Any changes to these characteristics can affect the filtering capacities of these areas. Activities such as channelization, which modify the hydrology of floodplain wetlands, can alter the ability of these areas to retain sediment when they are flooded and result in erosion and a net export of sediment from the wetland (Reinelt and Horner 1990).

Management measures have been developed for the control of NPS pollution through the protection and restoration of wetlands and riparian areas and the use of vegetated treatment systems. Information on degraded wetlands as potential contributors to nonpoint source pollution and the management measures for NPS pollution abatement is available in the USEPA Draft Guidance entitled "National Management Measures to Protect and Restore Wetlands and Riparian Areas for the Abatement of Nonpoint Source Pollution" (USEPA 2001).

Part I, Chapter 4: Water Quality and Use Support Ratings in the Lower East Fork White Watershed

This section provides a detailed overview of water quality monitoring, water quality, and use support ratings in the Lower East Fork White watershed and includes the following:

Section 4.1 Water Quality Monitoring Programs

Section 4.2 Summary of Ambient Monitoring Data for the Lower East Fork White Watershed

Section 4.3 Fish Consumption Advisories

Section 4.4 Clean Water Act Section 305(b) Report

Section 4.5 Clean Water Act Section 305(b) Assessment and Use-Support: Methodology

4.1 Water Quality Monitoring Programs

This section discusses water quality monitoring programs. Specifically, Section 4.1.1 describes IDEM's Office of Water Quality monitoring programs and Section 4.1.2 discusses other monitoring efforts in the watershed.

4.1.1 Office of Water Quality Programs

The Water Quality Assessment Branch of the Office of Water Quality is responsible for assessing the quality of water in Indiana's lakes, rivers and streams. This assessment is performed by field staff from the Survey Section and the Biological Studies Section. Virtually every element of IDEM's surface water quality management program of IDEM is directly or indirectly related to activities currently carried out by this Branch. The biological and surface water monitoring activities identify stream reaches, watersheds or segments where physical, chemical and/or biological quality has been or would be impaired by either point or nonpoint sources. This information is used to help allocate waste loads equitably among various sources in a way that would ensure that water quality standards are met along stream reaches in each of the nearly 100 stream segments in Indiana.

The purpose of the Surveys Section is to provide the water quality and hydrological data required for the assessment of Indiana's waters by conducting Watershed/Basin Surveys and Stream Reach Surveys. In 1996, the Section began a five-year comprehensive study (Basin Monitoring Strategy) of the State's ten major watersheds. Information from these studies is being integrated with data from biological and nonpoint source studies as well as the Fixed Station Monitoring Program to make a major assessment of the State's waters. Such surveys determine the extent to which water quality standards are being met and whether the fishable, swimmable and water supply uses are being maintained.

Information derived from this strategy will contribute significantly to improved planning processes throughout the Office of Water Quality. This plan should initiate the development of interrelated action plans, which encompass the wide range of responsibilities, such as rule-making, permitting, compliance, nonpoint source issues, and wastewater treatment facility oversight.

The Biological Studies Section conducts studies of fish and macroinvertebrate communities as well as stream habitats to establish biological conditions to which other streams may be compared in order to identify impaired streams or watersheds. The Biological Studies Section also conducts fish tissue and sediment sampling to pinpoint sources of toxic and bioconcentrating substances. Fish tissue data serve as the basis for fish consumption advisories, which are issued, through the Indiana State Department of Health, to protect the health of Indiana citizens. This Section also participates in the development of site-specific water quality standards.

The Biological Studies Section relies on the Volunteer Water Quality Monitoring Programs to provide additional data on lakes and wetlands that may not be sampling sites in the Monitoring Strategy. Volunteer-collected data provides IDEM scientists with an overall view of water quality trends and early warning of problems that may be occurring in a lake or wetland. If volunteers

detect that a lake or wetland is severely degraded, professional IDEM scientists will conduct follow-up investigation.

4.1.2 Local Volunteer Monitoring Programs

There are numerous local volunteer monitoring programs actively working throughout the Lower East Fork White watershed. Almost all of these volunteer monitoring programs are conducted through schools and county Soil and Water Conservation Districts. The individual volunteer monitoring programs in the watershed receive support and guidance from Indiana WaterWatchers, IDNR's Hoosier Riverwatch, and various other groups. The main focus of the various watershed volunteer monitoring programs is education.

The following two volunteer monitoring programs are involved in conservation and/or education activities in the Lower East Fork White watershed:

Group Name: Indiana Volunteer Lake Monitoring Program
Contact: William W. Jones
Contact Address: School of Public and Environmental Affairs Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405-2100
Contact Phone: 812 855-4556
Contact Email: joneswi@indiana.edu
Activity: Volunteer Monitoring
Description: The Indiana Volunteer Lake Monitoring Program was established by the Indiana Department of Environmental Management to help protect and manage the state's lakes. Nearly three-quarters of Indiana's 520 lakes of 50 or more acres suffer from deteriorating water quality. We train volunteers statewide to monitor Secchi transparencey. Each volunteer measures clarity from a boat at least biweekly from May to September.

Group Name: Lake Monroe-Salt Creek Alliance
Contact: Kim Shannon
Contact Address: 1508 Elliott Ave
Jeffersonville, INDIANA 47130
Contact Phone: 812-285-9722
Contact Email: kjs@aye.net
Activity: Watershed Alliance/Council

4.2 Summary of Ambient Monitoring Data for the Lower East Fork White Watershed

The fixed station-monitoring program managed by IDEM's Office of Water Quality has been monitoring surface water chemistry throughout the state since 1957. The data set from 1986 to 1995 was analyzed using the Seasonal Kendall test. This test deduces if a statistical change in the surface water chemistry occurred over a certain time period. The results of the Seasonal Kendall analysis for stations located in the Lower East Fork White watershed are provided in Table 4-1. The data collected from 1991 to 1997 from this monitoring program were also analyzed to determine benchmark characteristics. The results of the benchmark characteristic analysis for stations located in the Lower East Fork White watershed are provided in Appendix A. For a more in-depth discussion of this analysis, please refer to the 1997 Indiana Fixed Station Statistical Analysis (IDEM 1998b).

4.3 Fish Consumption Advisories

Since 1972, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, the IDEM, and the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH) have worked together to create the Indiana Fish Consumption Advisory (ISDH, IDNR, and IDEM 2001). Each year members from these three agencies meet to discuss the findings of recent fish monitoring data and to develop the new statewide fish consumption advisory.

The 2001 advisory is based on levels of PCBs and mercury found in fish tissue. Fish are tested regularly only in areas where there is suspected contamination. In each area, samples were taken of bottom-feeding fish, top-feeding fish, and fish feeding in between. Over 1,600 fish tissue samples collected throughout the state were analyzed for PCBs, pesticides, and heavy metals. Of those samples, the majority contained at least some mercury. However, not all fish tissue samples had mercury at levels considered harmful to human health. If they did, they are listed in Table 4-3. Because of past, widespread agricultural and industrial use of these materials, their great stability and persistence in the environment, and the potential for bioaccumulation, it

is not surprising that concentrations exceeding safe levels have been found in some species. Criteria for placing fish on the Indiana Fish Consumption Advisory are developed from the Great Lakes Task Force risk-based approach.

Table 4-2 shows the ISDH definitions for each Advisory Group.

Table 4-3 shows the waterbodies in the Lower East Fork White Watershed that are under the 2001 fish consumption advisory.

4.4 Clean Water Act Section 305(b) Report

Section 305(b) of the Clean Water Act requires states to prepare and submit to the EPA a water quality assessment report of state water resources. A new surface water monitoring strategy for the Office of Water Quality was implemented in 1996 with the goal of monitoring all waters of the state by 2001 and reporting the assessments by 2003. Each year approximately 20 percent of the waterbodies in the state will be assessed and reported the following year. To date, one five-year monitoring cycle to survey the surface water quality of the State has been completed. The second survey cycle was begun in 2001. Appendix B contains the listing of the Lower East Fork White watershed waterbodies assessed, status of designated use support, probable causes of impairment, and stream miles affected (IDEM 1998a). The methodologies of the Clean Water Act Section 305(b) assessment and use support ratings are discussed in Section 4.5.

4.5 Clean Water Act Section 305(b) Assessment and Use-Support: Methodology

The Office of Water Quality determines use support status for each stream and waterbody in accordance with the assessment guidelines provided by EPA (USEPA 1997). Results from four monitoring programs are integrated to provide an assessment for each stream and waterbody:

- Physical/chemical water column results,

- Benthic aquatic macroinvertebrate community assessments,

- Fish tissue and surficial aquatic sediment contaminant results, and

- *E. coli* monitoring results.

The assessment process was applied to each data sampling program. The individual assessments were integrated into an overall assessment for each waterbody by use designation: aquatic life support, fish consumption, and recreational use. River miles in a watershed appear as one waterbody while each lake in a watershed is reported as a separate waterbody.

Physical/chemical data for toxicants (total recoverable metals), conventional water chemistry parameters (dissolved oxygen, pH, and temperature), and bacteria (*E. coli*) were evaluated for exceedance of the Indiana Water Quality Standards (327 IAC 2-1-6). U.S. EPA 305(b) Guidelines were applied to sample results as indicated in Table 4-4 (U.S. EPA 1997).

Part I, Chapter 5: State and Federal Water Programs

This Chapter summarizes the existing point and nonpoint source pollution control programs available for addressing water quality problems in the Lower East Fork White watershed. Chapter 5 includes:

Section 5.1 Indiana Department of Environmental Management Water Quality Programs

Section 5.2 Indiana Department of Natural Resources Water Programs

Section 5.3 USDA/Natural Resources Conservation Service Water Programs

5.1 Indiana Department of Environmental Management Water Quality Programs

This Section describes the water quality programs managed by the Office of Water Quality within IDEM and includes:

Section 5.1.1 State and Federal Legislative Authorities for Indiana's Water Quality Program

Section 5.1.2 Indiana's Point Source Control Program

Section 5.1.3 Indiana's Nonpoint Source Control Programs

Section 5.1.4 Integrating Point and Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Strategies

Section 5.1.5 Potential Sources of Funding for Water Quality Projects

5.1.1 State and Federal Legislative Authorities for Indiana's Water Quality Program

Authorities for some of the programs and responsibilities carried out by the Office of Water Quality are derived from a number of federal and state legislative mandates outlined below. The major federal authorities for the state's water quality program are found in sections of the Clean Water Act. State authorities are from state statutes.

Federal Authorities for Indiana's Water Quality Program:

- The Clean Water Act Section 301 - Prohibits the discharge of pollutants into surface waters unless permitted by EPA.
- The Clean Water Act Section 303(c) - States are responsible for reviewing, establishing and revising water quality standards for all surface waters.
- The Clean Water Act Section 303(d) - Each state shall identify waters within its boundaries for which the effluent limits required by 301(b)(1)(A) and (B) are not stringent enough to protect any water quality standards applicable to such waters. Requires states to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads that set the maximum amount of pollution that a water body can receive without violating water quality standards.
- The Clean Water Act Section 305(b) - Each state is required to submit a biennial report to the EPA describing the status of surface waters in that state.
- The Clean Water Act Section 319 - Each state is required to develop and implement a nonpoint source pollution management program.

- The Clean Water Act Section 402 - Establishes the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program. Allows for delegation of permitting authority to qualifying states (which Indiana has received).

- The Clean Water Act Section 404/401 - Section 404 regulates the discharge of dredge and fill materials into navigable waters and adjoining wetlands. Section 401 requires the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to receive a state Water Quality Certification prior to issuance a 404 permit.

State Authority for Indiana's Water Quality Program:

IC 13-13-5 Designation of Department for Purposes of Federal Law: Designates the Indiana Department of Environmental Management as the water pollution agency for Indiana for all purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) effective January 1, 1988, and the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f through 300j) effective January 1, 1988. The state rulemaking authority for water is the Water Pollution Control Board. The board holds monthly meetings that are open to the public. Information on agendas, draft rules, and meeting notices can be obtained by contacting IDEM (see Appendix C).

5.1.2 Indiana's Point Source Control Program

The State of Indiana's efforts to control the direct discharge of pollutants to waters of the State were inaugurated by the passage of the Stream Pollution Control Law of 1943. The vehicle currently used to control direct discharges to waters of the State is the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (also referred to as the Clean Water Act). The State of Indiana was granted primacy from U.S. EPA to issue NPDES permits on January 1, 1975 through a Memorandum of Agreement. These permits place limits on the amount of pollutants that may be discharged to waters of the State by each discharger. Limits are set at levels protective of both the aquatic life in the waters which receive the discharge and human health.

U.S. EPA, Region V, has oversight authority for Indiana's NPDES permits program. Under terms of the Memorandum of Agreement, Region V has the right to comment on all draft Major discharger permits. In addition to NPDES, the Office of Water Quality Permits Section has a pretreatment group which regulates municipalities in their development of municipal pretreatment programs and indirect discharges, or those discharges of process wastewater to municipal sewage treatment plants through Industrial Waste Pretreatment permits, and regulates Stormwater, Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO), and variance requests through a special projects group currently known as the Urban Wet Weather Group. Land Application of waste treatment plant sludge is no longer a part of the Office of Water Quality but is now a part of the Office of Land Quality (formerly Office of Solid and Hazardous Waste).

The purpose of the NPDES permit is to control the point source discharge of pollutants into the waters of the State such that the quality of the water of the State is maintained in accordance with the standards contained in 327 IAC 2. The NPDES permit requirements must ensure that the minimum amount of control is imposed upon any new or existing point source through the application of technology-based treatment requirements contained in 327 IAC 5-5-2. According to 327 IAC 5-2-2, "any discharge of pollutants into waters of the State as a point source discharge, except for exclusions made in 327 IAC 5-2-4, is prohibited unless in conformity with a valid NPDES permit obtained prior to discharge." This is the most basic principal of the NPDES permit program.

There are several different types of permits that are issued in the NPDES permitting program. Table 5-1 lists and describes the various permits. The majority of NPDES permits have existed since 1974. This means that most of the permit writing is for permit renewals. Approximately 10 percent of each year's workload is attributed to new permits, modifications and requests for estimated limits. NPDES permits are designed to be re-issued every five years but are administratively extended in full force and effect indefinitely if the permittee applies for a renewal before the current permit expires.

The federal Clean Water Act Section 104(b)(3) is the authority for NPDES-related State Program Grants. The Section 104(b)(3) program provides for developing, implementing and demonstrating new concepts or requirements that will improve the effectiveness of the NPDES permit program. A project proposed for assistance by this program should deal predominantly with water pollution sources and activities regulated by the NPDES program and produce a strong, beneficial value for the statewide NPDES permit program. Organizations eligible for Section 104(b)(3) funding include State water pollution control agencies, interstate agencies, Tribes, colleges and universities, and other public or nonprofit organizations. For-profit entities, private associations and individuals are not eligible to receive this assistance. The Section 104(b)(3) grant program is administered by the Watershed Management Section within the Planning Branch of the IDEM Office of Water Quality.

5.1.3 Nonpoint Source Control Programs

Nonpoint source (NPS) pollution is so named because the pollutants do not originate at single point sources, such as industrial and municipal waste discharge pipes. Instead, NPS pollutants are carried over fields, lawns, and streets by rainwater, wind, or snowmelt. This runoff may carry with it such things as fertilizer, road salt, sediment, motor oil, or pesticides. These pollutants either enter lakes and streams or seep into groundwater. While some NPS pollution is naturally occurring, most of it is a result of human activities.

Reducing NPS pollution requires careful attention to land use management and local geographic and economic conditions. The state's NPS Program, administered by the IDEM Office of Water Quality's Watershed Management Section, focuses on the assessment and prevention of NPS water pollution. The program also provides for education and outreach in order to improve the way land is managed. Through the use of federal funding for the installation of best management practices (BMPs), the development of watershed management plans, and the implementation of watershed restoration pollution prevention activities, the NPS Program reaches out to citizens so that land is managed in such a way that less pollution is generated.

While a number of agencies and organizations currently have their own programs for addressing specific NPS issues, overall NPS coordination is being aided through the consolidated NPS Management Plan that was developed in the early stages of the Program's formation. The NPS Management Plan was prepared in 1989, partially based on findings from the NPS Assessment Report, which was also completed that year. The NPS Management Plan was updated and received EPA approval in 1999. Some of the objectives of the Management Plan include the education of land users and the reduction and remediation of NPS pollution caused by erosion and sedimentation of forested and agricultural lands and urban runoff. Other objectives address pesticide and fertilizer use, land application of sludge, animal waste practices, past and present mining practices, on-site sewage disposal, and atmospheric deposition.

The many nonpoint source projects funded through the Office of Water Quality are a combination of local, regional, and statewide efforts sponsored by various public and not-for-profit organizations. The emphasis of these projects has been on the local, voluntary implementation of NPS water pollution controls. Since the inception of the program in the late 1980s, it has utilized approximately $23 million of federal funds for the development of over 299 projects.

The federal Clean Water Act contains nonpoint source provisions in several sections of the Act including the Section 319 Nonpoint Source Program, the Section 314 Clean Lakes Program (no longer funded), and the Section 205(j) Water Quality Planning Program. The Section 319 program provides for various voluntary projects throughout the state to prevent water pollution and also provides for assessment and management plans related to water bodies in Indiana impacted by NPS pollution. Section 314 has assessment provisions that assist in determining the nonpoint and point source water quality impacts on lakes and provides recommendations for improvements, but it is currently not funded by Congress. Section 205(j) provides for planning activities relating to the improvement of water quality from nonpoint and point sources by making funding available to municipal and county governments, regional planning commissions, and other public organizations. For-profit entities, non-profit organizations, private associations, and individuals are not eligible for funding through Section 205(j).

The Watershed Management Section within the Planning Branch of the Office of Water Quality provides for the administration of the Section 319 funding source for the NPS-related projects, as well as Section 205(j) grants. Clean Water Act Section 319(h) grant monies are made available to the states on an annual basis by EPA. Agencies and organizations in the state that deal with NPS problems submit proposals to the Office of Water Quality each year for use of these funds in various projects.

One of the most important aspects of all NPS pollution prevention programs is the emphasis on the watershed approach to these programs. This calls for users in the watershed to become involved in the planning and implementation of practices which are designed to prevent pollution. By looking at the watershed as a whole, all situations causing the degradation of water quality will be addressed, not just a few. Appendix C lists the conservation partners and local stakeholders located in the Lower East Fork White watershed.

5.1.4 Integrating Point and Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Strategies

Two key long-term objectives of watershed management are integrating point and nonpoint source pollution controls and determining the amount and location of the remaining assimilative capacity in a watershed. The information is used for a number of purposes, including: determining if and where new or expanded municipal or industrial wastewater treatment facilities can be allowed; setting the recommended treatment level at these facilities; and identifying where point and nonpoint source pollution controls must be implemented to restore capacity and maintain water quality standards.

Total Maximum Daily Loads

The Clean Water Act mandates an integrated point and nonpoint source pollution control approach. This approach, called a total maximum daily load (TMDL), uses the concept of determining the total pollutant loading from point and nonpoint sources that a waterbody can assimilate while still maintaining its designated use (maintaining water quality standards). The U.S. EPA is responsible for ensuring that TMDLs are completed by States and for approving the completed TMDLs.

Under the TMDL approach, waterbodies that do not meet water quality standards are identified. States establish priorities for action, and then determine reductions in pollutant loads or other actions needed to meet water quality goals. The approach is flexible and promotes a watershed approach driven by local needs and directed by the State's list of priority waterbodies. The overall goal in developing the TMDL is to establish the management actions on point and nonpoint sources of pollution necessary for a waterbody to meet water quality standards.

The IDEM Office of Water Quality has reorganized its work activities around a five-year rotating basin schedule. The waters of the state have been grouped geographically into major river basins, and water quality data and other information will be collected and analyzed from each basin, or group of basins, once every five years. The schedule for implementing the TMDL Strategy is proposed to follow this rotating basin plan to the extent possible. Supplemental data collection (i.e. collection during a year other than the one prescribed in the Surface Water Quality Monitoring Strategy) may also be required to complete the TMDL process. The TMDL Strategy discusses activities to be accomplished in three phases. Phase One involves planning, sampling and data collection and will take place the first year. Phase Two involves TMDL development and will occur in the second year, and Phase Three is the TMDL implementation and will occur the third year. It is expected that some phases, especially implementation of TMDLs (Phase Three) in the basin(s), may take more than one year to fully accomplish.

In Phase Three, the TMDL scenario chosen in conjunction with watershed stakeholders during Phase Two will be used to develop a plan to implement the TMDL. During this process, stakeholder participation will be essential. The Basin Coordinator, in conjunction with the stakeholder groups, will develop a plan to implement the TMDL. Once the draft plan has been finalized through comments from stakeholder groups and IDEM, the plan becomes 'draft-final' and open to public review. Public meetings will be held in affected areas to solicit comments.

5.1.5 Potential Sources of Funding for Water Quality Projects

There are numerous sources of funding for all types of water quality projects. The sources of funding include federal and state agencies, nonprofits, and private funding. Funds may be loans, cost share projects, or grants. Section 319(h) grants and other funding sources are discussed below.

If a local government, environmental group, university researcher, or other individual or agency wants to find funding to address a local water quality problem, it is well worth the time to prepare a thorough but concise proposal and submit it to applicable funding agencies. Even if a project is not funded, follow-up should be done to determine what changes may be needed in order to make the application more competitive.

Section 319(h) Grants

EPA offers Clean Water Act Section 319(h) grant moneys to the state on an annual basis. These grants must be used to fund projects that address nonpoint source pollution issues. Some projects which the Office of Water Quality has funded with this money in the past include best management practice (BMP) demonstrations, watershed water quality improvements, data management, educational programs, modeling, stream restoration, and riparian buffer establishment. Projects are usually two to three years in length. Section 319(h) grants are intended to be used for project start-up, not as a continuous funding source. Units of government, nonprofit groups, and universities in the state that have expertise in nonpoint source pollution problems are invited to submit Section 319(h) proposals to the Office of Water Quality

Office of Water Quality staff review proposals for minimum 319(h) eligibility criteria such as:

- Does it support the state NPS Management Program objectives?
- Does the project address targeted, high priority watersheds?
- Are there sufficient non-federal cost-share matching funds available (25% of project costs, either cash or in-kind services)?

- Are measurable outputs identified?
- Is monitoring required? Is there a Quality Assurance/Quality Control plan for monitoring?
- If a Geographical Information System/Global Positioning System is used, is it compatible with that of the state?
- Is there a commitment for educational activities and a final report?
- Are upstream sources of NPS pollution addressed?
- Are local stakeholders involved in the project?

Office of Water Quality staff separately review and rank each proposal which meets the minimum 319(h) eligibility criteria. In their review, members consider such factors as: technical soundness; likelihood of achieving water quality results; degree of balance lent to the statewide NPS Program in terms of project type; and competence/reliability of contracting agency. They then convene to discuss individual project merits, to pool all rankings and to arrive at final rankings for the projects. Comments are also sought from outside experts in other governmental agencies, nonprofit groups, and universities. The Office of Water Quality seeks a balance between geographic regions of the state and types of projects. All proposals that rank above the funding target are included in the annual grant application to EPA, with EPA reserving the right to make final changes to the list. Actual funding depends on approval from EPA and yearly congressional appropriations.

To obtain more information about applying for a Section 319(h) grant, contact:

IDEM Office of Water Quality
Watershed Management Section
100 N. Senate Avenue
P.O. Box 6015
Indianapolis, IN 46206-6015
(317) 233-8803

Other Sources of Funding

Besides Section 319(h) funding, there are numerous sources of funding for all types of water quality projects. The sources of funding include federal and state agencies, nonprofit, and private funding. Funds may be loans, cost shares, or grants. Appendix D provides a summary list of agencies and funding opportunities.

5.2 Indiana Department of Natural Resources Water Programs

5.2.1 Division of Soil Conservation

The Division of Soil Conservation's mission is to ensure the protection, wise use, and enhancement of Indiana's soil and water resources. The Division's employees are part of Indiana's Conservation Partnership, which includes the 92 soil and water conservation districts (SWCDs), the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, and the Purdue University Cooperative Extension Service. Working together, the partnership provides technical, educational, and financial assistance to citizens to solve erosion and sediment-related problems occurring on the land or impacting public waters.

The Division administers the Clean Water Indiana soil conservation and water quality protection program under guidelines established by the State Soil Conservation Board, primarily through the local SWCDs in direct service to landusers. The Division staff includes field-based resource specialists who work closely with landusers, assisting in the selection, design, and installation of practices to reduce soil erosion on agricultural land. The Stormwater and Sediment Control Program works primarily with developers, contractors, realtors, property holders and others to address erosion and sediment concerns on non-agricultural lands, especially those undergoing development.

The Lake and River Enhancement (LARE) program utilizes a watershed approach to reduce non-point source sediment and nutrient pollution of Indiana's and adjacent states' surface waters to a level that meets or surpasses state water quality standards.

To accomplish this goal, LARE provides technical and financial assistance to local entities for qualifying projects that improve and maintain water quality in public access lakes, rivers, and streams.

Hoosier Riverwatch is a water quality monitoring initiative which aims to increase public awareness of water quality issues and concerns through hands-on training of volunteers in stream monitoring and cleanup activities. Hoosier Riverwatch collaborates with agencies and volunteers to educate local communities about the relationship between land use and water quality and to provide water quality information to citizens and governmental agencies working to protect Indiana's rivers and streams.

5.2.2 Division of Water

The IDNR Division of Water (DOW) is charged by the State of Indiana to maintain, regulate, collect data on, and evaluate Indiana's surface and ground water resources.

The Engineering Branch of the DOW includes Dam and Levee Safety, Project Development, Surveying, Drafting, and Computer Services. The Dam and Levee Safety Section performs geotechnical and hydraulic evaluation on existing and proposed dams and levees throughout the State. The Project Development Section provides technical support to locally funded water resource projects along with engineering leadership and construction management to State-funded water resource projects. The remaining sections provide support services to all Sections within the DOW such as reservoir depth mapping, topographic mapping, highwater marks, design of publications and brochures, and computer procurement and maintenance.

The Planning Branch of the DOW consists of Basin Studies, Coastal Coordination, Floodplain Management, Ground Water, Hydrology and Hydraulics, and Water Rights. Basin Studies are comprehensive reports on surface- and ground-water availability and use. Coastal Coordination is a communication vehicle to address Lake Michigan's diverse shoreline issues. Floodplain Management involves various floodplain management aspects including coordination with the National Flood Insurance Program and with State and Federal Emergency Management agencies during major flooding events. The Ground Water Section maintains the water-well record computer database and publishes reports and maps on the groundwater resource for the State. The Hydrology and Hydraulics Section develops and reviews floodplain mapping and performs hydrologic studies and modeling. The Water Rights Section investigates and mediates groundwater/surface water rights issues, licenses water-well drillers, and develops well construction and abandonment procedures.

The Regulations Branch of DOW is made up of Stream Permits, Lake Permits, Permit Administration, Public Assistance, and Legal Counsel. The Stream Permits Section is responsible for reviewing permit applications for construction activity in the 100 year regulatory floodway along Indiana's waterways. The Lake Permits Section reviews construction projects at or below the legal lake level for all of Indiana's public freshwater lakes. Permit Administration Section provides administrative support to Branch staff, maintains the application database, and coordinates the application review process with other Divisions. The Public Assistance Section provides technical assistance on possible permit applications on proposed construction projects, investigates and mediates unpermitted construction activities and in some cases, with the support of Legal Counsel, pursues legal action for violation of State laws.

5.3 USDA/Natural Resources Conservation Service Water Quality Programs

While there are a variety of USDA programs available to assist people with their conservation needs, the following assistance programs are the principal programs available.

Conservation of Private Grazing Land Initiative (CPGL)

The Conservation of Private Grazing Land initiative will ensure that technical, educational, and related assistance is provided to those who own private grazing lands. It is not a cost-share program. This technical assistance will offer opportunities for: better grazing land management; protecting soil from erosive wind and water; using more energy efficient ways to produce food and fiber; conserving water; providing habitat for wildlife; sustaining forage and grazing plants; using plants to sequester greenhouse gases and increase soil organic matter; and using grazing lands as a source of biomass energy and raw materials for industrial products.

Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)

NRCS provides technical assistance to landowners interested in participating in the Conservation Reserve Program administered

by the USDA Farm Service Agency. The Conservation Reserve Program reduces soil erosion, protects the Nation's ability to produce food and fiber, reduces sedimentation in streams and lakes, improves water quality, establishes wildlife habitat, and enhances forest and wetland resources. It encourages farmers to convert highly erodible cropland or other environmentally sensitive acreage to vegetative cover, such as tame or native grasses, wildlife plantings, trees, filterstrips, or riparian buffers. Farmers receive an annual rental payment for the term of the multi-year contract. Cost-share funding is provided to establish the vegetative cover practices.

Conservation Technical Assistance (CTA)

The purpose of the CTA program is to assist landusers, communities, units of state and local government, and other Federal agencies in planning and implementing conservation systems. The purpose of the conservation systems is to reduce erosion, improve soil and water quality, improve and conserve wetlands, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, improve air quality, improve pasture and range condition, reduce upstream flooding, and improve woodlands.

One objective of the program is to assist individual landusers, communities, conservation districts, and other units of State and local government and Federal agencies to meet their goals for resource stewardship and assist individuals in complying with State and local requirements. NRCS assistance to individuals is provided through conservation districts in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Governor of the State, and the conservation district. Assistance is provided to landusers voluntarily applying conservation practices and to those who must comply with local or State laws and regulations.

Another objective is to provide assistance to agricultural producers to comply with the highly erodible land (HEL) and wetland (Swampbuster) provisions of the 1985 Food Security Act as amended by the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 3801 et. seq.), the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, and wetlands requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. NRCS makes HEL and wetland determinations and helps landusers develop and implement conservation plans to comply with the law. The program also provides technical assistance to participants in USDA cost-share and conservation incentive programs.

NRCS collects, analyzes, interprets, displays, and disseminates information about the condition and trends of the Nation's soil and other natural resources so that people can make good decisions about resource use and about public policies for resource conservation. They also develop effective science-based technologies for natural resource assessment, management, and conservation.

Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)

The Environmental Quality Incentives Program provides technical, educational, and financial assistance to eligible farmers and ranchers to address soil, water, and related natural resource concerns on their lands in an environmentally beneficial and cost-effective manner. The program provides assistance to farmers and ranchers in complying with Federal, State, and tribal environmental laws, and encourages environmental enhancement. The program is funded through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The purposes of the program are achieved through the implementation of a conservation plan, which includes structural, vegetative, and land management practices on eligible land. Five to ten year contracts are made with eligible producers. Cost-share payments may be made to implement one or more eligible structural or vegetative practices, such as animal waste management facilities, terraces, filter strips, tree planting, and permanent wildlife habitat. Incentive payments can be made to implement one or more land management practices, such as nutrient management, pest management, and grazing land management.

Fifty percent of the funding available for the program is targeted at natural resource concerns relating to livestock production. The program is carried out primarily in priority areas that may be watersheds, regions, or multi-state areas, and for significant statewide natural resource concerns that are outside of geographic priority areas.

Small Watershed Program and Flood Prevention Program (WF 08 or FP 03)

The Small Watershed Program works through local government sponsors and helps participants solve natural resource and related economic problems on a watershed basis. Projects include watershed protection, flood prevention, erosion and sediment control, water supply, water quality, fish and wildlife habitat enhancement, wetlands creation and restoration, and public recreation in watersheds of 250,000 or fewer acres. Both technical and financial assistance are available.

Watershed Surveys and Planning

The Watershed and Flood Prevention Act, P.L. 83-566, August 4, 1954, (16 U.S.C. 1001-1008) authorized this program. Prior to fiscal year 1996, small watershed planning activities and the cooperative river basin surveys and investigations authorized by Section 6 of the Act were operated as separate programs. The 1996 appropriations act combined the activities into a single program entitled the Watershed Surveys and Planning program. Activities under both programs are continuing under this authority.

The purpose of the program is to assist Federal, State, and local agencies and tribal governments to protect watersheds from damage caused by erosion, floodwater, and sediment and to conserve and develop water and land resources. Resource concerns addressed by the program include water quality, opportunities for water conservation, wetland and water storage capacity, agricultural drought problems, rural development, municipal and industrial water needs, upstream flood damages, and water needs for fish, wildlife, and forest-based industries.

Types of surveys and plans include watershed plans, river basin surveys and studies, flood hazard analyses, and floodplain management assistance. The focus of these plans is to identify solutions that use land treatment and non-structural measures to solve resource problems.

Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP)

The Wetlands Reserve Program is a voluntary program to restore wetlands. Participating landowners can establish conservation easements of either permanent or 30 year duration, or can enter into restoration cost-share agreements where no easement is involved. In exchange for establishing a permanent easement, the landowner receives payment up to the agricultural value of the land and 100 percent of the restoration costs for restoring the wetlands. The 30 year easement payment is 75 percent of what would be provided for a permanent easement on the same site and 75 percent of the restoration cost. The voluntary agreements are for a minimum 10 year duration and provide for 75 percent of the cost of restoring the involved wetlands. Easements and restoration cost-share agreements establish wetland protection and restoration as the primary land use for the duration of the easement or agreement. In all instances, landowners continue to control access to their land.

Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)

The Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program provides financial incentives to develop habitat for fish and wildlife on private lands. Participants agree to implement a wildlife habitat development plan and USDA agrees to provide cost-share assistance for the initial implementation of wildlife habitat development practices. USDA and program participants enter into a cost-share agreement for wildlife habitat development. This agreement generally lasts a minimum of 10 years from the date that the contract is signed.

REFERENCES

Bunce, Nigel J. 1994. *Environmental Chemistry*. Second Edition. Wuerz Publishing Ltd., Winnipeg, Canada.

Davis, Mackenzie L. and David A. Cornwell. 1998. *Introduction to Environmental Engineering*. Third Edition. WCB/McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA.

Indiana Business Research Center (IBRC). 1999. *Indiana County Population Projections 1990-2020.* http://www.stats.indiana.edu/web/county/projections/99county_projections.html

IBRC. 1997. *Indiana Cities and Towns Population.* http://www.stats.indiana.edu/web/city/citytwnest99.html

Indiana Community Action Association (ICAA). 2000. *Combined Sewer Overflows.* http://www.incap.org/RCAPprojects.htm

Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM). 2001. *NPDES Permit Compliance System Facility, Outfall and Discharge Data.* Office of Water Quality. http://www.state.in.us/idem/owm/fasb/NPDESfacilitiesmap.html

IDEM. 1999a. *Confined Feeding Operations.* As presented on http://www.stat.in.us/idem/oshwm/confined.html

IDEM. 1999b. *Watershed Action Guide for Indiana*. Office of Water Quality, Watershed Management Section. http://www.in.gov/idem/water/planbr/wsm/watershed_action.html

IDEM. 1998. *Indiana's 1998 303(d) List of Impaired Waterbodies.* Office of Water Quality. http://www.IN.gov/idem/water/planbr/wqs/303d.html

IDEM. 1998a. Indiana 305(b) Report *in Indiana Water Quality Report 1998*. Office of Water Quality, Water Quality Standards Section. http://www.IN.gov/idem/water/planbr/wqs/quality.html

IDEM. 1998b. *Indiana Fixed Station Statistical Analysis 1997.* Office of Water Quality, Assessment Branch. *IDEM 32/02/005/1998*

Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR). 1999. *The Indiana Canoeing Guide.* Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Indianapolis, IN. http://www.state.in.us/dnr/outdoor/canoegui/index.htm

IDNR. 1980. *The Indiana Water Resource*. Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Indianapolis, IN.

Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH), IDNR, and IDEM. 2001. *Indiana Fish Consumption Advisory.* Indiana State Department of Health, Indiana Department of Natural Resources, and Indiana Department of Environmental Management. http://www.in.gov/isdh/dataandstats/fish/fish_2001/fish_cvr_2001.htm

Indiana State University (ISU). 2001. *Indiana GAP Analysis.* http://baby.indstate.edu/geo/rs/overgap.htm

Indiana Water Pollution Control Board. 1997. 327 IAC 2-1-11 Limited and exceptional use; designated waters. http://www.in.gov/legislative/iac/title327.html

Kormondy, Edward J. 1996. *Concepts of Ecology*. Fourth Edition. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.

Natural Resources Commission (NRC). 1997. *Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana.* As presented on http://www.ai.org/nrc/policy/outstand.htm Last update: October.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM). 2000. *Unified Watershed Assessment, 2000-2001.* NRCS, IDEM, and the Indiana W.A.T.E.R. Committee (Watershed Agency Team for Enhancing Resources). http://www.in.gov/idem/water/planbr/wsm/WatershedManagementInformation.html

Reinelt, L.E. and R.R. Horner. 1990. *Characterization of the Hydrology and Water Quality of Palustrine Wetlands Affected by Urban Stormwater.* Puget Sound Wetlands and Stormwater Management Research Program. King County Department of Natural Resources, King County, WA.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 1997. *1997 Census of Agriculture Profiles: Indiana State and County Profiles, Ranked*

Items and Other County Summary Data. http://www.nass.usda.gov/census/census97/profiles/in/inb.htm

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2002a. *Surf Your Watershed.* http://cfpub.epa.gov/surf/locate/hucperstate_search.cfm?statepostal=IN

USEPA. 2002b. *Envirofacts Warehouse: Hazardous Waste.* http://www.epa.gov/enviro/html/hazard.html#Superfund

USEPA. 2001. *National Management Measures to Protect and Restore Wetlands and Riparian Areas for the Abatement of Nonpoint Source Pollution.* Washington, DC: U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. *EPA 841-B-01-001*.

USEPA. 1999. *Level III Ecoregions of Indiana.* Washington, DC: U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory. Revised March 1999. http://www.hort.purdue.edu/newcrop/cropmap/indiana/maps/INeco3.html

USEPA. 1998. *Clean Water Action Plan: Restoring and Protecting America's Waters.* Washington, DC: U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds. *EPA 840-R-98-001*. http://www.cleanwater.gov/action/toc.html

USEPA. 1997. *Guidelines for Preparation of the State Water Quality Assessments (305[b] Reports) and Electronic Updates: Report Contents.* Washington, DC: U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. *EPA-841-B-97-002A*.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 2001. *Indiana Water Use Reports - 1995.* http://water.usgs.gov/watuse/spread95.html

USGS and EPA. Undated. *Ecoregions Map of Indiana and Ohio.* USGS, P.O. Box 25286, Denver, Colorado 80225. ISBN 0-607-90528-x.

Part I Tables

TABLE 0-1: WATERS OF THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE ON INDIANA'S 1998 303(D) LIST

ID	Waterbody	Parameter of Concern	Priority for TMDL development
IN-0166BIOTA-1998	CLEAR CREEK	IMPAIRED BIOTIC COMMUNITIES	2012-2014
IN-0166ECOLI-1998	CLEAR CREEK	E. COLI	2002-2004
IN-0166FCPCB-1998	CLEAR CREEK	FCA - PCBS	2012-2014
IN-0167FCMRC-1998	DOGWOOD LAKE	FCA - MERCURY	2012-2014
IN-0168BIOTA-1998	EAST FORK JACKSON CREEK	IMPAIRED BIOTIC COMMUNITIES	2007-2009
IN-0169FCMRC-1998	EAST FORK WHITE RIVER	FCA - MERCURY	2012-2014
IN-0169FCPCB-1998	EAST FORK WHITE RIVER	FCA - PCBS	2012-2014
IN-0170FCPCB-1998	EAST FORK WHITE RIVER	FCA - PCBS	2012-2014
IN-0173BIOTA-1998	JACKSON CREEK	IMPAIRED BIOTIC COMMUNITIES	2007-2009
IN-0176FCMRC-1998	MONROE RESERVOIR	FCA - MERCURY	2012-2014
IN-0179FCPCB-1998	PLEASANT RUN	FCA - PCBS	2012-2014
IN-0180FCMRC-1998	SALT CREEK	FCA - MERCURY	2012-2014
IN-0180FCPCB-1998	SALT CREEK	FCA - PCBS	2012-2014
IN-0185BIOTA-1998	WEST FORK CLEAR CREEK	IMPAIRED BIOTIC COMMUNITIES	2007-2009
IN-0186FCMRC-1998	YELLOWWOOD LAKE	FCA - MERCURY	2012-2014

FCA - Fish Consumption Advisory
PCB - Polychlorinated Biphenyls
Hg - Mercury

***Only waters for which fish tissue data support issuance of fish consumption advisories are individually cited above. The Indiana Department of Health has issued a general fish consumption advisory for all other waters of the state. This advisory was based on extrapolation of the fish tissue data that were available and generally recommends that if no site-specific advisory is in place for a waterbody, the public should eat no more than one meal (8 oz.) per week of fish caught in these waters. Women of child bearing age, women who are breast feeding, and children up to 15 years of age should eat no more than one meal per month. The basis for this general advisory is widespread occurrence of mercury or PCBs (or both) in most fish sampled throughout the state. Please refer to the most recent Fish Consumption Advisory booklet available through the Indiana Department of Health (317/233-7808). Sources of the mercury and PCBs are unknown for the most part, but it is suspected that they result from air deposition.

TABLE 2-1: LOWER EAST FORK WHITE COUNTY POPULATION PROJECTIONS 1990-2020

County	1990	2000	2010	2020	Percent Change (1990 to 2020)
Bartholomew	63657	71435	74132	76070	19
Brown	14080	14957	17825	18627	32
Daviess	27533	29820	31128	31946	16
Dubois	36616	39674	41674	42584	16
Greene	30410	33157	35743	36702	20
Jackson	37730	41335	45256	46826	24
Johnson	88109	115209	128610	136408	54
Lawrence	42836	45922	49035	50289	17
Martin	10369	10369	10497	10493	1
Monroe	108978	120563	126161	129574	18
Orange	18409	19306	21132	21761	18
Pike	12509	12837	14233	14763	18
Washington	23717	27223	31490	33050	39

(from IBRC 1999)

TABLE 2-2: LOWER EAST FORK WHITE CITY AND TOWN POPULATION ESTIMATES

City/Town	Census 1990	Estimate 1996	Percent Change (1990 to 1996)
Alfordsville	74	85	14
Bedford	14153	14982	5
Bloomington	63504	66743	5
Campbellsburg	630	743	17
French Lick	2122	2111	0
Livonia	189	227	20
Loogootee	3060	2797	-8
Millersburg	882	1038	17
Mitchell	4723	5207	10
Mount Carmel	116	126	8
Nashville	966	1063	10
Oolitic	1411	1446	2
Orleans	2113	2310	9
Paoli	3729	3646	-2
Saltillo	100	124	24
Shoals	853	891	4
West Baden Springs	675	681	0

(from IBRC 1997)

TABLE 2-3: LIVESTOCK IN THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE WATERSHED

	1997 Livestock Inventory							
	Hogs and pigs		Cattle and calves		Layers 20 weeks and older		All turkeys	
County	Number	State Rank*	Number	State Rank*	Number	State Rank*	Number	State Rank*
Bartholomew	24052	56	6736	58	204	74	@	@
Brown	203	92	2087	87	234	70	@	@
Daviess	154715	3	20298	11	1061	35	941225	2
Dubois	@	@	@	@	2841959	1	1687356	1
Greene	96385	12	21561	10	671	45	457100	3
Jackson	34410	39	@	@	(D)	2	(D)	14
Johnson	14037	67	8884	45	218	72	@	@
Lawrence	4218	80	27336	4	318	64	@	@
Martin	24716	53	8017	50	(D)	14	274000	4
Monroe	279	91	10717	34	@	@	@	@
Orange	16330	63	@	@	(D)	19	(D)	12
Pike	5986	77	3509	80	@	@	131008	8
Washington	17299	62	30138	3	69439	24	273000	5

* State Rank is out of a total of 92 counties in Indiana
@ - indicates species is not in the top 4 for this county
D - Numbers not disclosed by USDA-NASS
(from USDA 1997)

TABLE 2-4: CROPS PRODUCED IN THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE WATERSHED

	1997 Crops							
	Corn for grain		Soybeans for beans		Wheat		Hay crops	
County	Acres	State Rank*	Acres	State Rank*	Acres	State Rank*	Acres	State Rank*
Bartholomew	67794	39	58378	41	7670	19	5271	52
Brown	1840	91	1022	91	@	@	3221	78
Daviess	89873	18	54040	47	11650	7	10897	19
Dubois	59549	51	38911	63	9845	10	16215	7
Greene	51262	59	44818	58	3272	63	21797	6
Jackson	59118	53	64134	38	7351	20	9121	29
Johnson	59275	52	46312	55	4516	43	5225	53
Lawrence	18610	79	20293	79	2538	72	24104	2
Martin	16105	81	12623	83	2165	77	6838	34
Monroe	6047	87	5228	87	439	89	11487	14
Orange	22017	76	17977	82	3719	61	12170	10
Pike	29996	74	27609	72	4942	39	2857	81
Washington	34083	68	30036	69	4097	52	21895	5

* State Rank is out of a total of 92 counties in Indiana
@ - indicates species is not in the top 4 for this county
D - Numbers not disclosed by USDA-NASS
(from USDA 1997)

TABLE 2-5: OUTSTANDING RIVERS LIST FOR INDIANA

In 1993, the Natural Resources Commission adopted its "Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana." The listing was published in the Indiana Register on March 1 of that year as Information Bulletin #4 in Volume 16, Number 6, page 1677 through 1680 (sometimes cited as 16 IR 1677). The listing has also been specifically incorporated by reference into statutes and rules. Notably, the listing is referenced in the standards for utility line crossings within floodways, formerly governed by IC 14-28-2 and now controlled by 310 IAC 6-1-16 through 310 IAC 6-1-18. See, also, the general permit for logjam removals, implemented as an emergency rule and pending for adoption as a permanent rule at 310 IAC 6-1-20. Except where incorporated into a statute or rule, the listing is intended to provide guidance rather than to have regulatory application.

I. INTRODUCTION

To help identify the rivers and streams which have particular environmental or aesthetic interest, a special listing has been prepared by the division of outdoor recreation of the department of natural resources. The listing is a corrected and condensed version of a listing complied by American Rivers and dated October 1990. There are about 2,000 river miles included on the listing, a figure which represents less than 9% of the estimated 24,000 total river miles in Indiana. The natural resources commission has adopted the listing as an official recognition of the resource values of these waters.

A river included in the listing qualifies under one or more of the following 22 categories. An asterisk indicates that all or part of the river segment was also included in the "Roster of Indiana Waterways Declared Navigable," 15 IR 2385 (July 1992). [Note: this listing is now included in the 1997 "Roster of Indiana Waterways Declared Navigable or Nonnavigable."] A river designated "EUW" is an exceptional use water. A river designated "HQW" is a high quality water, and a river designated "SS" is a salmonoid stream.

1. Designated National Wild and Scenic Rivers. Rivers that Congress has included in the National Wild and Scenic System pursuant to the National Wild and Scenic River Act, Public Law 90-452.

2. National Wild and Scenic Study Rivers. Rivers that Congress has determined should be studied for possible inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

3. Federally Protected Rivers other than Wild and Scenic. Rivers subject to federal legal protection other than pursuant to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, such as National Rivers and Waterways and National Recreation Areas.

4. State designated Scenic Rivers. Rivers included in state river conservation systems or otherwise protected pursuant to an act of the state legislature.

5. Nationwide Rivers Inventory Rivers. The 1,524 river segments identified by the National Park Service in its 1982 "Nationwide Rivers Inventory" as qualified for consideration for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

6. Hydro Ban Rivers. Rivers on which Congress has prohibited future hydropower development.

7. Rivers Identified in State Inventories or Assessments. Outstanding rivers from state inventories or assessments, i.e., rivers identified as having statewide or greater significance.

8. Atlantic Salmon Restoration Rivers. Rivers undergoing active Atlantic salmon restoration efforts and identified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for planned restoration.

9. Federal Public Lands Rivers. Rivers identified in U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management resource planning as potential additions to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

10. State Fishing Rivers. Rivers identified by states as having outstanding fishing values, such as Blue Ribbon Trout Streams.

11. State Heritage Program Sites. Rivers identified by state natural heritage programs or similar state programs as having outstanding ecological importance.

12. Priority Aquatic Sites. Rivers identified in "Priority Aquatic Sites for Biological Diversity Conservation," published by the Nature Conservancy in 1985.

13. Canoe Trails. State-designated canoe/boating routes.

14. Outstanding Whitewater Streams. Rivers listed in the American Whitewater Affiliation's 1990 Inventory of American Whitewater.

15. Locally Protected Rivers. Rivers protected through local and private protection strategies.

16. State Park Rivers. Rivers protected by inclusion in a state park or state preserve.

17. Other Rivers. Miscellaneous rivers identified as having outstanding ecological, recreational, or scenic importance.

18. High Water Quality Rivers. "Outstanding Resources Waters" designated by states and other rivers identified by states as having outstanding water quality.

19. National Natural Landmark Rivers. Rivers designated as, or included within, National Natural Landmarks.

20. State Study Rivers. Rivers that have been formally proposed for state protection or designation.

21. BOR Western Rivers. Rivers listed in the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's 1982 "Western U.S. Water Plan" proposal as exhibiting identified free-flowing values.

22. State legislated Wabash River Heritage Corridor.

II. LISTING OF OUTSTANDING RIVERS AND STREAMS IN THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE WATERSHED

River	Significance	County	Segment
Lost River*	9,11,19,EUW	Martin, Orange	Potato Road to confluence with East Fork White River
White, East Fork	5, 11, 13	Bartholomew, Daviess, Dubois, Jackskon, Lawrence, White, Martin, Pike	Columbus to confluence with West Fork

TABLE 2-6: SPECIAL AREAS IN THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE WATERSHED

County	Special Area	Manager	Access
BARTHOLOMEW	ANDERSON FALLS NATURE PRESERVE	LOCAL- BARTHOLOMEW CO. PARKS AND RECREATION	OPEN-
BARTHOLOMEW	ATTERBURY FISH AND WILDLIFE AREA	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
BARTHOLOMEW	ATTERBURY RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	U.S. DEPT. OF DEFENSE	CLOSED-
BARTHOLOMEW	AZALIA BRIDGE (FLATROCK R.) PUBLIC ACCESS SITE	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
BARTHOLOMEW	CLIFTY CREEK PARK	LOCAL- COLUMBUS PARK BOARD	OPEN-
BARTHOLOMEW	DRIFTWOOD P.F.A.	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
BARTHOLOMEW	GROUSE RIDGE P.F.A.	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
BARTHOLOMEW	HARRISON RIDGE PARK	LOCAL- COLUMBUS PARK BOARD	OPEN-
BARTHOLOMEW	LOWELL BRIDGE PUBLIC ACCESS SITE	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
BROWN	ATTERBURY RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	U.S. DEPT. OF DEFENSE	CLOSED-
BROWN	BROWN COUNTY STATE PARK	DNR STATE PARKS	OPEN-
BROWN	CROOKED CREEK NATURE PRESERVE	DNR FORESTRY	CLOSED-
BROWN	HITZ - RHODEHAMEL WOODS	PRIV- THE NATURE CONSERVANCY	OPEN-
BROWN	HOOSIER N.F.-BROWNSTOWN R.D.-PLEASANT RUN P.U.	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
BROWN	HOOSIER N.F.-CHARLES DEAM WILDERNESS AREA NORTH	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
BROWN	MONROE RESERVOIR	COE, LEASED TO DNR RESERVOIRS	OPEN-
BROWN	NO NAME- PRIV OR LOCAL	PRIV- THE NATURE CONSERVANCY	RESTRICTED-
BROWN	OGLE HOLLOW NATURE PRESERVE	DNR STATE PARKS	OPEN-

County	Special Area	Manager	Access
BROWN	PRANGE (MIRIAM & HENRY) TRACT	DNR NATURE PRESERVES	RESTRICTED-
BROWN	STEELE (SELMA) NATURE PRESERVE	DNR STATE MUSEUM AND HISTORIC SITES	OPEN-
BROWN	T.C. STEELE STATE MEMORIAL	DNR STATE MUSEUM AND HISTORIC SITES	OPEN-
BROWN	VIETOR WOODS (WHIPPORWILL WOODS)	DNR NATURE PRESERVES & TNC	OPEN-
BROWN	YELLOWWOOD STATE FOREST	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
DAVIESS	CARNAHAN (DAVIESS CO/WHT R W FORK) PUB. ACC. SITE	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
DAVIESS	EAST SIDE PARK	LOCAL- WASHINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
DAVIESS	ELNORA (WHITE R. W. FORK) PUBLIC ACCESS SITE	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
DAVIESS	ELNORA MEMORIAL PARK	LOCAL- ELNORA PARK BOARD	OPEN-
DAVIESS	GLENDALE FISH AND WILDLIFE AREA	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
DAVIESS	LONGFELLOW PARK	LOCAL- WASHINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
DAVIESS	PORTERSVILLE BRIDGE PUBLIC ACCESS SITE	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
DAVIESS	THOUSAND ACRE WOODS	PRIV- THE NATURE CONSERVANCY	OPEN-
DUBOIS	ARMORY PARK	LOCAL-	OPEN-
DUBOIS	BARNES-SENG (JASPER MARSH) WETLAND CONS. AREA	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
DUBOIS	BUFFALO FLAT NATURE PRESERVE	DNR NATURE PRESERVES	OPEN-
DUBOIS	DUBOIS COUNTY PARK	LOCAL- DUBOIS COUNTY PARK BOARD	OPEN-
DUBOIS	FERDINAND HIGH SCHOOL	LOCAL-	OPEN-
DUBOIS	FERDINAND STATE FOREST	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
DUBOIS	FROMME WILDLIFE HABITAT AREA	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
DUBOIS	HOOSIER N.F.-TELL CITY R.D.-TELL CITY P.U.	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-

County	Special Area	Manager	Access
DUBOIS	HUNTINGBURG MUNICIPAL PARK	LOCAL- HUNTINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
DUBOIS	PATOKA RESERVOIR	COE, LEASED TO DNR RESERVOIRS	OPEN-
DUBOIS	WENING-SHERRITT SEEP SPRINGS NATURE PRESERVE	PRIV- THE NATURE CONSERVANCY	CLOSED-
GREENE	CRANE NAVAL WEAPONS SUPPORT CENTER	U.S. DEPT. OF DEFENSE	CLOSED-
GREENE	GREENE-SULLIVAN STATE FOREST	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
GREENE	OWEN-PUTNAM STATE FOREST	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
GREENE	WORTHINGTON (WHITE R.) PUBLIC ACCESS SITE	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
JACKSON	BELL FORD PUBLIC ACCESS SITE	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
JACKSON	BROWNSTOWN P.A.S./P.F.A.	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
JACKSON	CYPRESS LAKE P.F.A.	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
JACKSON	HEMLOCK BLUFF NATURE PRESERVE	DNR NATURE PRESERVES	OPEN-
JACKSON	HOOSIER N.F.-BROWNSTOWN R.D.-PLEASANT RUN P.U.	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
JACKSON	HOOSIER N.F.-CHARLES DEAM WILDERNESS AREA NORTH	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
JACKSON	JACKSON-WASHINGTON STATE FOREST	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
JACKSON	KNOBSTONE GLADES NATURE PRESERVE	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
JACKSON	MEDORA PUBLIC ACCESS SITE	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
JACKSON	MONROE RESERVOIR	COE, LEASED TO DNR RESERVOIRS	OPEN-
JACKSON	MUSCATATUCK ACID SEEP SPRING RNA	U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE	OPEN-
JACKSO	MUSCATATUCK NATIONAL WILDLIFE	U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE	OPEN-

County	Special Area	Manager	Access
N	REFUGE		
JACKSON	STARVE HOLLOW STATE RECREATION AREA	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
JACKSON	VALLONIA STATE NURSERY	DNR FORESTRY	RESTRICTED-
JOHNSON	ATTERBURY	LOCAL-	OPEN-
JOHNSON	ATTERBURY FISH AND WILDLIFE AREA	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
JOHNSON	ATTERBURY RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	U.S. DEPT. OF DEFENSE	CLOSED-
JOHNSON	DRIFTWOOD P.F.A.	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
JOHNSON	JOHNSON COUNTY PARK AREA	LOCAL- JOHNSON COUNTY PARK BOARD	OPEN-
JOHNSON	NEW WHITELAND PARK	LOCAL- NEW WHITELAND PARK BOARD	OPEN-
LAWRENCE	AVOCA STATE FISH HATCHERY	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	RESTRICTED-
LAWRENCE	BEDFORD (WHT R. E. FORK) SR 37 PUBLIC ACCESS SITE	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
LAWRENCE	CLAMPITT EASEMENT	U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE	OPEN-
LAWRENCE	CRANE NAVAL WEAPONS SUPPORT CENTER	U.S. DEPT. OF DEFENSE	CLOSED-
LAWRENCE	DONALDSON CAVE NATURE PRESERVE	DNR STATE PARKS	OPEN-
LAWRENCE	DONALDSON WOODS NATURE PRESERVE	DNR STATE PARKS	OPEN-
LAWRENCE	HOOSIER N.F.-BROWNSTOWN R.D.-LOST RIVER P.U.	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
LAWRENCE	HOOSIER N.F.-BROWNSTOWN R.D.-PLEASANT RUN P.U.	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
LAWRENCE	INDIAN CREEK (LAWRENCE CO)WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
LAWREN	LAWRENCEPORT (WHT R. E.	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-

County	Special Area	Manager	Access
CE	FORK/SUGAR CREEK) P.A.S.		
LAWRENCE	MITCHELL COMMUNITY PARK	LOCAL- MITCHELL PARK BOARD	OPEN-
LAWRENCE	SPICE VALLEY (WILLIAMS DAM) PUBLIC ACCESS SITE	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
LAWRENCE	SPRING MILL STATE PARK	DNR STATE PARKS	OPEN-
LAWRENCE	WILLIAMS DAM P.F.A.	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
MARTIN	BLUFFS OF BEAVER BEND (GORMLEY BLUFF)	PRIV- THE NATURE CONSERVANCY	OPEN-
MARTIN	CONSERVATION EASEMENTS	U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE	OPEN-
MARTIN	CRANE NAVAL WEAPONS SUPPORT CENTER	U.S. DEPT. OF DEFENSE	CLOSED-
MARTIN	DAVIESS-MARTIN CO. PARK (WEST BOGGS)	LOCAL- DAVIESS-MARTIN CO. PARK BOARD	OPEN-
MARTIN	HIGHWAY REROUTE POTENTIAL	STATE- DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	OPEN-
MARTIN	HINDOSTAN FALLS P.F.A.	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
MARTIN	HOOSIER N.F.-BROWNSTOWN R.D.-LOST RIVER P.U.	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
MARTIN	HOOSIER N.F.-PLEASANT VALLEY	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
MARTIN	JUG ROCK NATURE PRESERVE	DNR NATURE PRESERVES	OPEN-
MARTIN	LOOGOOTEE PARK	LOCAL- LOOGOOTEE PARK BOARD	OPEN-
MARTIN	MARTIN STATE FOREST	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
MARTIN	MT. CALVARY (MARTIN CO.) WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
MARTIN	PLASTER CREEK SEEPS	PRIV- THE NATURE CONSERVANCY	RESTRICTED- BY PERMISSION ONLY
MARTIN	PLASTER CREEK SEEPS NATURE PRESERVE	PRIV- THE NATURE CONSERVANCY	CLOSED-
MONROE	BEAN BLOSSOM BOTTOMS NATURAL AREA	PRIV- SYCAMORE LAND TRUST	OPEN-

County	Special Area	Manager	Access
MONROE	BEAN BLOSSOM BOTTOMS NATURE PRESERVE	PRIV- SYCAMORE LAND TRUST	OPEN-
MONROE	BRYAN PARK	LOCAL- BLOOMINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
MONROE	CASCADES COMMUNITY PARK	LOCAL- BLOOMINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
MONROE	CEDAR BLUFFS NATURE PRESERVE	PRIV- THE NATURE CONSERVANCY	OPEN-
MONROE	COUNTY FARM (KARST) PARK	LOCAL- MONROE COUNTY PARK BOARD	OPEN-
MONROE	CRESTMONT PARK	LOCAL- BLOOMINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
MONROE	GRIFFY LAKE	LOCAL- BLOOMINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
MONROE	GRIFFY WOODS NATURE PRESERVE	LOCAL- BLOOMINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
MONROE	HOOSIER N.F.-BROWNSTOWN R.D.-PLEASANT RUN P.U.	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
MONROE	HOOSIER N.F.-CHARLES DEAM WILDERNESS AREA NORTH	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
MONROE	HOOSIER N.F.-CHARLES DEAM WILDERNESS AREA SOUTH	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
MONROE	MONROE RESERVOIR	COE, LEASED TO DNR RESERVOIRS	OPEN-
MONROE	MORGAN-MONROE STATE FOREST	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
MONROE	MUSCATATUCK NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE (RESTLE UNIT)	U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE	OPEN-
MONROE	NORTH FORK WILDLIFE REFUGE	COE, LEASED TO DNR RESERVOIRS	OPEN-
MONROE	PARK RIDGE WEST PARK	LOCAL- BLOOMINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
MONROE	PARK SQUARE PARK	LOCAL- BLOOMINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
MONROE	RESTLE NATURAL AREA	PRIV- SYCAMORE LAND TRUST	OPEN-

County	Special Area	Manager	Access
MONROE	SCOUT RIDGE NATURE PRESERVE	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
MONROE	SOUTHEAST PARK	LOCAL- BLOOMINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
MONROE	WINSLOW SPORT COMPLEX AND TRAIL	LOCAL- BLOOMINGTON PARK BOARD	OPEN-
ORANGE	HARRISON-CRAWFORD STATE FOREST	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
ORANGE	HOOSIER N.F.-BROWNSTOWN R.D.-LOST RIVER P.U.	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
ORANGE	HOOSIER N.F.-PAOLI EXPERIMENTAL FOREST	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
ORANGE	HOOSIER N.F.-TELL CITY R.D.-LITTLE AFRICA P.U.	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
ORANGE	ORANGE CO. (JORDAN) GAME MANAGEMENT AREA	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
ORANGE	ORANGEVILLE RISE OF LOST RIVER NATURE PRESERVE	PRIV- THE NATURE CONSERVANCY	OPEN-
ORANGE	PATOKA RESERVOIR	COE, LEASED TO DNR RESERVOIRS	OPEN-
ORANGE	PIONEER MOTHERS MEMORIAL FOREST	U.S. FOREST SERVICE	OPEN-
PIKE	PIKE STATE FOREST	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
PIKE	SUGAR RIDGE FISH AND WILDLIFE AREA	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
WASHINGTON	BIG SPRING NATURE PRESERVE	DNR NATURE PRESERVES	OPEN-
WASHINGTON	CHARLES SPRING MANAGED AREA	DNR NATURE PRESERVES	RESTRICTED-
WASHINGTON	CHRISTIAN CHURCH PLAYGROUND	LOCAL- SALEM PARK BOARD	OPEN-
WASHINGTON	CLARK STATE FOREST	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
WASHINGTON	ELK CREEK FISH AND WILDLIFE AREA	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-
WASHINGTON	INDIAN-BITTER NATURE PRESERVE	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-

County	Special Area	Manager	Access
WASHINGTON	JACKSON-WASHINGTON STATE FOREST	DNR FORESTRY	OPEN-
WASHINGTON	SALEM COMMUNITY PARK	LOCAL- SALEM PARK BOARD	OPEN-
WASHINGTON	WHITE/MUSCATATUCK RIVER PUBLIC ACCESS SITE	DNR FISH & WILDLIFE	OPEN-

TABLE 2-7: 1995 WATER USE INFORMATION FOR THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE WATERSHED

Population and Water Use totals	**1995**
Total population in the watershed (thousands)	169.49
Public Water Supply	**1995**
Population served by public groundwater supply (thousands)	21.32
Population served by surface water supply (thousands)	123.2
Total population served by public water supply (thousands)	144.52
Total groundwater withdrawals (mgd)	2.07
Total surface water withdrawals (mgd)	20.89
Total water withdrawals (mgd)	22.96
Total per capita withdrawal (gal/day)	158.87
Population self-supplied with water (thousands)	24.97
Commercial Water Use	**1995**
Groundwater withdrawal for commercial use (mgd)	0.06
Surface water withdrawal for commercial use (mgd)	3.35
Deliveries from public water supplies for commercial use (mgd)	1.98
Total commercial water use (mgd)	0.81
Industrial Water Use	**1995**
Groundwater withdrawal for industrial use (mgd)	0.22
Surface water withdrawals for industrial use (mgd)	3.08
Deliveries from public water suppliers for industrial use (mgd)	2.42
Total industrial water use (mgd)	0.34

Agricultural Water Use	1995
Groundwater withdrawals for livestock use (mgd)	1.23
Surface water withdrawals for livestock use (mgd)	1.2
Total livestock water use (mgd)	1.94
Groundwater withdrawals for irrigation (mgd)	0.0
Surface water withdrawals for irrigation (mgd)	0.0
Total irrigation water use (mgd)	0.0

Notes:
mgd: million gallons per day
gal/day: gallons per day
(from USGS 2001)

- The water-use information presented in this table was compiled from information provided in the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water-Use Information Program data system for 1990 and 1995. The National Water-Use Information Program is responsible for compiling and disseminating the nation's water-use data. The U.S. Geological Survey works in cooperation with local, State, and Federal environmental agencies to collect water-use information at a site-specific level. Every five years, the U.S. Geological Survey compiles data at the state and hydrologic region level into a national water-use data system and publishes a national circular.

TABLE 3-1: CAUSES OF WATER POLLUTION AND CONTRIBUTING ACTIVITIES

Cause	Activity associated with cause
E. coli	Failing septic systems, direct septic discharge, animal waste (including runoff from livestock operations and impacts from wildlife), improperly disinfected wastewater treatment plant effluent
Toxic Chemicals	Pesticide/herbicide applications, household hazardous waste, disinfectants, automobile fluids, accidental spills, illegal dumping, urban stormwater runoff, direct septic discharge, industrial effluent
Oxygen-Consuming Substances	Wastewater effluent, leaking sewers and septic tanks, direct septic discharge, animal waste
Nutrients	Fertilizer on agricultural crops and residential/commercial lawns, animal wastes, leaky sewers and septic tanks, direct septic discharge, atmospheric deposition, wastewater treatment plants

TABLE 3-2: COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS IN THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE WATERSHED

Community	CSO Outfalls
Paoli	8

(from ICAA 2000)

TABLE 3-3: NPDES PERMITTED FACILITIES IN THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE WATERSHED

NPDES	Facility Name	Major/ Minor	City	County	Status
IN0001066	EXTRUDED ALLOYS CORP - NPR	MAJOR		LAWRENCE	INACTIVE
IN0001368	INDIANA LIMESTONE MCMILLAN MIL	MINOR	BEDFORD,	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0001376	INDIANA LIMESTONE COMPANY INC.	MINOR		LAWRENCE	INACTIVE
IN0001384	INDIANA LIMESTONE JOYNER MILL	MINOR	OOLITIC,	LAWRENCE	INACTIVE
IN0001392	INDIANA LIMESTONE COMPANY INC	MINOR		LAWRENCE	INACTIVE
IN0001775	LEHIGH PORTLAND CEMENT/MITCHEL	MINOR	MITCHELL	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0001911	BEDFORD WATER WORKS-ILL ST PLT	MINOR	BEDFORD	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0002062	VICTOR OOLITIC STONE COMPANY	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	INACTIVE
IN0003247	SPRINGS VALLEY REGIONAL W.D.	MINOR	WEST BADEN SPRINGS	ORANGE	ACTIVE
IN0003301	UNITED PLASTICS COMPANY	MINOR		JACKSON	INACTIVE
IN0003565	THOMSON CONSUMER ELECTRONICS,	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	INACTIVE
IN0003573	G.M. CORP., POWERTRAIN DIV.	MAJOR	BEDFORD	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0003646	U.S. GYPSUM COMPANY	MINOR	SHOALS	MARTIN	ACTIVE
IN0003905	PAOLI WATER PLANT	MINOR	PAOLI	ORANGE	ACTIVE
IN0004316	IDNR BROWN COUNTY STATE PARK	MINOR		BROWN	INACTIVE
IN0004332	YELLOWWOOD, IN DEPT NATL RESO	MINOR	NASHVILLE,	BROWN	INACTIVE
IN0004481	BLOOMINGTON MONROE WTR TRT PLT	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	INACTIVE
IN0004774	FRENCH LICK SPRINGS WTR TRTMNT	MINOR	FRENCH LICK,	ORANGE	ACTIVE
IN0004901	GOLD BOND BUILDING PRODUCTS	MINOR	SHOALS	MARTIN	ACTIVE
IN0021539	NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER	MAJOR	CRANE	MARTIN	ACTIVE
IN0021601	ORLEANS MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR	ORLEANS	ORANGE	ACTIVE
IN0022489	CAMPBELLSBURG MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR	CAMPBELLSBURG	WASHINGTON	ACTIVE
IN0022951	FRENCH LICK MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR	WEST BADEN SPRINGS	ORANGE	ACTIVE

NPDES	Facility Name	Major/ Minor	City	County	Status
IN0023744	MEDORA MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR	MEDORA	JACKSON	ACTIVE
IN0023787	MITCHELL MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR	MITCHELL	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0023876	NASHVILLE MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR	NASHVILLE	BROWN	ACTIVE
IN0023981	OOLITIC MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR	OOLITIC	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0024023	PAOLI MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR	PAOLI	ORANGE	ACTIVE
IN0024155	USDA LAKE MONROE DAM AREA WWTP	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	INACTIVE
IN0024953	USFS HARDIN RIDGE REC AREA	MINOR	HELTONVILLE	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0024996	GRAVES MONROE SERVICES INC	MINOR		MONROE	INACTIVE
IN0025623	BEDFORD MUNICIPAL STP	MAJOR	BEDFORD	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0029823	LAKE MONROE REGIONAL WASTE DIS	MINOR		MONROE	INACTIVE
IN0030163	PAYNETOWN ST RECREATION AREA	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	ACTIVE
IN0030171	IDNR FAIRFAX STATE REC. AREA	MINOR		MONROE	INACTIVE
IN0030236	SPRING MILL STATE PARK	MINOR	MITCHELL	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0030325	BROWN COUNTY STATE PARK	MINOR	NASHVILLE	BROWN	ACTIVE
IN0030350	GLENDALE FISH & WILDLIFE AREA	MINOR	MONTGOMERY	DAVIESS	ACTIVE
IN0031577	WEST WASHINGTON ELEM & HIGH SC	MINOR	CAMPBELLSBURG	WASHINGTON	ACTIVE
IN0035157	USDN USN CRN NVL AMMO DPT IND	MINOR		MARTIN	INACTIVE
IN0035718	BLOOMINGTON S (DILLMAN ROAD)	MAJOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	ACTIVE
IN0036684	IDNR - AVOCA FISH HATCHERY	MINOR		LAWRENCE	INACTIVE
IN0036854	BEDFORD NORTH LAWRENCE H.S.	MINOR	BEDFORD	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0037281	CAMP RIVERVALE	MINOR	LAWRENCEPORT	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0037435	SHOALS COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORPOR	MINOR		MARTIN	INACTIVE
IN0037681	MAUMEE SCOUT RESERVATION	MINOR	NORMAN	JACKSON	INACTIVE
IN0037770	SUN OIL CO OF PENNSYLVANIA	MINOR		LAWRENCE	INACTIVE

NPDES	Facility Name	Major/ Minor	City	County	Status
IN0038253	BLOOMINGTON READY MIX	MINOR		MONROE	INACTIVE
IN0038326	HARDIN-MONROE, INC.	MINOR	HELTONVILLE	MONROE	ACTIVE
IN0038580	OLD BEN COAL, ALFORD FIELD	MINOR	PETERSBURG	PIKE	INACTIVE
IN0038733	CATHOLIC YOUTH ORGAIZATION-CAM	MINOR		BROWN	INACTIVE
IN0038920	BRIARWOOD SUBDIVISION	MINOR	SPRINGVILLE	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0039241	LOOGOOTEE, TOWN OF	MINOR	LOOGOOTEE	MARTIN	ACTIVE
IN0040631	SHOALS MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR	SHOALS	MARTIN	ACTIVE
IN0041556	IDNR YELLOWWOOD STATE FOREST	MINOR		BROWN	INACTIVE
IN0041921	WEST BADEN SPRINGS MUN. STP	MINOR		ORANGE	INACTIVE
IN0042617	CAMP INDI-CO-SO	MINOR	OOLITIC	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0043125	EAST FORK WTR INC WTR TRMT PLT	MINOR	SHOALS,	MARTIN	ACTIVE
IN0043231	INDEPENDENT LIMESTONE CO.	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	INACTIVE
IN0043699	SALT CREEK SERVICES WWTP	MINOR	BELMONT	MONROE	ACTIVE
IN0043729	LOOGOOTEE WATER WORKS	MINOR	LOOGOOTEE,	MARTIN	ACTIVE
IN0043818	MITCHELL PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY	MINOR	MITCHELL	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0043826	CAMPBELLSBURG WTR DEPT	MINOR	CAMPBELLSBURG	WASHINGTON	INACTIVE
IN0044211	INPURSUIT/SPRING HILL INDIANA	MINOR	SEYMOUR	JACKSON	ACTIVE
IN0045187	MONROE COUNTY REG. WASTE DIST.	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	ACTIVE
IN0045411	RANSBURG SCOUT RESERVATION	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	ACTIVE
IN0046019	IDNR SITE 10, WASHINGTON PIKE	MINOR		PIKE	INACTIVE
IN0046108	UNITED MINERALS, BLACK MOUNTAI	MINOR		MARTIN	INACTIVE
IN0046116	ROGERS GROUP, OWENSBURG QUARRY	MINOR	OWENSBURG	GREENE	INACTIVE
IN0046663	PHOENIX NR, AMERICAN PIT I	MINOR	ALFORDSVILLE,	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0046671	UNITED MINERALS, BLESSINGER PI	MINOR		MARTIN	INACTIVE

NPDES	Facility Name	Major/ Minor	City	County	Status
IN0046841	FLUCK LIMESTONE COMPANY	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	INACTIVE
IN0046990	PHOENIX NR, WITTMER MINE	MINOR	CANNELBURG	MARTIN	INACTIVE
IN0047228	MARIGOLD MINING, INDIAN SPRNGS	MINOR	MONTGOMERY	MARTIN	INACTIVE
IN0047325	PHOENIX NR, CENTER PIT	MINOR	CANNELBURG	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0047643	KENTUCKIANA RESOURCES, INC.	MINOR	MONTGOMERY	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0047651	PHOENIX NR, PACKERS MINE	MINOR	LOOGOOTEE	MARTIN	INACTIVE
IN0047716	DELTA MINING CORP, SLATE CR M.	MINOR		DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0047813	FOWLER EXCAVATING, A&P PIT #2	MINOR		DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0047864	LAKE CUMBERLAND ENERGY, INC.	MINOR		DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0047899	PHOENIX NR, PARSONS MINE	MINOR	LOOGOOTEE	MARTIN	INACTIVE
IN0047902	ASSOCIATES MINING CO., ARVIN M	MINOR	WHITFIELD	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0047996	ROGERS GROUP, COMMERCIAL PIT	MINOR	CANNELBURG	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0048101	ENGLISH COAL, PHOENIX #6 MINE	MINOR		DUBOIS	INACTIVE
IN0048127	ROGERS GROUP, MINE #2	MINOR	LOOGOOTEE	MARTIN	INACTIVE
IN0048275	B.F.C. COAL, GLENDALE MINE #1	MINOR		DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0048453	CAMP MONETO	MINOR	NASHVILLE	BROWN	ACTIVE
IN0048518	PHOENIX NR, INDIAN PIT & SUPPO	MINOR	CANNELBURG	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0048534	PHOENIX NR, BURRESS MINE	MINOR	LOOGOOTEE	MARTIN	INACTIVE
IN0048551	FOERTSCH CONST, LITTLE SANDY 3	MINOR	LAMAR	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0048623	PHOENIX NR, MIDWAY PIT & SUPPO	MINOR	CANNELBURG,	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0049883	SPRUNICA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MINOR	NASHVILLE	BROWN	ACTIVE
IN0050105	MONROE COUNTY REGIONAL SEWER D	MINOR	STINESVILLE	MONROE	ACTIVE
IN0051161	INDIANA WOOD TREATING CORP.	MINOR		MONROE	INACTIVE
IN0051349	KENTUCKIANA ENERGY CORP	MINOR		DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0051535	STENFTENAGEL COAL MINE-NPR	MINOR		DAVIESS	INACTIVE

NPDES	Facility Name	Major/ Minor	City	County	Status
IN0052086	OTWELL WATER CORPORATION	MINOR	OTWELL	PIKE	ACTIVE
IN0052329	ESSEX GROUP, INC., MITCHELL	MINOR		LAWRENCE	INACTIVE
IN0052663	ESSEX GROUP, INC.	MINOR	ORLEANS	ORANGE	INACTIVE
IN0052949	JACKSON CO REGIONAL SEWAGE DIS	MINOR	FREETOWN	JACKSON	ACTIVE
IN0053741	NEEDMORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MINOR	BEDFORD	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0053848	GREEN CONST., NOLAN PIT	MINOR	CANNELBURG	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0053911	IDNR SITE 201, REEVE/DAVIESS	MINOR		DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0054356	B.F.C. COAL, ALFORDSVILLE MINE	MINOR	LOOGOOTEE	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0054364	SHAWSWICK ELEMENTARY/JR HIGH	MINOR	BEDFORD	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0055026	FOERTSCH CONST, TRETTER MINE	MINOR	NEWTONVILLE	SPENCER	INACTIVE
IN0055077	SCHWERMAN TRUCKING COMPANY	MINOR	MITCHELL,	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0055514	BLACK BEAUTY COAL, PIT #7	MINOR		MARTIN	INACTIVE
IN0055824	SALVATION ARMY HIDDEN FALLS CP	MINOR	BEDFORD	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
IN0057304	BLACK BEAUTY COAL COMPANY	MINOR		DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0057444	TRIAD MINING, PATOKA RIVER MIN	MINOR		GIBSON	INACTIVE
IN0057541	UNITED MINERALS, HARTLAND MINE	MINOR	CANNELBURG,	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0057592	HAWTHORNE COAL, PENNYVILLE MIN	MINOR	PENNYVILLE	DAVIESS	ACTIVE
IN0057681	IDNR SITE 1002, NANCY-JOYCE PI	MINOR	NEAR ALFORDSVILLE	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
IN0057843	IDNR SITE 434, CARTER PIT	MINOR	PETERSBURG	PIKE	INACTIVE
IN0060526	GNAW BONE REGIONAL SEWER DISTR	MINOR	NASHVILLE	BROWN	ACTIVE
IN0060810	MONROE WATER TREATMENT PLANT	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	ACTIVE
IN0061107	BLUE ELK SUBDIVISION	MINOR	NASHVILLE	BROWN	ACTIVE
ING040004	FOERTSCH CONSTR LITTLE SANDY10	MINOR	MONTGOMERY	DAVIESS	ACTIVE
ING040016	BLACK BEAUTY COAL, PENNYVILLE	MINOR	ALFORDSVILLE	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING040018	PHOENIX NR, AMERICAN PIT	MINOR	CANNELBURG,	DAVIESS	INACTIVE

NPDES	Facility Name	Major/ Minor	City	County	Status
ING040026	SOLAR SOURCES, CANNELBURG MINE	MINOR	CANNELBURG	DAVIESS	ACTIVE
ING040027	SOLAR SOURCES, SUGAR CREEK MIN	MINOR	CANNELBURG	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING040033	BLACK BEAUTY COAL, WEST FORK M	MINOR	HUNTINGBURG	DAVIESS	ACTIVE
ING040041	RICHLAND RESOURCES, WITTMER MI	MINOR	ALFORDSVILLE	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING040042	PHOENIX NR, CENTER PIT	MINOR	WASHINGTON	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING040045	PHOENIX NR, CORNING MINE	MINOR	CORNING	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING040046	PHOENIX NR, INDIAN PIT	MINOR	WASHINGTON	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING040048	PHOENIX NR, MIDWAY II PIT	MINOR	CANNELBURG	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING040113	BLACK BEAUTY COAL, PIT #7 MINE	MINOR	SHOALS,	MARTIN	INACTIVE
ING040114	BLACK BEAUTY COAL, HARTLAND MI	MINOR	LOOGOOTEE,	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING040116	UNITED MINERALS, BLESSINGER MI	MINOR	LOOGOOTEE	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING040125	MARIGOLD MINING, INDIAN SPRING	MINOR	BRAMBLE,	MARTIN	INACTIVE
ING040144	SOLAR SOURCES, ALFORDSVILLE MI	MINOR	ALFORDSVILLE,	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING040153	BLACK BEAUTY COAL, AMERICAN M.	MINOR	ALFORDSVILLE	DAVIESS	ACTIVE
ING040154	BLACK BEAUTY COAL, CORNING M.	MINOR	ALFORDSVILLE	DAVIESS	ACTIVE
ING040155	BLACK BEAUTY, INDIAN PIT	MINOR	CANNELBURG	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING040161	AML SITE #201, REGIONAL EQUIP.	MINOR	BOONVILLE	DAVIESS	ACTIVE
ING040174	AML SITE #301, FOUR RIVERS RC&	MINOR	ALFORDSVILLE,	DAVIESS	INACTIVE
ING080065	KIEL BROS. OIL CO., INC.	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON,	MONROE	ACTIVE
ING080113	MARATHON STATION #2045	MINOR	BLOOMINGTON	MONROE	INACTIVE
ING080132	KOCOLENE #63 SERVICE STATION	MINOR	BEDFORD	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
ING250001	U.S. GYPSUM COMPANY	MINOR	SHOALS,	MARTIN	ACTIVE
ING490041	CALCAR QUARRIES, INC.	MINOR	PAOLI	ORANGE	ACTIVE
ING490057	INDIANA LIMESTONE, JOYNER MILL	MINOR	OOLIITIC	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
INL023787	MITCHELL MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR		LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
INL023876	NASHVILLE MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR		BROWN	ACTIVE

NPDES	Facility Name	Major/ Minor	City	County	Status
INL023981	OOLITIC MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR		LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
INL025623	BEDFORD MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR		LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
INL035718	BLOOMINGTON S (DILLMAN ROAD)	MINOR		MONROE	ACTIVE
INL036854	BEDFORD NORTH LAWRENCE H.S.	MINOR		LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
INL039241	LOOGOOTEE, TOWN OF	MINOR		MARTIN	ACTIVE
INL040631	SHOALS MUNICIPAL STP	MINOR		MARTIN	ACTIVE
INL045187	MONROE COUNTY REG. WASTE DIST.	MINOR		MONROE	ACTIVE
INL049883	SPRUNICA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MINOR		BROWN	ACTIVE
INL052949	JACKSON CO REGIONAL SEWAGE DIS	MINOR		JACKSON	ACTIVE
INL053163	PINE RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MINOR		DUBOIS	ACTIVE
INL053741	NEEDMORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MINOR		LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
INL054364	SHAWSWICK ELEMENTARY/JR HIGH	MINOR		LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
INP000010	BRIDGEPORT BRASS CO.	MINOR		LAWRENCE	INACTIVE
INP000022	CARPENTER MANUFACTURING, INC.	MINOR	MITCHELL	LAWRENCE	INACTIVE
INP000174	MANCHESTER TANK AND EQUIPMENT	MINOR	BEDFORD	LAWRENCE	ACTIVE
INS320001	ROGERS GROUP, ORLEANS QUARRY	MINOR	ORLEANS	ORANGE	ACTIVE
INS800003	RUMPKE OF IN, ORANGE CNTY TRAN	MINOR	ORLEANS	ORANGE	ACTIVE
INU000159	INDIANA LIMESTONE COMPANY INC.	MINOR		MONROE	ACTIVE
INU000329	J. S. JONES APARTMENTS	MINOR	BEDFORD	LAWRENCE	INACTIVE
INU000331	WABASH VILLAGE APPARTMENTS	MINOR		BROWN	ACTIVE
INU000353	BROWN COUNTY TRAILER COURT	MINOR		BROWN	ACTIVE

(from IDEM 2001)

TABLE 4.1: RESULTS OF SEASONAL KENDALL ANALYSIS FOR STATIONS LOCATED

IN THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE WATERSHED 1986 TO 1995

Parameter	EW-1 East Fork White River S.R. 57 Bridge Petersburg	EW-79 East Fork White River Williams Dam Williams	EW-94 East Fork White River U.S. 50 Bridge South of Bedford	SLT-12 Salt Creek Old State Hwy 37 Bridge Oolitic
Biological Oxygen Demand	↓	↔	↘	↔
Chemical Oxygen Demand	↔	↔	↔	?
Dissolved Oxygen	↑	↔	↔	↔
E. coli	↔	↔	↔	↔
Ammonia	↔	↔	↔	↔
Nitrite + Nitrate	↔	↓	↓	↔
Total phosphorus	↓	↔	↘	↓
Total Residue	↖	↘	↘	↖
Total Residue, Filterable	?	?	?	↔
Total Residue, Nonfilterable	↓	↔	↔	↑

Notes

↔ = No Statistical Change; significance < 80% or reported slope = 0.00000

↓ = Statistically Decreasing; significance >95% with a negative slope

↘ = Potentially Decreasing; significance >80% with a negative slope

↖ = Potentially Increasing; significance >80% with a positive slope

↑ = Statistically Increasing; significance >95 % with a positive slope

? = Insufficient Data for analysis

TABLE 4-2: ISDH DEFINITIONS FOR FISH CONSUMPTION ADVISORY GROUPS

Group 1	Unrestricted consumption
Group 2	One meal per week (52 meals per year) for adult males and females. One meal per month for women who are pregnant or breastfeeding, women who plan to have children, and children under the age of 15.
Group 3	One meal per month (12 meals per year) for adult males and females. Women who are pregnant or breastfeeding, women who plan to have children, and children under the age of 15 do not eat.
Group 4	One meal every two months (six meals per year) for adult males and females. Women who are pregnant or breastfeeding, women who plan to have children, and children under the age of 15 do not eat.
Group 5	No consumption (DO NOT EAT)

Carp generally are contaminated with both PCBs and mercury. Except as otherwise noted, carp in all Indiana rivers and streams fall under the following risk groups:

Carp, 15-20 inches - Group 3

Carp, 20-25 inches - Group 4

Carp over 25 inches - Group 5

(from ISDH, IDNR, and IDEM 2001)

TABLE 4-3: 2001 INDIANA FISH CONSUMPTION ADVISORY

Location	Species	Fish Size (inches)	Contaminant	Group
Clear Creek				
Monroe County	**ALL SPECIES**	**ALL**	■	**5**
Dogwood Lake				
Daviess County	Largemouth Bass	10-14 14+	❍ ❍	2 3
East Fork of the White River				
Jackson County	Freshwater Drum	17-18 18+	❍ ❍	2 3
	Golden Redhorse	14-16 16+	■ ■	3 4
	Silver Redhorse	20-22 22+	■ ■	2 3
	Smallmouth Buffalo	19-26 26+	■ ■	3 4
	Bigmouth Buffalo	18+	■❍	3
Lawrence County	**Carp**	**22+**	■❍	**5**
	Channel Catfish	15-21 **21+**	■❍ ■❍	4 **5**
	Freshwater Drum	12-15 **15+**	■ ■	4 **5**
	Bigmouth Buffalo	18+	❍	4
	Flathead Catfish	10-16 16+	■ ■	3 4
	Largemouth Bass	11-14 **14+**	■ ■	4 **5**
	River Carpsucker	**13+**	■	**5**

	Sauger	14+	■❍	3
	Shorthead Redhorse	14-16 **16+**	■ ■	4 **5**
	Smallmouth Buffalo	**15+**	■	**5**
	Spotted Bass	10+	■❍	2
	Spotted Sucker	17+	■	3
	Striped Bass	22+	■	4
Martin County	Channel Catfish	12-14 14+	■ ■	3 4
	Freshwater Drum	10-12 12+	■ ■	3 4
	Longear Sunfish	6+	■	3
	Shorthead Redhorse	14-16 **16+**	■ ■	4 **5**
	Smallmouth Buffalo	19+	■	3
Lake Wapehani				
Monroe County	Largemouth Bass	9-14 14+	❍ ❍	2 3
Monroe Reservoir				
Brown County	Largemouth Bass	11+	❍	2
Monroe County	Largemouth Bass	10-18 18+	❍ ❍	2 3
Pleasant Run Creek				
Lawrence County	**ALL SPECIES**	**ALL**	■	**5**
Salt Creek				
Monroe County ** (tailwaters of Monroe Reservoir Dam to Clear Creek)	Bluegill	7+	■	2
	Freshwater Drum	**16+**	■	**5**

Clear Creek)	Striped Bass	12+	■	3
	Walleye	15-21 21+	■ ■	3 4
	White Crappie	7+	■	2
	Yellow Bass	8+	■	2
Monroe County (confluence of Clear Creek to Lawrence Co.)	**ALL SPECIES**	**ALL**	■❍	**5**
Lawrence County	**ALL SPECIES**	**ALL**	■❍	**5**
** *This listing is based on limited data. It should be noted that fish migrate. Fish not sampled from these waters may migrate from the confluence of Clear Creek and Salt Creek, 1.3 miles south. Those water bodies have No Consumption advisories. Future sampling of the Salt Creek tailwaters below the Monroe Reservoir Dam is planned for more comprehensive results.*				
Yellowwood Lake				
Brown County	Largemouth Bass	9-14 14+	❍ ❍	2 3

*❍ = Mercury, ■ = PCBs
(from ISDH, IDNR, and IDEM 2001)

TABLE 4-4: CRITERIA FOR USE SUPPORT ASSESSMENT (U.S. EPA 305(B) GUIDELINES)

Parameter	Fully Supporting	Partially Supporting	Not Supporting
Aquatic Life Use Support			
Toxicants	Metals were evaluated on a site by site basis and judged according to magnitude of exceedance and the number of times exceedances occurred.		
Conventional inorganics	There were very few water quality violations, almost all of which were due to natural conditions.		
Benthic aquatic macroinvertebrate Index of Biotic Integrity (mIBI)	mIBI $\geq$ 4.	mIBI < 4 and $\geq$ 2.	mIBI < 2.
Qualitative habitat use evaluation (QHEI)	QHEI $\geq$ 64.	QHEI < 64 and $\geq$ 51.	QHEI < 51.
Fish community (fIBI) **(Lower White River only)**	IBI $\geq$ 44.	IBI < 44 and $\geq$ 22	IBI < 22.
Sediment **(PAHs = polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons. AVS/SEM = acid volatile sulfide/ simultaneously extracted metals.)**	All PAHs $\leq$ 75th percentile. All AVS/SEMs $\leq$ 75th percentile. All other parameters $\leq$ 95th percentile.	PAHs or AVS/SEMs > 75th percentile. (Includes Grand Calumet River and Indiana Harbor Canal sediment results, and so is a conservative number.)	Parameters > 95thpercentile as derived from IDEM Sediment Contaminants Database.
Indiana Trophic State Index (lakes only)	Nutrients, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, algal growth, and sometimes pH were evaluated on a lake-by-lake basis. Each parameter judged according to magnitude.		
Fish Consumption			
Fish tissue	No specific Advisory*	Limited Group 2 - 4 Advisory*	Group 5 Advisory*
* Indiana Fish Consumption Advisory, 1997, includes a statewide advisory for carp consumption. This was not included in individual waterbody reports because it obscures the magnitude of impairment caused by other parameters.			
Recreational Use Support (Swimmable)			
Bacteria (cfu = colony forming units.)	No more than one grab sample slightly > 235 cfu/100ml, and geometric mean not exceeded.	No samples in this classification.	One or more grab sample exceeded 235 cfu/100ml, and geometric mean exceeded.

(from Indiana Water Quality Report for 1998 (IDEM 1998))

TABLE 5-1: TYPES OF PERMITS ISSUED UNDER THE NPDES PROGRAM

Type of Permit	Subtype	Comment
Municipal, Semi-Public or State (sanitary discharger)	Major	A facility owned by a municipality with a design flow Municipal of 1 MGD or greater (Cities, Towns, Regional Sewer Districts)
	Minor	Any municipally owned facility with a design flow of less than 1 MGD (Cities, Towns, Regional Sewer Districts)
	Semi-public	Any facility not municipally, State or Federally owned (i.e. mobile home parks, schools, restaurants, etc.)
	State Owned	A facility owned or managed by a State agency (State parks, prisons, etc.)
	Federally Owned	A facility owned by a federal agency (military owned installation, national park, federal penitentiary, etc.)
Industrial (Wastewater generated in the process of producing a product)	Major	Any point source discharger designated annually by agreement between the commissioner and EPA. Classification of discharger as major involves consideration of factors relating to significance of impact on the environment, such as: nature and quantity of pollutants discharged; character and assimilative capacity of receiving waters; presence of toxic pollutants in discharge; compliance history of discharger.
	Minor	All dischargers which are not designated as major dischargers.
	General	General permit rule provides streamlined NPDES permitting process for certain categories of industrial point source discharges under requirements of the applicable general permit rule, rather than requirements of an individual permit specific to a single discharge. General permit rules: 327 IAC 15-7 Coal mining, coal processing, and reclamation activities; 327 IAC 15-8 Non-contact cooling water; 327 IAC 15-9 Petroleum product terminals; 327 IAC 15-10 Groundwater petroleum remediation systems; 327 IAC 15-11 Hydrostatic testing of commercial pipelines; 327 IAC 15-12 Sand, gravel, dimension stone or crushed stone operations.
	Cooling Water	Water which is used to remove heat from a product or process; the water may or may not come in contact with the product.
	Public Water Supply	Wastewater generated from the process of removing pollutants from ground or surface water for the purpose of producing drinking water.
Pretreatment Urban Wet Weather Group (Associated with NPDES but do not fall under same rule.)	Stormwater-related	Wastewater resulting from precipitation coming in contact with a substance which is dissolved or suspended in the water.
	Industrial Wastewater Pre-treatment	Processed wastewater generated by industries that contribute to the overall wastewater received by the wastewater treatment plant.
	Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO)	Wastewater discharged from combined storm and sanitary sewers due to precipitation events. Municipal and Industrial Urban Wet Weather Programs

Part II, FOREWORD

The Lower East Fork White Watershed Restoration Action Strategy (WRAS) is intended to be a living document designed to assist restoration and protection efforts of stakeholders in their sub-watersheds. As a "living document" information contained within the WRAS will need to be revised and updated periodically.

The WRAS is divided into two parts: Part I, Characterization and Responsibilities and Part II, Concerns and Recommendations.

The first draft of the Lower East Fork White WRAS was released for public review during the spring of 2002. A 60-day public comment period followed the public meetings at which this WRAS document was introduced. This final version of the WRAS includes public comments received during the 60-day comment period. For comments to be included in the final version, they were required to be written and submitted to WHPA, Inc. (the firm contracted to produce this WRAS) during the comment period.

Wittman Hydro Planning Associates, Inc.
320 West Eighth Street
Showers Plaza, Suite 201
Bloomington, IN 47404

812-333-9399

inquiry@wittmanhydro.com

Part II, Chapter 1: Concerns and Recommendations

Part II of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy discusses the water quality concerns identified for the Lower East Fork White Watershed and lists recommended management strategies to address these concerns.

Part II includes:

Section 1 - Water Quality Concerns and Priority Issues Identified by Stakeholder Groups

Section 2 - Water Quality Concerns and Priority Issues Identified by State and Federal Agencies

Section 3 - Identification of Impaired Waters

Section 4 - Priority Issues and Recommended Management Strategies

Section 5 - Future Actions and Expectations

1. Water Quality Concerns and Priority Issues Identified by Stakeholder Groups

The Lower East Fork White watershed contains potential stakeholder groups that have different missions (contact information is included in Appendix C). Many of these groups have a long history of working in the Lower East Fork White watershed. The following discussion briefly describes some of the watershed groups.

Natural Resources Conservation Service

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), under the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), provides leadership in a partnership effort to help people conserve, maintain, and improve our natural resources and environment. The NRCS offers landowners financial, technical, and educational assistance to implement conservation practices on privately owned land. Using this help, farmers, ranchers, and forest landowners apply practices that reduce soil erosion, improve water quality, and enhance crop land, forest land, wetlands, grazing lands, and wildlife habitat. Incentives offered by USDA promote sustainable agricultural and forestry practices, which protect and conserve valuable farm and forest land for future generations. USDA assistance also helps individuals and communities restore natural resources after floods, fires, or other natural disasters.

Soil and Water Conservation Districts

Local Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD) assist land users and residents in the protection and improvement of the local environment. SWCDs can provide technical and financial assistance to local watershed conservation groups.

Central Indiana Land Trust, Inc.

The Central Indiana Land Trust (CILTI) is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) corporation formed in 1990. CILTI maintains that development must be balanced with adequate greenspace. It operates in a regional capacity throughout central Indiana, and actively seeks to protect a broad array of natural areas from small urban greenspaces to pristine nature preserves of high biological integrity.

Dubois and Pike Counties USDA-NRCS

In Pike County two tributaries to the White River are currently under a 319 water quality improvement grant. The Conger and Little Conger Creeks will be covered by this grant from July 2001 until June 2003. The grant concentrates on the Core Four Practices of conservation tillage, weed and pest management, crop nutrient management, and conservation buffers.

Four Rivers Resource Conservation & Development

The Four Rivers RC&D serves Daviess, Dubois, Gibson, Greene, Knox, Martin, Pike, Posey, Vanderburg, and Warrick counties. Its mission is to empower the people of the Four Rivers RC&D Area in the wise enhancement of economical, cultural, and natural resources to improve their quality of life. Four Rivers, Hoosier Heartland, and Sycamore Trails RC&D's, in partnership with seventeen SWCDs, are working together to assist with water quality issues on the Eel and Lower White River Watersheds. An IDEM-319 grant provides a coordinator and cost-share for practice application under the CORE4 program. The Southwest Indiana Brine Coalition, under Four Rivers RC&D administration, has received an IDEM-319 grant for funding a coordinator position to remediate brine, which is a waste product of oil production that frequently leaks from pipes and holding ponds onto the land. Other projects include technical assistance for farmers developing waste management plans and environmental education.

Hoosier Heartland Resource Conservation and Development

The vision of the Hoosier Heartland Resource Conservation and Development is "to realize sustained economic and social prosperity while conserving our natural resources for future generations." Projects include the Backyard Tree Farm Program, Building with Nature, Urban Erosion Control seminars, Woodland Owners Clinics, and a Youth Farm Stand and outreach project.

Hoosier River Watch

Hoosier Riverwatch is a state-sponsored water quality monitoring initiative. The program was started in 1994 to increase public awareness of water quality issues and concerns by training volunteers to monitor stream water quality. Hoosier Riverwatch collaborates with agencies and volunteers to:

- Increase public involvement in water quality issues through hands-on training of volunteers in stream monitoring and cleanup activities.
- Educate local communities about the relationship between land use and water quality.
- Provide water quality information to citizens and governmental agencies working to protect Indiana's rivers and streams.

Indiana Karst Conservancy

The Indiana Karst Conservancy is a non-profit organization dedicated to the preservation and conservation of Indiana's unique karst features. The IKC was formed by concerned individuals when it was apparent that no similar group was actively protecting such features for their inherent geological, biological, and archaeological importance. The purposes of the IKC are the management, protection, and acquisition of the karst areas in Indiana. The IKC also supports research and promotes education related to karst and its appropriate use.

Lincoln Hills Resource Conservation & Development

RC&D is a unique process that helps people protect and develop their economic, natural, and social resources in ways that improve their area's economy, environment, and quality of life. Local RC&D Councils provide a way for people to plan and implement projects that will make their communities a better place to live. Lincoln Hills RC&D serves Crawford, Perry, Harrison, Spencer, and Washington counties. Their vision is to have a favorable economic climate in harmony with all resources for a higher quality of life. The Fish and Wildlife Resource Committee promotes wildlife food plots by distributing donated seed to landowners. They recently purchased a Warm Season Grasses No Till Drill that can be rented by landowners to improve wildlife habitat by planting warm season grasses that can be used as buffer strips that also protect the land.

Lost River Conservation Assoc.

The primary goal of the Lost River Conservation Association always has been, and remains, the permanent protection of Indiana's Lost River Karst System. We are concerned about the various sources of pollution: air, land, and water. We believe it is essential that solutions to pollution be identified and implemented. We favor pursuing advances in pollution remediation,

including full scale composting of organic wastes. We actively promote public awareness and education in an effort to protect the unique features, ground and surface water quality, wetlands, and overall biology of Indiana's Lost River Karst System.

Tri-County Nutrient Management Committee

The Washington, Lawrence, and Orange County SWCD's organized to form the Tri-County Nutrient Management Committee (TCNMC) to apply for a 319 grant from IDEM to address nutrient management in the watersheds of the Blue River, Lost River, Muscatatuck River, and East Fork White River. The grant was received and allowed the committee to hire a nutrient management specialist to work with livestock producers, educating them on the need for proper management of animal waste. The TCNMC has completed two demonstration projects and will host several more in the summer of 2002. The committee is working to get a second grant to continue the work with the livestock producers.

Orange Co. SWCD

The Orange County Soil and Water District was recently awarded a Clean Water Indiana, Lake and River Enhancement Grant to apply conservation practices in the Lost River karst region of the county. The overall goal of the project is to improve the water quality of Lost River by demonstrating conservation practices that limit the movement of soil and nutrients into the fragile underground system of the Lost River Drainage.

Orange County USDA-NRCS

The Upper Lost River Conservation Priority (CPA) is a cost share program through the Natural Resources Conservation Service that uses Best Management Practices (BMP's) to address soil erosion, water quality, and nutrient management in Orange County.

Part II, Chapter 2: Water Quality Concerns and Priority Issues Identified by State and Federal Agencies

This section presents the combined efforts of state and federal agencies, and universities (such as IDEM, IDNR, USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service, Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, Purdue University, Indiana University, Indiana Geologic Survey, and US Geological Survey) to assess water quality concerns and priority issues in the Lower East Fork White Watershed. This multi-organization effort formed the basis of the Unified Watershed Assessment for Indiana. At this time, the Unified Watershed Assessment has been completed for 1998 and updated for 2000-2001.

Indiana's Unified Watershed Assessment (UWA)

The UWA workgroup gathered a wide range of water quality data that could be used to characterize Indiana's water resources. These data were used in 'layers' in order to sort the 8-digit HUC watersheds according to the present condition of the water in lakes, rivers, and streams. The workgroup used only those data which concerned the water column, organisms living in the water, or the suitability of the water for supporting aquatic ecosystems. Each 'layer' of information/data was partitioned by percentiles into scores. The scores ranged between one and five, with a score of one indicative of good water quality or minimum impairment, and a score of five indicating heavily impacted or degraded water quality.

The data layers used in the 1998 and the 2000-2001 update include:

- Lake Fishery: Large-mouth bass community information for lakes
- Stream Fishery: Small-mouth bass community information for streams
- Aquatic Life Use Support: The "livability" of the water column for aquatic life, determined from evaluation of chemical and physical water data, and assessment of aquatic life
- Fish Consumption Advisories: Site specific advisories based on current data
- Fish Index of Biotic Integrity: Based on fish community diversity and fish health
- Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index: Measure of whether the aquatic habitat is suitable for diverse communities, based on visual observations
- Lake Trophic Scores: Indicator for the rate at which a lake is 'aging' due to inputs of nutrients and other factors
- Sediment Potential: Indicator of potential sediment input to waterbodies in the watershed

The sources and additional information for these data layers include:

- Lake Fishery: From IDNR fisheries surveys of lakes and reservoirs from 1972 to 1994. Raw scores were averaged for all lakes in the watershed
- Stream Fishery: From IDNR fisheries surveys of streams from 1970 to 1994. Raw scores were averaged for all streams in the watershed
- Aquatic Life Use Support: IDEM, Office of Water Quality, Assessment Branch
- Fish Consumption Advisories: ISDH and IDEM, Office of Water Quality, Assessment Branch

- Fish Index of Biotic Integrity: IDEM, Office of Water Quality, Assessment Branch

- Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index: IDEM, Office of Water Quality, Assessment Branch

- Lake Trophic Scores: Indiana Clean Lakes Program through IDEM, Office of Water Quality, Assessment Branch. This score was based on information gathered from sampling conducted in the 1970's and 1980's

During summer 1999 the UWA workgroup used additional layers of information to identify the resource concerns and stressors for each of the 361 11-digit watersheds in Indiana. Examination of the human activities that have the potential to impact the ecosystem will help planners to focus on those areas where restoration may be most critical. Organizations can identify opportunities to use their programs and resources to address those areas.

This focusing process will illuminate areas where the interests of two or more partner agencies may converge. It is intended that this will lead to more effective allocation of resources for restoration and protection activities. At the local level, this information can assist groups to prioritize watershed activities and provide some discussion points for planning.

This amended assessment has the following benefits:

- Provides a logical process for targeting funds, which may be expanded or updated without changing the basic framework.

- Provides information at a finer resolution (11-digit hydrologic units) to agencies and local groups interested in watershed assessment.

- Identifies data gaps.

- Can be used as a compliment to other assessments, such as the 305(b) Report and 303(d) List.

Table 2-1 and Figure 2-1 show the results of the 2000-2001 UWA for the Lower East Fork White watershed (NRCS & IDEM 2000).

Part II, Chapter 3: Identification of Impaired Waters

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act requires states to identify waters that do not or are not expected to meet applicable water quality standards with federal technology-based standards alone. States are also required to develop a priority ranking for these waters taking into account the severity of the pollution and the designated uses of the waters. Indiana's 303(d) list was approved by EPA on February 16, 1999.

Once the Section 303(d) list and ranking of waters is completed, the states are required to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for these waters in order to achieve compliance with the water quality standards. The TMDL is an allocation that determines the point and nonpoint source (plus margin of safety) load reductions required in order for the waterbody to meet water quality standards. IDEM's Office of Water Quality has and continues to perform point source waste load allocations for receiving waters. Part I of the WRAS briefly outlines IDEM's strategy for developing TMDLs.

Table 0-1 shows the Lower East Fork White Watershed waterbodies that are on Indiana's 1998 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list submitted and approved by EPA (IDEM 1998, Figure 3-1). The 2002 draft 303(d) list has been completed and the final list will be released in October 2002. The draft 2002 list is not included in this document, but is available from IDEM's Office of Water Quality (http://www.state.in.us/idem/water/planbr/wqs/303d.html)

Part II, Chapter 4: Priority Issues and Recommended Management Strategies

Part I provided the existing water quality information for the Lower East Fork White Watershed and Part II lists priority issues and concerns from local, state, and federal stakeholders in the watershed. This section pulls together the priority issues and concerns held by all stakeholders and recommends management strategies. Underlying all discussions of priority issues and concerns is the fact that improving water quality in the Lower East Fork White Watershed will also enhance the natural and recreational values of the Lower East Fork White River . Each subsection below focuses on a single priority issue.

4.1 Data/Information and Targeting

The success in restoring water quality in the Lower East Fork White Watershed is fundamentally based on identifying the specific geographic problem areas; identifying all sources contributing to the impairment of the waterbody; and quantifying the contribution of a pollutant by each source.

Recommended Management Strategy 1: Numerous data collection efforts are ongoing in the Lower East Fork White Watershed. This information should be used in prioritizing and targeting specific problems and geographic areas in the watershed. The scale at which targeting and prioritization should occur is the 14-digit HUC watershed area (Figure 2-2 of Part I). Targeting and prioritization will require input from stakeholders living in those geographic areas. The purpose of prioritization and targeting is to enhance allocation of resources in the effort of improving water quality.

Recommended Management Strategy 2: Through the development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for impaired waterbodies in the Lower East Fork White Watershed, all sources contributing to the impairment of a waterbody will be identified and quantified in terms of their contribution to the waterbody. This includes gathering more data and information on nonpoint sources of water pollution. Throughout the TMDL process, information and feedback from watershed stakeholders will be required in order to generate appropriate allocation scenarios. The result of developing TMDLs will be an understanding of the impact of nonpoint sources on water quality in the watershed.

4.2 Streambank Erosion and Stabilization

The cutting and erosion of streambanks within the Lower East Fork White Watershed is a major concern. This cutting and erosion increases the sediment load in waterbodies and directly impacts the scenic and recreational values of waterbodies in the Lower East Fork White Watershed. Streambank cutting and erosion is often a function of many factors that include stream energy and velocity, flooding, and land management. Increased drainage in headwater streams and ditches increases stream energy during rainfall events and often leads to increased streambank cutting and erosion downstream. Land clearing and urban development also impact volume and velocity of runoff. Hence, this problem is not easily solved.

Recommended Management Strategy 1: Structural stabilization of specific streambank areas in the Lower East Fork White watershed may solve problems on a temporary basis. However, a comprehensive understanding of drainage, stream flows and energies, and land management practices is required to adequately approach this problem. Conservation partners (local, state, and federal) are actively working within their specific geographic areas (typically at the county level); however, this may not facilitate solving the streambank cutting and erosion problems because efforts may not be coordinated between headwater and downstream areas. For example, drainage should take into account the work and efforts of downstream partners to reduce flooding and streambank cutting. Conservation efforts should be in the context of watersheds and span county boundaries in order to account for downstream impacts. Local Drainage Boards, Planning and Zoning Boards, and County Commissioners could effectively address this issue by involving local stakeholders in the decision making process and approaching the issue on a watershed basis.

4.3 Failing Septic Systems and Straight Pipe Discharges

Local county health departments and other stakeholders have identified failing septic systems and straight pipe discharge from septic tanks as significant sources of water pollution in the Lower East Fork White watershed. Straight pipe discharges from septic tanks and septic tanks connected to drainage tiles are illegal (327 IAC 5-1-1.5); however, these practices still exist in the Lower East Fork White watershed.

Recommended Management Strategy 1: The direct impact of communities discharging their septic tank effluent to waterbodies needs to be adequately characterized. This will involve coordination between the Office of Water Quality, local health departments, Indiana State Department of Health, and other stakeholders. The choice to eliminate the illegal discharges will be a cooperative effort between homeowners and local, state, and federal stakeholders.

Recommended Management Strategy 2: Local planning, zoning, and health ordinances could be adopted or strengthened to address this problem during new development. Existing local ordinances could be enforced more vigorously to correct problems with existing systems. Both of these strategies will require input from local stakeholders.

Recommended Management Strategy 3: An education/outreach program on the health and environmental risks of septic system discharges, system maintenance, and system function would provide homeowners and others with basic information to better understand the impacts of inadequate systems. This kind of education effort would involve local health departments, Indiana State Department of Health, IDEM, and other stakeholders. For example, the Arrowhead Country RC&D in northwest Indiana is working on a project to demonstrate proper septic system installation.

4.4 Water Quality - General

The Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list presented in Chapter 3 lists impaired waterbodies for the Lower East Fork White watershed.

Recommended Management Strategy: The Clean Water Act requires states to complete TMDLs for waterbodies listed on the Section 303(d) list. The Office of Water Quality is currently evaluating and exploring the modeling process and data needs required to complete TMDLs for the Section 303(d) listed waterbodies. Completion of a TMDL will involve loading allocations of a pollutant to both point and nonpoint sources. The development of TMDLs will involve meetings with stakeholder groups linked to the Section 303(d) waterbodies. As TMDLs are developed, this Watershed Restoration Action Strategy will be amended to incorporate the final TMDLs.

4.5 Fish Consumption Advisories

As noted in Part I and Part II, fish consumption advisories are concerns within the Lower East Fork White watershed.

Recommended Management Strategy 1: In many cases, the source of the contamination is unknown and may be from atmospheric deposition or some unknown discharge. To address this concern, the cause or source must be identified. Until that is accomplished, the fish consumption advisories should be followed.

4.6 Nonpoint Source Pollution - General

Nonpoint source pollution contributions are often difficult to assess or quantify. They can include sediment deposition from soil erosion, nutrient runoff from animal wastes and commercial fertilizer, herbicide and insecticide runoff, and oil or fuel waste runoff. Degraded wetlands may also contribute to nonpoint source pollution, as their capacity for abatement of runoff and the associated pollutants is diminished or lost. Nonpoint pollution can emanate from agricultural as well as urban lands. Currently, loadings of nonpoint source pollutants to water are often inferred by examination of land use practices, without actual measurements. In addition, the actual water quality impairments related to nonpoint source pollutants have not been well characterized in the Lower East Fork White watershed. Finally, very few regulatory control mechanisms exist to control nonpoint source pollution.

Recommended Management Strategy 1: Through the TMDL development process, the Office of Water Quality will identify, assess, and quantify nonpoint source pollutant loadings to impaired waterbodies. In order to accomplish this task, the Office of Water Quality will work closely with local, state, and federal stakeholders at the watershed and subwatershed level. Loading scenarios for nonpoint source pollutants will be developed by the Office of Water Quality and reviewed by local, state, and federal stakeholders. Implementation of nonpoint source controls will involve a blend of funding assistance and regulatory action, where applicable.

Recommended Management Strategy 2: Numerous funding mechanisms, such as Conservation Reserve Program, Environmental Quality Incentive Program, Lake and River Enhancement program, and 319(h) grants, exist to promote practices to reduce nonpoint source pollution in the watershed. To more efficiently and effectively address nonpoint source pollution in the watershed, the prioritization and targeting discussed previously in Part II should be used to allocate further application of

resources.

Recommended Management Strategy 3: The management of urban nonpoint sources can be addressed through effective land use planning and site design. Designs that incorporate less impervious area and more natural infiltration areas have proven effective in reducing urban nonpoint pollution. Local stakeholders working with local planning and zoning authorities, and developers, should implement more stringent site design requirements to reduce nonpoint source contaminants. This effort would be supported by the state and federal stakeholders.

Recommended Management Strategy 4: Practicing the following management measures for NPS pollution abatement may significantly reduce the sediment, nutrient, pesticide and other pollutant contributions to surface waters:
1) Protection of Wetlands and Riparian Areas of those serving a significant NPS pollution abatement function
2) Restoration of Wetlands and Riparian Areas of preexisting functions in damaged and destroyed areas, esp. where the systems will serve significant NPS pollution abatement function
3) Vegetated Treatment Systems (VTS) to promote use of constructed wetlands and vegetated filter strips where these systems will serve significant NPS pollution abatement function
*The information on degraded wetlands as potential contributors to nonpoint source pollution and the management measures for NPS pollution abatement is compiled from the USEPA Draft Guidance entitled "National Management Measures to Protect and Restore Wetlands and Riparian Areas for the Abatement of Nonpoint Source Pollution" (EPA 841-B-01-001 June 2001).

4.6.1 Nonpoint Source Pollution- Education and Outreach

This Watershed Restoration Action Strategy is a beginning point for education and outreach efforts. It compiles existing knowledge about the water resources in this watershed and presents it to the stakeholders who live in the Lower East Fork White watershed. It brings to a public forum the available information and local concerns. However, the education process does not stop with the publication of this document.

Recommended Management Strategy: Local stakeholders, in cooperation with state and federal agencies, need to seek additional information on water quality concerns and issues addressed in this document and make that information available to the public. Additionally, the problems associated with septic failures, soil erosion, land use issues, and riparian zones can be emphasized through meetings, training sessions, and stakeholder group discussions. Field days are excellent ways to present information and encourage discussion. Use of experts with strong background knowledge coupled with local sponsors is an effective method to convey solutions to these problems.

4.7 Point Sources - General

There are 169 active NPDES permitted dischargers, and 8 CSO discharge points in the Lower East Fork White watershed. Additionally there are illegal point source discharges, such as tiles discharging septic tank effluent that exist in the watershed.

Recommended Management Strategy: The Permitting and Compliance Branch of the Office of Water Quality is responsible for issuing and monitoring compliance of NPDES permit holders. Clearly, more emphasis and resources are needed to identify and correct illegal point sources and noncomplying point sources. Improving compliance of NPDES dischargers and identifying illegal dischargers will involve fostering a working relationship with other local, state, and federal stakeholders to monitor compliance and report unusual discharges or stream appearance. In regards to illegal discharges, the Office of Water Quality will work with local, state, and federal stakeholders to identify and eliminate these sources of water pollution.

Part II, Chapter 5: Future Expectations and Actions

As discussed in Part I, this Watershed Restoration Action Strategy is intended to be a fluid document that will be revised or amended as new information becomes available. Section 5.1 discusses expectations derived from the Strategy and how progress will be measured. Specific revisions and amendments to the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy are discussed in Section 5.2. Finally, the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy will be reviewed by all stakeholders before it becomes final, as described in Section 5.3.

5.1 Expectations and Measuring Progress

The Lower East Fork White Strategy provides a starting point to address water quality concerns held by local, state, and federal stakeholders. Part II provides recommended management strategies to address these concerns. Through cooperative efforts with stakeholders, all of the recommended management strategies listed will begin implementation by the summer of 2003.

Measurement of progress is critical to the success of any plan. Water quality improvements will not take place overnight. Measuring of progress in terms of water quality will be provided through the Office of Water Quality Assessment Branch's rotating basin monitoring strategy.

5.2 Expected Revisions and Amendments

This Watershed Restoration Action Strategy is intended to provide a starting point to improve water quality and measure the improvement. Hence, this document will require revisions and amendments as new information becomes available. The future revisions and amendments have been divided into those that are expected within the next year (Section 5.2.1) and those that will occur over a long-term basis (Section 5.2.2).

5.2.1 Short Term Revisions and Amendments

The most significant revisions and amendments will likely occur during 2002 and after, as a result of stakeholder review.

5.2.2 Long Term Revisions and Amendments

The Office of Water Quality is moving toward adopting a watershed management approach to solve water quality problems. Part of the watershed approach is the use of a rotating basin management cycle. The Assessment Branch of the Office of Water Quality has already adopted this rotating basin cycle in its intensive monitoring and assessment of Indiana waterbodies (this is in addition to the already established fixed station monitoring which occurs on a monthly basis). The Watershed Restoration Action Strategy may be revised or amended when sufficient information becomes available.

5.3 Review of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy

Before this Watershed Restoration Action Strategy becomes final, it will undergo rigorous review. The first stage of review will be performed internally by the Office of Water Quality. Once the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy has been revised to address internal Office of Water Quality comments, it will be circulated to local, state, and federal stakeholders in the watershed. Written comments from local, state, and federal stakeholders will be addressed and the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy will again be revised to incorporate applicable comments. Once internal and external comments have been addressed, the final version of the Watershed Restoration Action Strategy will be released.

Part II Tables

TABLE 2-1: UNIFIED WATERSHED ASSESSMENT FOR THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE WATERSHED, 2000-2001

Hydrologic Unit Scores for Each Parameter Used in the Unified Watershed Assessment [2000-2001]															
	Measured Parameters														
11 Digit Hydrologic Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
05120208010	1	1	nd	5	nd	nd	2	4	4	2	1	2	4	2	1
05120208020	4	1	nd	5	nd	nd	2	5	2	2	3	2	4	1	1
05120208030	nd	1	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	3	5	1	2	1	3	2	1
05120208040	4	1	nd	5	nd	nd	nd	2	3	2	4	2	3	1	1
05120208050	nd	1	nd	5	nd	nd	nd	4	5	1	3	2	1	1	1
05120208060	nd	1	5	nd	nd	nd	nd	4	4	1	1	1	3	2	1
05120208070	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	2	3	5	2	2	1	1	1	1
05120208080	nd	nd	nd	nd	3	nd	1	4	4	3	4	2	2	1	1
05120208090	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	2	4	3	1	4	2	3	1	1
05120208100	5	nd	nd	5	nd	nd	nd	4	3	1	3	2	4	1	2
05120208110	nd	nd	nd	5	nd	nd	nd	4	5	1	3	1	4	1	2
05120208120	5	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	4	5	1	2	2	4	1	2
05120208130	nd	nd	nd	nd	4	nd	4	3	3	1	1	2	4	1	3
05120208140	5	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	3	3	1	2	2	4	1	3
05120208150	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	2	5	2	1	2	2	4	1	1
05120208160	nd	nd	nd	5	3	nd	nd	4	5	4	1	2	4	1	2
05120208170	nd	nd	nd	nd	1	nd	2	4	2	1	2	2	5	3	4

KEY

Parameters:

1 - Mussel Diversity and Occurrence
2 - Aquatic Life Use Support
3 - Recreational Use Attainment
4 - Stream Fishery
5 - Lake Fishery
6 - Eurasian Milfoil Infestation Status
7 - Lake Trophic Status
8 - Critical Biodiversity Resource
9 - Aquifer Vulnerability
10 - Population Using Surface Water for Drinking Water
11 - Residential Septic System Density
12 - Degree of Urbanization
13 - Density of Livestock
14 - % Cropland
15 - Mineral Extraction Activities

Score range:

1 = good water quality (minimum impairment)
5 = heavily impacted or degraded water quality
nd = no data

(from NRCS & IDEM 2000)

TABLE 0-1: WATERS OF THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE ON INDIANA'S 1998 303(D) LIST

ID	Waterbody	Parameter of Concern	Priority for TMDL development
IN-0166BIOTA-1998	CLEAR CREEK	IMPAIRED BIOTIC COMMUNITIES	2012-2014
IN-0166ECOLI-1998	CLEAR CREEK	E. COLI	2002-2004
IN-0166FCPCB-1998	CLEAR CREEK	FCA - PCBS	2012-2014
IN-0167FCMRC-1998	DOGWOOD LAKE	FCA - MERCURY	2012-2014
IN-0168BIOTA-1998	EAST FORK JACKSON CREEK	IMPAIRED BIOTIC COMMUNITIES	2007-2009
IN-0169FCMRC-1998	EAST FORK WHITE RIVER	FCA - MERCURY	2012-2014
IN-0169FCPCB-1998	EAST FORK WHITE RIVER	FCA - PCBS	2012-2014
IN-0170FCPCB-1998	EAST FORK WHITE RIVER	FCA - PCBS	2012-2014
IN-0173BIOTA-1998	JACKSON CREEK	IMPAIRED BIOTIC COMMUNITIES	2007-2009
IN-0176FCMRC-1998	MONROE RESERVOIR	FCA - MERCURY	2012-2014
IN-0179FCPCB-1998	PLEASANT RUN	FCA - PCBS	2012-2014
IN-0180FCMRC-1998	SALT CREEK	FCA - MERCURY	2012-2014
IN-0180FCPCB-1998	SALT CREEK	FCA - PCBS	2012-2014
IN-0185BIOTA-1998	WEST FORK CLEAR CREEK	IMPAIRED BIOTIC COMMUNITIES	2007-2009
IN-0186FCMRC-1998	YELLOWWOOD LAKE	FCA - MERCURY	2012-2014

FCA - Fish Consumption Advisory
PCB - Polychlorinated Biphenyls
Hg - Mercury

***Only waters for which fish tissue data support issuance of fish consumption advisories are individually cited above. The Indiana Department of Health has issued a general fish consumption advisory for all other waters of the state. This advisory was based on extrapolation of the fish tissue data that were available and generally recommends that if no site-specific advisory is in place for a waterbody, the public should eat no more than one meal (8 oz.) per week of fish caught in these waters. Women of child bearing age, women who are breast feeding, and children up to 15 years of age should eat no more than one meal per month. The basis for this general advisory is widespread occurrence of mercury or PCBs (or both) in most fish sampled throughout the state. Please refer to the most recent Fish Consumption Advisory booklet available through the Indiana Department of Health (317/233-7808). Sources of the mercury and PCBs are unknown for the most part, but it is suspected that they result from air deposition.

Figures

Part One, Figure 2-1: Watershed Area

Part One, Figure 2-2: 14 Digit HUCs



Part One, Figure 2-3 Erosion Potential



Map showing soil erosion potential of Indiana soil associations.

(from The Indiana Water Resource, IDNR 1980)

Part One, Figure 2-4: Land Cover



Part One, Figure 3-1: NPDES Facility Locations



Part Two, Figure 2-1: Unified Watershed Assesment

Part Two, Figure 3-1: 303d Streams



APPENDIX A

BENCHMARK CHARACTERISTIC ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM FIXED STATIONS IN THE LOWER EAST FORK WHITE WATERSHED

Station: EW-79

	Valid N	Mean	Confid -95.000%	Confid +95.000%	Median	Sum	Minimum	Maximum	Lower Quartile	Upper Quartile	Range	Quartile Range	Variance	Std.Dev.	Standard Error	Skewness	Std.Err. Skewness	Kurtosis	Std.Err. Kurtosis
Alkalinity (mg/l)	80	171.7	161.6993	181.7007	166	13736	67	297	148	197	230	49	2019.529	44.93917	5.024352	0.282234	0.268909	0.557218	0.531786
Ammonia (mg/l as N)	80	0.1325	0.025184	0.238816	0.05	10.6	0.05	4.3	0.05	0.1	4.25	0.05	0.228234	0.477739	0.053413	8.623309	0.268909	75.97642	0.531786
BOD (mg/l)	38	1.673684	1.183129	2.164239	1.3	63.6	0.5	6.6	0.5	2	6.1	1.5	2.227397	1.492447	0.242107	1.658263	0.382818	3.551836	0.7497
COD (mg/l)	80	14.85625	12.8972	16.8153	13.4	1188.5	2.5	76.6	11	17.75	74.1	6.75	77.49566	8.803162	0.984223	4.492238	0.268909	30.45328	0.531786
Cyanide (mg/l)	18	0.005111	0.004877	0.005346	0.005	0.092	0.005	0.007	0.005	0.005	0.002	0	2.22E-07	0.000471	0.000111	4.242641	0.536278	18	1.037795
Nitrate (mg/l as N)	80	1.940625	1.674377	2.206873	1.95	155.25	0.05	9.6	1.2	2.4	9.55	1.2	1.431398	1.196411	0.133763	3.359758	0.268909	20.4544	0.531786
Total Phosphorus (mg/l as P)	80	0.135313	0.053242	0.217383	0.08	10.825	0.015	3.37	0.06	0.115	3.355	0.055	0.136007	0.368792	0.041232	8.756077	0.268909	77.71301	0.531786
Total Solids (mg/l)	80	332.6375	313.4969	351.7781	318.5	26611	214	918	282	356	704	74	7397.702	86.0099	9.616199	4.202278	0.268909	26.86536	0.531786
Suspended Solids (mg/l)	80	32.325	25.82884	38.82116	22.5	2586	2	165	13.5	39.5	163	26	852.1209	29.19111	3.263665	2.256844	0.268909	6.414553	0.531786
Dissolved Solids (mg/l)	21	266.8095	241.8523	291.7667	257	5603	200	422	236	288	222	52	3006.062	54.82757	11.96436	1.306914	0.501195	2.062036	0.971941
Sulfate (mg/l)	22	37.5	24.93205	50.06795	31.5	825	16	160	28	36	144	8	803.5	28.34608	6.043404	4.177547	0.490962	18.67304	0.95278
TKN (mg/l as N)	80	0.78	0.57689	0.98311	0.6	62.4	0.2	8	0.5	0.8	7.8	0.3	0.833013	0.912695	0.102042	6.730789	0.268909	51.32922	0.531786
E. coli (CFU/100ml)	77	284.026	148.4338	419.6182	100	21870	5	4400	40	250	4395	210	356881.6	597.3957	68.07956	4.973897	0.273908	30.37554	0.54146
TOC (mg/l)	21	3.019048	2.68622	3.351875	2.9	63.4	1.5	5.1	2.7	3.3	3.6	0.6	0.534619	0.731176	0.159556	0.720846	0.501195	2.881751	0.971941
Hardness (mg/l)	80	214.7125	203.0997	226.3253	215.5	17177	94	316	182.5	254	222	71.5	2723.094	52.18327	5.834267	-0.16708	0.268909	-0.45722	0.531786
Chloride (mg/l)	22	25.68182	12.45652	38.90712	18.5	565	10	155	14	26	145	12	889.7511	29.8287	6.359499	4.228659	0.490962	18.94201	0.95278
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	61	10.1077	9.590157	10.62525	10.25	616.57	4.9	13.84	8.4	11.86	8.94	3.46	4.083581	2.020787	0.258735	-0.36098	0.30627	-0.26544	0.603837
pH	62	7.900806	7.811499	7.990114	7.965	489.85	6.9	8.7	7.71	8.1	1.8	0.39	0.123673	0.351672	0.044662	-0.76263	0.303902	0.903605	0.599288
Copper (ug/l)	77	2.963636	2.514437	3.412836	2	228.2	2	16	2	4	14	2	3.916818	1.979095	0.225539	4.1238	0.273908	24.26608	0.54146
Iron (ug/l)	77	1058.429	846.0521	1270.805	710	81499	89	5000	510	1300	4911	790	875523	935.6939	106.6322	1.939854	0.273908	4.195213	0.54146
Zinc (ug/l)	78	10.47821	8.60597	12.35044	10	817.3	2.25	50	5	10	47.75	5	68.95439	8.303878	0.940229	2.873874	0.272211	9.412449	0.538176

Station: EW-1

	Valid N	Mean	Confid -95.000%	Confid +95.000%	Median	Sum	Minimum	Maximum	Lower Quartile	Upper Quartile	Range	Quartile Range	Variance	Std.Dev.	Standard Error	Skewness	Std.Err. Skewness	Kurtosis	Std.Err. Kurtosis
Alkalinity (mg/l)	75	171.84	160.4268	183.2532	165	12888	53	359	139	207	306	68	2460.704	49.60546	5.727948	0.619128	0.2774	1.791755	0.546211
Ammonia (mg/l as N)	75	0.069333	0.057239	0.081427	0.05	5.2	0.05	0.3	0.05	0.05	0.25	0	0.002763	0.052565	0.00607	3.175937	0.2774	10.00993	0.546211
BOD (mg/l)	34	1.777941	1.238885	2.316997	1.6	60.45	0.05	6.3	0.5	2.3	6.25	1.8	2.386847	1.544942	0.264955	1.54545	0.403053	2.304411	0.787898
COD (mg/l)	75	15.184	13.63906	16.72894	13.3	1138.8	2.5	32.3	10.8	19	29.8	8.2	45.08893	6.714829	0.775362	0.821284	0.2774	0.295157	0.546211
Cyanide (mg/l)	73	0.005082	0.004967	0.005197	0.005	0.371	0.005	0.009	0.005	0.005	0.004	0.004	2.43E-07	0.000493	5.77E-05	7.341765	0.281029	57.39118	0.555223
Nitrate (mg/l as N)	75	1.901333	1.895015	2.107652	1.9	142.6	0.05	4.2	1.2	2.6	4.15	1.4	0.8041 2	0.896727	0.103545	0.093243	0.2774	-0.37275	0.546211
Total Phosphorus (mg/l as P)	75	0.108733	0.092198	0.125269	0.09	8.155	0.015	0.39	0.07	0.13	0.375	0.06	0.005165	0.071867	0.008299	1.928877	0.2774	4.670579	0.546211
Total Solids (mg/l)	75	362.1333	345.2636	379.0031	346	27160	217	556	311	407	339	96	5376.063	73.32164	8.466454	0.635326	0.2774	-0.00657	0.546211
Suspended Solids (mg/l)	75	52.6	39.85895	65.34105	46	3945	2	356	22	62	354	40	3066.595	55.37684	6.394367	3.575054	0.2774	16.09071	0.546211
Dissolved Solids (mg/l)	22	265.5455	239.4723	291.6186	253	5842	202	430	218	280	228	62	3458.165	58.80616	12.53752	1.359905	0.490962	1.617291	0.95278
Sulfate (mg/l)	24	41.20833	34.36776	48.0489	36.5	989	19	83	30	52	64	22	262.433	16.19978	3.306767	0.994394	0.472261	0.465967	0.917777
TKN (mg/l as N)	24	0.597917	0.480697	0.715136	0.6	14.35	0.05	1.5	0.45	0.75	1.45	0.3	0.077061	0.277598	0.056664	1.103523	0.472261	4.117673	0.917777
E. coli (CFU/100ml)	71	413.5915	161.655	665.5281	70	29365	5	6100	20	210	6095	190	1132922	1064.388	126.3195	4.093717	0.284805	17.83669	0.562511
TOC (mg/l)	22	3.109091	2.793225	3.424957	3.05	68.4	2	4.5	2.6	3.5	2.5	0.9	0.507532	0.712413	0.151887	0.502308	0.490962	-0.52901	0.95278
Hardness (mg/l)	75	226.4	213.2747	239.5253	223	16980	112	352	192	269	240	77	3254.351	57.04692	6.587211	0.027054	0.2774	-0.42972	0.546211
Chloride (mg/l)	24	16.91667	14.25501	19.57833	17	406	9	34	12	19.5	25	7.5	39.73188	6.303323	1.28666	1.201944	0.472261	1.28953	0.917777
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	57	10.08404	9.645529	10.52254	9.94	574.79	5.7	13.7	9.09	11.17	8	2.08	2.731239	1.652646	0.218898	-0.12386	0.316327	0.012029	0.623134
pH	58	8.001724	7.905607	8.098842	8.01	464.1	6.88	8.54	7.82	8.29	1.66	0.47	0.130864	0.361751	0.0475	-1.26381	0.31372	1.882454	0.618136
Copper (ug/l)	25	2.864	2.260993	3.467007	2	71.6	2	6.5	2	4.1	4.5	2.1	2.134067	1.460845	0.292169	1.285731	0.463684	0.080418	0.901721
Iron (ug/l)	24	1614.583	939.4286	2289.738	1350	38750	160	8100	735	1900	7940	1165	2556469	1598.896	326.3733	3.121801	0.472261	12.1002	0.917777
Zinc (ug/l)	25	9.84	7.119285	12.56071	7.8	246	2.25	34	6.8	12	31.75	5.2	43.44396	6.591203	1.318241	2.259313	0.463684	6.852235	0.901721

Station: SLT-12

	Valid N	Mean	Confid. -95.000%	Confid. +95.000%	Median	Sum	Minimum	Maximum	Lower Quartile	Upper Quartile	Range	Quartile Range	Variance	Std Dev	Standard Error	Skewness	Std.Err. Skewness	Kurtosis	Std.Err. Kurtosis
Alkalinity (mg/l)	78	114.7436	100.653	128.8342	93.5	8950	36	254	67	145	218	78	3905.7	62.4956	7.076233	0.839056	0.272211	-0.50687	0.538176
Ammonia (mg/l as N)	78	0.069231	0.056877	0.081584	0.05	5.4	0.05	0.4	0.05	0.05	0.35	0	0.003002	0.05479	0.006204	4.283487	0.272211	20.88695	0.538176
BOD (mg/l)	38	1.182895	0.857949	1.50784	1	44.95	0.05	4.4	0.5	1.5	4.35	1	0.977335	0.988602	0.160372	2.032497	0.382818	4.254454	0.7497
COD (mg/l)	1	13				13	13	13											
Cyanide (mg/l)	1	0.005				0.005	0.005	0.005											
Nitrate (mg/l as N)	78	1.14359	0.962502	1.324677	0.9	89.2	0.2	3.2	0.5	1.6	3	1.1	0.645088	0.803174	0.090942	0.913611	0.272211	-0.1374	0.538176
Total Phosphorus (mg/l as P)	77	0.096429	0.076561	0.116296	0.07	7.425	0.015	0.56	0.05	0.1	0.545	0.05	0.007662	0.087531	0.009975	3.102545	0.273908	12.3194	0.54146
Total Solids (mg/l)	79	250.2278	218.6643	281.7914	208	19768	110	977	148	336	867	188	19857.49	140.9166	15.85436	2.475984	0.270545	9.220378	0.534952
Suspended Solids (mg/l)	79	34.62025	17.14231	52.0982	13	2735	2	600	6	33	598	27	6088.803	78.03078	8.779149	5.866084	0.270545	38.68946	0.534952
Dissolved Solids (mg/l)	77	205.7013	185.5496	225.853	187	15839	98	399	125	278	301	153	7882.765	88.78494	10.11798	0.554951	0.273908	-0.9041	0.54146
Sulfate (mg/l)	79	33.74684	30.85862	36.63505	32	2666	18	110	25	39	92	14	166.2684	12.89451	1.450746	2.820777	0.270545	14.58522	0.534952
TKN (mg/l as N)	21	0.366667	0.310301	0.423032	0.3	7.7	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.015333	0.123828	0.027021	0.711477	0.501195	-0.15073	0.971941
E. coli (CFU/100ml)	74	655.9459	165.671	1146.221	70	48540	5	17000	10	350	16995	340	4478142	2116.162	245.9988	6.659904	0.279197	50.15883	0.551684
TOC (mg/l)	21	3.088095	2.6428	3.53339	3.2	64.85	0.25	4.6	2.8	3.8	4.35	1	0.956976	0.978252	0.213472	-1.23113	0.501195	2.301882	0.971941
Hardness (mg/l)	79	152.3165	134.7521	169.8808	120	12033	54	382	96	196	328	100	6149.168	78.41663	8.82256	0.926314	0.270545	-0.16222	0.534952
Chloride (mg/l)	22	9.318182	6.035333	12.60103	6	205	2.5	26	2.5	16	23.5	13.5	54.82251	7.404222	1.578586	0.915768	0.490962	-0.5591	0.95278
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	61	8.788689	8.169634	9.407743	9.1	536.11	4.01	14.1	6.97	10.42	10.09	3.45	5.842498	2.417126	0.309481	-0.03243	0.30627	-0.67834	0.603837
pH	62	7.730806	7.639667	7.821946	7.74	479.31	6.91	8.6	7.5	7.89	1.69	0.39	0.128798	0.358884	0.045578	0.173743	0.303902	-0.2451	0.599288
Copper (ug/l)	21	2.5	1.836914	3.163086	2	52.5	2	8.2	2	2	6.2	0	2.122	1.456709	0.31788	3.431708	0.501195	12.56583	0.971941
Iron (ug/l)	21	628.0952	399.4733	856.7172	460	13190	120	1800	290	650	1680	360	252256.2	502.2511	109.6002	1.566762	0.501195	1.521829	0.971941
Zinc (ug/l)	21	6.314286	4.711734	7.916838	6.5	132.6	2.25	14	2.25	8.8	11.75	6.55	12.39454	3.520587	0.768255	0.583805	0.501195	-0.20509	0.971941

Station: EW-94

	Valid N	Mean	Confid. -95.000%	Confid. +95.000%	Median	Sum	Minimum	Maximum	Lower Quartile	Upper Quartile	Range	Quartile Range	Variance	Std Dev.	Standard Error	Skewness	Std.Err. Skewness	Kurtosis	Std.Err. Kurtosis
Alkalinity (mg/l)	75	190.5467	180.6225	200.4708	196	14291	73	274	165	229	201	64	1860.521	43.13376	4.980658	-0.5609	0.2774	-0.21333	0.548211
Ammonia (mg/l as N)	75	0.129333	0.023473	0.235194	0.05	9.7	0.05	4	0.05	0.05	3.95	0	0.211695	0.460104	0.053128	8.278207	0.2774	70.2938	0.548211
BOD (mg/l)	36	1.669444	1.13167	2.207219	1.1	60.1	0.5	6.2	0.5	2.15	5.7	1.65	2.526183	1.589397	0.264899	1.541399	0.392544	1.618314	0.768076
COD (mg/l)	75	14.55867	12.76011	16.35723	13.5	1091.9	2.5	56.9	9.4	18	54.4	8.6	61.10759	7.817135	0.902645	2.439451	0.2774	10.9444	0.548211
Cyanide (mg/l)	2	2.5025	-29.2312	34.23625	2.5025	5.005	0.005	5			4.995		12.47501	3.531998	2.4975				
Nitrate (mg/l as N)	75	2.244	1.987872	2.500128	2.2	168.3	0.4	7.7	1.4	2.8	7.3	1.4	1.239254	1.113218	0.128543	1.531379	0.2774	6.409188	0.548211
Total Phosphorus (mg/l as P)	75	0.153	0.060015	0.245985	0.08	11.475	0.015	3.55	0.07	0.13	3.535	0.06	0.163334	0.404146	0.046667	8.247198	0.2774	70.03457	0.548211
Total Solids (mg/l)	74	366.027	345.2589	386.7952	363.5	27086	164	902	325	392	738	67	8035.534	89.64114	10.42057	3.077381	0.279197	17.78419	0.551684
Suspended Solids (mg/l)	75	45.96	35.03182	56.88818	32	3447	2	272	17	56	270	39	2256.012	47.49749	5.484538	2.745703	0.2774	9.532281	0.548211
Dissolved Solids (mg/l)	72	303.2083	289.769	316.6476	314.5	21831	93	417	266.5	349	324	82.5	3270.843	57.19129	6.740058	-0.89498	0.282898	1.487276	0.558831
Sulfate (mg/l)	75	41.84	35.56245	48.11755	38	3138	15	219	33	43	204	10	744.4335	27.28431	3.150521	5.364679	0.2774	31.27856	0.548211
TKN (mg/l as N)	22	0.963636	0.441434	1.485839	0.8	21.2	0.3	6.1	0.5	1	5.8	0.5	1.387186	1.177789	0.251105	4.297302	0.490962	19.48257	0.95278
E. coli (CFU/100ml)	71	464.7183	167.4831	761.9535	70	32995	5	7500	20	220	7495	200	1576951	1255.767	149.0321	4.567936	0.284805	22.45746	0.562511
TOC (mg/l)	21	3.690476	2.68061	4.700342	3	77.5	1.5	12.4	2.6	4.1	10.9	1.5	4.921905	2.218537	0.484124	3.260103	0.501195	12.67814	0.971941
Hardness (mg/l)	75	235.8667	223.0556	248.6777	249	17690	94	320	194	282	226	88	3100.387	55.68112	6.429502	-0.67327	0.2774	-0.45335	0.548211
Chloride (mg/l)	23	28.30435	16.87111	39.73758	23	651	10	145	17	29	135	12	699.0395	26.43936	5.512987	4.231574	0.481337	19.25046	0.934764
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	61	9.863934	9.422063	10.30581	10.02	601.7	5.6	12.91	8.72	11.2	7.31	2.48	2.976688	1.725308	0.220903	-0.29999	0.30627	-0.41152	0.603837
pH	62	7.948871	7.857857	8.039885	7.985	492.83	6.79	8.8	7.76	8.19	2.01	0.43	0.128443	0.358389	0.045516	-0.75053	0.303902	1.378973	0.599288
Copper (ug/l)	24	4.204167	2.155714	6.252619	2	100.9	2	25	2	5	23	3	23.53346	4.85113	0.990233	3.721724	0.472261	15.71756	0.917777
Iron (ug/l)	23	1422.609	840.9732	2004.244	720	32720	120	4900	440	2500	4780	2060	1809111	1345.032	280.4586	1.168329	0.481337	0.380644	0.934764
Zinc (ug/l)	24	9.404167	5.913498	12.89484	7.75	225.7	2.25	40	3.575	12	37.75	8.425	68.33629	8.266576	1.687408	2.375673	0.472261	7.600592	0.917777

APPENDIX B

LOWER EAST FORK WHITE WATERS ASSESSED IN THE CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 305(B) REPORT

Statewide data from the state's Clean Water Act Section 305(B) Report are available at the link below (IDEM's Office of Water Quality website) (http://www.state.in.us/idem/water/planbr/wqs/quality.html). Adobe Acrobat Reader(tm) is required to read these files.

- **Attachment A** - 1998 305 (B) Report (Upper White, Lower White, Patoka)
- **Attachment B** - 1999 & 2000 305 (B) Report (Eel-Wabash, Lower East Fork White, Middle Wabash-Deer, Muscatatuck, Salamonie, Upper East Fork White, Upper Wabash, Whitewater)
- **Attachment C** - 2001 305 (B) Report (Lower Wabash, Middle Wabash-Busseron, Middle Wabash-Little Vermilion, Sugar)
- **Attachment D** - 2002 305 (B) Report (Blue-Sinking, Little Calumet-Galien, Lower Ohio-Little Pigeon, Silver-Little Kentucky, St. Joseph-Maumee)

APPENDIX C

Potential Stakeholders

in the Lower East Fork White Watershed

Avoca State Fish Hatchery
P.O. Box 16
Avoca, IN 47420
812-279-1215

Central Indiana Land Trust, Inc.
324 West Morris St.
Indianapolis, IN 46225
317-631-5263

Cikana State Fish Hatchery
2650 State Road 44
Martinsville, IN 46151
765-342-5527

Driftwood State Fish Hatchery
4931 S. CR 250 W.
Vallonia , IN 47281
812-358-4110

Dubois and Pike Counties USDA-NRCS
1486 Executive Blvd.
Suite A
Jasper, IN 47546-9300
812-482-1171

Four Rivers Resource Conservation & Development
715 S. 9th Street
Petersburg, IN 47567-1820
812-354-6808

Friends of the White River
P.O. Box 90171
Indianapolis, IN 46240
317-767-4140

Hoosier Environmental Council
PO Box 1145
Indianapolis, IN 46206
317-685-8800

Hoosier Heartland Resource Conservation and Development
5995 Lakeside Blvd.
Indianapolis, IN 46278-1996
317-290-3250

Hoosier River Watch
5785 Glenn Rd.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46216-1066
317-541-0617

Indiana Karst Conservancy
PO Box 2401
Indianapolis, IN 46206-2401
317-882-5420

Indiana Lakes Management Society
207 S. Wayne St., Suite B
Angola, IN 46703

Indiana Waterways Association
301 Fort Harrison Road
Terre Haute, IN 47804
812-460-1567

Izaak Walton League of America
Indiana Division President
2173 Pennsylvania Street
Portage, IN 46368-2448
219-762-4876

Know Your Watershed
Conservation Technology Information Ctr
1220 Potter Drive, Room 170
West Lafayette, IN 47906-1383
765-494-9555

Lincoln Hills Resource Conservation & Development
Courthouse Annex
125 South 8th Street
Cannelton, IN 46520-1251
812-547-7028

Lost River Conservation Assoc.
3101 N. Washington Blvd.
Indianapolis, IN 46205
317-253-6951

National Audubon Society
700 Broadway
New York, NY 10003
212-979-3000

Sassafras Audubon Society
P.O. Box 85
Bloomington , IN 47402

Southeastern Indiana SWMD
102 N. Main Street
P.O. Box 166
Versailles, IN 47042
812-689-3525

Sugar Ridge Fish and Wildlife Area
2310 E. State Road 364
Winslow, IN 47598
812-789-2724

Sycamore Land Trust
PO Box 7801
Bloomington, IN 47407-7801
812-336-5257

The Nature Conservancy
1505 N. Delaware St., Suite 200
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202
317-951-8818

Tri-County Nutrient Management Committee
c/o Washington County USDA-NRCS
103 E. Westminster Center, Suite 115
Salem, IN 47167-9731
812-883-3704

Wabash Heritage Land Trust
PO Box 732
New Harmony, IN 47631-0732
812-851-3288

Bartholomew County Commissioner (Bartholomew County)
440 Third Street
Columbus, IN 47201
812-379-1515

Bartholomew County Cooperative Extension Office (Bartholomew County)
1971 State Street
Columbus , IN 47201-6965
812-379-1665

Bartholomew County Department of Health/Board of Health (Bartholomew County)
440 Third Street
Columbus, IN 47201
812-379-1550

Bartholomew County Drainage Board (Bartholomew County)
440 Third Street
Columbus , IN 47201
812-379-1525

Bartholomew County Farm Service Agency (Bartholomew County)
2314 State Street
Columbus, IN 47201-7346
812-378-1280

Bartholomew County Government Offices (Bartholomew County)
440 Third Street
Columbus, IN 47201

Bartholomew County Landfill (Bartholomew County)
811 East 550 South
Columbus, IN 47201
812-342-2756

Bartholomew County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Bartholomew County)
1971 State St.
Columbus, IN 47201
812-379-1665

Bartholomew County SWCD (Bartholomew County)
2314 State Street
Columbus, IN 47201-7346
812-378-1280

Bartholomew County Surveyor (Bartholomew County)
440 Third Street
Room 400
Columbus, IN 47201
812-379-1525

Bartholomew County USDA-NRCS (Bartholomew County)
2314 State Street
Columbus , IN 47201-7346
812-378-1280

Columbus City Utilities (Bartholomew County)
PO Box 1987
Columbus, IN 47202-1987
812-372-8861

Brown County Chamber of Commerce (Brown County)
37 W. Main St.
Nashville, IN 47448
812-988-6647

Brown County Commissioners (Brown County)
P.O. Box 37
Nashville, IN 47448
812-988-5485

Brown County Farm Service Agency (Brown County)
1931 Liberty Dr.
Bloomington, IN 47403
812-334-2343

Brown County Health Department (Brown County)
County Office Building
Nashville, IN 47448
812-988-2255

Brown County Planning Commission (Brown County)
201 Locust Ln.
Nashville, IN 47448
812-988-5490

Brown County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Brown County)
802 Memorial Dr.
Nashville, IN 47448
812-988-5495

Brown County SWCD (Brown County)
46 E. Gould
P.O. Box 308
Nashville, IN 47448
812-988-2211

Brown County Solid Waste (Brown County)
176 Old SR 46
Nashville, IN 47448
812-988-0140

Brown County Solid Waste Mngmnt Dist. (Brown County)
P.O. Box 1308
Nashville, IN 47448
812-988-0140

Brown County Surveyor (Brown County)
P.O. Box 37
Nashville, IN 47448
812-988-5500

Brown County USDA-NRCS (Brown County)
1931 Liberty Dr.
Bloomington , IN 47403
812-334-4323

Nashville Waste Water Treatment Plant (Brown County)
State Road 46 S.
Nashville , IN 47448
812-988-7315

Nashville Water Department (Brown County)
200 Commercial St.
Nashville, IN 47448
812-988-5524

Southern Brown County Water (Brown County)
P.O. Box 134
Nashville, IN 47448
812-988-7408

Yellowwood State Forest (Brown County)
772 Yellowwood Lake Rd.
Nashville, Indiana
812-988-7945

Daviess County Commissioners (Daviess County)
c/o Auditor's Office
200 E. Walnut
Washington, IN 47501
812-254-8662

Daviess County Drainage Board (Daviess County)
c/o Auditor's Office
200 E. Walnut
Washington, IN 47501
812-254-8662

Daviess County Engineer (Daviess County)
204 SE 3rd St.
Washington, IN 47501-3518
812-254-5798

Daviess County Farm Service Agency (Daviess County)
State St. RR 3
Washington , IN 47501
812-254-4780

Daviess County Growth Council (Daviess County)
P.O. Box 191
Washington, IN 47501
812-254-1500

Daviess County Health Department (Daviess County)
303 E. Hefron St.
Washington, IN 47501
812-254-8666

Daviess County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Daviess County)
214 N. E. 3rd
Washington, IN 47501
812-254-8668

Daviess County SWCD (Daviess County)
2524 E. National Hwy
Washington, IN 47501
812-254-4780

Daviess County Surveyor (Daviess County)
200 E. Walnut
Washington, IN 47501
812-644-7463

Daviess County USDA-NRCS (Daviess County)
2524 E. National Highway
Washington, IN 47501
812-254-4780

Daviess County Visitor's Bureau (Daviess County)
1 Train Depot St.
P.O. Box 430
Washington , IN 47501
812-254-5262

City of Jasper Mayor (Dubois County)
P.O. Box 29
Jasper, IN 47547-0029
812-482-4255

Dubois County Commissioner (Dubois County)
1 Courthouse Square
Jasper, IN 47546
812-481-7000

Dubois County Drainage Board (Dubois County)
1 Courthouse Square
Jasper, IN 47546
812-481-7000

Dubois County Farm Service Agency (Dubois County)
1486 Executive Blvd.
Jasper, IN 47546
812-482-1171

Dubois County Health Department (Dubois County)
602 Main St.
Jasper, IN 47546
812-481-7050

Dubois County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Dubois County)
1482 Executive Blvd., Suite A
Jasper, IN 47546
812-482-1782

Dubois County SWCD (Dubois County)
1486 Executive Blvd.
Jasper, IN 47546-9300
812-482-1171

Dubois County Surveyor (Dubois County)
1 Courthouse Square
Jasper, IN 47546
812-482-2171

Green County SWCD (Green County)
30 W. Indiana Ave
Suite 2
Bloomfield, IN 47424
812-384-3517

Green County Solid Waste Mngmnt District (Green County)
RR 1, Box 61A
Switz City, IN 47465-9720
812-659-3788

Greene County Commissioners (Greene County)
Courthouse Room 108
Bloomfield, IN 47424
812-384-8658

Greene County Drainage Board (Greene County)
117 E. Spring St.
Bloomfield, IN 47424
812-384-2026

Greene County Farm Service Agency (Greene County)
30 W. Indiana Ave
Bloomfield, IN 47403
812-384-3517

Greene County Health Department (Greene County)
217 E. Spring St. Suite 1
Bloomfield, IN 47424
812-384-4496

Greene County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Greene County)
SR 54 W RR2 Box 38-A
Bloomfield, IN 47424
812-659-2122

Greene County Surveyor (Greene County)
Courthouse
Bloomfield, IN 47424
812-384-2026

Greene County USDA-NRCS (Greene County)
30 W. Indiana Ave
Bloomfield, IN 47424
812-384-3517

Jackson County Commissioner (Jackson County)
111 S. Main St.
Courthouse
Brownstown, IN 47220
812-358-6122

Jackson County Department of Health (Jackson County)
207 N. Pine St.
Seymour, IN 47274-2143
812-522-6474

Jackson County Drainage Board (Jackson County)
111 S. Main St.
Courthouse
Brownstown, IN 47220
812-358-6107

Jackson County Farm Service Agency (Jackson County)
Brownstown Service Center
102 E. Commerce St.
Brownstown, IN 47220-2004
812-358-2367

Jackson County Government Office (Jackson County)
111 S. Main St.
Courthouse
Brownstown, IN 47220
812-358-6122

Jackson County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Jackson County)
111 S. Main St.
Courthouse
Brownstown, IN 47220-2055
812-358-6101

Jackson County SWCD (Jackson County)
102 E. Commerce Street
Brownstown, IN 47220-2004
812-358-2367

Jackson County Surveyor (Jackson County)
111 S. Main St.
Courthouse
Brownstown, IN 47220
812-358-6106

Jackson County USDA-NRCS (Jackson County)
102 E. Commerce St.
Brownstown, IN 47220-2004
812-358-2367

Jackson County Water Utility (Jackson County)
1119 West Spring St.
Brownstown, IN 47220
812-358-3654

Rumpke of Indiana Landfill (Jackson County)
546 S. County Rd. 870 West
Medora, IN 47260
812-966-2935

Johnson County Farm Service Agency (Johnson County)
3059 N. Morton St.
Franklin , IN 46131
(317) 736-6822

Johnson County Health Department (Johnson County)
86 W. Court St.
Franklin, IN 46131
317-736-3770

Johnson County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Johnson County)
80 S. Jackson St.
Franklin, IN 46131
317-736-3724

Bedford City Mayor (Lawrence County)
1102 16th St.
Bedford, IN 47421
812-279-6555

Bedford City Utilities (Lawrence County)
27th and Illinois
Bedford, IN 47421-3730
812-275-1626

East Lawrence Water Corp. (Lawrence County)
1009 Crawford Dr.
Bedford, IN 47421-3418
812-279-9562

Lawrence County Commissioners (Lawrence County)
916 15th St.
Room 28
Bedford, IN 47421
812-275-3111

Lawrence County Farm Service Agency (Lawrence County)
1919 Steven Ave
Bedford, IN 47421
812-279-8117

Lawrence County Health Department (Lawrence County)
2419 Mitchell Rd.
Bedford, IN 47421
812-275-3234

Lawrence County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Lawrence County)
1410 I St.
Bedford, IN 47421
812-275-4623

Lawrence County SWCD (Lawrence County)
1919 Steven Ave.
Bedford, IN 47421
812-279-8117

Lawrence County Surveyor (Lawrence County)
916 15th St.
Bedford, IN 47421
812-275-4124

Lawrence County USDA-NRCS (Lawrence County)
1919 Steven Ave
Bedford, IN 47421
812-279-8117

Mitchell Water Department (Lawrence County)
Route 3, Pumphouse Rd.
Mitchell, IN 47446

North Lawrence Water Corp. (Lawrence County)
116 Bailey Scales Rd.
Bedford, IN 47421-9249
812-279-2774

South Lawrence Utilities (Lawrence County)
RR 11
Mitchell, IN 47446

East Fork Water Company (Martin County)
PO Box 488
Shoals, Indiana 47581

Loogootee Water Works (Martin County)
401 JFK Ave.
Loogootee, IN 47553
812-295-3889

Martin County Commissioners (Martin County)
P.O. Box 600
Shoals, IN 47581
812-247-3731

Martin County Farm Service Agency (Martin County)
State St. RR 3
Washington , IN 47501
(812) 254-4780

Martin County Health Department (Martin County)
120 E. Mulberry St. 206
Shoals, IN 47581
812-247-3303

Martin County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Martin County)
4 Courthouse Dr.
Shoals, IN 47581
812-247-3041

Martin County SWCD (Martin County)
PO Box 34
Shoals, IN 47581
812-247-2423

Martin County Surveyor (Martin County)
RR1, Box 319
Loogootee, IN 47553
812-295-2554

Martin County USDA-NRCS (Martin County)
2524 E. National Highway
Washington, IN 47501-4500
812-254-4780

Naval Surface Warfare Center-Crane Division (Martin County)
300 Highway 361
Crane, Indiana 47522-5001

Shoals Water Co. (Martin County)
Lynwood St. at McCormick St.
Shoals, IN 47581
812-247-2110

Bloomington Convention & Visitors Bureau (Monroe County)
2855 N. Walnut St.
Bloomington, IN 47404
812-334-8900

Bloomington Office of the Mayor (Monroe County)
401 N. Morton, Suite 210
Bloomington, Indiana 47404
812-349-3406

City of Bloomington Utilities (Monroe County)
4770 S. Shield Ridge Rd.
Bloomington, IN 47401
812-349-3655

East Monroe Water Corp. (Monroe County)
3429 S. Knight Ridge Rd.
Bloomington, IN 47401
812-335-8499

Monroe County Building Department (Monroe County)
Courthouse
Room 310
Bloomington, IN 47404
812-349-2580

Monroe County Commissioners (Monroe County)
Courthouse
Room 322
Bloomington, IN 47404
812-349-2550

Monroe County Farm Service Agency (Monroe County)
1931 Liberty Dr.
Bloomington, IN 47403
812-334-4323

Monroe County Health Department (Monroe County)
119 W. 7th St.
Bloomington, IN 47404
812-349-2542

Monroe County Planning Department (Monroe County)
Courthouse
Room 306
Bloomington, IN 47404
812-349-2560

Monroe County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Monroe County)
119 W. 7th St.
Bloomington, IN 47404
812-349-2575

Monroe County SWCD (Monroe County)
1931 Liberty Drive
Bloomington, IN 47403-9373
812-334-4323

Monroe County Surveyor (Monroe County)
119 W. 7th St.
Bloomington, Indiana 47404
812-349-2570

Monroe County USDA-NRCS (Monroe County)
1931 Liberty Dr.
Bloomington, IN 47403
812-334-4323

Southern Monroe Water Corp (Monroe County)
5790 S. Fairfax
Bloomington, IN 47
812-824-7220

Orange Co. SWCD (Orange County)
573 SE Main Street
Paoli, IN 47454
812-723-3311

Orange County Commissioner (Orange County)
c/o Orange County Auditor
205 E. Main St., Suite 1
Paoli, IN 47454
812-723-3600

Orange County Government Office (Orange County)
205 E. Main St.
Paoli, IN 47454
812-723-3600

Orange County Health Department (Orange County)
205 E. Main St.
Paoli, IN 47454
812-723-7112

Orange County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Orange County)
205 E. Main St.
Suite 4
Paoli, IN 47454
812-723-7107

Orange County Surveyor (Orange County)
205 E. Main St.
Paoli, IN 47454
812-723-3600

Orange County US Farm Service Agency (Orange County)
Paoli Service Center
573 SE Main Street
Paoli, IN 47454
812-723-3311

Orange County USDA-NRCS (Orange County)
Paoli Service Center
573 SE Main Street, Suite 1
Paoli, IN 47454
812-723-3311

Orleans Water Works (Orange County)
8236 N. SR 37
Orleans, IN 47452-0146
812-865-2539

Paoli Town Council President (Orange County)
110 N. Gospel
Paoli, IN 47454
812-723-2739

Paoli Water Department (Orange County)
110 Braxton St.
Paoli, IN 47454
812-723-3479

Springs Valley Regional Water District (Orange County)
7782 W. SR 56
West Baden, IN 47469
812-936-9658

Petersburg City Mayor (Pike County)
704 Main St.
Petersburg, IN 47567
812-354-8511

Petersburg Water Company (Pike County)
704 Main St.
Petersburg, IN 47567
812-354-8707

Pike County Commissioner (Pike County)
801 Main St.
Petersburg, IN 47567
812-354-8448

Pike County Farm Service Agency (Pike County)
2130 E. Main St.
Petersburg, IN 47567
812-354-6120

Pike County Health Department (Pike County)
801 Main St.
Petersburg, IN 47567
812-354-8796

Pike County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Pike County)
801 Main St.
Petersburg, IN 47567
812-354-6838

Pike County SWCD (Pike County)
2101 E. Main Street
Petersburg, IN 47567
812-354-6120

Pike County Surveyor (Pike County)
801 Main St.
Petersburg, IN 47567
812-354-9736

Campbellsburg Water Works (Washington County)
Route 1
P.O. Box 207
Campbellsburg, IN 47108
812-755-4878

Washington County Commissioner (Washington County)
County Courthouse
99 Public Square
Salem, IN 47167
812-883-4805

Washington County Government Office (Washington County)
County Courthouse
99 Public Square
Salem, IN 47167
812-883-4805

Washington County Health Department (Washington County)
103 Westminster Ctr
Ste 114
Salem, IN 47167
812-883-5603

Washington County Landfill (Washington County)
2682 N. Highland Rd
Salem, IN
812-883-4811

Washington County Purdue Univ. Co-op Extension Service (Washington County)
806 Martinsburg Rd.
Suite 104
Salem, IN 47167
812-883-4601

Washington County SWCD (Washington County)
103 E. Westminster Center, Suite 115
Salem, IN 47167
812-883-3704

Washington County Solid Waste Mngmnt District (Washington County)
Courthouse
92 Public Square
Salem, IN 47167
812-883-3039

Washington County Surveyor (Washington County)
99 Public Square
Salem, IN
812-883-4604

Washington County US Farm Service Agency (Washington County)
Salem Service Center
2 E. Westminster Center
Salem, IN 47167-9731
812-883-3006

Washington County USDA-NRCS (Washington County)
103 E. Westminster Center, Suite 115
Salem, IN 47167-9731
812-883-3704

STATE STAKEHOLDERS

Indiana Farm Bureau Inc.
225 S East St
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(317) 692-7851

Indiana Department of Environmental Management
100 N. Senate Ave
P.O. Box 6015
Indianapolis, IN 46206-6015

IDEM Switchboard
(317) 232 8603 or (800) 451 6027

Agricultural Liaison
(317) 232 8587

Air Quality
(317) 233 0178

Community Relations
(317) 233 6648

Compliance and Technical Assistance
(317) 232 8172

Criminal Investigations
(317) 232 8128

Enforcement
(317) 233 5529

Environmental Response
(317) 308 3017

Legal Counsel
(317) 232 8493

Media and Communication Services
(317) 232 8560

Pollution Prevention and Technical Assistance
(317) 232 8172

Solid and Hazardous Waste Management
(317) 233 3656

Water Management
(317) 232 8670

Indiana Department of Natural Resources
402 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204 2748

Division of Engineering
(317) 232 4150

Division of Entomology and Plant Pathology
(317) 232 4120

Division of Fish & Wildlife
(317) 232 4080

Division of Forestry
(317) 232 4105

Division of Historic Preservation & Archaeology
(317) 232 1646

Division of Law Enforcement
(317) 232 4010

Division of State Parks and Reservoirs
(317) 232 4124

Division of Water
(317) 232 4160

Division of Public Information and Education
(317) 232 4200

Division of Reclamation
(317) 232 1547

Division of Safety and Training
(317) 232 4145

Division of Soil Conservation
(317) 233 3870

Division of Oil and Gas
(317) 232 4055

Division of Outdoor Recreation
(317) 232 4070

Division of Nature Preserves
(317) 232 4052

Indiana State Department of Health
2 North Meridian St.
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 233 1325

FEDERAL STAKEHOLDERS

Natural Resources Conservation Service
6013 Lakeside Blvd
Indianapolis, In 46278
(317) 290 3200
NRCS Field Representatives are generally located with the SWCD office in each county.

U.S. EPA Region 5
77 West Jackson Blvd
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 353-2000
(800) 632-8431

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Chicago District
111 N. Canal
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 353-6400

Detroit District
P.O. Box 1027
Detroit, MI 48231-1027
(888) 694-8313

Louisville District
600 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.
Louisville, KY 40202
(502) 315-6768

APPENDIX D

FUNDING SOURCES

This listing of funding sources was derived from the May 1999 *Watershed Action Guide for Indiana*, which is available from the Watershed Management Section of IDEM (IDEM 1999b).

FEDERAL CONSERVATION AND WATERSHED PROGRAMS

Environmental Protection Agency

Section 319, 205(j), and 104(b)(3) Grants

Grants for conservation practices, water body assessment, watershed planning, and watershed projects. Available to non-profit or governmental entities. These monies, enabled by the Clean Water Act, are funneled through the Indiana Department of Environmental Management. *For details see IDEM below.*

EPA Great Lakes Program

Numerous sources of funding are available for the area that drains into the Great Lakes. The complete grants guidance and application package for EPA Great Lakes grants is on the web, and additional funding sources are at the Great Lakes Information Network (http://www.great-lakes.net/). Grants are submitted in early spring for most of these sources.

U.S. Department of Agriculture/Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) (See Appendix C for local federal agency contacts.)

CRP: Conservation Reserve Program.

Administered by the Farm Service Agency with technical assistance from NRCS. Conservation easements in certain critical areas on private property. CRP encourages farmers to convert highly erodible cropland or other environmentally sensitive acreage to vegetative cover, such as tame or native grasses, wildlife plantings, trees, filterstrips, or riparian buffers. Easements are for 10 or 15 years, depending on vegetative cover, and compensation payments are made yearly to replace income lost through not farming the land. Cost share is available for planting vegetative cover on restored areas. http://www.fsa.usda.gov/dafp/cepd/crp.htm

EQIP: Environmental Quality Incentive Program.

Administered by the NRCS. Provides technical, financial, and educational assistance. Conservation cost-share program for implementing Best Management Practices, available to agricultural producers who agree to implement a whole-farm plan that addresses major resource concerns. Up to $50,000 over a 5- to 10- year period. Some parts of the state are designated Conservation Priority Areas and receive larger funding allotments. http://www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov/PROGRAMS/COD/cit/eqipsmry.htm

FIP: Forestry Incentive Program.

Administered by the NRCS. Assists forest management on private lands of at least 10 acres and no more than 1,000 acres. Eligible practices are tree planting, timber stand improvement, site preparation for natural regeneration, and other related activities. Land must be suitable for conversion from nonforest to forest land, for reforestation, or for improved forest management and be capable of producing marketable timber crops. Cost share up to 65%, with a maximum of $10,000 per person per year. http://www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov/CCS/FB96OPA/FIPfact.html

Small Watershed Program.

The Small Watershed Program works through local government sponsors and helps participants solve natural

resource and related economic problems on a watershed basis. Projects include watershed protection, flood prevention, erosion and sediment control, water supply, water quality, fish and wildlife habitat enhancement, wetlands creation and restoration, and public recreation in watersheds of 250,000 or fewer acres. Both technical and financial assistance are available. http://www.ftw.nrcs.usda.gov/pl566/pl566.html

WRP: Wetland Reserve Program.

Administered by the NRCS. Easement and restoration program to restore marginal agricultural land to wetland. Easements may be for 10 years, 30 years, or permanent. Longer easements are preferred. Partnerships with other acquisition programs are encouraged. Restoration and legal costs are paid by NRCS. Landowner retains ownership of the property and may use the land in ways that do not interfere with wetland function and habitat, such as hunting, recreational development, and timber harvesting. http://www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov/PROGRAMS/wrp/

WHIP:Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program.

Administered by the NRCS. Cost share and technical assistance to develop and improve wildlife habitat on private land. Private landowners who are agricultural producers are eligible. A wildlife habitat plan is developed that describes landowner's goals for improving wildlife habitat, includes a list of practices and schedule for installing them, and details the steps necessary for maintenance. Cost share up to 75%, and contracts are for 10 years. http://www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov/PROGRAMS/whip/

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Partners for Wildlife Habitat Restoration Program

Provides technical and financial assistance to private landowners through voluntary cooperative agreements in order to restore formerly degraded wetlands, native grasslands, riparian areas, and other habitats to conditions as natural as feasible. Landowners agree to maintain restoration projects as specified in the agreement but otherwise retain full control of the land. Agreements are for fixed term of at least 10 years. No more than 60% of project cost is paid by Federal moneys (the program seeks remainder of cost share from landowners and nationally-based and local entities). http://www.fws.gov/

STATE CONSERVATION AND WATERSHED PROGRAMS

IDNR Division of Soil Conservation

LARE: Lake & River Enhancement Program

Funds diagnostic and feasibility studies in selected watersheds and cost-share programs through local Soil & Water Conservation Districts. Project oversight provided through county-based Resource Specialists and Lake & River Enhancement Watershed Coordinators. Funding requests for Watershed Land Treatment projects must come from Soil & Water Conservation Districts. If a proposed project area includes more than one district, the affected SWCDs should work together to develop an implementation plan. The SWCDs should then apply for the funding necessary to administer the watershed project. Before applying for funding, the SWCDs should contact the Lake & River Enhancement Coordinators to determine (1) the appropriate watershed to include in the project, (2) if the proposed project meets the eligibility criteria, and (3) if funding is available. http://www.in.gov/dnr/soilcons/lare.htm

IDNR Division of Fish & Wildlife

Classified Wildlife Habitat Program

Incentive program to foster private wildlife habitat management through tax reduction and technical assistance. Landowners need 15 or more acres of habitat to be eligible. IDNR provides management plans and assistance through District Wildlife Biologists (see county listings). http://www.ai.org/dnr/fishwild/about/habitat.htm

IDNR Division of Forestry

Classified Forest Program

Incentive program to foster private forest management through tax reduction and technical assistance. Landowners need 10 or more acres of woods to be eligible. IDNR provides management plans and assistance through District Foresters (see county listings). http://www.state.in.us/dnr/forestry/landassist/clasfor.htm

Classified Windbreak Act

Establishment of windbreaks at least 450 feet long adjacent to tillable land. Provides tax incentive, technical assistance through IDNR District Foresters.

Forest Stewardship Program & Stewardship Incentives Program

Cost share and technical assistance to encourage responsibly managed and productive private forests. http://www.state.in.us/dnr/forestry/htmldocs/grants.htm

IDNR Division of Reclamation

Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative

Funds for acid mine drainage abatement.

IDNR Division of Nature Preserves

State Nature Preserve Dedication

Acquisition and management of threatened habitat. http://www.in.gov/dnr/naturepr/

IDEM Office of Water Quality

State Revolving Fund

Available to municipalities and counties for a range of water quality infrastructure projects. Funds are available for a wide variety of projects including all types of nonpoint source management projects, as well as more traditional wastewater treatment projects. Funding is through very low-interest loans. http://www.in.gov/idem/water/fasb/srflp.html

Section 319 Grants - Nonpoint Source Program

Available to nonprofit groups, municipalities, counties, and universities for implementing water quality improvement projects that address nonpoint source pollution concerns. Twenty-five percent match is required, which may be cash or in-kind. Maximum grant amount for local watershed projects is $112,500, but statewide or larger scale projects may be funded up to $300,000. Projects are usually two to three years in length. Projects may be for land treatment through implementing Best Management Practices, for education, and for developing tools and applications for state-wide use. Proposals are due October 1, 2002 for FY2003 funds. See Section 5.1.5 for more details. http://www.in.gov/idem/water/planbr/wsm/index.html

Section 205(j) Grants - Water Quality Management Planning Program

Available to municipalities, counties, conservation districts, drainage districts, and other public organizations. For-profit entities, non-profit organizations, private associations, and individuals are not eligible for funding through Section 205(j). Grants are for water quality management projects such as studies of nonpoint pollution impacts, nonagricultural NPS mapping, and the development and implementation of watershed management projects. Funds can be requested for up to $100,000 and no match is required. http://www.in.gov/idem/water/planbr/wsm/index.html

Section 104(b)(3) Grants - NPDES Related State Grant Program

Provide for developing, implementing and demonstrating new concepts or requirements that will improve the

effectiveness of the NPDES permit program. A project proposed for assistance by this program should deal predominantly with water pollution sources and activities regulated by the NPDES program. These may include innovative demonstration projects to promote statewide watershed approaches for permitted discharges, development of storm water management plans by small municipalities, projects involving a watershed approach to municipal separate sewer systems, and projects that directly promote community based environmental protection. Available to State water pollution control agencies, interstate agencies, Tribes, colleges and universities, and other public or nonprofit organizations. For-profit entities, private associations and individuals are not eligible to receive this assistance. Funds can be requested for up to $100,000. Five percent match is required, either cash or in-kind. http://www.in.gov/idem/water/planbr/wsm/index.html

NOTE: proposals are due to IDEM by January 31 annually for projects beginning the following December.

PRIVATE FUNDING SOURCES

National Fish and Wildlife Foundation

1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 900, Washington DC 20036. (http://www.nfwf.org/programs/grant_apply.htm)

Nonprofit, established by Congress 1984, awards challenge grants for natural resource conservation. Federally appropriated funds are used to match private sector funds. Six program areas include wetland conservation, conservation education, fisheries, migratory bird conservation, conservation policy, and wildlife habitat.

Individual Utilities

Check local utilities such as IPALCO, CINergy, REMC, NIPSCO. Many have grants for educational and environmental purposes (IPALCO Golden Eagle Program - http://www.ipalco.com/ABOUTIPALCO/Environment/Golden_Eagle/2001_Winners.html; CINergy - http://www.cinergy.com/Environment/default.asp).

Indiana Hardwood Lumbermen's Association

Indiana Tree Farm Program. http://www.ihla.org/leaders.htm

Conservation Technology Information Center (CTIC)

'Know Your Watershed' educational materials are available. http://www.ctic.purdue.edu/CTIC/CTIC.html

Ducks Unlimited

Land acquisition and habitat restoration assistance. http://www.ducks.org/

National Wild Turkey Federation

Funds for turkey and wildlife habitat improvement projects. http://www.nwtf.org/

Quail Unlimited

Funds for quail and wildlife habitat improvement projects. http://www.qu.org/

Pheasants Forever

Land acquisition and funds for local habitat improvement projects. http://www.pheasantsforever.org/

Indiana Heritage Trust

Land acquisition programs. http://www.state.in.us/dnr/heritage/

The Nature Conservancy

Land acquisition and restoration. http://nature.org/wherewework/northamerica/states/indiana/

Southern Lake Michigan Conservation Initiative

Blue River Focus Area

Kankakee Sands Focus Area

Upper St. Joseph River Focus Area

Tippecanoe River Focus Area

Natural Areas Registry

Hoosier Landscapes Capitol Campaign

Local/Regional Land Trusts

Land acquisition, conservation easements, and restoration

Acres Inc. (Fort Wayne, IN)

- http://www.acres-land-trust.org/

Buffalo Trace Land Trust, LLC (Mount Saint Francis, IN)

Central Indiana Land Trust, Inc. (Indianapolis, IN)

- http://www.cilti.org/

Clark's Valley Land Trust (Charlestown, IN)

- http://www.clarkswcd.org/LandTrust/LandTrusthome.htm

Indiana Karst Conservancy (Indianapolis, IN)

- http://www.caves.org/conservancy/ikc/

Laporte County Conservation Trust Inc. (La Porte, IN)

Little River Wetlands Project (Ft. Wayne, IN)

- http://www.lrwp.org/

Mud Creek Conservancy (Indianapolis, IN)

- http://www.mudcreekconservancy.org/

NICHES Land Trust (Lafayette, IN)

- http://dcwi.com/~niches/

Ohio River Conservancy (Bloomington, IN)

Oxbow, Inc. (Cincinnati, OH)

- http://math.uc.edu/~pelikan/OXBOW/wm.html

Red-tail Conservancy, Inc. (Muncie, IN)

- http://ourworld.cs.com/rtconserv1/id18.htm

River Fields, Inc. (Louisville, KY)

- http://www.riverfields.org/

Shirley Heinze Environmental Fund (Michigan City, IN)

- http://www.heinzefund.org/

Sycamore Land Trust (Bloomington, IN)

- http://www.sycamorelandtrust.org/

Wabash Heritage Land Trust (New Harmony, IN)

Wawasee Area Conservancy Foundation (Syracuse, IN)

- http://www.wacf.com/

Whitewater Valley Land Trust, Inc. (Centerville, IN)

Wood-Land-Lakes Resource Conservation & Development (Kendallville, IN)

- http://www.in.nrcs.usda.gov/conservation%20programs/rcd/woodland_lakes.htm

SOURCES OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Catalog of Federal Funding Sources for Watershed Protection

EPA Office of Water (EPA841-B-99-003) December 1999

(http://www.epa.gov/owow/watershed/wacademy/fund.html)

GrantsWeb:

http://www.srainternational.org/cws/sra/resource.htm

APPENDIX E

Superfund (CERCLA) Site Fact Sheets

for sites listed within the Lower East Fork White watershed

BENNETT STONE QUARRY

Site Information:

Site Name: BENNETT STONE QUARRY

Address: ST RTE 37 & ST RTE 46

BLOOMINGTON, IN 47401

EPA ID: IND006418651

EPA Region: 05

County: 105 MONROE

Latitude: +39.190200

Longitude: -086.561200

NPL Status: Currently on the Final NPL

Non-NPL Status:

Federal Facility Flag: Not a Federal Facility

Incident Category: Industrial Waste Treatment

Record of Decision (ROD) List:

	ROD ID	ROD Date	OU
1	EPA/541/R-99/144	10/16/1998	
01			

1) Record of Decision (ROD):

Operable Unit: 01

ROD ID: EPA/541/R-99/144

ROD Date: 10/16/1998

Media: Soil

Contaminant: PCBs

Abstract: Please note that the text in this document summarizes the Record of Decision for the purposes of facilitating searching and retrieving key text on the ROD. It is not the officially approved abstract drafted by the EPA Regional offices. Once EPA Headquarters receives the official abstract, this text will be replaced.

Bennett's Dump, sometimes referred to as Bennett's Stone Quarry, is located approximately 2.5 miles northwest of Bloomington , Indiana. After quarrying operations were completed, portions of the site were used for waste disposal. The disposal areas consist of 3.5 acre main stite, an adjacent .5 acre satellite site, and a very small area north of the two main fill areas. Stout's Creek is adjacent to the dumping area and directly west of the main site. The site was discovered in early 1983 after a Monroe County Health Department inspection revealed the dumping of PCB-contaminated electrical parts and PCB contaminated capacitors at the site. The materials were transported, for the most part, to the site by Fell Iron and Metal - a local scrap metal hauler. In May 1983, EPA's Technical Assistance Team completed an inspection and discovered electrical components, including capacitors and capacitor paper, along with stained soil throughout the main dumping area. Nine soil samples were collected and ranged from 380,000 ppm to below 5ppm. Based upon the inspection and sampling data, EPA determined that an emergency action was warranted and the EPA would fund this removal action. The removal action consisted of: removal and disposal in an approved facility of 252 capacitors located on the surface along with 14 cubic yards of adjacent contaminated soils. The extent of contamination studies including aerial photographic survey, a geophysical study, and 63 soil borings and samples. Results showed PCBs up to 24,648 ppm at .5 feet, up to 52,332 ppm at 2.5 feet, and up to 15,947ppm at 5.5 feet. The removal also included placement of a clay cap over the main site to prevent surface runoff of contaminants, and construction of a security fence around the site and the satellite areas.

Remedy: The original remedy action for Bennett's Dump called for the excavation and incineration of an estimated 55,000 cubic yards of PCB contaminated soils and materials at Bennett's Dump. The EPA, in consultation

with other government parties, determined that the alternatives to be considered for the two sites should range from complete containment to complete excavation. The modified remedy includes excavation of PCBs to residential and industrial standards. Treatment by incineration of capacitors containing PCB oil is a component of each remedy and solid material greater than or equal to 50 ppm PCBs will be disposed of in an approved chemical waste landfill. PCB material less than 50 ppm will be disposed of off-site in a special waste landfill.

URL: http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/rodsites/0501373.htm
This page was last updated on: April 15, 2002
Site maintained by: Office of Emergency and Remedial Response
brown.margret@epa.gov

APPENDIX F

STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

The following comments were received within the 60-day public comment period after the initial public meetings introducing the draft version of the Lower East Fork White WRAS. These meetings were held on March 21, 2002, in Shoals, Indiana, and on March 25, 2002, in Nashville, Indiana.

The Lower East Fork White WRAS has been revised to incorporate stakeholder comments, where appropriate. The following is a reproduction of the stakeholder comments:

General Comments

- The **primary** goal of the Lost River Conservation Association always has been, and remains, the permanent protection of Indiana's Lost River Karst System. We are concerned about the various sources of pollution; air, land, and water. We believe it is essential that solutions to pollution be identified and implemented. We favor pursuing advances in pollution remediation, including full scale composting of organic wastes.

  We actively promote public awareness and education in an effort to protect the unique features, ground and surface water quality, wetlands, and overall biology of Indiana's Lost River Karst System.

  We also believe that the Amish are **un-represented** stakeholders. They will not voluntarily petition for participation - but they **must** be included because they represent a significant portion of the areas total population.

  We consider **our** organization a 'stakeholder' because we are dedicated to achieving permanent protection for Indiana's Lost River Karst System. The nature and attributes of the system are our educational focus.

Specific Comments

None