

## Use Attainability Analysis

<b>1 Water Body Name</b>	Unnamed Tributary to Twelvemile Creek
<b>2 Segment Description</b>	Mouth to Green Valley Chemical Corporation outfall
<b>3 Segment Length (mi)</b>	1.0
<b>4 Drainage Area (sq. mi.)</b>	1.46
<b>5 Segment Start Latitude, Longitude (DD)</b>	41.12397, -94.32531
<b>6 Segment End Latitude, Longitude (DD)</b>	41.11629, -94.33817
<b>7 Route of Flow (Next Downstream Adopted Designated Use)</b>	Unnamed Tributary (A2, BWW2, proposed) to Twelvemile Creek (A2, BWW2, pending) to Twelve Mile Creek Lake (A1, BLW, HH, C)
<b>8 NPDES Facility and Permit Number (If Applicable)</b>	Green Valley Chemical Corporation (8800100)
<b>9 Sample Site ID(s)</b>	666-2
<b>10 Segment County Name(s)</b>	Union
<b>11 Field Work Date(s)</b>	9/18/2006

### 12 Aquatic Life Use Attainability Analysis - Conclusion

<b>Recommended Highest Attainable Use: Aquatic Life Use</b>	BWW2
<b>40 CFR 131.10(g)(2) (Flow)</b>	The natural low flow conditions of the stream segment are insufficient to create the habitat necessary to support a viable community of game fish. A lack of age ranges and diversity of game fish species indicates a non-reproducing population (see Site Observations Table). A BWW1 designation requires multiple species and age ranges to be viable. Therefore, the highest attainable aquatic life use for this stream segment is BWW2.
<b>40 CFR 131.10(g)(5) (Physical Conditions)</b>	Physical conditions related to the natural features of the water body are insufficient to support a viable community of game fish. Drainage area, stream width, and average depth fall within the "consistently negative" game fish indicator responses (see Table 2 in Appendix I). A lack of age ranges and diversity of game fish species indicates a non-reproducing population (see Site Observations Table). A BWW1 designation requires multiple species and age ranges to be viable. Therefore, the highest attainable aquatic life use for this stream segment is BWW2.

### 13 Recreational Use Attainability Analysis - Conclusion

<b>Recommended Highest Attainable Use: Recreational Use</b>	A2
<b>40 CFR 131.10(g)(2) (Flow)</b>	The natural low flow conditions and water levels of the stream segment prevent the attainment of an A1 recreational use (see Site Observations Table). An A1 designation requires the ability for full body immersion. Therefore, the highest attainable recreational use is A2.

### 14 Flow

Field Work Date	Description
9/18/2006	<a href="#">USGS stream gage data</a> for the area indicated stream flows were normal at the time of assessment.

### Use Attainability Analysis - Data

#### Site Observations

Use	Site parameter	Site ID #666-2
AL/R	<b>15 Latitude, Longitude (DD)</b>	41.11787, -94.33734
AL/R	<b>16 Average Depth (in)</b>	1
AL/R	<b>17 Maximum Depth (in)</b>	30
AL/R	<b>18 Stream Width (ft)</b>	1.75
AL/R	<b>19 Pools Observed?</b>	Yes
AL only	<b>20 Non-Game Fish Present and Counts (Species: Number)</b>	Fathead minnow: 27
	<b>21 Game Fish Present and Counts (Species (Size Range): Number)</b>	Black bullhead: 15 Bluegill: 6 Largemouth bass: 2
	<b>22 Stream Habitat (See also: #29 Site Photos)</b>	The stream was very muddy/silty. The maximum depth of the pool below the upstream culvert was 30". The pasture along the stream had cattle in it. A pond was observed upstream, and the stream banks had gradual slopes. The fish were only found in the pool below the culvert (healthy).
	<b>23 Evidence of Use for Primary Contact Recreation? (Yes*/No)</b>	No
R only	<b>24 Evidence of Use by Children? (Yes*/No)</b>	No
	<b>25 Evidence of Use for Secondary Contact Recreation? (Yes*/No)</b>	No
AL/R	<b>26 Additional Description</b>	No access and no parking. A no trespassing sign was present.

AL = Aquatic Life

R = Recreation

\*If yes, elaborate.

#### **27 Supplemental Data**

Desktop review verified that the UAA field work is still valid.

28 Map of Segment, Outfall, and Site(s)



29 Site Photos



Figure 1. 666-2 Bridge view, looking upstream.



Figure 2. 666-2 Bridge view, looking upstream #2.



Figure 3. 666-2 Bridge view, looking downstream.




Figure 4. 666-2 Bridge view, looking downstream #2.



Figure 5. 666-2 Start of aquatic assessment, looking upstream.



Figure 6. 666-2 Start of aquatic assessment, looking upstream #2.



Figure 7. 666-2 Start of aquatic assessment, looking downstream.




Figure 8. 666-2 Start of aquatic assessment, looking downstream #2.



Figure 9. 666-2 End of aquatic assessment, looking upstream.



Figure 10. 666-2 End of aquatic assessment, looking upstream #2.



Figure 11. 666-2 End of aquatic assessment, looking downstream.



Figure 12. 666-2 End of aquatic assessment, looking downstream #2.



Figure 13. 666-2 Largemouth Bass.



Figure 14. 666-2 Bluegill.



**Figure 15. 666-2 Black Bullhead.**



Figure 16. 666-2 Upstream recreational assessment site, looking upstream.



Figure 17. 666-2 Upstream recreational assessment site, looking upstream #2.



Figure 18. 666-2 Upstream recreational assessment site, looking downstream.



Figure 19. 666-2 Upstream recreational assessment site, looking downstream #2.



Figure 20. 666-2 Downstream recreational assessment site, looking upstream.



Figure 21. 666-2 Downstream recreational assessment site, looking upstream #2.



Figure 22. 666-2 Downstream recreational assessment site, looking downstream.




Figure 23. 666-2 Downstream recreational assessment site, looking downstream #2.



**Figure 24. 666-2 Lagoon.**



**Figure 25. 666-2 View of creek from lagoon.**



**Figure 26. 666-2 Outfall.**



**Figure 27. 666-2 Outfall #2.**



**Figure 28. 666-2 View of creek from pond.**



**Figure 29. 666-2 View of creek.**



**Figure 30. 666-2 Culvert on downstream side of road.**



**Figure 31. 666-2 Culvert on downstream side of road.**

## Appendix I.

### c. Stream Flow and Habitat Data

Data analysis results for stream flow and habitat variables were similar to game fish indicator results. Stream width, average thalweg depth, maximum depth, and flow appear to be the characteristics that correlate the best with consistently positive game fish indicators. Stream flow and habitat dimensions (where available) were consistently larger for streams with watershed sizes exceeding 275 square miles. Habitat measurements are not available for the largest sample sites that were sampled by boat instead of the typical wading method.

Ranges of stream size, habitat and flow associated with varying levels of game fish indicator responses are listed in Table 2. These are general statewide values, which may assist in decision making related to the recommendation of warm water aquatic life use designations. In general terms, stream segments that have watershed area, flow and habitat characteristics in the green shaded boxes have a greater probability that game fish indicators will be consistently positive (i.e., consistent with Class B(WW-1)), while stream habitat and flow levels that equate to the red boxes are much less likely to support game fish populations (i.e., Class B(WW-2) or Class B(WW-3)). Stream segments that have a mixture of characteristics, mainly in the yellow range, may require consideration of the additional habitat features collected during the field assessment, to determine the appropriate aquatic life use designation.

**Table 2. Generalized statewide ranges of stream habitat indicator levels and associated game fish indicator responses.**

Game Fish Indicator Responses	Stream Watershed Area (sq.mi.)	Stream Flow (typical base flow - cfs)	Stream Width Average (ft)	Average Depth (ft)	Avg. Thalweg Depth (ft)	Maximum Depth (ft)
Consistently Positive	>275	>30	>65	>1.2	>2.2	>4.4
Mixed	25-275	0.8-30	11-65	0.2-1.2	0.8-2.2	1.8-4.4
Consistently Negative	<25	<0.8	<11	<0.2	<0.8	<1.8

Iowa uses U.S. EPA's Level IV Ecoregions as a template for wadeable stream biological condition assessment. Stream flow and habitat characteristics can vary from ecoregion to ecoregion. To provide additional insight into where the area of overlap exists between Class B(LR/WW-2) and Class B(WW/WW-1) streams, a query of Iowa's bioassessment database produced 476 habitat assessment records from which a summary of habitat characteristics was prepared (Table 3a-f) (see appendix for full spreadsheet). The summary is grouped by ecoregion and former designated uses in order to illustrate the extremes and ranges of overlap in habitat characteristics.