

Use Attainability Analysis

1 Water Body Name	Unnamed Tributary to Peas Creek
2 Segment Description	Mouth to confluence with unnamed tributary
3 Segment Length (mi)	0.3
4 Drainage Area (sq. mi.)	0.31
5 Segment Start Latitude, Longitude (DD)	42.02308, -93.86808
6 Segment End Latitude, Longitude (DD)	42.02547, -93.86919
7 Route of Flow (Next Downstream Adopted Designated Use)	Unnamed Tributary (A2, BWW2, proposed) to Peas Creek (A2, BWW2)
8 NPDES Facility and Permit Number (If Applicable)	Proliant Health & Biologicals (0819102)
9 Sample Site ID(s)	N/A
10 Segment County Name(s)	Boone
11 Field Work Date(s)	N/A

12 Aquatic Life Use Attainability Analysis - Conclusion

Recommended Highest Attainable Use: Aquatic Life Use	BWW2
40 CFR 131.10(g)(2) (Flow)	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.
40 CFR 131.10(g)(5) (Physical Conditions)	Physical conditions related to the natural features of the water body are insufficient to support a viable community of game fish. Drainage area falls 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

Recommended Highest Attainable Use: Recreational Use	A2
40 CFR 131.10(g)(2) (Flow)	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: N/A

Use Attainability Analysis - Data

Site Observations

Use	Site parameter	Site ID (N/A)
AL/R	15 Latitude, Longitude (DD)	N/A
AL/R	16 Average Depth (in)	N/A

Use	Site parameter	Site ID (N/A)
AL/R	17 Maximum Depth (in)	N/A
AL/R	18 Stream Width (ft)	N/A
AL/R	19 Pools Observed?	N/A
AL only	20 Non-Game Fish Present and Counts (Species: Number)	N/A
	21 Game Fish Present and Counts (Species (Size Range): Number)	N/A
	22 Stream Habitat (See also: #29 Site Photos)	N/A
R only	23 Evidence of Use for Primary Contact Recreation? (Yes*/No)	N/A
	24 Evidence of Use by Children? (Yes*/No)	N/A
	25 Evidence of Use for Secondary Contact Recreation? (Yes*/No)	N/A
AL/R	26 Additional Description	<p>Unable to access this stream segment. However, a UAA site on UT to Peas Creek upstream of this stream segment taken on 7/15/2016 during normal flow conditions did not identify any recreation or enough water to support fish. The only tributary that enters UT to Peas Creek is recommended to be given an A3, BWW3 designation. At the mouth of UT to Peas Creek, Peas Creek currently has an A2, BWW2 designation. This UT to Peas Creek stream segment does not intersect with any population centers or parks. Based on the above information and a review of aerial imagery, A2, BWW2 was determined to be the highest attainable uses for this short segment. See Site Photos for reference.</p>

AL = Aquatic Life


R = Recreation

*If yes, elaborate.

27 Supplemental Data

N/A

28 Map of Segments and Outfall



29 Site Photos



Figure 1. Color infrared imagery of Unnamed Tributary to Peas Creek.



Figure 2. View upstream.



Figure 3. View downstream.

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.