

**State of South Carolina**  
**Integrated Report for 2006**  
**Part II: *Section 305(b) Assessment and Reporting***

March 29, 2006





## **PREFACE**

The South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) prepared this report as a requirement of Section 305(b) of Public Law 100-4, last reauthorized and commonly known as The Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1987, and as a public information document. The report presents a general assessment of water quality conditions and water pollution control programs in South Carolina. SCDHEC has published Watershed Water Quality Management Assessments (WWQA), that contain information pertaining to the specific watersheds and give a more complete picture of the waters referenced in this document. While the title page states that this is an integrated report, Section 303(d) of the CWA requirements are submitted separately as a companion document.

The determinations of surface water quality were based on data collected by SCDHEC at ambient water quality monitoring stations, point source permit required monitoring and evaluation of nonpoint source (NPS) data. Other information in this report was obtained from SCDHEC programs associated with water quality monitoring and water pollution control.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE .....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	iv
LIST OF FIGURES .....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	5
BACKGROUND .....	6
1. Resource Overview .....	6
2. Total Waters .....	6
3. Water Pollution Control Program .....	7
A. Watershed Approach .....	7
B. Water Quality Standards and Classifications .....	8
<i>Surface Water Classes - Freshwaters</i> .....	9
<i>Surface Water Classes - Saltwaters</i> .....	10
<i>Groundwater Classes</i> .....	10
<i>Reclassifications and Site-Specific Criteria</i> .....	11
C. Point Source Program - Municipal Facilities .....	11
<i>Loan Program</i> .....	12
<i>Pretreatment and Toxicity Program</i> .....	12
<i>Stormwater Controls</i> .....	12
<i>Land Application of Treated Waste</i> .....	13
<i>Strategies to Improve the Municipal Permitting Program</i> .....	13
D. Point Source Program - Industrial and Agricultural Facilities .....	14
<i>Industrial Facilities</i> .....	14
<i>Agricultural Facilities</i> .....	14
<i>Toxics Controls</i> .....	14
<i>Land Application of Treated Wastewater</i> .....	14
<i>Stormwater Permits-Industrial, Construction, MS4</i> .....	14
E. Permit Compliance and Enforcement .....	15
F. Nonpoint Source Program .....	16
G. Wasteload Allocations and Total Maximum Daily Loads .....	18
H. Special State Concerns and Recommendations .....	19
SURFACE WATER ASSESSMENT .....	24
1. Surface Water Monitoring Program .....	24
A. Purpose and Design .....	24
B. Networks and Programs .....	24
C. Laboratory Analytical Support .....	25
D. Quality Assurance .....	25
E. Data Storage, Management and Interpretation .....	27
2. Assessment Methodology .....	27
A. Probability-Based §305(b) Assessment Approach .....	27
<i>Rivers and Streams</i> .....	27
<i>Lakes and Reservoirs</i> .....	28
<i>Estuaries</i> .....	28
B. Determination of Attainment of Classified Uses .....	29

	<i>General Considerations</i> .....	29
	<i>Aquatic Life Use Support</i> .....	30
	<i>Macroinvertebrate Data Interpretation</i> .....	31
	<i>Recreational Use Support</i> .....	32
3.	Rivers and Streams Water Quality Assessment.....	32
	A. Summary Statistics.....	32
4.	Lakes Water Quality Assessment.....	34
	A. Summary Statistics.....	34
	B. Section 314 Reporting.....	35
	<i>Background</i> .....	35
	<i>Trophic Status</i> .....	356
	<i>Control Methods</i> .....	41
	<i>Restoration Efforts</i> .....	41
	<i>Acid Effects on Lakes</i> .....	41
	<i>Toxic Effects on Lakes</i> .....	41
5.	Estuary and Coastal Assessment.....	41
	A. Summary Statistics.....	42
6.	Wetlands Assessment.....	43
	A. Summary Statistics.....	43
	B. Extent of Wetlands Resources.....	44
	C. Integrity of Wetlands Resources.....	44
	<i>Section 404 Permit Program</i> .....	44
	<i>Section 401 Water Quality Certification</i> .....	44
	<i>Water Quality Certification, Nationwide Permits (NWP)</i> .....	45
	D. Development of Water Quality Standards for Wetlands.....	46
	E. Additional Protection Activities.....	46
7.	Public Health - Aquatic Life Concerns.....	47
	A. Sizes of Water Affected by Toxicants.....	47
	B. Public Health: Aquatic Life Impacts.....	47
	<i>Pollution Caused Fish Kills/Abnormalities</i> .....	47
	<i>Fish Consumption Advisories</i> .....	48
	<i>Shellfish Restrictions/Closures</i> .....	48
	<i>Restrictions on Bathing Areas</i> .....	50
	<i>Ocean Water Quality Monitoring</i> .....	51
	C. Public Health: Drinking Water.....	62
	<i>Restrictions in Surface Drinking Water Supplies and Incidents of</i> <i>Waterborne Diseases</i> .....	62
	GROUNDWATER ASSESSMENT.....	64
	1. Overview of Groundwater Contamination Sources.....	64
	2. Overview of Groundwater Protection Programs.....	70
	3. Summary of Groundwater Quality.....	72
	4. Summary of Groundwater/Surface Water Interactions.....	73
	References.....	74

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Atlas .....	6
2. Freshwater Classifications and Descriptions .....	9
3. Saltwater Classifications and Descriptions.....	10
4. Groundwater Classifications and Descriptions.....	10
5. Summary of Supported Classified Uses for South Carolina.....	11
6. Rivers and Streams Use Support Summary (Miles) .....	33
7. Summary of Fully Supporting and Impaired Rivers and Streams (Not including Fish Consumption Use) .....	33
8. Total Sizes of Rivers and Streams Impaired by Various Cause Categories (Miles) .....	33
9. Categories of Data Used in Aquatic Life Use Support (ALUS)Assessments for All Rivers and Streams .....	34
10. Lake Use Support Summary (Acres).....	34
11. Summary of Fully Supporting and Impaired Lakes (Not including Fish Consumption Use) .....	35
12. Total Sizes of Lakes Impaired by Various Cause Categories (Acres).....	35
13. Condition of Significant South Carolina Lakes .....	36
14. Estuaries Use Support Summary (Square Miles) .....	42
15. Summary of Fully Supporting and Impaired Estuaries (Not including Fish/Shellfish Consumption Use).....	42
16. Total Sizes of Estuaries Impaired by Various Cause Categories (Square Miles).....	43
17. Extent of Wetlands, by Type .....	43
18. Total Size Affected by Toxicants .....	47
19. Summary of Shellfish Harvesting Status in South Carolina Shellfish Waters .....	50
20. Areas of Bathing Restrictions .....	51
21. Areas Affected by Beach Advisories.....	51
22. Major Sources of Groundwater Contamination.....	65
23. Groundwater Contamination Summary .....	67
24. Groundwater Contamination Summary (above fall line).....	68
25. Groundwater Contamination Summary (2) .....	69
26. Groundwater Contamination Summary (below fall line) .....	70
27. Summary of State Groundwater Protection Programs.....	71
28. Aquifer Monitoring Data .....	72
29. Aquifer Monitoring Data (2).....	73

## LIST OF FIGURES

1. South Carolina Watershed Water Quality Management Basins .....	7
---	---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Clean Water Act (CWA) states "it is the national goal that wherever attainable, an interim goal of water quality that provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and provides for recreation in and on the water shall be achieved by July 1, 1983."

The State of South Carolina has promulgated S.C. Regulation 61-68, *Water Classifications and Standards* and S.C. Regulation 61-69, *Classified Waters* that establish specific standards and general rules to protect and maintain these uses and designate classified uses for each waterbody. It is the intent and purpose of the regulations that waters that meet standards shall be maintained and waters that do not meet standards shall be improved.

The statewide Probability-Based, or random sampling, component of the ambient monitoring program is designed to make statewide estimates of water quality. The data derived from those monitoring activities is used to develop the stream, lake/reservoir, and estuarine summary information presented in this report. A probability-based monitoring design is a type of a survey design in that the population of interest is sampled in a fashion that allows statements to be made about the whole population based on a subsample. The advantage of the probability-based sampling design is that statistically valid statements about water quality can be made about large areas based on a relatively small subsample.

Based on the modified USEPA National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) and the results of probability site selection validation, South Carolina has an estimated 20,954 miles of freshwater rivers and streams representing the stream sampling design frame, and 308,765 acres of lake and reservoir representing the lake/reservoir sampling design frame. Based on a hydrographic GIS cover developed jointly by SCDHEC and the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources and the results of probability site selection validation, South Carolina has an estimated 277 combined square miles of tide creek and open water habitat representing the estuarine sampling design frame.

Quality assured water quality data collected as part of the probability network from 2001 through 2004 provided the database for this assessment. Evaluation of these data determines if water quality in rivers, lakes, and estuaries is suitable to support State classified uses. The tables on the following page include the level of use support for the waters of South Carolina and the cause of nonattainment affecting the largest size in each waterbody type for aquatic life and primary contact recreation uses.

### Aquatic Life Use Support

<b>Waterbody Type</b>	<b>Fully Supported</b>	<b>Partially Supported</b>	<b>Not Supported</b>	<b>Predominant Cause</b>
Rivers	65%	18%	17%	Macroinvertebrate Community
Lakes	84%	4%	11%	pH
Estuaries	78%	3%	19%	Turbidity

### Recreational Use Support

Waterbody Type	Fully Supported	Partially Supported	Not Supported	Predominant Cause
Rivers	47%	22%	31%	Fecal Coliform
Lakes	99%	<1%	0%	Fecal Coliform
Estuaries	99%	0%	<1%	Fecal Coliform

## BACKGROUND

### 1. Resource Overview

The following table gives a representation of state population and geographical information.

**Table 1. Atlas**

Topic	Value
State Population	3,602,900
State Surface Area (square miles)	30,203
Total miles of rivers and streams	29,794
- Border Miles	408
- Border Rivers: Chattooga, Tugaloo, Savannah, Catawba	
- Border Lakes: Hartwell, Thurmond, Russell, Wylie	
Number of lakes/reservoirs/ponds	
- 10 - 1000 acres (total acreage of 60,335)	1,598
- >1000 acres (total acreage of 461,402)	19
Estuarine waters (square miles)	401
Total miles of Ocean Coast	190
Freshwater wetlands (acreage)	4,146,510
Tidal wetlands (acreage)	512,490

### 2. Total Waters



The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has developed a system to determine estimates of total river miles and total lake acres for the states to use in reporting for §305(b) reports. This system is based on the Digital Line Graph (DLG) database and the USEPA National Hydrography Dataset (NHD), that are in turn based on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 1:100,000 scale topographic maps. The original DLG database was missing several lakes of relatively recent construction as well as a significant number of streams. Many of these missing features have been added by SCDHEC, with the cooperation and oversight of the USEPA. This revised system was utilized in this §305(b) report to estimate the sizes of the different use support categories and cause sizes for the Rivers and Streams, and Lakes summary statistics. Other base maps were used to estimate sizes for the Clean Lakes Program, Estuaries, and Shellfish Restrictions/Closures. These alternative databases are identified in the appropriate sections.

### 3. Water Pollution Control Program

#### A. Watershed Approach

SCDHEC conducts water quality assessment and protection on a watershed basis in order to promote a coordinated approach to river basin development and water quality maintenance or improvement, to better address congressional and legislative mandates, to better utilize current resources, and to better inform the public and regulated community of existing and future water quality issues. Watershed water quality management recognizes the interdependence of water quality and all the activities that occur in the associated drainage basin including: monitoring, assessment, problem identification and prioritization, water quality modeling, planning, permitting, and other activities. In the Watershed Water Quality Assessments (WWQA), these activities are integrated by basin leading to watershed management plans and implementation strategies and serve to appropriately refocus water quality protection efforts.

Watershed water quality management planning and strategy development provides SCDHEC with the tools and information necessary for program implementation. The planning process and the resulting strategy provide a structured and predictable schedule for carrying out program elements to ensure the protection of the State's water resources. While an important aspect of the program is water quality problem identification and problem solving, the emphasis of the program is on problem prevention.

SCDHEC has divided the state into eight major drainage basins along USGS hydrologic units (Figure 1), encompassing approximately 280 Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) watersheds. These watersheds serve as the hydrologic boundaries that guide SCDHEC water quality activities. The majority of water quality activities in these watersheds are based on a five-year rotation.




Figure 1. South Carolina Watershed Water Quality Management Basins

For most activities the Savannah and Salkehatchie basins are addressed in the same year, as are the Saluda and Edisto basins, and the Catawba and Santee basins. Five years are required to assess all basins in the State, and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits have a five-year lifespan. Each year SCDHEC revises the assessment for the targeted basin(s). Planning on a watershed basis is consistent with basic ecological principles of watershed management. It allows the coordination of implementation activities so that all actual and potential impacts on water quality can be evaluated. Both point source and nonpoint source impacts can be evaluated when making water quality protection decisions. Problem areas in a particular drainage basin can be identified and existing and potential contributors can be examined. Subsequently, waste assimilative capacities can be determined and allocated in a more equitable fashion.

Proposed permit issuances within a watershed are consolidated and presented to the public in groups rather than one at a time. By issuing all the NPDES permits during the same period, SCDHEC will be able to realize a resource savings and the public will realize an information advantage since all of the permitting activity for a specific area will occur in a specified period of time when public notices and public meetings and hearings will be conducted.

The watershed management process also focuses resources. Limited resources require targeting work efforts in order to maximize useful results. Focusing on specific basins each year allows SCDHEC to coordinate staff activities to make efficient use of available resources. While the statewide ambient monitoring network is maintained, the monitoring strategy has been revised so the district monitoring staff concentrate on the targeted basin(s). The monitoring activities support the development of wasteload allocations and total maximum daily loads (TMDLs). Developing wasteload allocations and TMDLs on a watershed basis allows for an equitable assessment of all actual and potential impacts on the water quality from both point sources and nonpoint sources. Focusing decision making efforts in a single watershed will highlight the need to examine water quality standards and use designation for the appropriate waterbodies. An examination of the water quality and use designations may point to the need for site specific standards or stream classification changes.

In preparing the eight watershed assessments and in updating and revising each one on a five-year rotation, SCDHEC will be able to respond more efficiently, and in a timely manner, to federal requirements. More importantly, SCDHEC will be better able to utilize available resources, coordinate water quality improvement efforts, and protect water quality in South Carolina. These watershed assessments serve as a starting point to fulfill a number of EPA reporting requirements. EPA requires various reporting activities under §303(d), §305(b), §314, and §319 of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

## **B. Water Quality Standards and Classifications**

S.C. Regulations 61-68, *Water Classifications and Standards* and S.C. Regulation 61-69, *Classified Waters* were promulgated by SCDHEC pursuant to the South Carolina Pollution Control Act (48-1-10, *et seq.*, S.C. Code of Laws, 1976).

The water quality standards regulation contains provisions that provide for the protection and maintenance of the existing and classified uses of the waters of the State. The water quality standards include general rules and specific water quality criteria, both narrative and numeric, to protect those classified and existing uses as well as antidegradation rules to protect the public health and welfare and maintain and enhance water quality.

The water quality standards also serve as the basis for decisions in the other water quality program areas. NPDES permit limitations for waste discharges are determined according to the classification and standards of the receiving water. The standards and classifications also affect the control of toxic substances, thermal discharges, stormwater discharges, dredge and fill activities, and other water related activities. SCDHEC implements the antidegradation rules through its regulatory programs.

S.C. Regulation 61-69 alphabetically lists the waterbodies in South Carolina that have been specifically classified by name, gives the classification, describes the boundaries of the use classification, the county of location, and any applicable site-specific standards.

Revisions to water quality standards and any reclassification of waters of the State require a public hearing process, approval by the Board of SCDHEC, approval by the General Assembly, and publication in the State Register. S.C. Regulation 61-68 was last amended on June 25, 2004 and R. 61-69 was last amended May 28, 2004.

**Surface Water Classes - Freshwaters**

**Table 2. Freshwater Classifications and Descriptions**

<b>Freshwaters</b>	<b>Description</b>
Outstanding National Resource Waters	Exceptional national recreational and/or ecological resource.
Outstanding Resource Waters	Exceptional recreational and/or ecological resource and suitable for drinking water source with minimal treatment.
Trout Waters - (3 types) Natural Put, Grow and Take	Suitable for supporting reproducing and/or stocked trout populations and cold water indigenous aquatic community and the survival and propagation of aquatic life. Primary and secondary recreational contact including fishing and as drinking water source. Suitable for industrial and agricultural uses.
Put and Take	(See Freshwater Description)
Freshwater	Suitable for the survival and propagation of aquatic life; fishing and primary and secondary recreational contact and as drinking water source. Suitable also for industrial and agricultural uses.

**Surface Water Classes - Saltwaters**

**Table 3. Saltwater Classifications and Descriptions**

<b>Saltwaters</b>	<b>Description</b>
Outstanding National Resource Waters	Exceptional national recreational and/or ecological resource.
Outstanding Resource Waters	Exceptional recreational and/or ecological resource.
Shellfish Harvesting Waters	Suitable for survival and propagation of aquatic life; primary and secondary contact recreation. Suitable for harvesting of shellfish, crabbing, and fishing for market purposes and/or for human consumption.
Class SA	Suitable for survival and propagation of aquatic life; primary and secondary contact recreation; crabbing and fishing for market purposes and/or human consumption.
Class SB	Suitable for survival and propagation of aquatic life; primary and secondary contact recreation; crabbing and fishing for market purposes and/or human consumption.

**Groundwater Classes**

**Table 4. Groundwater Classifications and Descriptions**

<b>Groundwater Type</b>	<b>Description</b>
Class GA	Vulnerable to contamination due to hydrological characteristics.
Class GB	Suitable as an underground source of drinking water. All groundwaters of the State unless otherwise classified.
Class GC	Not suitable for underground drinking water source.

The following table summarizes the uses of each of the surface water classifications. No degradation of existing uses is permitted regardless of classification and no degradation of natural conditions is allowed in Outstanding Resource Waters or Outstanding National Resource Waters.

**Table 5. Summary of Supported Classified Uses for South Carolina**

Uses	Description
Fish and wildlife	All classes
Domestic water supply	All freshwater classes
Primary contact recreation	All classes
Secondary contact recreation	All classes
Industrial	All freshwater classes
Agriculture	All freshwater classes
Navigation	All classes

### Reclassifications and Site-Specific Criteria

SCDHEC is presently reclassifying several waterbodies to recognize their best and/or existing uses. Most reclassifications are initiated after receiving a written request from an individual, special interest group, or organization. SCDHEC also proposes waters for reclassification where existing water quality is better than required to protect the classified uses or if there is an existing use not recognized by the present classification. Also added to the classification system is the designation of No Discharge Zones (NDZs). NDZs relate specifically to the discharge of treated waste from Marine Sanitation Devices (MSDs) and are authorized pursuant to §312 of the Federal Clean Water Act. Waters of the State designated as NDZ prohibit any discharge from MSDs into these waters and require that the MSDs be pumped out at an appropriate facility. SCDHEC has designated seven waterbodies as NDZs and is currently considering designating other coastal waters as NDZs. SCDHEC is in the process of reclassifying several waterbodies within the boundary of the Congaree National Park to Outstanding Resource Waters (ORWs) and a portion of Cedar Creek which is contained within the boundary of the park to an Outstanding National Resource Water (ONRW). Cedar Creek will be the State's first ONRW.

Site-specific criteria applicable to a single waterbody is also incorporated into R.61-69. SCDHEC has adopted a dissolved oxygen (DO) standard for the lower Saluda River which is classed as a Trout- Put, Grow, and Take waterbody. The revised DO standard better protects the trout resources of this waterbody.

Water reclassifications, NDZ designations, and site-specific criteria are amendments to state regulation and, as such, are not effective until approved by the South Carolina General Assembly and published in the State Register.

### C. Point Source Program - Municipal Facilities

The EPA has delegated the authority to SCDHEC for administering the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program within the State. As a functional part of this NPDES program, all municipal and private domestic wastewater treatment works that discharge to surface water in South Carolina are monitored by the Bureau of Water (BOW). Permit effluent limits of each surface water discharge are derived using water quality models and other tools.

### *Loan Program*

Beginning with fiscal year 1989, the state established a State Revolving Loan Fund (SRF) program, with EPA providing annual capitalization grants to seed the SRF program. This program is a low-interest, revolving loan program established pursuant to Public Law (P.L. 100-4), Water Quality Act of 1987. The State, in accordance with EPA requirements, has established a project priority rating system. The State's priority list ranks each wastewater treatment project need as well as other projects based on water quality and sludge disposal needs.

Projects receiving SRF loans since fiscal year 1989 have totaled over \$425,753,822 million through June 30, 2003.

The result of the newly constructed or upgraded treatment works using these funding sources has been improved wastewater treatment resulting in favorable water quality benefits. This construction has eliminated poorly treated effluent from many streams and provided improvements to facility capacity. The improvement of water quality has been seen by routine monthly discharge monitoring reports (DMRs) submitted by each treatment plant owner to SCDHEC. As an overall result, the SRF helps to improve and maintain water quality.

### *Pretreatment and Toxicity Program*

The implementation of SCDHEC pretreatment program continues. The State approves implementation pretreatment programs for Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs). The pretreatment programs are typically updated upon permit renewal or when the facility expands the discharge. An assessment of program requirements is conducted to insure that the latest pretreatment regulation requirements are in place. There has been a direct benefit to in-stream water quality demonstrated from many, if not all, of the implemented pretreatment programs. With the implementation of approved programs many industries previously discharging untreated wastewater to a POTW must pretreat their discharges. This has resulted in a significant reduction in the amounts of materials (contaminants) that POTWs are now receiving from the industries. This allows the POTW to adequately treat all wastewater prior to discharging to a State stream, resulting in the ability to better maintain the existing stream water quality standards.

Since FY 89 appropriate majors, significant minors (minors with pretreatment programs) and selected other permits have been issued or reissued with effluent toxicity monitoring requirements to be performed as appropriate based on the information related to the discharge characteristics. Depending on the in-stream waste concentration and presence or absence of a diffuser, there can be either an acute test, chronic test, or both required. The toxicity testing typically will be multi concentration tests that will allow an assessment of the potential toxicity of the effluent at varying concentrations.

### *Stormwater Controls*

South Carolina has no known combined stormwater/sanitary sewer discharges associated with POTWs. Combined sewers are usually prohibited by local ordinance to preclude overloading treatment systems with stormwater. Stormwater runoff control on POTW sites is mandatory in some areas of the State.

SCDHEC is implementing a state stormwater permitting program policy in support of EPA guidelines

of requirements required by the 1987 amendments to the Clean Water Act. See the Section on Stormwater Permits under "D. Point Source Program - Industrial and Agricultural Facilities."

#### *Land Application of Treated Waste*

SCDHEC issues State discharge permits to facilities that discharge directly to land as spray irrigation. This involves the application of, at least, secondary-treated wastewater to land surfaces with the applied effluent being further treated as it percolates through the plant-soil matrix. A portion of the applied effluent percolates to groundwater, some is absorbed by vegetation, and some evaporates to the atmosphere.

#### The primary objectives of this program are:

- (a) Treatment and disposal of applied wastewater without exceeding ground-water quality standards as specified in S.C. Regulation 61-68 *Water Classifications and Standards*.
- (b) Economic return from use of treated effluent, water and nutrients, to produce marketable crops.
- (c) Water conservation by replacing potable water with treated effluent.
- (d) Preservation of open space through vegetation.

As a permit requirement, a program for monitoring the quality of groundwater is typically established and implemented. Proper placement of ground-water monitoring wells will provide a check on the effectiveness of the wastewater renovation and will serve as an early warning system for ground-water quality protection for nearby ground-water users. The direction of groundwater flow determines the placement of ground-water monitoring wells.

#### *Strategies to Improve the Municipal Permitting Program*

SCDHEC district personnel inspect the operation and maintenance programs of POTWs on a routine basis. Deficiencies noted during inspections are conveyed to the POTW and may require SCDHEC to take formal enforcement action. Operational advice is provided on a limited basis by SCDHEC staff. The South Carolina Environmental Training Center at Sumter Area Technical College also provides training for treatment plant operators.

SCDHEC has developed sludge management regulations and guidance for permittees. All NPDES permits issued or reissued have sludge disposal requirements. The permit typically requires the sludge generator to monitor the content of its sludge and to dispose of it in an environmentally acceptable manner. The permit authorizes specific methods (e.g., land application, land filling, etc.) and procedures to be fully implemented.

## **D. Point Source Program - Industrial and Agricultural Facilities**

### *Industrial Facilities*

SCDHEC reviews NPDES permit applications for new and existing facilities and determines whether treatment must be technology-based or based on water quality standards. The more stringent of these derived numbers are used as the applicable permit limits. Effluent guidelines, where promulgated by EPA, are used to determine technology-based limits. If EPA effluent guidelines have not been developed, best professional judgment of technology-based limits is used. Water quality limits are developed using computerized water quality modeling procedures, which result in wasteload allocations for constituents affecting in-stream oxygen levels. South Carolina water quality standards and/or biological monitoring are used to determine limits for potentially toxic constituents. Where appropriate, permit limits are developed using a combination of water quality limitations for specific constituents, whole effluent toxicity limits, and in-stream biological monitoring to insure no adverse impacts from industrial point source dischargers.

### *Agricultural Facilities*

Unregulated wastewater discharges from agricultural animal facilities or fruit and vegetable processing facilities may affect water quality. Additionally, South Carolina does not allow surface water discharges from these facilities under any circumstances. To ensure these wastes do not enter the waters of the State, SCDHEC requires that both solid and liquid agricultural wastes from these facilities be collected, treated, and disposed in an environmentally acceptable manner. This is accomplished through a State permitting and inspection program requiring recycling or land application of agricultural wastes. Land application of wastes to viable crops at agronomic rates eliminates direct surface water discharges of agricultural wastes and is effective in insuring water quality. South Carolina's state agricultural program is and will continue to be more stringent than the federal NPDES program for animal facilities.

### *Toxics Controls*

Toxic pollutants are generally defined as substances which by themselves or in combination with other chemicals are harmful to animal life or human health. They include some of the metals, pesticides, and other synthetic organic pollutants that have the potential to contaminate water, fish tissue, and bottom sediments. Each NPDES permit application is reviewed for potential toxic pollutants. These pollutants are evaluated for aquatic life and human health concerns. If determined to be potentially toxic, a limitation is placed in the NPDES permit for that specific pollutant using South Carolina water quality standards. SCDHEC has EPA-approved standards for specific pollutants. Whole effluent toxicity testing is placed in many NPDES permits; those tests being for acute and/or chronic monitoring as appropriate. In-stream biological assessments are also being utilized in some cases (i.e., to evaluate stormwater runoff).

### *Land Application of Treated Wastewater*

The process utilized for industrial and agricultural facilities is the same as that for municipal facilities. However, limitations for the spray effluent are not permitted as secondary limits, but are based on site-specific requirements.

### *Stormwater Permits- Industrial*



SCDHEC regulates storm water discharges associated with industrial activities. The State has issued two general NPDES permits for activities associated with industry. These permits are the Construction Activity NPDES Permit and the Associated with Industrial Activity, except construction, NPDES Permit.

The general permits require permittee's to develop and implement Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) that will minimize pollutants in their storm water discharges. Some industrial activities, except construction, must monitor on either an annual or semiannual basis while all industrial activities, except construction, are required to update their SWPPP's on an annual basis. Industrial construction activities are required to conduct inspections weekly and after every rainfall event of 1 inch or greater.

Where appropriate, individual NPDES permits will be issued in accordance with EPA's tiered permitting strategy. Water quality monitoring will help identify the industrial activities that must receive individual permits instead of general permits. In the watershed approach, the individual permits will be tailored to address the water quality concerns of the storm water discharges from industrial activity.

#### *Stormwater Permits – Construction*

In addition to regulating storm water discharges associated with industrial activities, SCDHEC is charged with regulation storm water discharges originating from construction sites. This is done through the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges from Large and Small Construction Sites (SCR100000).

The newest version of the General Permit was issued in February of 2006 and is anticipated to become effective in the spring of 2006. The new permit includes additional inspection and reporting requirements. Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) are to be prepared and submitted to the Department for review. Plans are to be updated and must reflect the activities, from initial clearing to final stabilization, that are to take place on the construction site. Plans must also reflect any controls necessary to keep the site in compliance with existing TMDLs or other water quality concerns.

#### *Stormwater Permits- MS4*

SCDHEC also regulates Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) in the overall storm water program. There are four Phase I MS4's in South Carolina, one large and three medium. The large one is SCDOT and is scheduled to be issued on June 1, 2006. Two of the three medium MS4's, Greenville County and Richland County, are already permitted and are in the preliminary draft stage of re-issuance. The remaining medium MS4 is the City of Columbia and the application is currently under review by EPA. The Phase Two NPDES Permit is now effective and 64 automatically regulated SMS4's will be phase in for coverage during the permit term. These permits help insure water quality protection within the boundaries of the affected local governments.

### **E. Permit Compliance and Enforcement**

Compliance tracking is a complex activity that involves various program elements and activities within the Bureau of Water. Regulatory functions require ongoing monitoring of all permits, inspection activities, and investigatory work. A computer based tracking system, the WPC Network, is maintained

for the storage, retrieval, and management of permit compliance information for individual permits, including all effluent limits and compliance schedule data, facility operation and maintenance and pretreatment status. The availability of this information and ability to manage the data electronically enhances the Bureau information base providing greater program management capabilities.

All data necessary for issuing permits and tracking the compliance of those individual permits is maintained on the Bureau's network. Staff have access to information on permitting status, compliance monitoring, enforcement status, etc.

The WPC Network is designed to interface with EPA's Permit Compliance System (PCS). Updated compliance data is batched to PCS weekly. The Bureau is continuing its efforts to improve its utilization of the computer generated EPA Quarterly Noncompliance Report (QNCR).

Enforcement activities are performed in order to identify and appropriately respond to facilities in permit noncompliance and other entities found to be in violation of state statutes and regulations. Data accessibility through the Bureau's networking system, as well as organizational changes, have greatly enhanced enforcement staff capabilities for efficient case development and management. Improvements in entry of limits and data will further improve tracking and enforcement efficiency.

An emphasis on enforcement activity will continue in accordance with implementation of the Bureau's Watershed Water Quality Management Program. Appropriate and timely enforcement responses in conjunction with the activities of other program areas are expected to contribute significantly to accomplishment of this program's goals through the development of TMDLs.

Enforcement staff will become more involved in the referral of cases for criminal investigation and providing assistance to criminal investigators. A greater emphasis has been placed upon pursuing prosecution of violators under the criminal statutes and the support and assistance of enforcement staff in this process will continue to be invaluable; however, criminal and administrative investigations must be conducted separately.

It is recognized that aggressive enforcement activity encourages compliance. In this regard, enforcement staff are committed to secure for South Carolina the benefits from these activities to protect our water resources through implementation of appropriate enforcement strategies. The development and continued improvement of automated tools and methodology to accomplish this is considered to be vital to this function and will be given priority.

## **F. Nonpoint Source Program**

Nonpoint Source (NPS) water pollution generally comes from diffuse, numerous sources. Runoff occurring after a rain event may transport sediment from plowed fields, construction sites, or logging operations, pesticides and fertilizers from farms and lawns, motor oil and grease deposited on roads and parking lots, or bacteria containing waste from agricultural animal facilities or malfunctioning septic systems. The rain moves the pollutants across the land to the nearest water body or storm drain where they may impact the water quality in creeks, rivers, lakes, estuaries and wetlands. Nonpoint source pollution may also impact groundwaters when it is allowed to seep or percolate into aquifers. The adverse effects of NPS pollution include physical destruction of aquatic habitat, fish die-offs, interference with or elimination of recreational uses of a water body (particularly lakes), closure of

shellfish beds, reduced water supply or taste and odor problems in drinking water, potential human health problems due to bacteria and toxic chemicals in NPS runoff, and increased potential for flooding because water bodies become choked with sediment.

The *South Carolina Nonpoint Source Management Program, 1999 Update* outlines the state's strategic plan for addressing statewide water quality impairments attributable to nonpoint source pollution discharges. To accomplish this strategy, 17 long-term goals for reducing or preventing NPS pollution are enumerated. Throughout the document, five-year action strategies are described that lead to attainment of the long-term goals, and annual milestones leading to attainment of the action strategies are further described. The Program is two-pronged; focusing on reducing NPS impacts in priority watersheds, and implementing activities statewide in order to prevent NPS pollution. Components include both regulatory and voluntary approaches.

To facilitate success in achieving water quality improvements, South Carolina's NPS program focuses federal Clean Water Act Section 319 funding and state resources on impaired 303(d) listed waterbodies in priority watersheds through the implementation of approved NPS Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). The state's Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program under federal Coastal Zone Management legislation is also implemented.

Nine categories of NPS pollution that impact South Carolina's waters are identified and described: agriculture, forestry, urban areas, marinas and recreational boating, mining, hydrologic modification, wetlands disturbance, land disposal/groundwater impacts, and atmospheric deposition. Technology based controls, or management measures, are employed to address these categorical impacts. The Program describes specific management measures for each category as well as implementation schedules. South Carolina has the legal authority to implement all of the necessary management measures.

SCDHEC is responsible for Program implementation, but is dependent upon the cooperation of all levels of government, private sector stakeholders, and especially the citizens of the State in order to realize positive results. Many organizations have expertise that can be beneficial to the NPS pollution management program. For example, trade and environmental organizations have program delivery mechanisms that reach persons capable of implementing NPS controls, e.g., farmers, contractors, mine operators, and homeowners. These partnership roles are described in the program.

A system of evaluation/monitoring techniques is a necessary component of the NPS Management Program, in order to evaluate its progress and success. Evaluation will show whether the Program is attaining the state's overall water quality vision, stated long-term goals, and five-year action strategies. In South Carolina, several monitoring and tracking efforts are described that address available information on improvements in water quality, implementation milestones, and available information on reductions in NPS pollution. Evaluation techniques include water quality monitoring, level of participation in management measure implementation, and stakeholder feedback.

This *South Carolina NPS Management Program Update* fulfills the requirements of both Section 319 of the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1987, and Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA) of 1990. It comprehensively describes a framework for agency coordination and cooperation and serves to implement a strategy for employing effective management measures and programs to control NPS pollution statewide for the next five years.

It incorporates nine key elements that are iterated in Environmental Protection Agency NPS guidance. Through the use of a framework that addresses these key elements, South Carolina will continue to have an effective NPS program that is designed to achieve and maintain beneficial uses of water.

South Carolina receives funding in excess of \$3 million annually for implementation of projects to reduce or eliminate NPS pollution through section 319 of the Clean Water Act. Some of these projects are statewide or regional in scope and include activities such as water quality monitoring, NPS outreach and education, and best management practice (BMP) compliance. Other projects are watershed based, aimed at remediating NPS related problems from the state's 303(d) list. A relatively new focus for section 319 funding is the development and implementation of total maximum daily loads (TMDLs). Since FY 2003, one-half of the State's allocation has been used for this purpose.

### **G. Wasteload Allocations and Total Maximum Daily Loads**

A total maximum daily load (TMDL) is the maximum load of a pollutant that can be assimilated by a waterbody without contravening water quality standards. Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act requires that TMDLs be developed for waters that are determined to be impaired, that is, not meeting applicable water quality standards. A TMDL is made up of a wasteload allocation (WLA) which is the portion of the assimilative capacity allocated to point sources, a load allocation (LA) which is the portion of the assimilative capacity allocated to nonpoint sources, plus a margin of safety. A TMDL can be developed for an individual pollutant, such as bacteria, or for a category of pollutants, such as oxygen demanding substances. In addition to developing WLAs in conjunction with TMDLs for waters on the State's 303(d) list of impaired waters, SCDHEC also develops WLAs as part of the routine review required for new discharges or for permit reissuance for existing discharges.

Various techniques, ranging from simple mathematical models to complex computer based models, are used by SCDHEC to determine the ability of a waterbody to assimilate various pollutants. TMDLs and WLAs developed using these techniques allow use of the assimilative capacity of a waterbody while protecting water quality and maintaining existing and classified uses. WLAs are developed as part of the basin review process as well as in response to proposals for new and expanded projects throughout the State. WLAs for oxygen demanding substances (carbonaceous and nitrogenous oxygen demand) and ammonia toxicity are determined by the Water Quality Modeling Section. WLAs for metals, total residual chlorine, organic pollutants and most toxicants are determined by the individual permitting sections.

Wasteload allocations fall into one of two categories, effluent limited or water quality limited. In instances when the assimilative capacity of a waterbody exceeds the existing or proposed pollutant loading, the waterbody is said to be effluent limited and a TMDL is not required. Effluent limitations for discharges to such waters are determined by the minimum standards required for the type of discharge involved. In instances where the permitted loading is equal to or a proposed loading is greater than the assimilative capacity, the stream is said to be water quality limited. The limits on the discharges to such waters are determined by the water quality of the receiving stream, rather than the minimum standards. TMDLs are not required for water quality limited streams that meet applicable standards. In cases where the water body is meeting standards but a previously permitted or proposed loading would cause the waterbody to be impaired, the new wasteload allocation is a maximum allowable loading. In multiple discharge situations, the load must be divided or allocated among the discharges.

To date, TMDLs have been developed for fecal coliform bacteria, phosphorus, pH, and oxygen

demanding substances for many waterbodies. Development of additional TMDLs is currently underway. Wasteload allocations have been developed for numerous waterbodies for ammonia and oxygen demanding substances. While not TMDLs, these WLAs in many cases constitute the maximum allowable loading to the waterbody. WLAs for phosphorus have been developed for several waterbodies including Eighteen Mile Creek, Reedy River, Bush River and Catawba River, with efforts underway or planned for development of nutrient TMDLs for the Reedy River and Catawba River. Development of new TMDLs is expected to play an increasingly important part in the overall wasteload allocation process as SCDHEC continues implementation of the basin planning and permitting strategy with emphasis on restoring the State's impaired waters.

## **H. Special State Concerns and Recommendations**

The Bureau of Water continues to implement the operational plan initiated in 2001. These efforts implement portions of the Agency's and Environmental Quality Control's strategic plans. Elements of the operational plan embrace the Bureau's mission and the Agency's values, and visions.

### *Bureau of Water Mission*

The water people drink in South Carolina is safe, and that there is plenty of it. Water resources of South Carolina are of such quality that they are suitable for use by all citizens and that all surface waters are of a quality suitable to support and maintain aquatic flora and fauna.

### *DHEC Values*

Customer service  
Teamwork  
Use of applied scientific knowledge

### *DHEC Visions*

Cultural competence  
Excellence in government  
Local solutions

### *Bureau of Water Goals*

The eight goals of the Bureau of Water will ensure that our mission is accomplished while embracing the DHEC values and visions.

The primary way to accomplish this is reflected in **Goal 1**: Protect Surface and Ground Water Quality. **Goal 2**: Adequately Assess Water Quality allows us to track the progress of achieving the first goal. **Goal 3**: Reduce and Eliminate Water Pollution offers ways to improve upon the activities supporting Goal 1.

Water quality protection includes protecting the habitat necessary for aquatic organisms, indicators of water quality. This is reflected in **Goal 4**: Protect and Restore Aquatic Habitat.

Citizens of the State are the ultimate consumers requiring clean water. Safe, clean drinking water is essential for life and is accomplished through the activities in **Goal 5**: Provide Safe Drinking Water.

Many Bureau of Water Programs provide protection of health and safety for activities undertaken in or on waters. **Goal 6:** Protect Public Health and Safety accomplishes this.

It is important for citizens to understand their role in water quality protection as presented in **Goal 7:** Expand the Public's Knowledge about Water Issues.

Finally, if we implement **Goal 8:** Plan Effectively for Growth, water pollution impacts can be further minimized and the ability to achieve all other goals will be enhanced.

The Bureau of Water continues to implement the operational plan initiated in 2001. These efforts implement portions of the Agency's and Environmental Quality Control's strategic plans. Elements of the operational plan embrace the Bureau's mission and the Agency's values, and visions.

Program funding continues to be a central concern and overall limiting factor to the development of new programs or enhancement of existing water quality programs. While we suffered significant reductions in State funds in previous fiscal years, State reductions in FY 04 and FY 05 were not significant. However Federal rescissions and reductions are causing us to take a close look at program priorities.

Since 1992, SCDHEC's Bureau of Water has successfully implemented a Watershed Water Quality Management Program designed to maximize the use of resources, equalize workloads on an annual basis, and develop strategies for water quality maintenance or improvement on a priority basis. Last year we had a low backlog for major NPDES permits. The Watershed Water Quality Management Program also has allowed us to better utilize water quality monitoring resources to evaluate water quality in the State as well as wasteload modeling resources for permit limits development.

Our current or future activities will be focused on implementing the following recommendations and strategies. They are presented according to the goal they will help us attain.

#### *Protect Surface and Ground Water Quality*

- \* In May 2004, we received Legislative approval for the triennial review completed in December 2003. Major revisions are adoption of current federal criteria, revision of the bacterial indicator for coastal recreational waters, and inclusion of a variance from standards for NPDES permit holders.
- \* The SCDHEC continues an assertive process to evaluate and to properly classify surface waters. In February 2006, our Board approved the reclassification of waters within Congaree National Park, South Carolina's first National Park, to Outstanding Resource Waters. They also approved reclassification of a portion of Cedar Creek within the Park to National Outstanding Resource Waters. This amendment regulation is presently pending Legislative approval
- \* The SCDHEC continues its point source permitting policy of issuing water quality based NPDES permits.

#### *Adequately Assess Water Quality*

- \* Water quality monitoring efforts must be continually revised and expanded to address

the additional potential impacts of increasing population and development. We have completed our fifth year of monitoring waters at statistically selected stations for lakes and rivers and use these data for our overall statements about water quality in this report.

There remains the need for increased analytical capabilities to measure the presence of chemicals at very low concentrations. A greater emphasis on biological integrity is also a recognized need. We participated in the national wadeable streams monitoring effort and are assisting in data evaluation. The SCDHEC must continue to seek resources to develop and implement more extensive biological monitoring and assessment. Supplemental monitoring funds in the Section 106 grant has not yet been used to fund staff since there is some uncertainty as to the continuation of this supplement. Recognizing that EPA may be moving away from STORET, we are exploring other ways to house our monitoring data.

### *Reduce and Eliminate Water Pollution*

- \* Improving water quality of impaired waters continues to be a SCDHEC priority. The SCDHEC must develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for all waters listed on the 303(d) list of impaired waters. The SCDHEC has used Federal Section 319 funds to assist with TMDL development and are now focusing 319 funds on TMDL implementation. South Carolina has 312 approved TMDLs and local partners are implementing 34 TMDLs where nonpoint sources must be controlled. In addition, SCDHEC is implementing several more TMDLs through stringent NPDES permits.
- \* Regulations dealing with Phase II of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water permit program have been finalized. The SCDHEC has issued a General Permit for small MS4s and has reissued General Permits for industrial storm water and construction activities. We have added staff for storm water permitting but additional inspectors would make this program more effective.

### *Protect and Restore Aquatic Habitat*

- \* The SCDHEC will more aggressively integrate the Shellfish Sanitation Program into its ongoing efforts to maintain and enhance water quality by focusing corrective actions on impaired shellfish harvesting waters.
- \* The SCDHEC will continue to protect wetlands as waters of the State through its water programs including 401 water quality certification, NPDES permitting, and State stormwater permitting. The SCDHEC is using storm water permitting programs in conjunction with the SC Pollution Control Act to protect isolated wetlands since a Supreme Court decision removed them from regulatory jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. We have not been successful in amending water quality certification regulations to provide for protection of isolated wetlands; however, a new statute to protect isolated wetlands was introduced by the Legislature in 2006.

### *Provide Safe Drinking Water*

- \* Source Water Protection and Wellhead Protection Programs will receive priority to insure drinking water uses of surface and ground waters are given the highest levels of

protection. The SCDHEC completed all source water protection reports ahead of schedule and has provided them to the water systems for implementation. We have recently added staff with Source Water set-aside funding to work with water systems on implementation.

#### *Protect Public Health and Safety*

- \* The fish tissue monitoring program was previously expanded, but State budget cuts have affected this program greatly. We have maintained the capability to monitor a limited number of fish samples for mercury in order to keep our advisories current. In 2005, we made significant improvements to our advisory booklets and our on-line advisory information.
- \* Ocean water quality monitoring with appropriate advisories to the public continues with federal funding under the BEACH Act. In Horry County, the SCDHEC is collecting rainfall data along with surf samples in order to use rainfall levels to predict bacterial levels thereby reducing the amount of monitoring needed.

#### *Expand the Public's Knowledge about Water Issues*

- \* The SCDHEC publishes environmental quality data in its annual report, *Healthy People Living in Healthy Communities*, to inform and educate the general public, State legislature, and State congressional delegation as to the status of our progress to date and important issues. This effort to increase the general awareness of the citizens of the State to the mission, programs, and achievements of the SCDHEC and to help them better understand environmental issues should be expanded through other activities that facilitate interaction between citizens and SCDHEC representatives.
- \* The Bureau of Water has a stable program to provide education in connection with nonpoint source pollution and drinking water issues. We also have a well-established partnership program, Champions of the Environment, for youth. With staff changes and diminished 319 funding, we are evaluating the continuation of our Water Watch Program.
- \* The Bureau of Water has an excellent Internet web site to facilitate information exchange and to provide public participation in the regulatory process. We continue to provide speakers to address issues of interest to the public and have participated in developing an education curriculum for primary and secondary schools.
- \* In addition to public education on water quality issues, we also recognize the need to provide public forums for participation in water quality management planning and TMDL development.
- \* The SCDHEC continues to expand and upgrade its computer and electronic capabilities, including implementation of the new STORET database system. We are also using a LIMS (Laboratory Information Management System) to input data from the lab into STORET. There are numerous areas where electronic management and processing of



data and tracking systems would relieve valuable manpower for other activities and allow a more effective use of available resources. EPA support for better utility of STORET is essential and we are concerned about EPA's moving away from STORET. We also see a need for modernizing the Permit Compliance data system.

*Plan Effectively for Growth*

- \* The Governors of South Carolina and Georgia, through Executive Orders, established committees specifically for the purpose of protecting shared water resources. They are currently engaged in discussions on two issues that could significantly affect growth in both states: saltwater intrusion into the upper Floridan aquifer and development and implementation of a Total Maximum Daily Load for the Savannah River.
- \* Legislation in both South Carolina and North Carolina established joint river basin advisory commissions for the Catawba/Wateree River and the Yadkin/Pee Dee River. Members have been named for the Catawba/Wateree Commission and they have met several times. Issues of concern are ensuring adequate quantity for downstream uses and increased pollutant loadings into the Catawba River.
- \* Legislation to allow the SCDHEC to regulate water withdrawals has been introduced this year. The Governor's Water Law Review Committee recommended in its 2004 Report that this legislation is needed for South Carolina to be able to negotiate with neighboring states on water quantity issues.

# SURFACE WATER ASSESSMENT

## 1. Surface Water Monitoring Program

### A. Purpose and Design

State administrators need to assess the quality of the aquatic environment so that they can make decisions concerning water program priorities and provide reports to the public on the state of the environment, important trends over time, and accomplishments. They also need to evaluate the effectiveness of control measures. Water quality monitoring data provide information necessary to meet these needs.

The SCDHEC operates and collects data from a statewide network of ambient monitoring sites. The ambient monitoring network is directed toward determining long-term water quality trends, assessing attainment of water quality standards, identifying locations in need of additional attention, and providing background data for planning and evaluating stream classifications and standards. The ambient monitoring network, as a program, involves sampling a wide range of physical and chemical parameters and analyzing them for the presence or effects of contaminants and comparing them to criteria to determine use support.

There are several major components to SCDHEC's ambient water quality monitoring activities, including ongoing fixed-location monitoring, cyclic watershed monitoring, and statewide probability-based monitoring, each designed to provide data for water quality assessment of major water resource types at different spatial and temporal scales. For a detailed discussion of each of these components, please see the most recent version of the State of South Carolina Monitoring Strategy at <http://www.scdhec.gov/water/html/monitoring.html>.

### B. Networks and Programs

The statewide Probability-Based, or random sampling, component of the ambient monitoring program is designed to make statewide estimates of water quality. The data derived from those monitoring activities is used to develop the stream, lake/reservoir, and estuarine summary information presented in this report. A probability-based monitoring design is a type of a survey design in that the population of interest is sampled in a fashion that allows statements to be made about the whole population based on a subsample, and produces an estimate of the accuracy of the assessment results. The advantage of the probability-based sampling design is that statistically valid statements about water quality can be made about large areas based on a relatively small subsample.

Separate monitoring schemes have been developed for stream, lake/reservoir, and estuarine resources. Site selection is done in association with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory (NHEERL), Corvallis, Oregon. Random Sites are sampled once a month for one year, and a new statewide set of probability-based random sites is selected for each waterbody type every year. Please refer to the State of South Carolina Monitoring Strategy at <http://www.scdhec.gov/water/html/monitoring.html> for details of parameters sampled.

Although statements about resource conditions can theoretically be made based on data from a single year, the compilation of data from multiple years increases the confidence and accuracy of statements about water quality. An additional advantage of the probability-based approach is that it presents the

opportunity for previously unsampled locations to be selected for data collection.

### **C. Laboratory Analytical Support**

The Analytical and Radiological Environmental Services Division (ARESD) provides laboratory services to the Bureaus of Water and Land and Waste Management. The analytical services offered include bacteriological, chemical, and physical analyses. The types of samples analyzed include water, wastewater, leachate, soil, sediment, chemical waste, fish, and shellfish.

The organizational structure encompasses five sections and seven regional laboratories. The Central Laboratory Sections include Sample Characterization/ Automated Analysis/ Data Management, Metals Analysis, Organic Analysis, and Environmental Microbiology located in the Hayne Building in Columbia. The Radiological Environmental Monitoring Section is located in the Sims/Aycock Building in Columbia. The seven regional laboratories are located in Aiken, Beaufort, North Charleston, Florence, Greenville, Lancaster, and Myrtle Beach.

The Regional Laboratories, except for Beaufort and Myrtle Beach, initiate all stream and wastewater analysis. The Central Laboratories provide support analyses, i.e., metal, nutrient, toxic extraction procedures, and organic analyses. The Beaufort and Myrtle Beach Regional Laboratories analyze microbiological samples only. The Central Laboratory also acts as the Regional Laboratory for the Central Midlands District, performing the same functions as the other Regional Laboratories. Drinking Water Chemical Analysis is essentially a Central Laboratory program with support from the Regional Laboratories. All Regional Laboratories perform microbiological analyses for the Drinking Water Program.

### **D. Quality Assurance**

SCDHEC's Quality System is the means by which the Department implements the quality management process. The Quality System encompasses a variety of technical and administrative elements which are outlined in the SCDHEC Quality Assurance Management Plan, 2003. This plan describes how programs within Environmental Quality Control (EQC) will plan, implement, and assess the quality of environmental work to be performed as part of the various programs' functions within the Agency.

The Deputy Commissioner for Environmental Quality Control has the overall responsibility for the development, implementation, and continued operation of EQC's QA Program. To insure that EQC's QA policy is uniformly applied to the generating and processing of all environmental data, a State Quality Assurance Management Office (SQAMO) has been established.

This office is responsible for the Quality Assurance Program. Environmentally-related measurement activities conducted by or for EQC shall be done only with the approval of the State Quality Assurance Management Office (SQAMO) after assuring that adequate quality assurance guidelines and procedures have been incorporated. This includes study-planning, sample collection, preservation and analysis, data handling, and use of physical, chemical, biological, and other data related to the effects, sources, transport and control of pollution, as well as personnel review and training.

To accomplish these goals the Water Quality Monitoring Section, Aquatic Biology Section, and Pollution Source Compliance Section have developed and instituted SQAMO approved field study procedures and documentation, data review, and routine EPA operating overview. These procedures are

documented in SCDHEC's Environmental Investigations Standard Operating Procedures and Quality Assurance Manual (SOP) (2001). This document describes in detail the field sampling procedures, meter calibration and maintenance procedures, sample chain-of-custody documentation, sample preservation, holding times and recommended sample containers specifications, data sheet examples, and data submission requirements.

At least once yearly all field personnel are accompanied on sample collection activities by the appropriate program quality assurance officer for evaluation of adherence to standard operating procedures (SOP) for QA/QC. These evaluations each year are for water quality monitoring SOP review and for facility compliance sampling SOP review. Approximately every other year the EPA conducts on-site routine overviews of SCDHEC's QA/QC procedures.

The Division Director and the Quality Assurance Officer for EQC Laboratories coordinate the internal quality assurance program. The laboratory quality assurance program encompasses every aspect of the laboratory analysis from container preparation through the actual data release from the Analytical Services Laboratory to the Environmental Quality Control (EQC) Programs.

Analytical Services has developed two quality control manuals that detail the day-to-day operation of the quality assurance program: (1) Procedures and Quality Control Manual for Chemistry Laboratories--Analytical Services; and (2) Laboratory Procedures Manual for Environmental Microbiology-- Analytical Services. The elements of quality control addressed in the manuals include organization and sample chain of custody; personnel training; quality control of laboratory services, scope and application, equipment and supplies, reagents, standards, methodology, preservation and storage, calibration, performance criteria and quality assurance, and waste management.

The overall laboratory quality assurance program, which includes the previously discussed elements, requires a minimum of 25% of allocated resources. The frequency for analysis of replicates and spike recovery samples is noted in the manuals and is in compliance with U.S. EPA guidelines. Acceptance criteria for each QC check is stated. Performance samples are also analyzed as noted in the manuals. The Environmental Microbiology Laboratories perform replicate analyses, positive test controls, media control tests, equipment control tests, etc., as required by EPA Laboratory Certification and Evaluation guidelines. In addition, Analytical Services and the seven regional laboratories participate in annual Water Supply and Water Pollution Proficiency Testing Programs. All district personnel who collect samples that require field testing participate in either the yearly Water Supply or Water Pollution Proficiency Testing Program, whatever is appropriate.

The laboratory analyses are conducted according to the List of Approved Test Procedures in the Federal Register, Volume 49, No. 209, October 26, 1984; Federal Register, Volume 59, No. 20, January 31, 1994; and Federal Register, Volume 67, No. 205, October 23, 2002. The Analytical Services quality control manuals include a section on methodology designed to reduce variations in applied techniques among the State laboratories where methods permit analyst interpretation, and thus provide a more uniform approach that will increase the reproducibility of results reported from the laboratory system. Analytical SOPs are identified by number and date of revision. Each SOP includes the approved method reference.

SOPs includes instrument calibration and maintenance procedures as well as corrective actions for any deficiencies or problems encountered.

## **E. Data Storage, Management and Interpretation**

Routine ambient stream and sediment samples are collected by Regional Office personnel while special study and biological samples are generally collected by Water Quality Monitoring Section or Aquatic Biology Section personnel. Some sample analyses are conducted in the Regional Laboratories and others by the Central Laboratory. Data for samples that are analyzed in the Regional Laboratories are reported on the appropriate data sheets and released by the sample custodian for the region. These data sheets are sent to the Analytical and Radiological Environmental Services Division in Columbia where they, along with data sheets generated in the Central Laboratory, are sent to the appropriate program areas. All Ambient Surface Water Physical & Chemical Monitoring data are distributed by the Compliance Assurance Division to the Water Quality Monitoring Section. The data are reviewed by the Water Quality Monitoring Section and are sent to the Information Services Section for data entry. The data are edited and stored on at least an annual basis in the EPA's STORET distributed water quality database. Data sheets are kept on file in the Water Quality Monitoring Section.

After biological samples are collected, data sheets are kept on file in the Aquatic Biology Section until sample analysis is completed. Macro invertebrate and habitat data are entered into an in-house relational database program. Phytoplankton data are stored in a separate in-house database. Fish tissue results are entered into an Excel database and hard copies are filed and kept on site. Data sheets describing biological data are kept on file in the Aquatic Biology Section.

### **2. Assessment Methodology**

#### **A. Probability-Based §305(b) Assessment Approach**

The initial selection of prospective probability-based, or random, monitoring site locations is conducted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory (NHEERL), Corvallis, Oregon. Independently for each waterbody type, rivers and streams, lakes and reservoirs, and estuarine habitat, a statewide grid system and computer selection program is used to randomly select a particular grid to achieve a statewide spatial distribution of sites, and then a specific location within a selected grid is chosen according to the specifics of each waterbody design as described below.

The basic starting dataset for stream and lake site selection is the USEPA National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) coverage at a scale of 1:100,000, which is based on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Digital Line Graph map base. Because of stream density inconsistencies in NHD some missing stream reaches in part of the state were added by digitization for a more consistent statewide representation. Similarly some important reservoirs that are missing in NHD were also added.

Estuarine sites selection uses a hydrographic GIS cover developed jointly by SCDHEC and the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources from the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) digital files at a scale of 1:24,000.

#### *Rivers and Streams*

Streams of different sizes may be more or less sensitive to different types of environmental perturbations. Because of this, three stream sizes have been specifically targeted to ensure they

are represented in the selected random sites. Approximately 30 total randomly selected stream sites are sampled each year. Each site is sampled monthly for one year.

1. First Order streams, or headwater streams, are targeted because these represent streams with the least dilution capacity and therefore are most immediately impacted by adjacent land use activities and associated runoff. These streams may also serve as spawning areas for fish and refuge areas for young from larger aquatic predators.
2. Second Order streams, are also streams with relatively small dilution capacity and represent important habitat for reproduction and survival of aquatic life. They may also reflect the direct impacts of major land use activities.
3. Third Order and larger streams, that include the major rivers of the State. In general these streams have greater dilution capacity and are less affected by small scale land use perturbations and may be heavily utilized for contact recreation.

These different sizes do not occur in equal proportions in the state, therefore an unequal weighting procedure is used in the site selection process to guarantee inclusion of approximately equal numbers of sites in all three stream sizes. These differential weights are based on the relative proportions of these three size classes in the streams of the state and are used in the assessment to adjust the contribution of each stream site to the statewide resource size.

### *Lakes and Reservoirs*

Eligible lakes/reservoirs are restricted to “significant lakes,” defined as those freshwater lakes/reservoirs with at least 40 acres surface area that offer public access. The size of significant lakes/reservoirs varies immensely; therefore two size classes of lakes/reservoirs have been specifically targeted to ensure that the smaller lakes/reservoirs are represented in the selected random sites. Approximately 30 total randomly selected lake and reservoir sites are sampled each year. Each site is sampled monthly for one year.

1. Major Lakes/Reservoirs greater than 850 acres surface area.
2. Minor Lakes/Reservoirs greater than 40 acres surface area, but less than or equal to 850 acres.

These different sizes do not occur in equal proportions in the state, therefore an unequal weighting procedure is used in the site selection process to guarantee inclusion of approximately equal numbers of sites in both sizes. These differential weights are based on the relative proportions of these two size classes in the lakes and reservoirs of the state and are used in the assessment to adjust the contribution of each lake site to the statewide resource size.

### *Estuaries*

The coastal estuarine probability-based monitoring scheme has been developed jointly by SCDHEC, Bureau of Water, and the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR), Marine Resources Research Institute (MRRI). This effort has been dubbed the South Carolina Estuarine and Coastal Assessment Program (SCECAP) and sampling of the

probability-based coastal estuarine sites is a cooperative venture between SCDHEC and SCDNR-MRRI. To ensure inclusion of a variety of estuarine ecosystems and habitats, the coastal estuaries have been divided into two discrete categories (strata) based on a common GIS cover developed and utilized by both agencies.

1. Tidal Creeks, identified as less than 100 meters wide on the GIS cover, serve as nursery areas for important marine species and are most immediately affected by upland land use activities and associated runoff.
2. Open Water areas, identified as greater than 100 meters wide on the GIS cover, represent larger estuarine rivers and sounds.

Within these waterbody types there are two distinct types of monitoring sites based on sampling frequency, Core Sites and Supplemental Sites. Core Sites are sampled monthly for one year by SCDHEC for water column physical and chemical parameters and are used for §305(b) reporting purposes.

The Supplemental Sites are sampled one time by SCDNR-MRRI and SCDHEC and are used in conjunction with one time samples collected at the Core Sites in the SCECAP reports and USEPA National Coastal Assessment.

Each year there will be approximately 15 Core Tidal Creek sites and 15 Core Open Water sites. Differential weights are based on the relative proportions of these two size classes in the estuarine areas of the state and are used in the assessment to adjust the contribution of each estuary site to the statewide resource size.

## **B. Determination of Attainment of Classified Uses**

### *General Considerations*

Physical, chemical and biological data were evaluated, as described below, to determine if water quality met the water quality criteria established to protect the State classified uses defined in S.C. Regulation 61-68, *Water Classifications and Standards*. Some waters may exhibit characteristics outside the appropriate criteria due to natural conditions. Such natural conditions do not constitute a violation of the water quality criteria. To determine the appropriate classified uses and water quality criteria for specific waterbodies and locations, refer to S.C. Regulation 61-69, *Classified Waters*, in conjunction with S.C. Regulation 61-68.

Water samples for analysis are collected as surface grab samples once per month, quarter, or year, depending on the parameter. Grab samples collected at a depth of 0.3 meters are considered to be a surface measurement. At most stations sampled by boat, dissolved oxygen and temperature are sampled as a water column profile, with measurements being made at either a depth of 0.3 meters below the water surface and at one-meter intervals to the bottom or at 0.3 meters, bottom and mid-depth. At stations sampled from bridges, these parameters are measured only at a depth of 0.3 meters. For the purpose of assessment, only surface samples are used in standards comparisons. Because of the inability to target individual high or low flow events on a statewide basis these data are considered to represent typical physical conditions and chemical concentrations in the waterbodies sampled. All samples are collected and analyzed according to standard procedures (SCDHEC 2001).

Results from water quality samples can be compared to State and USEPA criteria, with some restrictions due to time of collection and sampling frequency. For certain parameters, the monthly sampling frequency employed is insufficient for strict interpretation of the standards. The grab sample method is considered to be representative for the purpose of indicating excursions relative to criteria, within certain considerations. A single grab sample is more representative of a one-hour average than a four-day average, more representative of a one-day average than a one-month average, and so on; thus, when inferences are drawn from grab samples relative to criteria, sampling frequency and the intent of the criteria must be weighed. When the sampling method or frequency does not agree with the intent of the particular standard, any conclusion about water quality should be considered as only an indication of conditions, not as a proven circumstance.

Macroinvertebrate community structure is analyzed routinely at selected stream stations as a means of detecting adverse biological impacts on the aquatic fauna of the state's waters due to water quality conditions that may not be readily detectable in the water column chemistry.

The following statewide assessment information is based on the available quality assured physical, chemical and biological water quality data collected through the probability-based monitoring design from 2001-2004.

*Aquatic Life Use Support* - One important goal of the Clean Water Act, the South Carolina Pollution Control Act, and the State Water Quality Classifications and Standards is to maintain the quality of surface waters to provide for the survival and propagation of a balanced indigenous aquatic community of fauna and flora. The degree that aquatic life is protected (Aquatic Life Use Support) is assessed by comparing important water quality characteristics and the concentrations of potentially toxic pollutants with numeric criteria.

Support of aquatic life uses is determined based on the percentage of numeric criteria excursions and, where data are available, the composition and functional integrity of the biological community. The term excursion is used to describe a measured pollutant concentration that is outside of the acceptable range as defined by the appropriate criterion. Some waters may exhibit characteristics outside the appropriate criteria due to natural conditions. Such natural conditions do not constitute a violation of the water quality criteria. A number of waterbodies have been given waterbody-specific criteria for pH and dissolved oxygen, to reflect natural conditions. To determine the appropriate numeric criteria and classified uses for specific waterbodies and locations, please refer to S.C. Regulation 61-68, *Water Classifications and Standards* and S.C. Regulation 61-69, *Classified Waters*.

If the appropriate criterion for dissolved oxygen and pH are contravened in 10 percent or less of the samples, the criterion is said to be fully supported. If the percentage of criterion excursions is greater than 10 percent, but less than or equal to 25 percent, the criterion is partially supported, unless excursions are due to natural conditions. If there are more than 25 percent excursions, the criterion is not supported, unless excursions are due to natural conditions. The decision that criteria excursions are due to natural conditions is determined by consensus and/or the professional judgment of SCDHEC staff with specific local knowledge.

If the appropriate acute or chronic aquatic life criterion for any individual toxicant (heavy metals, priority pollutants, ammonia) is exceeded more than once, representing more than 10 percent of the samples collected, the criterion is not supported. If the acute or chronic aquatic life criterion is



exceeded more than once, but in less than or equal to 10 percent of the samples, the criterion is partially supported.

The total recoverable metals criteria for heavy metals are adjusted to account for solids partitioning following the approach set forth in the Office of Water Policy and Technical Guidance on Interpretation and Implementation of Aquatic Life Metals Criteria, October 1, 1993, by Martha G. Prothro, Acting Assistant Administrator for Water, available from the Water Resource center, USEPA, 401 M St., SW, mail code RC4100, Washington, DC 20460; and 40CFR131.36(b)(1). Under this approach, a default TSS value of 1 mg/L is used. Where the metals criteria are hardness based, a default value of 25 mg/L is used for waters where hardness is 25 mg/l or less.

For ammonia, the calculation of the appropriate criterion value requires the values of several associated field parameters measured concurrent with the ammonia sample collection. Where direct measurements of any of the parameters are lacking the ammonia value will not be used to determine compliance with the standards.

For turbidity in all waters, and for waters with numeric total phosphorus, total nitrogen, and chlorophyll-a criteria, if the appropriate criterion is exceeded in more than 25 percent of the samples, the criterion is not supported. If the criterion is exceeded in more than 10 but less than 25 percent, sites are evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine if local conditions indicate that classified uses are impaired. Among the characteristics considered are: hydrology and morphometry of the waterbody, existing and projected trophic state, characteristics of pollutant loadings and ongoing pollutant control mechanisms. If the criterion is exceeded in less than 10 percent of the samples, then the criterion is fully supported.

If the conclusion for any single parameter is that the criterion is “not supported”, then it is concluded that aquatic life uses are not supported in the waterbody, at that monitoring location. If there are no criteria that are “not supported”, but the conclusion for at least one parameter criterion is “partially supported”, then it is concluded that aquatic life uses are partially supported. Regardless of the number of samples, no monitoring site will be listed as partially or not supporting for any pollutant based a single water chemistry sample result because of the possibility of an anomalous event.

For aquatic life uses, the goal of the standards is the protection of a balanced indigenous aquatic community. Therefore, biological data are the ultimate deciding factor, regardless of chemical conditions. If biological data shows a healthy, balanced community, the use is considered supported even if chemical parameters do not meet the applicable criteria.

*Macroinvertebrate Data Interpretation* - Macroinvertebrate community assessment data are used to directly determine Aquatic Life Use Support and to support determinations based on water chemistry data. Macroinvertebrate community data may also be used to evaluate potential impacts from the presence of sediment contaminants. Aquatic and semi-aquatic macroinvertebrates are identified to the lowest practical taxonomic level depending on the condition and maturity of specimens collected.

The EPT Index and the North Carolina Biotic Index (BI) are the main indices used in analyzing macroinvertebrate data. To a lesser extent, taxa richness and sometimes total abundances may be used to help interpret data. The EPT Index or the Ephemeroptera (mayflies) - Plecoptera (stoneflies) - Trichoptera (caddisflies) Index is the total taxa richness of these three generally pollution-sensitive orders. EPT values are compared with least impacted regional sites. The Biotic Index for a sample is the average pollution tolerance of all organisms collected, based on assigned taxonomic tolerance

values.

Taxa richness is the number of distinct taxa collected and is the simplest measure of diversity. High taxa richness is generally associated with high water quality. Increasing levels of pollution progressively eliminate the more sensitive taxa, resulting in lower taxa richness. Total abundance is the enumeration of all macroinvertebrates collected at a sampling location. When gross differences in abundance occur between stations, this metric may be considered as a potential indicator.

*Recreational Use Support* - The degree to that the swimmable goal of the Clean Water Act is attained (Recreational Use Support) is based on the frequency of fecal coliform bacteria excursions.

For fecal coliform bacteria, an excursion is an occurrence of a bacteria concentration greater than 400/100 ml for all surface water classes. Comparisons to the bacteria geometric mean standard are not considered appropriate based on sampling frequency and the intent of the standard.

If 10 percent or less of the samples are greater than 400/100 ml then recreational uses are said to be fully supported. A percentage of criteria excursions greater than 10 and less than or equal to 25 is considered partial support of recreational uses, and greater than 25 percent is considered to represent nonsupport of recreational uses.

### 3. Rivers and Streams Water Quality Assessment

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has developed a system to determine estimates of total river miles and total lake acres for the states to use in reporting for §305(b) reports. The estimates are based on the Digital Line Graph (DLG) database and the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD), that are in turn based on the U.S. Geological Survey 1:100,000 scale hydrologic maps. The original DLG database was missing a significant number of South Carolina streams. Many of these missing features have been added by SCDHEC, with the cooperation and oversight of the USEPA.

#### A. Summary Statistics

Based on the modified USEPA National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) and the results of probability site selection validation, South Carolina has an estimated 20,954 miles of freshwater rivers and streams representing the stream sampling design frame previously described.

A summary of classified use support statewide based on 118 probability-based monitoring sites sampled from 2001-2004, along with causes for partial or nonattainment, is presented below. The Lower and Upper 95 Percent Confidence Intervals for the probability-based estimates signify that it is 95% certain that the true mileage is between the upper and lower confidence limits.

**Table 6. Rivers and Streams Use Support Summary (Miles)**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Probability-Based Estimated Percent of Total Resource</b>	<b>Probability-Based Estimated Miles of Total Resource</b>	<b>Lower 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Miles)</b>	<b>Upper 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Miles)</b>
Aquatic Life Use	Fully Supporting	65.1%	13,647	11,610	15,683

	Partially Supporting	18.2%	3,816	2,076	5,555
	Not Supporting	16.7%	3,492	2,103	4,880
Recreational Use	Fully Supporting	46.8%	9,807	7,846	11,768
	Partially Supporting	21.9%	4,580	2,891	6,270
	Not Supporting	31.3%	6,567	4,675	8,458

**Table 7. Summary of Fully Supporting and Impaired Rivers and Streams (Not including Fish Consumption Use)**

Category	Probability-Based Estimated Percent of Total Resource	Probability-Based Estimated Miles of Total Resource	Lower 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Miles)	Upper 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Miles)
Fully Supporting All Assessed Uses	33.3%	6,970	5,205	8,735
Impaired for One or More Use	66.7%	13,984	12,219	15,748

**Table 8. Total Sizes of Rivers and Streams Impaired by Various Cause Categories (Miles)**

Cause Category	Probability-Based Estimated Miles of Total Resource	Lower 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Miles)	Upper 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Miles)
Macroinvertebrate Community*	3,075	1,905	4,246
Turbidity	407	72	742
Dissolved Oxygen	1,747	768	2,726
pH	809	23	1594
Metals (Combined)	2,183	1,038	3,328
Chromium	106	0	289
Copper	1,375	383	2,366
Nickel	106	0	289
Zinc	809	202	1,415
Fecal Coliform Bacteria	11,147	9,186	13,108

\*Macroinvertebrates could not be collected at all sites, so the total resource size represented by macroinvertebrate results is 5,667 miles.

The following table summarizes the use of macroinvertebrate data in the preparation of this report. Although macroinvertebrate data are available for other locations in South Carolina, no estimates of the mileage represented by these sites were available.

**Table 9. Categories of Data Used in Aquatic Life Use Support (ALUS) Assessments for All Rivers and Streams**

Degree of ALUS	Miles Assessed Based on Physical/Chemical Data Only	Miles Assessed Based on Physical/Chemical and Biological/Habitat Data	Total Miles Assessed for ALUS
Fully Supporting	9,741	3,906	13,647
Partially Supporting	0	3,816	3,816
Not Supporting	2,497	995	3,492

#### 4. Lakes Water Quality Assessment

##### A. Summary Statistics

Based on the modified USEPA National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) and the results of probability site selection validation, South Carolina has an estimated 308,765 acres of lake and reservoir representing the lake/reservoir sampling design frame previously described. A significant amount of data associated with the 2004 probability-based lake and reservoir monitoring sites is still awaiting final QA/QC verification. Therefore the assessment of the probability-based results is based only on the 2001-2003 data. A summary of classified use support statewide based on 91 probability-based monitoring sites sampled from 2001-2003, along with causes for partial or nonattainment, is presented below. The Lower and Upper 95 Percent Confidence Intervals for the probability-based estimates signify that it is 95% certain that the true acreage is between the upper and lower confidence limits.

**Table 10. Lake Use Support Summary (Acres)**

Indicator	Category	Probability-Based Estimated Percent of Total Resource	Probability-Based Estimated Acres of Total Resource	Lower 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Acres)	Upper 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Acres)
Aquatic Life Use	Fully Supporting	84.4%	260,767	235,640	285,894
	Partially Supporting	4.4%	13,432	0	28,209
	Not Supporting	11.2%	34,566	13,504	55,629
Recreational Use	Fully Supporting	99.9%	308,436	308,039	308,765
	Partially Supporting	0.1%	329	0	726

**Table 11. Summary of Fully Supporting and Impaired Lakes (Not including Fish Consumption Use)**

Category	Probability-Based Estimated Percent of Total	Probability-Based Estimated Acres of Total	Lower 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Acres)	Upper 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Acres)
----------	--	--	--	--

	Resource	Resource		
Fully Supporting All Assessed Uses	84.4%	260,438	235,312	285,565
Impaired for One or More Use	15.6%	48,327	23,201	73,454

**Table 12. Total Sizes of Lakes Impaired by Various Cause Categories (Acres)**

Cause Category	Probability-Based Estimated Acres of Total Resource	Lower 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Acres)	Upper 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Acres)
Turbidity	658	161	1,155
Dissolved Oxygen	494	40	947
pH	32,921	11,934	53,909
Total Phosphorus	20,970	5,017	36,924
Total Nitrogen	329	0	733
Chlorophyll- <i>a</i>	7,209	0	17,859
Metals (Combined)	494	60	927
Copper	164	0	464
Zinc	329	22	636
Fecal Coliform Bacteria	329	0	726

## B. Section 314 Reporting

Section 314(a) of the Clean Water Act of 1987 directs each State to prepare or establish: (1) an identification and classification according to trophic condition of publicly-owned freshwater lakes within such State; (2) procedures, processes, and methods to control sources of pollution of such lakes; (3) methods and procedures, in conjunction with appropriate Federal agencies, to restore the quality of such lakes; (4) a list and description of lakes for that uses are known to be impaired; and (5) an assessment of the status and trends of water quality in lakes. Further, States are required to submit a biennial assessment of lake trophic condition as part of their §305(b) report.

### *Background*

Monthly sampling is conducted each year in lakes throughout the state as part of SCDHEC’s ambient water quality monitoring activities, including ongoing fixed-location monitoring, cyclic watershed monitoring, and statewide probability-based monitoring.

### *Trophic Status*

In 2001, South Carolina adopted numeric nutrient criteria for lakes by ecoregion and beginning FY 2002, trophic condition assessment was based upon the criteria for Total Phosphorus (TP), Total Nitrogen (TN) and Chlorophyll *a* (CHL-A). Table 13 lists those lake sites that were identified as not meeting one or more of these numeric criteria as part of the current §303(d) assessment reported in *Part I: Listing of Impaired Waters* of this Integrated Report. The second part of the same table lists all other

sites that were assessed and found to meet the numeric criteria.

**Table 13. Condition of Significant South Carolina Lakes**

Lake Sites Not Attaining Numeric Nutrient Criteria		
<b>PIEDMONT</b>		
<b>STATION ID(S)</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Parameters</b>
S-308 / CL-052	LAKE GREENWOOD, REEDY RVR ARM, 150 YDS US RABON CK	TP
SV-268	LAKE HARTWELL - EIGHTEEN MILE CK ARM AT S-04-1098	TP
CL-035	LAKE JOHNSON AT SPILLWAY AT S-42-359	TP, CHL-A
S-222	LAKE MURRAY, LITTLE SALUDA ARM AT SC 391	TP
S-309 / CL-081	LAKE MURRAY, BUSH RVR ARM, 4.6 KM US SC 391	TP, CHL-A
CL-021	LAKE OLIPHANT, FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES	CHL-A
CW-207	LK WATEREE AT END OF S-20-291	TP
CW-208	LK WATEREE AT S-20-101 11 MI ENE WINNSBORO	TP, CHL-A
CW-209	LK WATEREE AT SMALL ISLAND 2.3 MI N OF DAM	TP
CW-231	LK WATEREE HEADWATERS APPROX 50 YDS DS CONFL CEDAR CK	TP
RL-02314	LAKE WATEREE 1.0 MI SW FROM MOUTH OF BEAVER CK	TP
RL-03336	LAKE WATEREE NEARSHORE ALONG S-28-802 OPP COLONEL CK CONFL	TP
RL-01029	LAKE WELCHEL 2.7 M N OF GAFFNEY	CHL-A
S-311 / CL-013	BOYD MILL POND .6 KM W DAM	TN, TP
CW-033	CEDAR CK RESERVOIR 100 M N OF DAM	TP
CW-174	CEDAR CK RESERVOIR AT UNIMP RD AB JCT WITH ROCKY CK	TN, TP
CW-175	CEDAR CK RESERVOIR/ROCKY CK AT S-12-141 SE OF GREAT FALLS	TP
RL-01007	CEDAR CK RES 2.15 M SE OF GREAT FALLS	CHL-A
RL-02319	CEDAR CK RES FROM W OF BIG ISL 7 MI BELOW ROCKY CK CONFL	TP
RL-02452	CEDAR CK RES 0.15 MI SE OF S TIP PICKETT ISLAND	TP
RL-03351	CEDAR CREEK RESERVOIR 0.3 MI NE OF DAM AND W OF BIG ISLAND	TP
RL-03353	CEDAR CREEK RESERVOIR 1.9 MI SE OF GREAT FALLS AND E OF BIG ISLAND	TP
RL-03458	GREAT FALLS RSVR 1 MI NE OF GREAT FALLS	TP
RL-04375	CEDAR CREEK RESERVOIR 2.2 MI SE OF GREAT FALLS SE OF BOWDEN ISLAND	TP
RL-04379	CEDAR CREEK RESERVOIR 1.25 MI ESE OF GREAT FALLS NW OF HILL ISLAND	TP
CW-016F	FISHING CK RES 2 MI BL CANE CREEK	TP
CW-057	FISHING CK RES 75 FT AB DAM NR GREAT FALLS	TP
RL-01012	FISHING CK RES 3.8 M S OF FORT LAWN OFF W SHORE OF THE TOWN OF LAKE VIEW	CHL-A
RL-03332	GREAT FALLS RESERVOIR 0.9 MI NE OF GREAT FALLS	TN, TP
B-346 / CL-075	PARR RESERVOIR 4.8 KM N OF DAM, UPSTREAM MONTICELLO RESERVOIR	TP
<b>SOUTHEASTERN PLAINS</b>		
<b>STATION ID(S)</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Parameters</b>
CL-077	LAKE ASHWOOD, FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES	TN, CHL-A
C-058	LK INSPIRATION - ST MATTHEWS (FRONT OF HEALTH DEPT)	TN, TP
RL-04388 / SC-044	LAKE MARION 0.5 MI NE OF CALHOUN LANDING (USE SC-044)	TP
SC-005	UPPER LAKE MARION NEAR PACK'S LANDING	TP
SC-010	UPPER LAKE MARION AT CHANNEL MARKER 150	TP
SC-014	UPPER LAKE MARION @ HEADWATERS OF CHAPEL BRANCH CREEK	TP, CHL-A
SC-038	UPPER LAKE MARION @ THE MOUTH OF HALFWAY SWAMP CREEK	TP
SC-039	UPPER LAKE MARION 2.0 KM BELOW RIMINI RAILROAD TRESTLE	TP
ST-034 / RL-01002 / SC-008	LAKE MARION AT RR TRESTLE AT LONE STAR (SC-008)	TP
<b>MIDDLE ATLANTIC COASTAL PLAIN</b>		
<b>STATION ID(S)</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Parameters</b>
RL-03331	LAKE GEORGE WARREN 0.2 MI W OF SPILLWAY NE CORNER OF LAKE CLOSER TO LAKE WARREN ST PARK SHORELINE	TN, TP, CHL-A

Lake Sites Not Attaining Numeric Nutrient Criteria		
RL-03340	GOOSE CREEK RESERVOIR 1.0 MI NW OF SPILLWAY NEAR W SHORELINE	TP, CHL-A
RL-04390	GOOSE CREEK RESERVOIR 2.8 MI NW OF SPILLWAY NEAR OTRANTO	TP
ST-032 / CL-049	GOOSE CREEK RESERVOIR 100 M US OF DAM	TP, CHL-A
ST-033 / CL-050	GOOSE CK RESERVOIR AT 2ND POWERLINES US OF BOAT RAMP	TP, CHL-A

Lake Sites Attaining Numeric Nutrient Criteria		
<b>BLUE RIDGE</b>		
STATION ID(S)	Location	
CL-019	LK JOCASSEE IN FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES	
SV-334	LK JOCASSEE, MAIN BODY	
SV-335	LK JOCASSEE AT TOXAWAY, HORSE PASTURE, & LAUREL FORK CONFLUENCE	
SV-336	LK JOCASSEE AT CONFLUENCE OF THOMPSON AND WHITEWATER RVRS	
SV-337	LK JOCASSEE OUTSIDE COFFER DAM AT BAD CK PROJECT	
RL-04380	LAKE KEOWEE, EASTATOE CREEK ARM 0.5 MI N OF KEOWEE/TOXAWAY STATE PARK	
RL-01030	YONAH LAKE 0.8 M UPLAKE FROM YONAH DAM WHERE IT EMPTIES INTO TUGALOO RIVER	
RL-04376	LAKE YONAH 0.65 MI NNE OF SPILLWAY	
SV-358 / CL-014	LAKE YONAH, 50% BETWEEN CENTER OF SPILLWAY AND OPPOSITE SHORE	
S-292	NORTH SALUDA RESERVOIR AT WATER INTAKE	
S-291	TABLE ROCK RESERVOIR AT WATER INTAKE	
SV-359 / RL-02320	TUGALOO LAKE, FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM SPILLWAY AND SHORELINES	
<b>PIEDMONT</b>		
STATION ID(S)	Location	
B-347	LAKE BLALOCK IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM	
RL-01019	LAKE BLALOCK 4 M SSW OF CHESNEE AND 0.3 M NE OF BUCK CREEK CHURCH	
RL-02323	LAKE BLALOCK AT S-42-43	
RL-03345	LAKE BLALOCK 0.1 MI SE BUCK CREEK CHURCH/S-42-189	
RL-04363	LAKE BLALOCK 0.3 MI UPLAKE OF US 221	
RL-04367	LAKE BLALOCK 0.9 MI UPLAKE OF US 221	
RL-04389	LAKE BLALOCK 0.6 MI UPLAKE OF US 221	
RL-04461	LAKE BLALOCK AT US 221	
B-339 / CL-006	LAKE BOWEN 0.3 MI W OF SC 9	
B-340 / CL-007	LAKE BOWEN NEAR HEADWATERS, 0.4 KM W OF S-42-37	
RL-02455	LAKE BROADWAY 0.2 MI NW OF ALLEN PARK	
B-343 / CL-028	LAKE CHEROKEE IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM	
B-348 / RL-02325	LAKE COOLEY IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM	
CL-033 / RL-04383	LAKE CRAIG 45 M NORTHWEST OF DAM	
RL-01005	LAKE CRAIG IS IN CROFT STATE PARK 7.5 M SE OF SPARTANBURG	
RL-01035	LAKE CRAIG IS IN CROFT STATE PARK 7.95 M SE OF SPARTENBURG	
B-341 / CL-009 / RL-03347	LAKE CUNNINGHAM IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM	
RL-02311	LAKE GREENWOOD 1.0 MI NW OF SEABOARD RR CROSSING	
RL-04387	LAKE GREENWOOD 2.2 MI NW OF LAKE GREENWOOD STATE PARK	
S-022	REEDY FORK OF LK GREENWOOD AT S-30-29	
S-024	LAKE GREENWOOD, HEADWATERS, JUST US S-30-33	
S-097	LAKE GREENWOOD - CANE CK ARM AT SC 72 3.1 MI SW CROSS HILL	
S-131	LK GREENWOOD AT US 221 7.6 MI NNW 96	
S-303	LAKE GREENWOOD 200 FT US OF DAM	
S-307 / CL-051	LAKE GREENWOOD, RABON CK ARM, .8 KM N RD S-30-307	
RL-01018	LAKE HARTWELL, 12 M WSW OF ANDERSON AND 3.5 M W OF ROBERTS CHURCH	
RL-01020	LAKE HARTWELL 6 M NNW OF ANDERSON	
RL-02315	LK HARTWELL 12.0 NW OF ANDERSON 2.0 MI N OF SADLERS CK ST PK	
RL-02330	LK HARTWELL 0.4 MI SE OF OCONEE/ANDERSON CO LINE 5.0 M W OF SANDY SPRINGS	
RL-03333	LAKE HARTWELL 3.9 MI NW OF SADLERS CREEK ST PARK	
RL-03352	LK HARTWELL 0.9 MI NE ANDERSON/OCONEE/HART CO, GA JUNCTION	
RL-03459	LK HARTWELL TUGALOO RVR ARM APPROXIMATELY 1.2 MI S OF JCT S-04-890 & S-04-23	

Lake Sites Attaining Numeric Nutrient Criteria	
RL-04371	LAKE HARTWELL COVE 0.75 MI SE OF SADLERS CREEK STATE PARK
RL-04378	LAKE HARTWELL, SENECA RVR ARM 0.8 MI WNW OF CLEMSON LOOKOUT TOWER
SV-106	MARTIN CK ARM OF LAKE HARTWELL AT S-37-65 N OF CLEMSON
SV-107	LAKE HARTWELL - TWELVE MI CK ARM AT SC 133
SV-200	TUGALOO RVR ARM OF LAKE HARTWELL AT US 123
SV-236	LAKE HARTWELL AT S-37-184 6.5 MI SSE OF SENECA
SV-249	LAKE HARTWELL HEADWATERS, SENECA RVR ARM AT SC 183 3.8 MI WSW SIX MILE
SV-288	LK HARTWELL, SENECA RVR ARM AT USACE BUOY BTWN MRKRS S-28A & S-29
SV-339	LK HARTWELL, SENECA RVR ARM AT USACE BUOY BTWN S-14 AND S-15
SV-340	LK HARTWELL, MAIN BODY AT USACE WQ BUOY BTWN MRKRS 11 & 12
SV-363	LAKE HARTWELL OFF GLENN FORD LANDING US BEAVERDAM CK COVE
SV-360	LAKE ISSAQUEENA, FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES
RL-02304	LAKE KEOWEE 7.0 MI E OF WALHALLA
RL-03354	LAKE KEOWEE 1.6 MI NW OF SC 188 & 0.7 MI SE OF S-37-175
SV-311	LK KEOWEE AT SC 188 - CANE CK ARM 3.5 MI NW SENECA
SV-312	LK KEOWEE AT SC 188 - CROOKED CK ARM 4.5 MI N SENECA
SV-338	LK KEOWEE ABOVE SC ROUTE 130 AND DAM
SV-361	LK KEOWEE IN FOREBAY OF LITTLE RIVER DAM
B-099A	ON # 1 INLET LK LANIER IN GREENVILLE CO
B-099B	AT DAM LK LANIER IN GREENVILLE CO
B-344 / CL-038	LAKE JOHN D. LONG IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM
RL-01010	LAKE LONG 7.75 MI NE OF UNION AND 3.5 M W OF SUMTER NATIONAL FOREST
CL-083	LK MURRAY IN FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES
RL-01023	LAKE MURRAY 9.3 M N OF GILBERT AND 0.75 M NNE FROM THE END OF S-32-443
RL-02316	LAKE MURRAY SW OF JAKES MARINA
RL-03334	LAKE MURRAY COVE 1.3 MI W OF BALLENTINE
RL-03338	LAKE MURRAY 0.8 MI S OF COUNTS ISLAND & 0.75 MI NW OF LUNCH ISLAND
RL-04372	LAKE MURRAY HOLLOW/HORSE CREEKS ARM 1.75 MI NNE OF US 378 CROSSING
S-204	LK MURRAY AT DAM AT SPILLWAY (MARKER 1)
S-211	HOLLANDS LANDING LK MURRAY OFF S-36-26 AT END OF S-36-3
S-212	MACEDONIA LANDING LK MURRAY AT END OF S-36-26 MACEDONIA
S-213	LAKE MURRAY AT S-36-15
S-223	BLACKS BR, LK MURRAY AT SC 391
S-273 / RL-04460	LK MURRAY AT MARKER 166
S-274	LK MURRAY AT MARKER 143
S-279 / RL-02318	LK MURRAY AT MARKER 63
S-280	LK MURRAY AT MARKER 102
S-310 / CL-080	LAKE MURRAY, SALUDA RVR ARM, US BUSH RVR, 3.8 KM US SC 391
RL-02307	LAKE OOLENOY SAMPLED FROM S SIDE OF SC 11 BRIDGE
S-798	LAKE OOLENOY AT DRAIN NEAR SPILLWAY AT SC 11
RL-01014	LAKE RABON 7.6 M W OF THE TOWN OF LAURENS
RL-02303	LAKE RABON NEAR NE SHORE AND BELOW US 76
RL-02305	LAKE RABON NEAR BOAT LANDING ON UNN CNTY RD OFF S-30-54
RL-03359	LAKE RABON 0.6 MI SE S-30-312
S-296 / CL-102 / RL-04381	LAKE RABON 300 FT US OF DAM
S-312 / CL-101	LAKE RABON, S RABON CK ARM, JUST DS S-30-312
S-313 / CL-103	LAKE RABON, N RABON CK ARM, 2.5 MI US DAM
CL-100	LAKE ROBINSON, FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES
RL-01025	LAKE ROBINSON 5.9 M NNW OF GREER (PREVIOUSLY THE SOUTH TYGER RIVER)
RL-02321	LAKE ROBINSON 6.3 MI NNW OF GREER
RL-02327	LAKE ROBINSON 0.4 MI S OF S-23-113
RL-02453	LAKE ROBINSON 0.7 MI S OF S-23-113
RL-03343	LAKE J ROBINSON IN COVE 0.5 MI SW OF S-23-113 CROSSING
RL-04361	LAKE ROBINSON 2.3 MI NNW OF DAM
RL-04365	LAKE ROBINSON 1 MI NNW OF DAM
SV-098 / RL-03337	LAKE RUSSELL AT SC 72 3.1 MI SW CALHOUN FALLS
SV-100	LAKE RUSSELL AT SC 181 6.5 MI SW STARR



Lake Sites Attaining Numeric Nutrient Criteria	
SV-357 / CL-098	LAKE RUSSELL, ROCKY RVR ARM BETWEEN MARKERS 48 & 49, DS FELKEL
SV-331 / CL-004	LK SECESSION, 1 1/4 MI BELOW SC ROUTE 28
SV-332 / CL-005	LK SECESSION APPROX 400 YDS ABOVE DAM
B-342 / CL-032 / RL-03457	LAKE THICKETTY IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM
RL-02301	LAKE THICKETTY NEAR SE SHORE APPROX 1.0 MI FROM MACEDONIA
CL-089	LK WATEREE IN FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES
RL-01003	LAKE WATEREE 11.25 NW OF CAMDEN ON WESTERN SHORE OF LAKE
RL-01033	LAKE WATEREE 9.7 M NW OF CAMDEN, TOWARD THE SOUTHERN END OF THE LAKE
RL-03341	LAKE WELCHEL 2.7 MI NE OF GAFFNEY LAUNCH FROM GAFFNEY PUBLIC WORKS BOAT LANDING
CW-197	LAKE WYLIE AB MILL CK ARM AT END OF S-46-557
CW-198	LAKE WYLIE OUTSIDE MOUTH OF CROWDERS CK ARM
CW-200	LK WYLIE AT SC 274 9 MI NE OF YORK
CW-201	LK WYLIE N LAKEWOODS S/D AT EBENEZER ACCESS
CW-230	LAKE WYLIE AT DAM, UNDER POWERLINES
CW-245 / CW-665	LAKE WYLIE, CROWDERS CK ARM AT FIRST POWERLINES US OF MAIN POOL
RL-03339	LAKE WYLIE 0.1 MI W OF TEGA CAY SAMPLE CLOSER TO TEGA CAY SIDE
B-737	LAKE YORK IN KINGS MOUNTAIN STATE PARK
RL-03355	BROADWAY LAKE 0.5 NW OF SPILLWAY NEARSHORE OPPOSITE END OF S-04-152
SV-258	BROADWAY LAKE, NEALS CK ARM 50% BETWEEN BANKS AT GOLF COURSE
SV-319	BROADWAY LAKE, BROADWAY CK ARM UPSTREAM OF PUBLIC ACCESS
SV-321	BROADWAY LAKE FOREBAY, 50% BETWEEN SPILLWAY AND OPPOSITE LAND
RL-01017	CEDAR CK RES 2.5 M SE OF GREAT FALLS
CL-023	CHESTER STATE PARK LAKE 100 M EAST OF SPILLWAY
CL-039	LITTLE RIVER ARM OF CLARKS HILL RESERVOIR
CL-040	THURMOND (CLARKS HILL) RESERVOIR HEADWATERS (SAVANNAH RVR)
CL-041	THURMOND (CLARKS HILL) RESERVOIR IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM
RL-04385	THURMOND (CLARKS HILL) RESERVOIR COVE 0.5 MI SW OF HAMILTON BRANCH STATE PARK
SV-291	THURMOND (CLARKS HILL) RESERVOIR AT US 378 7 MI SW MCCORMICK
RL-01004	THURMOND (CLARKS HILL) RESERVOIR 0.65 M SW OF SC-81 LAKE BRIDGE ON SHORE NEAREST DELA HOWE SCHOOL
RL-01024	THURMOND (CLARKS HILL) RESERVOIR 1.5 M SE (ALONG SHORELINE) FROM US-378 BRIDGE BETWEEN GA AND SC
RL-01028	THURMOND (CLARKS HILL) RESERVOIR 0.4 M N OF THE DAM SEPERATING THE LAKE AND THE SAVANNAH RIVER
RL-01034	THURMOND (CLARKS HILL) RESERVOIR 4.9 M NE F MCCORMICK, NEAR BAKER CREEK STATE PARK
RL-02309	THURMOND (CLARKS HILL) RESERVOIR NEAR HAMILTON BRANCH ST PK
B-735	DUNCAN CREEK RESERVOIR 6B IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM
B-110	ELIZABETH LAKE AT SPILLWAY ON US 21
B-327	MONTICELLO LK-LOWER IMPOUNDMENT BETWEEN LARGE ISLANDS
B-328	MONTICELLO LK-UPPER IMPOUNDMENT AT BUOY IN MIDDLE OF LAKE
RL-04370	MONTICELLO LAKE 1.7 MI NW OF MONTICELLO
RL-04374	MONTICELLO LAKE 3.5 MI N OF JENKINSVILLE
B-345 / CL-074	PARR RESERVOIR IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM
RL-01015	SALUDA LAKE IS 5 M W OF GREENVILLE AND .8 M NE OF WESTWOOD CHURCH
RL-03349	SALUDA LAKE 0.9 MI SE SC 183 IN SMALL ARM
S-250	SALUDA LAKE AT FARRS BRDG ON SC 183 7 MI NE EASLEY
S-314 / CL-010	SALUDA LAKE, .5 MI US OF LANDING
B-113	SPARTANBURG RESERVOIR #1 ON S-42-213 NE OF INMAN
SV-294	STEVENS CK RESERVOIR HEADWATERS AT CLARKS HILL DAM BOAT RAMP
<b>SOUTHEASTERN PLAINS</b>	
<b>STATION ID(S)</b>	<b>Location</b>
C-025	LK CAROLINE SPILLWAY AT PLATT SPRINGS RD
CL-064	LAKE EDGAR BROWN IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM
CL-042 / SC-022	LAKE MARION FOREBAY, SPILLWAY MARKER 44 (SC-022)
RL-01001	LAKE MARION 2.5 M DIRECTLY SW OF I-95 BRIDGE (MIDDLE) OVER LAKE

Lake Sites Attaining Numeric Nutrient Criteria	
RL-01011 / SC-035	LAKE MARION 1.10 M SSE OF SANTEE NAT. WILDLIFE REFUGE AND 1MI S OF EAGLE POINT (SC-035)
RL-01016	LAKE MARION 1.6 M DIRECTLY SW OF I-95 BRIDGE (MIDDLE) OVER LAKE
RL-01021	LAKE MARION 3 M WSW OF EADYTOWN IN SE CORNER OF THE LAKE MARION
RL-01031	LAKE MARION 3.75 M DIRECTLY SW OF I-95 BRIDGE OVER LAKE MARION
RL-02306 / SC-012	LK MARION @ JACK'S CK EMBAYMENT; USE SANTEE COOPER SC-012
RL-02308 / SC-016	LK MARION @ CHANNEL MARKER 69; USE SANTEE COOPER SC-016
RL-02310	LAKE MARION NEAR SANTEE NATL WILDLIFE REFUGE
RL-03358	LAKE MARION 4.0 MI SE OF I-95
RL-03360	LAKE MARION 0.4 MI W OF DAM
RL-04382	LAKE MARION 1 MI DOWNLAKE OF I-95 BRIDGE IN OLD RIVER CHANNEL
RL-04384	LAKE MARION 3.8 MI W OF EADYTOWN
RL-04386	LAKE MARION EUTAW CREEK ARM NEAR CATHEAD BOAT RAMP
SC-017	MID LAKE MARION @ TAW CAW CREEK EMBAYMENT
SC-019	LOWER LAKE MARION @ POTATO CREEK FLOODED EMBAYMENT
SC-021	LOWER LAKE MARION, 1.5 KM NE OF ROCK'S POND CAMPGROUND
SC-023	LOWER LAKE MARION @ WYBOO CREEK FLOODED EMBAYMENT
SC-036	MID LAKE MARION @ THE MOUTH OF TAW CAW CREEK
SC-040	MID LAKE MARION @ CHANNEL MARKER 79
SC-041	MID LAKE MARION 3.2 KM NORTH OF CHANNEL MARKER 79
SC-042	MID LAKE MARION @ NORTH END OF I-95 / U.S. 301 BRIDGES
ST-024	LK MARION AT END OF S-14-64 AT CAMP BOB COOPER
ST-025 / SC-015	LK MARION AT OLD US 301/15 BRDG AT SANTEE (SC-015)
ST-036 / SC-023A	LK MARION, WYBOO CREEK ARM DS OF CLUBHOUSE BR (SC-023A)
CL-094	LK ROBINSON IN FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES FROM PRIVATE ACCESS
PD-327 / RL-03342	LK ROBINSON AT S-13-346 5 MI E MCBEE BY BOAT
CL-086	LAKE WALLACE, FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES
RL-02324	LAKE WALLACE S OF S-35-47
RL-04368	LAKE WALLACE 0.4 MI NNE OF FISHING PIER
CL-078	ADAMS MILLPOND, FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES
RL-03346	EUREKA LAKE IN CHERAW STATE PARK APPROX MID-LAKE
SV-686	FLAT ROCK POND IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM
C-068	FOREST LAKE AT DAM
SV-722 / RL-05419	GRANITEVILLE POND #2 IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM
CL-088	JUNIPER LAKE, FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES
CL-069	LANGLEY POND IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM
RL-02317	LANGLEY POND NEAR NW SHORE AND 0.6 MI NE OF SPWY
RL-03335	LANGLEY POND 0.05 MI OFF NW END OF DAM AND SHORELINE
RL-04373	LANGLEY POND 0.85 MI UPLAKE (NE) OF SPILLWAY
PD-081	PRESTWOOD LK AT US 15
PD-268	SONOVISTA CLUB HARTSVILLE OFF DOCK OF PRESTWOOD LK
CL-067	VAUCLUSE POND IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM
C-048	WINDSOR LK SPILLWAY ON WINDSOR LK BLVD
MIDDLE ATLANTIC COASTAL PLAIN	
STATION ID(S)	Location
RL-01009	LAKE WARREN IN STATE PARK 3.9 M SW OF HAMPTON
RL-01006	LAKE MOULTRIE 5.5 M N OF MONCK'S CORNER AND 1.5 M NW OF CAMP MOULTRIE
RL-01026	LAKE MOULTRIE 4.5 M N OF MONCK'S CORNER, 1.5 M NNE OF WHERE S-08-5 ENDS
RL-02322	LAKE MOULTRIE NE 3.0 MI FM BONNEAU BEACH
RL-02328	LAKE MOULTRIE SW NEAR DUCK PD AND APPROX 2.0 E OF CROSS
RL-02454	LAKE MOULTRIE SW IN OPEN WATER
RL-03348	LAKE MOULTRIE 5.25 MI NNW OF PINOPOLIS
RL-04362	LAKE MOULTRIE 2.2 MI SE OF CROSS
RL-04364	LAKE MOULTRIE 3.3 MI NW OF BONNEAU BEACH

Lake Sites Attaining Numeric Nutrient Criteria	
RL-04462	LAKE MOULTRIE 4.2 MI SW OF RUSSELLVILLE
SC-027	SW QUADRANT OF LAKE MOULTRIE 1.2 KM EAST OF SHORELINE
SC-028	NW QUADRANT OF LAKE MOULTRIE NEAR ANGEL'S LANDING COVE
SC-031	NORTH QUADRANT OF LAKE MOULTRIE @ MOUTH OF REDIVERSION CANAL
SC-032	SE QUADRANT OF LAKE MOULTRIE @ CHANNEL MARKER 2
SC-046	SE QUADRANT OF LAKE MOULTRIE AT PINOPOLIS EMBAYMENT
ST-037 / SC-030	LAKE MOULTRIE AT CHANNEL MARKER 17 (SC-030)
CL-062 / RL-02451	LAKE GEORGE WARREN IN FOREBAY NEAR DAM
CSTL-075 / RL-05415	LAKE WARREN, BLACK CK ARM, AT S-25-41 5 MI SW OF HAMPTON
CSTL-124	BACK RIVER RES IN FOREBAY EQUIDISTANT FROM DAM AND SHORELINES
RL-01008	GOOSE CK RES 2.3 M S OF GOOSE CREEK TOWN CENTER

### *Control Methods*

NPDES permits and nonpoint source control programs, that were previously described in the Municipal and Industrial permitting sections, are designed to protect lake water quality. South Carolina's water classifications and criteria are applicable to lakes.

### *Restoration Efforts*

Plans to restore and/or protect lake quality are integrated with the watershed water quality management approach and other watershed pollution control plans.

### *Acid Effects on Lakes*

SCDHEC measures pH as part of its routine monitoring program at all lake sites. Acidic conditions, for the purposes of this report, existed in any lake for that pH was less than the appropriate State standard in more than 10% of samples. Five lakes, Windsor Lake in Richland County, the South Rabon Creek arm of Lake Rabon in Laurens County, the headwaters of Lake Wateree near Cedar Creek on the border of Lancaster and Fairfield Counties, Lake Welchel in Cherokee County, and the headwater area of Stephens Creek Reservoir in McCormick County were found to experience acidic conditions.

State water quality criteria specify, with few exceptions, a pH of at least 6.0 SU to protect classified and existing uses. EPA's Eastern Lake Survey reported high acid neutralizing capacity in Southern Blue Ridge region lakes, including those in northwestern South Carolina.

### *Toxic Effects on Lakes*

As part of the State's probability-based monitoring all lake sites are monitored for metals and/or ammonia. In the Summary Statistics for this section, Table 10 lists causes for partial or non-support of lake classified uses, and Table 18 lists the total size affected by toxicants. The section on Public Health: Aquatic Life Impacts contains a discussion of fish consumption advisories issued in South Carolina.

## **5. Estuary and Coastal Assessment**

Based on a hydrographic GIS cover developed jointly by SCDHEC and the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources and the results of probability site selection validation, South Carolina has an

estimated 277 combined square miles of tide creek and open water habitat representing the estuarine sampling design frame previously described.

**A. Summary Statistics**

A summary of classified use support statewide based on 120 probability-based monitoring sites sampled from 2001-2004, along with causes for partial or nonattainment, is presented below. The Lower and Upper 95 Percent Confidence Intervals for the probability-based estimates signify that it is 95% certain that the true mileage is between the upper and lower confidence limits.

**Table 14. Estuaries Use Support Summary (Square Miles)**

Indicator	Category	Probability-Based Estimated Percent of Total Resource	Probability-Based Estimated Square Miles of Total Resource	Lower 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Square Miles)	Upper 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Square Miles)
Aquatic Life Use	Fully Supporting	77.6%	215	194	236
	Partially Supporting	2.9%	8	0	17
	Not Supporting	19.5%	54	33	75
Recreational Use	Fully Supporting	99.8%	277	276	277
	Not Supporting	0.2%	0.7	0	1.7

**Table 15. Summary of Fully Supporting and Impaired Estuaries (Not including Fish/Shellfish Consumption Use)**

Category	Probability-Based Estimated Percent of Total Resource	Probability-Based Estimated Square Miles of Total Resource	Lower 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Square Miles)	Upper 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Square Miles)
Fully Supporting All Assessed Uses	77.6%	215	194	236
Impaired for One or More Use	22.4%	62	41	83

**Table 16. Total Sizes of Estuaries Impaired by Various Cause Categories (Square Miles)**

Cause Category	Probability-Based Estimated Square Miles of Total Resource	Lower 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Square Miles)	Upper 95 Percent Confidence Interval (Square Miles)
Turbidity	31.0	16.5	45.5
Dissolved Oxygen	21.1	8.1	34.2

Ammonia	4.0	0.0	10.4
Metals (Combined)	15.2	3.0	27.4
Copper	14.5	2.4	26.7
Zinc	0.7	0.0	1.7
Fecal Coliform Bacteria	0.7	0.0	1.7

## 6. Wetlands Assessment

### A. Summary Statistics

**Table 17. Extent of Wetlands, by Type**

Wetland Type	Historical Extent in Acreage	1980's Reported Acreage	1994 Reported Acreage	Most Recent Acreage
Saturated Bottomland Forest	6,414,000	4,659,000	1,804,884	1,804,884
Nonforested Wetlands/Marsh			485,314	485,314

SCDHEC maintains a number of GIS land use coverages that include wetland acreages. SCDHEC and S.C. Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR) have derived land use/land cover data from SPOT satellite imagery from December 1988 to March 1990.

The National Land Cover Dataset or NLCD (SCDHEC GIS coverage last edited March 16, 2003) includes 15 classes (2 wetland classes) and was compiled from Landsat 5 Thematic Mapper satellite imagery with a spatial resolution of 30 meters and supplemented by a host of ancillary data. The NLCD was produced as a cooperative effort between the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) to produce a consistent, land cover data layer for the coterminous U.S. using early 1990s (1991-1993) Landsat Thematic Mapper data purchased by the Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics (MRLC Consortium). The MRLC Consortium is a partnership of federal agencies that produce or use land cover data. Partners include the USGS (National Mapping, Biological Resources, and Water Resources Divisions), U.S. EPA, the U.S. Forest Service, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics (MRLC) Consortium Home:

<http://www.mrlc.gov/index.asp>

National Land Cover Dataset Home:

<http://landcover.usgs.gov/natl/landcover.asp>

The SC-GAP project mapped the State's natural and man-made vegetation to two classifications, a general 27-class (8 wetland classes) habitat map that was used in modeling vertebrate distributions, and a more detailed 54-class map (at least 21 wetland classes) in accordance with the National GAP guidelines of mapping to the alliance level where possible. The initial data used in developing the map was remotely sensed satellite data from the Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics (MRLC) Consortium.

Ancillary data included detailed soil surveys, National Wetlands Inventory surveys, and elevation maps to improve this classification and develop the 54-class land cover. This was aggregated into the habitat map for use in producing vertebrate distributions. From: "A Gap Analysis of South Carolina, 2001 Final Report"

A detailed National Wetlands Inventory mapping is current, but not yet complete for the State.

## **B. Extent of Wetlands Resources**

A tracking system called Environmental Facilities Information System or EFIS has been adopted agency-wide. The Water Quality Certification, Standards, and Wetlands Programs Section has developed a module into which all Section 10 and Section 404/401 projects are entered. This module includes information on project location (latitude/longitude, basin, and watershed unit), purpose, types of impacts, acreage of wetland and non-wetland impacts, compensation requirements and location (latitude/longitude, basin, and watershed unit) and remediation requirements. Information regarding projects from the years of 1983 to the present has been entered into this tracking system. We are currently working to get this system operational and the data verified. Once this data has been verified, statistics on the location and types of wetland impacts in South Carolina will be available. Currently, maps of compensatory mitigation sites (1990 to present) are being digitized and entered into GIS for future analyses.

## **C. Integrity of Wetlands Resources**

There is no specific legislation authorizing a statewide wetlands protection program. The primary mechanisms for wetlands protection in the state are federal and state regulatory programs for the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the state and for activities in the critical areas of the coastal zone.

*Section 404 Permit Program* - Section 404 of the Clean Water Act requires a permit for the discharge of dredged or fill material into navigable waters, including wetlands, throughout the United States. Certain activities, such as normal agriculture, silviculture and ranching activities, are exempt from such permit requirements. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) administers the Section 404 permitting program, but the EPA exercises final authority. The Agency can prohibit the use of a disposal area if the discharge will have an adverse impact on municipal water supplies, shellfish beds, fishing areas, wildlife, or recreational areas. No permit can be issued without a Section 401 Certification from SCDHEC's Division of Water Quality, and in coastal areas, a determination of consistency with the Coastal Zone Management Program (CZM) from SCDHEC's Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) is required. Other state and federal natural resource agencies, such as DNR, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Marine Fisheries Service, provide input to decisions of the federal permitting agency and the state certifying agencies on proposed activities.

Section 404 permit authority can be delegated to states but South Carolina has elected not to assume that authority. In 1986, SCDHEC completed a study to determine the feasibility of assuming the Section 404 program. The study concluded that although SCDHEC had the legal authority and the technical expertise, it was not advisable to assume that authority because of the limited area of the jurisdiction involved. Perhaps more importantly, there would be no new funding from EPA to support assumption.

*Section 401 Water Quality Certification* - Section 401 of the Clean Water Act requires any applicant for

a federal permit or license involved in an activity that may result in a discharge to navigable waters to receive certification from the state that the discharge will not cause violations of the state's water quality standards. Consequently, 401 Certification is required for all activities requiring a Section 404 permit from the ACE. This mechanism provides a State position on wetlands alterations.

The Division of Water Quality evaluated 605 projects that required a §401 Water Quality Certification in FYs 2000 through 2002. Approximately 23% of these projects involved impacts to wetlands. SCDHEC routinely requires compensation for wetland impacts at greater than a one to one basis. This compensation may be in the form of preservation, lineation, enhancement, or restoration and may not strictly meet the State and Federal “no net loss” goals.

SCDHEC administers certification programs using as guidance the South Carolina Pollution Control Act. S. C. Regulation 61-101, *Water Quality Certification*, guides the administration and technical review for the §401 Certification Program that determines if the standards of S. C. Regulation 61-68 will be met.

The S. C. Pollution Control Act provides authority for regulation of wetlands since it defines waters of the State as:

**"lakes, bays, sounds, ponds, impounding reservoirs, springs, wells, rivers, streams, creeks, estuaries, marshes, inlets, canals, the Atlantic Ocean within the territorial limits of the State and all other bodies of surface or underground water, natural or artificial, public or private, inland or coastal, fresh or salt, that are wholly or partially within or bordering the State or within its jurisdiction."**

This definition does not specifically list wetlands, but wetlands are included through the generic use of the word "marshes" as well as within the broad inclusion of the phrase "all other bodies of surface or underground water." Therefore, all water pollution control programs administered by SCDHEC apply to activities in wetlands.

During review of applications for §401 Certification, SCDHEC, with authority from S.C. Regulation 61-101, evaluates whether or not there are feasible alternatives to the activity that reduce adverse consequences on water quality and classified water uses, if the activity is water dependent, and the intended purpose of the activity. Certification is denied if the activity will adversely affect existing or designated uses. Certification is granted if water quality standards, that includes protection of existing uses, will not be violated. The federal permit cannot be issued if certification is denied.

*Water Quality Certification, Nationwide Permits (NWP)* - SCDHEC sent a Notice of Proposed Decision for the 2002 NWPs on February 28, 2002 to the ACE. SCDHEC proposed to deny NWPs: 15, 16, 17, 21, 34, and 35. In regard to NWP 17, SCDHEC currently reviews all applications for FERC licenses. The following NWPs were proposed for issuance with conditions: 3, 7, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 36 through 44. The most shared condition states that proposed impacts will not exceed 0.10 ac or 50 linear ft. of special aquatic sites including wetlands, or if exceeded a mitigation plan will be required; and, depending on the NWP some allowed impacts are capped at 0.25 ac or 100 linear ft. of stream. In March of 2000, the ACE proposed to replace NWP 26 with several “activity specific” NWPs and NWP 26 was placed on reserve. To take advantage of a NWP permit, the applicant must submit a wetlands delineation and, in some cases, a pre-construction notification to the ACE.

Wetlands losses can cause significant adverse, but avoidable, cumulative environmental impacts. Wetlands losses may lead to increased costs to the public for flood control and drinking water treatment. Moreover, wetlands are especially important in providing storm water filtration to maintain surface and ground water quality. Protection of wetlands is imperative if South Carolina is to achieve the goals of the Clean Water Act to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of its waters.

#### **D. Development of Water Quality Standards for Wetlands**

S.C. Regulation 61-68 provides that waters not classified by name assume the classification of the waterbody to that they are adjacent. Wetlands contiguous to a stream or lake assume the classification of the waterbody to that they are contiguous. The standards allow variation from specific numeric standards if those variations are due to natural conditions. SCDHEC is continuing to evaluate the development of water quality classifications and standards specifically applicable to wetlands.

With funding from the EPA, SCDHEC developed classifications and standards for wetlands. The intent was that the system would augment the State's existing water quality classifications and standards to ensure greater protection of the State's wetlands through Clean Water Act programs.

Before proceeding with regulation development for the proposed classifications and standards for wetlands, there is the need to gain general agreement regarding wetlands protection policy and mechanisms in the State. Consensus-building among Federal, State, and local regulators with developers, farmers, forestry industry, and environmental groups would ensure acceptance of a clearly defined South Carolina wetlands protection policy. In 1993, SCDHEC received additional funding from EPA to further determine wetlands protection mechanisms and encourage consensus-building through education.

#### **E. Additional Protection Activities**

SCDHEC also uses antidegradation rules in S.C. Regulation 61-68 to evaluate applications for Water Quality Certification. The basic tenet of antidegradation is:

**"existing uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect existing uses in all segments of a water body must be maintained"**

Strict application of this water quality standard is impossible if there is to be any fill in wetlands. Therefore, the federal government determined that some fill in wetlands may be allowed pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. S.C. Regulation 61-68 provided for this by adding a provision that states,

**"Discharge of fill into waters of the State is not allowed unless the activity is consistent with Department regulations and will result in enhancement of classified uses with no significant degradation to the aquatic ecosystem or water quality".**

Fill may only be allowed if it does not cause or contribute to significant degradation of the aquatic environment that can be determined by whether or not the activity will cause adverse effects on:

1. Human health or welfare;



2. Life stages of aquatic life or wildlife dependent upon the aquatic ecosystem;
3. Ecosystem diversity, productivity, and stability;
4. Recreational, aesthetic, and economic values.

## 7. Public Health - Aquatic Life Concerns

### A. Sizes of Water Affected by Toxicants

Toxic pollutants in South Carolina's surface waters were assessed for this report through the evaluation of data collected through the statewide probability-based ambient monitoring program.

**Table 18. Total Size Affected by Toxicants**

Waterbody Type	Size Monitored for Toxicants	Probability-Based Estimate of Total Resource	Lower 95 Percent Confidence Interval	Upper 95 Percent Confidence Interval
Rivers (miles)	20,954	2,183	1,038	3,328
Lakes (acres)	308,765	494	60	927
Estuaries (square miles)	277.4	19.2	5.4	32.9

### B. Public Health: Aquatic Life Impacts

#### *Pollution Caused Fish Kills/Abnormalities*

During 2004 there were 40 fish kills reported to SCDHEC and in 2005, 77 reports. Dissolved oxygen depletion, weather conditions, and other natural causes accounted for approximately 60 % of all fish kills in 2004 and 61% in 2005. In approximately 10% of the fish kills reported in 2004, and 15.5 % in 2005, the cause could not be determined. Approximately 17.5% of the fish kills investigated in 2004 and 22% in 2005 were from unnatural causes. Unnatural causes ranged from fish being caught and dumped back into lakes and streams to runoff of pesticides or oil/chemical spills or releases. One fish kill of an estimation of 4,655 fish occurred in the North Fork Edisto River in 2005 as a result of a sodium hydroxide (NaOH) spill into the river. This spill resulted in a lengthy investigation by both DHEC and DNR and culminated in a fine of \$20,472.56 issued to the responsible party. Two minor kills of <1000 fish occurred in 2004 and 2 in 2005 as a result of pesticide or herbicide spraying.

Most investigations were conducted a day or more after the initial occurrence of the fish kill. Late reporting of fish kills to SCDHEC investigators hinders accurate determination of the cause of the fish kills.

The *Pfiesteria* program continues to be an important program in South Carolina with the coastal regional offices maintaining trained personnel to investigate *Pfiesteria* related incidents. For the 2004 and 2005 FY's, no fish kills could be linked directly to *Pfiesteria*. *Pfiesteria piscicida*, the only known form to kill fish, has not been detected in South Carolina waters.

There are no waters in the State that routinely experience fish kills or fish abnormalities due to toxics.

When fish kills do occur that can be attributed to other than natural causes, enforcement action is taken. The action usually takes the form of an administrative order and includes penalties commensurate with the violation. Schedules for corrective actions are included in the order along with appropriate assessment of monetary damage of the fish killed. As of May 31, 2001, SCDHEC required that its entire staff use its Field Manual for Investigation of Fish Kills.

### *Fish Consumption Advisories*

SCDHEC uses a risk-based approach to evaluate contaminant concentrations in fish tissue and to issue consumption advisories in affected waterbodies. This approach contrasts the average daily exposure dose to the reference dose (RfD). Using these relationships, fish tissue data are interpreted by determining the consumption rates that would not be likely to pose a health threat to adult males and nonpregnant adult females. Because an acceptable RfD for developmental neurotoxicity has not been developed and because scientific studies suggest that exposure before birth may have adverse effects the health of infants, pregnant women, infants, and children are advised to avoid consumption of fish from any waterbody where an advisory has been issued.

Fish consumption advisories are updated annually in April. For background information and the most current advisories, please visit the Bureau of Water homepage at <http://www.scdhec.gov/fish> or call SCDHEC's Division of Health Hazard Evaluation, toll-free, at (888) 849-7241.

### *Shellfish Restrictions/Closures*

The goal of SCDHEC's Shellfish Sanitation Program (SSP) is to ensure that mollusk and shellfish and areas from which they are harvested meet the health and environmental quality standards provided by federal and state regulations, laws, and guidelines. Additionally, SCDHEC promotes and encourages coastal quality management programs consistent with protected uses established through the S.C. Regulation 61-68, *Water Classifications and Standards*. SSP management policy is primarily determined by S.C. Regulation 61-47, *Shellfish*, as well as other State legislation. The National Shellfish Sanitation Program (NSSP) Model Ordinance, developed through participation in the Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Conference (ISSC) and endorsed by all shellfish producing states and the United States Food and Drug Administration (USFDA), is used as primary guidance for shellfish regulation development.

Sanitary surveys are conducted by SCDHEC to assess the quality of the coastal waters. These surveys result in shellfish harvesting classifications described as follows:

Approved: Growing areas shall be classified Approved when the sanitary survey concludes that fecal material, pathogenic microorganisms, and poisonous or deleterious substances are not present in concentrations that would render shellfish unsafe for human consumption. Approved area classification shall be determined upon a sanitary survey that includes water samples collected from stations in the designated area adjacent to actual or potential sources of pollution. For waters sampled under adverse pollution conditions, the median fecal coliform Most Probable Number (MPN) or the geometric mean MPN shall not exceed fourteen per one hundred milliliters, nor shall more than ten percent of the samples exceed a fecal coliform MPN of forty-three per one hundred milliliters (per five tube decimal dilution). For waters sampled under a systematic random sampling plan, the geometric mean fecal coliform Most Probable Number (MPN) shall not exceed

fourteen per one hundred milliliters, nor shall the estimated ninetieth percentile exceed an MPN of forty-three (per five tube decimal dilution). Computation of the estimated ninetieth percentile shall be obtained using National Shellfish Sanitation Guidelines.

#### Conditionally

**Approved:** Growing areas may be classified Conditionally Approved when they are subject to temporary conditions of actual or potential pollution. When such events are predictable as in the malfunction of wastewater treatment facilities, non-point source pollution from rainfall runoff, discharge of a major river, potential discharges from dock or harbor facilities that may affect water quality, a management plan describing conditions under that harvesting will be allowed shall be adopted by the Department, prior to classifying an area as Conditionally Approved. Where appropriate, the management plan for each Conditionally Approved area shall include performance standards for sources of controllable pollution, e.g., wastewater treatment and collection systems, evaluation of each source of pollution, and means of rapidly closing and subsequent reopening areas to shellfish harvesting. Memorandums of agreements shall be a part of these management plans where appropriate.

**Restricted:** Growing areas shall be classified Restricted when sanitary survey data show a limited degree of pollution or the presence of deleterious or poisonous substances to a degree that may cause the water quality to fluctuate unpredictably or at such a frequency that a Conditionally Approved area classification is not feasible. Shellfish may be harvested from areas classified as Restricted only for the purposes of relaying or depuration and only by special permit issued by the Department and under Department supervision. For Restricted areas to be utilized as a source of shellstock for depuration, or as source water for depuration, the fecal coliform geometric mean MPN of restricted waters sampled under adverse pollution conditions shall not exceed eighty-eight per one hundred milliliters nor shall more than ten percent of the samples exceed a MPN of two hundred and sixty per one hundred milliliters for a five tube decimal dilution test. For waters sampled under a systematic random sampling plan, the fecal coliform geometric mean MPN shall not exceed eighty-eight per one hundred milliliters nor shall the estimated ninetieth percentile exceed an MPN of two hundred and sixty (five tube decimal dilution). Computation of the estimated ninetieth percentile shall be obtained using National Shellfish Sanitation Guidelines.

**Prohibited:** Growing areas shall be classified Prohibited if there is no current sanitary survey or if the sanitary survey or monitoring data show unsafe levels of fecal material, pathogenic microorganisms, or poisonous or deleterious substances in the growing area or indicate that such substances could potentially reach quantities that could render shellfish unfit or unsafe for human consumption.

As a matter of SCDHEC policy, prohibited areas are established adjacent to all point source and/or marinas as a precaution to protect public health. These prohibited areas are not necessarily an indication of lesser water quality or that standards are not being met; rather, they are areas that have the potential for variable water quality.

South Carolina currently has approximately 571,014 estuarine/riverine surface acres classified for the harvest of molluscan shellfish. Of this total, Approved accounts for 67.5% of total acreage,

Conditionally Approved – 1.4%, Restricted –18.7%, and Prohibited – 12.3%

**Table 19. Summary of Shellfish Harvesting Status  
in South Carolina Shellfish Waters**

Harvesting Status	Acreage	Percent
Approved	385542	67.5%
Conditionally Approved	8064	1.4%
Restricted	106975	18.7%
Prohibited	70433	12.3%
Total Assessed	571014	100.0%

*Restrictions on Bathing Areas*

There are currently fifty-eight (58) Natural Public Swimming Areas permitted for operation by SCDHEC. These areas are tested for Fecal Coliform (FC) bacteria prior to obtaining a yearly operating permit and are tested twice per month during the swimming season. The following swimming areas exceeded acceptable fecal coliform levels as specified in S.C. Regulation 61-50, *Natural Public Swimming Area*. Areas exceeding the specified parameters are closed until satisfactory sample results are collected. These are all fresh waters. Saltwater areas are addressed in the Ocean Water Quality Monitoring section.

**Table 20. Areas of Bathing Restrictions**

<b>Natural Area</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Langley Pond Park	one time 07/01/02
Gem Lakes	recurrent 06/04/02, 09/03/02
Berkeley County Family YMCA – Swim Area A	recurrent 04/17/02, 04/30/02, 05/02/02, 05/21/02, 07/22/02, 07/24/02, 07/26/02
Berkeley County Family YMCA – Swim Area B	recurrent 05/21/02, 06/04/02, 07/22/02, 07/24/02, 07/25/02, 07/26/02
Somerset Point	one time 06/16/03
Paris Mountain State Park	recurrent 08/06/02, 06/03/03
Pleasant Ridge County Park	one time 05/07/03
Look-Up Lodge	recurrent 06/05/03, 06/06/03
Rocks Pond Campground	recurrent 07/08/02, 08/29/02

*Ocean Water Quality Monitoring*

Ocean water quality is currently monitored at a total of 125 sample sites along the South Carolina coast. Sampling frequency is based on beach Tier level. Tier 1 beaches are high use, high risk beaches. Tier 2 beaches are lower use and/or lower risk beaches. Tier 1 beaches are sampled weekly May 15 through October 15. Sampling is also conducted at Tier 1 beaches following significant rainfall. Tier 2 beaches are sampled twice per month May 15 through October 15. Advisories are issued based on EPA guidelines of 104 Enterococci per 100 ml or greater from two consecutive samples taken within 24 hours. Advisories are issued following a single sampling event if the Enterococcus level exceeds 500 colonies per 100 ml. Precautionary advisories are issued without sampling data based on historical knowledge of the effects of rainfall on specific areas. Advisories are retracted when Enterococcus counts return to below 104 colonies per 100 ml.

**Table 21. Areas Affected by Beach Advisories**

<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	May/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	7	June/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	11	June/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.19	2	July/2004

<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
City of North Myrtle Beach	038	4	July/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	July/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	July/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	8.5	5	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	8.5	5	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	8.5	5	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	8.5	5	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	6	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	8.5	5	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	11	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	8.5	5	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	8.5	5	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	8.5	5	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	8.5	5	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	8.5	5	August/2004
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	August/2005
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	August/2005
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	August/2005

<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	August/2005
City of North Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	July/2005
White Point Swash	0.076	2	September/2004
White Point Swash	0.076	4	June/2004
White Point Swash	0.076	4	June/2004
White Point Swash	0.076	5	July/2004
White Point Swash	0.076	3	August/2004
White Point Swash	0.076	3	August/2004
White Point Swash	0.54	5	August/2004
White Point Swash	0.076	2	August/2004
White Point Swash	0.076	10	August/2004
White Point Swash	0.076	4	June/2003
White Point Swash	0.076	5	September/2004
White Point Swash	0.076	6	June/2005
White Point Swash	0.076	2	June/2005
White Point Swash	0.076	2	June/2005
White Point Swash	0.076	2	July/2005
White Point Swash	0.076	3	July/2005
White Point Swash	0.076	3	August/2005
White Point Swash	0.076	5	August/2005
White Point Swash	0.076	32	September/2005
White Point Swash	0.076	6	October/2005
Town of Briarcliffe Acres	0.076	2	September/2004
Town of Briarcliffe Acres	0.54	5	August/2004
Town of Briarcliffe Acres	0.076	3	August/2004
Town of Briarcliffe Acres	0.076	1	September/2004

<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
Town of Briarcliffe Acres	0.076	2	September/2004
Town of Briarcliffe Acres	0.076	3	August/2005
Town of Briarcliffe Acres	0.076	5	October/2005
Arcadia Beach	3.47	5	August/2004
Arcadia Beach	3.47	5	August/2004
Arcadia Beach	0.076	3	August/2004
Arcadia Beach	3.47	5	August/2004
Arcadia Beach	0.076	4	June/2004
Arcadia Beach	0.076	7	June/2004
Arcadia Beach	0.076	4	August/2004
Arcadia Beach	0.076	4	August/2004
Arcadia Beach	3.47	5	August/2004
Arcadia Beach	0.076	10	September/2004
Arcadia Beach	0.076	3	September/2004
Arcadia Beach	0.076	5	September/2004
Arcadia Beach	0.076	6	June/2005
Arcadia Beach	0.076	14	June/2005
Arcadia Beach	0.076	4	July/2005
Arcadia Beach	0.076	5	July/2005
Arcadia Beach	0.076	5	August/2005
Arcadia Beach	0.076	8	August/2005
Arcadia Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
Arcadia Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
Arcadia Beach	0.076	2	September/2005
Arcadia Beach	0.076	9	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	3	June/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	June/2004



<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	June/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	8	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	8	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	3	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	9	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	October/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	9	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	September/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	September/2004

<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	June/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	June/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0076	7	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0076	5	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	7	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	8	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	September/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	June/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	June/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	June/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	7	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	July/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	9.77	5	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	9	August/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	September/2004
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	7	May/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	7	May/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	6	June/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	6	June/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	June/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	June/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	June/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	June/2005

<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	June/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	June/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	July/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	July/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	July/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	7	July/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	July/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	July/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	July/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	July/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	July/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	6	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	8	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	9	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	9	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	10	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	August/2005

<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	August/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	September/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	September/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	23	September/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	September/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	September/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	September/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	5	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	6	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	9	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	4	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	2	October/2005

<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	October/2005
City of Myrtle Beach	0.076	3	October/2005
Springmaid Beach	0.33	5	August/2004
Springmaid Beach	0.33	4	August/2005
SC State Park	3.4	5	August/2004
SC State Park	0.076	4	June/2004
SC State Park	0.076	4	July/2004
SC State Park	0.076	5	July/2004
SC State Park	0.076	4	August/2004
SC State Park	3.4	5	August/2004
SC State Park	0.076	2	August/2004
SC State Park	0.076	9	August/2004
SC State Park	0.076	3	September/2004
SC State Park	0.076	3	June/2004
SC State Park	0.076	3	July/2004
SC State Park	3.4	5	August/2004
SC State Park	0.076	2	August/2004
SC State Park	0.076	4	July/2004
SC State Park	0.076	2	August/2004
SC State Park	3.4	5	August/2004
SC State Park	0.076	6	August/2004
SC State Park	0.076	2	September/2004
SC State Park	1.79	5	August/2004
SC State Park	1.79	5	August/2004
SC State Park	0.076	2	September/2004

<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
SC State Park	0.076	10	May/2005
SC State Park	0.076	4	June/2005
SC State Park	0.076	2	June/2005
SC State Park	0.076	2	June/2005
SC State Park	0.076	3	July/2005
SC State Park	0.076	3	July/2005
SC State Park	0.076	3	July/2005
SC State Park	0.076	4	July/2005
SC State Park	0.076	7	July/2005
SC State Park	0.076	3	July/2005
SC State Park	0.076	2	July/2005
SC State Park	0.076	5	July/2005
SC State Park	0.076	4	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	4	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	4	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	7	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	2	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	4	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	5	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	5	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	5	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	6	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	7	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	7	August/2005
SC State Park	3.4	4	August/2005
SC State Park	0.076	7	September/2005
SC State Park	0.076	7	September/2005

<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
SC State Park	0.076	6	October/2005
SC State Park	0.076	4	October/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	2	May/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	7	May/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	7	May/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	7	May/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	7	May/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	6	June/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	June/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	3	June/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	3	June/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	3	June/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	July/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	2	July/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	2	July/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	2	July/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	5	July/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	3	July/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	3	July/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	3	July/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	2	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	5	August/2005

<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Miles of Beach Affected</b>	<b>Days Posted</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	6	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	6	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	6	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	8	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	3	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	3	August/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	September/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	7	September/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	5	October/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	5	October/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	5	October/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	5	October/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	8	October/2005
Town of Surfside Beach	0.076	4	October/2005
Garden City Beach	0.076	3	September/2004
Garden City Beach	0.076	2	August/2005
Garden City Beach	0.076	2	August/2005

**C. Public Health: Drinking Water**

*Restrictions in Surface Drinking Water Supplies and Incidents of Waterborne Diseases*

There were no Notices of Violation (NOV) issued to systems during the period of July 2003 - June 2004 for Treatment Technique and Monitoring and Reporting violations under the Stage 1 Disinfectants/Disinfection Byproducts and Surface Water Treatment Rules. The State reported two (2)



exceedances of the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) for one (1) system for Trihalomethanes (THMs) and eleven (11) exceedances of the MCL for five (5) systems for Haloacetic Acids (HAAs). The state reported no incidences of waterborne disease during the same period.

There were eleven (11) Notices of Violation (NOV) issued to seven (7) systems during the period of July 2004 - June 2005 for Treatment Technique and Monitoring and Reporting violations under the Stage 1 Disinfectants/Disinfection Byproducts and Surface Water Treatment Rules. The State reported six (6) exceedances of the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) for four (4) systems for Trihalomethanes (THMs) and no exceedances of the MCL for Haloacetic Acids (HAAs). The state reported no incidences of waterborne disease during the same period.

## GROUNDWATER ASSESSMENT

Groundwater is the source of drinking water for more than 40 percent of the population of the State. This resource is also used by agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests. The policy of the State of South Carolina, with respect to groundwater protection, is founded on the belief that there is a direct connection between land use and groundwater quality, and that at least some activities of man will always impact groundwater, regardless of the regulatory safeguards employed. Because it is an expensive and technologically complex task to restore contaminated groundwater to its original pristine state within a reasonable time frame, a justifiable goal of any groundwater protection strategy is to protect the present and future uses of the resource.

SCDHEC maintains a primary long term objective for groundwater protection. As expressed in the S.C. Regulation 61-68, *Water Classifications and Standards*.

**"It is the goal of the Department to maintain or restore groundwater quality so it is suitable as a drinking water source without any treatment. Recognizing the technical and economic difficulty in restoring groundwater quality, the Department will emphasize a preventive approach in protecting groundwater."**

This goal fulfills the Core Adequacy Criteria #1 of Strategic Activity 1 in the implementation of the Comprehensive State Groundwater Protection Program (CSGWPP).

The groundwater quality data are to be presented in a series of tables and it is recognized that all states do not have all the information requested at this time. Therefore this year's report serves as a template by that future monitoring and reporting can be designed. The data presented were assembled from existing reports: the state wide ambient groundwater quality monitoring network, the groundwater contamination inventory that is updated annually, the volatile organic compound (VOC) monitoring program for public supply wells, and reports from domestic well owners.

### 1. Overview of Groundwater Contamination Sources

The major sources of contamination impacting groundwater are presented in Table 22. Underground storage tank (UST) releases account for 3493 of the 4214 total instances. The additional nine sources indicated were the next most numerous instances. Another factor indicated was human health and/or environmental risk for those sources for petroleum products and hazardous waste. The size of the population at risk was also indicated for USTs given the large number of releases. The next column on Table 22 indicates the contaminants associated with the highest priority sources. Petroleum compounds, halogenated solvents, metals and nitrates are the contaminants most frequently detected.

**Table 22. Major Sources of Groundwater Contamination**

<b>Contaminant Source</b>	<b>Ten Highest-Priority Sources (T)</b>	<b>Factors Considered in Selecting a Contaminant Source</b>	<b>Contaminants</b>
<b><i>Agricultural Activities</i></b>			
Agricultural chemical facilities			
Animal feedlots			
Drainage wells			
Fertilizer applications			
Irrigation practices			
Pesticide applications			
<b><i>Storage and Treatment Activities</i></b>			
Land application	T	D	E
Material stockpiles			
Storage tanks (above ground)	T	D,A	D
Storage tanks (underground)	T	D,A,B	D
Surface impoundments	T	D	C,E
Waste piles			
Waste tailing			
<b><i>Disposal Activities</i></b>			
Deep injection wells			
Landfills	T	D	C,D,H
Septic systems			
Shallow injection wells			
<b><i>Other</i></b>			
Hazardous waste generators	T	D,A	C,H
Hazardous waste sites	T	D,A	C,H
Industrial facilities	T	D	C,E
Material transfer operations			
Mining and mine drainage	T	A,C	A,M Acid mine drainage
Pipeline and sewer lines			
Salt storage and road salting			

Contaminant Source	Ten Highest-Priority Sources (T)	Factors Considered in Selecting a Contaminant Source	Contaminants
Salt water intrusion			
Spills	T	D	D
Transportation of materials			
Urban runoff			
Other sources (please specify)			
Other sources (please specify)			

1. Check (T) up to 10 contaminant sources identified as highest priority in your State.

2. Specify the factor(s) used to select each of the contaminant sources. Denote the following factors by their corresponding letter (A through G) and list in order of importance. Describe any additional or special factors that are important within your State in the accompanying narrative.

- A. Human health and/or environmental risk (toxicity)
- B. Size of the population at risk
- C. Location of the sources relative to drinking water sources
- D. Number and/or size of contaminant sources
- E. Hydrogeologic sensitivity
- F. State findings, other findings
- G. Other criteria (please add or describe in the narrative)

3. List the contaminants/classes of contaminants considered to be associated with each of the sources that was checked. Contaminants/contaminant classes should be selected based on data indicating that certain chemicals may be originating from an identified source. Denote contaminants/classes of contaminants by their corresponding letter (A through M).

- A. Inorganic pesticides
- B. Organic pesticides
- C. Halogenated solvents
- D. Petroleum compounds
- E. Nitrate
- F. Fluoride
- G. Salinity/brine
- H. Metals
- I. Radionuclides
- J. Bacteria
- K. Protozoa
- L. Viruses
- M. Other (please add or describe in the narrative)

Tables 23, 24, 25 and 26 were designed to report the stress that contaminated sites place on individual aquifers or hydrogeologic settings. The report on each identified aquifer is further subdivided by type of source based on program area, contaminants present, and degree of remediation accomplished thus far. South Carolina's major drinking water aquifers are in the subsurface of the Coastal Plain. The sources and contaminants indicated in Table 22 are generally present in the near surface, shallowest aquifers. At this point, contamination data is gathered on a site by site basis, rather than by aquifer. Thus, portions of these tables can be completed for the Piedmont saprolite/bedrock and the Coastal Plain water table aquifers only. The number of confirmed groundwater contamination cases that have been identified in the Coastal Plain is 2828 and 1385 have been confirmed in the Piedmont. This number was obtained by counting the sites county by county.

**Table 23. Groundwater Contamination Summary**

Aquifer Description: Above Fall Line  
 Aquifer Setting: Saprolite/Bedrock Aquifer  
 Data Reporting Period: Ending July 2001

Source Type	Present in reporting area	Number of sites in area	Number of sites that are listed and/or have confirmed releases	Number with confirmed ground water contamination	Contaminants
NPL	YES		13	13	C,H
CERCLIS (non-NPL)	YES		40	40	C,H
DOD/DOE	YES		11	11	D,C,H
LUST	YES		1100	1100	D
RCRA Corrective Action	YES		27	27	C,H
Underground Injection	NO	0	0	0	
State Sites	YES		37	37	C,H,A,B,D
Nonpoint Sources	YES		2	2	E
Other (specify)	YES		157	157	C,D,E,H
Totals			1387	1387	

NPL - National Priority List  
 CERCLIS (non-NPL) - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System  
 DOE - Department of Energy  
 DOD - Department of Defense  
 LUST - Leaking Underground Storage Tanks  
 RCRA - Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

List of Contaminants:

- |                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| A. Inorganic pesticides | H. Metals  |
| B. Organic pesticides   | I. Radionuclides                                   |
| C. Halogenated solvents | J. Bacteria  |
| D. Petroleum compounds  | K. Protozoa  |
| E. Nitrate              | L. Viruses   |
| F. Flouride             | M. Other (please add or describe in the narrative) |
| G. Salinity/brine       |  |

**Table 24. Groundwater Contamination Summary (above fall line)**

<b>Source Type</b>	<b>Number of Site Investigations (optional)</b>	<b>Number of sites that have been stabilized or have had the source removed (optional)</b>	<b>Number of sites with corrective action plans (optional)</b>	<b>Number of sites with active remediation (optional)</b>	<b>Number of sites with cleanup completed (optional)</b>
NPL					
CERCLIS (non-NPL)					
DOD/DOE					
LUST					
RCRA Corrective Action					
Underground Injection					
State Sites					
Nonpoint Sources					
Other (specify)					

NPL - National Priority List  
 CERCLIS (non-NPL) - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System  
 DOE - Department of Energy  
 DOD - Department of Defense  
 LUST - Leaking Underground Storage Tanks  
 RCRA - Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

**Table 25. Groundwater Contamination Summary (2)**

Aquifer Description: Below Fall Line  
 Aquifer Setting: Coastal Plain  
 Data Reporting Period: Ending July 2001

Source Type	Present in reporting area	Number of sites in area	Number of sites that are listed and/or have confirmed releases	Number with confirmed ground water contamination	Contaminants
NPL	YES		15	15	C,H
CERCLIS (non-NPL)	YES		65	65	C,H
DOD/DOE	YES		170	170	C,D,H
LUST	YES		2313	2313	D
RCRA Corrective Action	YES		27	27	C,H
Underground Injection	NO	0	0	0	
State Sites	YES		35	35	C,D,A,B,D
Nonpoint Sources	YES		8	8	E
Other (specify)	YES		196	196	C,D,E,H
Totals			2829	2829	

NPL - National Priority List  
 CERCLIS (non-NPL) - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System  
 DOE - Department of Energy  
 DOD - Department of Defense  
 LUST - Leaking Underground Storage Tanks  
 RCRA - Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

List of Contaminants:

- A. Inorganic pesticides
- B. Organic pesticides
- C. Halogenated solvents
- D. Petroleum compounds
- E. Nitrate
- F. Flouride
- G. Salinity/brine
- H. Metals
- I. Radionuclides
- J. Bacteria
- K. Protozoa
- L. Viruses
- M. Other (please add or describe in the narrative)

**Table 26. Groundwater Contamination Summary (below fall line)**

Source Type	Number of Site Investigations (optional)	Number of sites that have been stabilized or have had the source removed (optional)	Number of sites with corrective action plans (optional)	Number of sites with active remediation (optional)	Number of sites with cleanup completed (optional)
NPL					
CERCLIS (non-NPL)					
DOD/DOE					
LUST					
RCRA Corrective Action					
Underground Injection					
State Sites					
Nonpoint Sources					
Other (specify)					

NPL - National Priority List

CERCLIS (non-NPL) - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System

DOE - Department of Energy

DOD - Department of Defense

LUST - Leaking Underground Storage Tanks

RCRA - Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

Each source type is listed in each area with the exception of underground injection as waste or contaminant injection, which is not permitted in this state. The "state" sites are state Superfund sites. The "Nonpoint Source" category contains spray irrigation sites only at this time. Pesticide and nitrate monitoring data is gathered by Clemson University, Department of Fertilizer and Pesticide Control. The "other" category includes spills and leaks; pits, ponds and lagoons; landfills; unpermitted disposal; aboveground storage tanks; and septic tanks/tile fields. The "number of sites in the area" is left blank because any number of facilities can be potential sources and that data is not tracked at this time. The number of sites that have confirmed groundwater contamination are listed along with the contaminants (using the contaminant classes from Table 22). The remediation status represented by Tables 24 and 26 is not fully completed because that information is not recorded in that format in all program areas.

## 2. Overview of Groundwater Protection Programs

The state's groundwater protection programs are summarized and characterized in Table 27. The Groundwater Working Group, which is comprised of SCDHEC's groundwater program managers, was formed to provide consistency across the programs.



**Table 27. Summary of State Groundwater Protection Programs**

<b>Programs or Activities</b>	<b>Check (Y)</b>	<b>Implementation Status</b>	<b>Responsible State Agency</b>
Active SARA Title III Program	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BL&amp;WM/Emergency Response</b>
Ambient groundwater monitoring system	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BOW/GWM</b>
Aquifer vulnerability assessment	<b>Y</b>	<b>Under Development</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BOW/GWM</b>
Aquifer mapping	<b>Y</b>	<b>Continuing Efforts</b>	<b>DNR-SCDHEC/BOW/GWM</b>
Aquifer characterization	<b>Y</b>	<b>Continuing Efforts</b>	<b>DNR-SCDHEC/BOW/GWM</b>
Comprehensive data management system	<b>Y</b>	<b>Under Development</b>	<b>DNR-SCDHEC</b>
EPA-endorsed Core Comprehensive State Groundwater Protection Program (CSGWPP)	<b>Y</b>	<b>Under Development</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BOW/GWM</b>
Groundwater discharge permits	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BOW</b>
Groundwater Best Management Practices	<b>Y</b>	<b>Under Development</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BOW/IAWD</b>
Groundwater legislation	<b>Y</b>	<b>Continuing Efforts</b>	<b>SCDHEC-DNR</b>
Groundwater classification	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BOW</b>
Groundwater quality standards	<b>Y</b>	<b>Under Revision</b>	<b>SCDHEC</b>
Interagency coordination for groundwater protection initiatives	<b>Y</b>	<b>Under Development</b>	<b>SCDHEC-DNR-Clemson Univ.</b>
Nonpoint source controls	<b>Y</b>	<b>Under Development</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BOW</b>
Pesticide State Management Plan	<b>Y</b>	<b>Under Development</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BOW/GWM-Clemson Univ.</b>
Pollution Prevention Program	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BL&amp;WM</b>
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Primacy	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BL&amp;WM</b>
State Superfund	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BL&amp;WM/CERCLA</b>
State RCRA Program incorporating more stringent requirements than RCRA primacy		<b>Not Applicable</b>	
State septic system requirements	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/ENV. HEALTH</b>
Underground storage tank installation requirements	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BL&amp;WM/UST Program</b>
Underground Storage Tank Remediation Fund	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BL&amp;WM/UST Program</b>
Underground Storage Tank Permit Program	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BL&amp;WM/UST Program</b>
Underground Injection Control Program	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BOW/GWM</b>
Vulnerability assessment for drinking water/wellhead protection	<b>Y</b>	<b>Fully Established</b>	<b>SCDHEC/BOW/GWM</b>

Programs or Activities	Check (Y)	Implementation Status	Responsible State Agency
Well abandonment regulations	Y	Fully Established	SCDHEC/BOW
Wellhead Protection Program (EPA-approved)	Y	Fully Established	SCDHEC/BOW/GWM
Well installation regulations	Y	Fully Established	SCDHEC/BOW

Implementation of the Comprehensive State Ground-Water Protection Program (CSGWPP) is the major initiative undertaken since the last 305(b) report. The draft Core CSGWPP was completed and submitted to the Region IV EPA, Groundwater 106 Program, comments from EPA have been received. The Source Water Assessment and Protection Plan was approved to EPA Region IV. The Groundwater Contamination Inventory and the Ambient Groundwater Quality Monitoring Report were also completed last quarter.

### 3. Summary of Groundwater Quality

Aquifer Monitoring Data are presented in Tables 28 and 29. The state's ambient quality monitoring network is designed to develop a baseline for groundwater quality for each of the aquifers within the state. The wells were selected in areas to avoid known or potential contamination in order to test the assumption that variability in water chemistry reflects differences in geologic framework and/or spatial setting. In addition, neither VOCs nor SOCs are included in the analytical parameters. Accordingly, no data from the ambient monitoring network is included in Tables 28 and 29.

**Table 28. Aquifer Monitoring Data**

Aquifer Description \_\_\_\_\_  
 Aquifer Setting \_\_\_\_\_

County(ies) (optional)  
 Longitude/Latitude (optional)  
 Data Reporting Period

		Number of Wells				
Monitoring Data Type	Total No. of Wells Used in the Assessment	Parameter Groups	No detections of Parameters above MDLs of background levels		No detections of parameters above MDLs or background levels and nitrate concentrations range from background levels to less than or equal to 5 mg/l.	
			ND	Number of Wells in Sensitive or Vulnerable Areas (optional)	ND/Nitrate # 5 mg/l	Number of wells in sensitive or vulnerable areas (optional)
Ambient Monitoring Network (optional)		VOC				
		SOC				
		NO				
		Other				
Raw Water		VOC				

Quality Data from Public Water Supply Wells		SOC				
		NO				
		Other				
Finished Water Quality Data from Public Water Supply Wells		VOC	1314		41	
		SOC	1252		22	
		NO	4343		4222	
		Other				

**Table 29. Aquifer Monitoring Data (2)**

Aquifer Description \_\_\_\_\_  
 Aquifer Setting \_\_\_\_\_

County(ies) (optional)  
 Longitude/Latitude (optional)  
 Data Reporting Period

Number of Wells				
Parameters are detected at concentrations exceeding the MDL but are less than or equal to the MCLs and/or nitrate ranges from greater than 5 to less than or equal to 10 mg/l	Parameters are detected at concentrations exceeding the MCLs	Removed from Service	Special Treatment	Background parameters exceed MCLs
Finished Water Quality Data from Public Water Supply Wells	VOC			
	SOC			
	NO			
	Other			

**4. Summary of Groundwater/Surface Water Interactions**

The Drinking Water Program reports that no Public Water Supply well is under the influence of surface water. Although there are anecdotal reports of groundwater in wells being heavily pumped showing signs of influence by surface water, no instance of groundwater being impacted by surface water has been confirmed.

As groundwater serves to recharge most of the streams in South Carolina, instances where contaminated groundwater impacts surface water are more prevalent. In the Groundwater Contamination Inventory 131 cases of contaminated groundwater discharging from the surficial aquifer to surface water have been noted. A table was not included in this report because contaminant concentration levels in both the aquifer and surface water are not available. It is surmised that, due to dilution, levels in the surface water are very low or not detectable in most cases.

## References

- South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. 1998. Laboratory Procedures Manual for Environmental Microbiology. Bureau of Environmental Services, Columbia, S.C.
- South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. 2005. Procedures and Quality Control Manual for Chemistry Laboratories. Bureau of Environmental Services, Columbia, S.C.
- South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. 2001. Environmental Investigations Standard Operating Procedures and Quality Assurance Manual. Office of Environmental Quality Control. Columbia, SC.
- South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. 2004. Water Classifications and Standards (Regulation 61-68) and Classified Waters (Regulation 61-69) for the State of South Carolina. Office of Environmental Quality Control, Columbia, S.C.
- South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. 2005. State of South Carolina Monitoring Strategy for Calendar Year 2005. Technical Report 003-05. Bureau of Water Pollution Control, Columbia, S.C.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. 1992. National Toxics Rule, December 22, 1992. Federal Register Reference 57FR60848.