

Proposed Final Version of the 2010 303(d) List

Summary of Public Comments and Departmental Responses

(Note: in some instances, public comments have been summarized in order to group similar observations by multiple reviewers.)

A. GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment A-1. *The department needs to do a better job getting the word out about the public meetings associated with the 2010 draft 303(d) review. Meetings should be better attended.*

Response: We also wish that more people would become involved in the public participation aspects of the 303(d) listing process. We get the word out about this process in several different ways: we published public notices, sent out group emails, posted information on our website, and issued a press release. We held public meetings in multiple locations across the state and arranged video conference links from additional areas. We have a standing offer to meet with anyone who would like to discuss the specifics of the listing process.

We feel that we have met not only the letter, but also the spirit, of the public participation requirements.

Comment A-2. *Silt in First and Second creeks in Knox County should be addressed.*

Response: The department's Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for siltation and habitat alteration in the Fort Loudoun Lake Watershed in Knox County was submitted to EPA for review in late 2005 and was formally approved on 01/26/2006. As the control strategy for the TMDL is implemented, siltation levels in streams in these watersheds will improve.

Comment A-3. *Given that many streams cross MS4 jurisdictions, can impaired streams be split to reflect these boundaries?*

Response: It would be difficult and time consuming to backtrack to do this additional segmenting for the 2010 303(d) List. We will consider this comment in the 2012 version of the list. New GIS coverages of MS4 boundaries make this suggestion more practical than before.

Comment A-4. *The department lists state and federal agencies that have contributed data to the assessment process. Can MS4 programs be added to this list?*

Response: Yes. We will add Metro Water Services to this list.

Comment A-5. *Why aren't forestry activities cited much more often as a source of impacts to Tennessee streams? The commenter has seen numerous sites where sloppy forestry practices have been employed.*

Response: Historically, forestry impacts have been difficult for us to accurately quantify. No discharge permit is necessary for these activities and because logging often takes place far from roads, we do not necessarily see problem areas nor do citizens who might bring issues to our attention.

We have also seen a trend of off-road vehicles utilizing areas that have been recently clearcut, an activity that can produce more erosion and damage to streams.

We feel that we will be able to more accurately quantify forestry impacts in the future as we now have access to recently taken, higher resolution aerial photographs in most parts of the state. If the commenter sees areas where water quality appears to have been damaged by forestry activities or off-road vehicles in the future, these conditions should be reported to the division and we will investigate.

Comment A-6. *When will the siltation/habitat alteration TMDLs for the Stones and Harpeth be published? These TMDLs are not currently on the TDEC website.*

Response: The siltation/habitat alteration TMDLs for the Harpeth and Stones River Watersheds were approved by EPA Region 4 on 10/31/02. Both TMDL documents are online and can be accessed at: <http://tn.gov/environment/wpc/tmdl/approved.shtml>.

Comment A-7. *According to the 303(d) List, dissolved oxygen and siltation TMDLs have been published for Mill Creek in Davidson and Williamson counties. These TMDLs are not currently on the TDEC website.*

Response: We looked at the draft 303(d) for the listed segments of Mill Creek. All the pollutants for these segments have been given a TMDL completion priority and the comments field makes no mention of approved TMDLs.

Comment A-8. *The 303(d) List should use consistent terminology for causes and sources.*

Response: We agree with this comment, but the list is updated a portion at a time, consistent with the watershed approach, rather than all at once. We try to maintain a consistent nomenclature, but sometimes it will be an assessment cycle or two before we catch up.

Comment A-9. *The 303(d) List should go further to identify the specific type of source, especially with mines. For example, zinc, copper, or clay mining rather than just “mining.”*

Response: Sometimes this information is in the comment field, but our agreement with EPA is that we generally use the names for causes and sources they provide in their assessment software, the Assessment Database. As we’ve stated previously, the 303(d) List is designed to be a general inventory of sources, not a detailed one like might be expected in a TMDL.

Comment A-10. *The 303(d) List should explain why impacts due to the various cause or sources have either increased or decreased since the last assessment cycle.*

Response: We believe this is more the job of the 305(b) Report, rather than the 303(d) List. The 303(d) responsibility is simply to create an inventory of streams that fail to meet states clean water goals (or are clearly threatened by such impacts). The 305(b) is a more narrative discussion of existing water quality.

However, the commenter should know that statistically valid trend analysis is difficult due to the nature of the watershed approach utilized by Tennessee. Something that might appear on the surface to be a trend may simply be because we monitored differently from one cycle to the next. For example, the number of pathogen impaired streams has increased in the last few assessment cycles. Is this because the amount of pathogens in surface waters is increasing, or due to the dramatically increased monitoring for bacteria by state and federal agencies, plus these ever increasing number of local MS4 programs?

We would suggest that it is due to the latter rather than the former, but that is conjecture rather than science. We are attempting, as resources allow, to do statistically based monitoring so that we might have a more scientific basis for trend analysis in the future.

Comment A-11. *Some of the segment numbers of 303(d) listed streams changed between 2008 and 2010.*

Response: The commenter is correct. When we began using the assessment database over ten years ago to store assessment information, along with the Reach Indexing Tool to spatially relate assessment information in a GIS format, we needed a system to number individual stream segments beyond the traditional eleven digit River Reach Indexing System developed by EPA. Unable to wait until guidance came along, we developed a segment numbering system in which mainstem streams were numbered in the thousands (1000, 2000, 3000, etc.) and tributaries were numbered in the hundreds (0100, 0200, 0300, ect.) clockwise around the mainstem stream. Smaller tributaries were numbered in the tens (0110, 0120, 01230) or even in the ones (0111, 0112), following the same clockwise pattern.

This system seemed to work well, but it meant that we had to assign segment numbers statewide all at once over the course of two years. We weren't sure how big to make individually numbered segments and as a result, some were large and others small, based on how much we knew about the stream.

As we've refined assessments for individual segments during later cycles, we've needed to resegment larger sections, or to create numbers for previously unnumbered segments. This occasionally means that the renumbering affects segments on the 303(d) List.

The GIS based "Tennessee Online Water Quality Assessment" is a mapping system that can help resolve any confusion over which segments are impacted. It can be accessed on the department's homepage at the following address: <http://tnmap.tn.gov/wpc/>

B. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Comment B-1. *The impacted mileage for Straight Creek in Claiborne County (TN05130101015_0600) was reduced. Why?*

Response: The primary source of pollutants impacting Straight Creek are in Rock Creek, a tributary. The division surveyed Straight Creek upstream of the mouth of Rock Creek and it had a TMI score of 34 and a habitat score of 167. The size of the impacted segment was adjusted downward to reflect the good water quality upstream of Rock Creek.

Comment B-2. *There are numerous straight pipes from residential septic systems along Straight Creek. Is the stream not impacted by pathogens?*

Response: We have not performed bacteriological monitoring on Straight Creek so currently have no data upon which to base an assessment. We could monitor for pathogens in a future cycle, but in the meantime, we will alert the Division of Ground Water Protection.

Comment B-3. *There were additional pollutant sources added to the assessment for Bennett Fork (TN05130101046_0200). Why didn't the number of impacted miles go up?*

Response: The same listed segment can be impacted by more than one type of pollutant or source. Adding more sources or causes does not automatically increase the size of the impaired section.

Comment B-4. *"Abandoned mining" was added as a source to the assessment for Bennett Fork (TN05130101046_0200). Was a site abandoned between 2008 and 2010? Reclamation activities are occurring in this watershed, so should it be considered abandoned?*

Response: There are abandoned sites in this watershed so it is appropriate to add it as a source. We are familiar with reclamation efforts, but they are not taking place at all the abandoned sites.

Comment B-5. *The following 2008 listed segments had reduced mileages in 2010: Bear Creek (TN05130104050_1000), He Creek (TN05130107023_0230), Little Laurel Creek (TN06010208020_0600), and Hogskin Branch (TN060200001067_1100). Were these reduced impaired miles due to reclamation of abandoned mines or because the streams are improving naturally.*

Response: All mileages reported in the 303(d) List are calculated with the Reach Indexing Tool from the GIS stream coverages we have at the time. Sometimes there are small differences in mileages from one cycle to another due to changes in the GIS coverages.

The reduction in Bear Creek miles are due to segmenting of small tributaries which in the past were included in with the mainstem. We separated Big He Creek and Little He Creek from He Creek, thus making the He Creek section smaller. Little Laurel Creek, a tributary to Crab Orchard Creek, is a new listing and did not appear in the 2008 303(d) List. The confusion may be over the next tributary, Laurel Creek, which was listed in 2008. The small difference in the length of Hogskin Branch from 2008 to 2010 is due to GIS indexing differences.

Comment B-6. *Big He Creek (TN05130107023_0232) and Little He Creek (TN05130107023_0231) were added to the 303(d) List and “Abandoned mining” included as a pollutant source. A mining company is engaged in mitigation efforts at this site and the reclamation bond has not been released by OSM. Is it accurate to call this site abandoned?*

Response: We are familiar with the efforts of the mining company. But there are abandoned sites in this watershed so it is appropriate to include it as a source.

Comment B-7. *The assessment for Rocky River (TN05130108024_1000) is strange in that the source of the pollutants impacting the stream was changed from dredge mining to highway construction, yet the number of impaired miles did not change.*

Response: It is not correct that the source changed. Dredge mining is still listed as the source of silt impacting this segment. However, changing the source does not necessarily impact the size of the segment.

Comment B-8. *Falling Water River (TN05130108045_1000) needs a TMDL priority for low dissolved oxygen.*

Response: We will make this revision.

Comment B-9. *Little Creek (TN05130202010_0700) was delisted for E. coli in 2008, yet reappears as impacted in 2010. Is this a mistake?*

Response: The commenter is correct and we will make this correction.

Comment B-10. *Metro Nashville recently collected pathogen data at multiple listed streams: Murphy Road Branch (TN05130202314_0200), Manskers Creek (TN05130202220_2000), and Walkers Creek (TN05130202220_0200). Can these data be used to delist these streams?*

Response: These streams are in the Cheatham Lake watershed, which is in Group 5 of the assessment cycle. (The 2010 303(d) List reflects a reassessment of Groups 1 & 2.) The department is also collecting data at some of these sites.

Because continuing monitoring has not revealed additional water quality violations at Murphy Road Branch, we will add it to Appendix A as a proposed delisting. Since there were continuing water quality criteria violations in

Manskers and Walker creeks in 2009, we would prefer to see additional results before making a decision on delisting.

Comment B-11. *A segment of East Fork Stones River (TN05130203026_2000) is listed as being in Davidson County. Isn't this segment in Cannon County?*

Response: The commenter is correct and we will make this correction.

Comment B-12. *Scotts Creek (TN05130203035_0100) is listed for siltation and habitat alteration. Wouldn't the fact that it has a bedrock bottom make the biological results suspect? Scotts Creek should be studied further before listing.*

Response: Scotts Creek was randomly selected for the Department's 2007 Wadeable Streams study. All streams in the study had a Single Habitat Semiquantitative (SQSH) survey performed, which is our definitive biological integrity survey. Additionally, a biorecon was also performed on Scotts Creek. Both scores failed badly.

We understand the commenters concern, but if appropriate habitat had not been available to be surveyed in Scotts Creek, the stream would have been dropped (as were many others) as being unsuitable for the study. Further, assessments of siltation and habitat alteration are not solely based on biological results but also incorporate physical surveys and measurements.

We are confident that we have accurately assessed the stream.

Comment B-13. *Dry Fork Creek (TN05130203035_0300) should not be listed for siltation if a SQSH biological survey has not been performed. The biorecon score for this stream was inconclusive.*

Response: Biorecon surveys are completed in the field. SQSH surveys must be processed at the laboratory and animals must be IDed to genera, a time consuming and expensive process. Departmental resources are not unlimited and we must use our judgment regarding where these more intensive surveys would be most valuable.

Dry Fork Creek scored a biorecon score of 7 and the commenter has correctly observed that score is technically rated as "inconclusive" in departmental SOPs. However, it is on the low end of that range and department staff believe that when combined with the habitat scores at that station (114) - and obvious silt deposition - an assessment of siltation impaired is justified. We would be happy to review any additional biological data on this stream that are brought to our attention.

Comment B-14. *West and East Branch Hurricane Creeks, plus the mainstem Hurricane Creek near LaVergne are listed as being in Rutherford County. Aren't they shared with Davidson County?*

Response: We consulted our online water quality assessment mapping system and do not believe that any portion of the East Branch is shared with Davidson County. However, the commenter is correct about the West Branch and the mainstem Hurricane Creek. We also note that the map indicates "indefinite boundary" for the county line, so there may be some uncertainty here. We will make this correction.

Comment B-15. *Two unnamed tributaries to the Harpeth River (TN05130204010_0200 & 1400) are listed for flow alteration due to an upstream impoundment. Would the department's TMDL for these segments require an MS4 program to monitor this non-pollutant?*

Response: The commenter is correct that the department considers flow alteration to be pollution not caused by a pollutant. We would not require an MS4 to monitor such conditions.

Comment B-16. *The Harpeth River Watershed Association collected pathogen samples of several Harpeth River tributaries in the vicinity of Eagleville. These data should be incorporated into the assessments of these streams.*

Response: The commenter originally submitted these data as a comment in the 2008 assessment cycle. These data were included in our assessments of this watershed for the 2010 assessment cycle.

Comment B-17. *The department has proposed delisting two segments of the West Harpeth River (TN05130204013_1000 & 3000). Visual observations of these streams do not support this proposal.*

Response: The basis for the delisting is provided in Appendix A. Surveys conducted in two straight assessment cycles indicate that the biological integrity criterion is being met in these segments.

Comment B-18. *The 303(d) list does not identify the use or uses impacted by color in the Pigeon River.*

Response: The criterion that is violated is for protection of the recreational use. “There shall be no total suspended solids, turbidity or color in such amounts or character that will result in any objectionable appearance to the water, considering the nature and location of the water.”

Comment B-19. *Regarding the assessment of Pigeon River segment TN06010106001_4000, Tennessee’s water quality criterion for color only applies to flows over 30Q5.*

Response: According to our calculations, the 30Q5 of the Pigeon River at the stateline is 144 cfs. With the exception of October 2008, the Pigeon had flows over the 30Q5. Objectionable color in the Pigeon River was not limited to flows lower than the 30Q5.

Additionally, we note the following passage from EPA’s Water Quality Standards Handbook, Section 5.2 (updated July, 2007):

Water quality standards should protect water quality for designated uses in critical low-flow situations. In establishing water quality standards, States may designate a critical low-flow below which numerical water quality criteria do not apply. At all times, waters shall be free from substances that settle to form objectionable deposits; float as debris, scum, oil, or other matter; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause acutely toxic conditions; or produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life.

Comment B-20. *Average apparent color levels are no higher in the Pigeon River at the stateline than they are in the Nolichucky River, French Broad River, or even the portion of the Pigeon River downstream of the listed segment. The upper Pigeon River is listed for color while the other segments are not.*

Response: The measurement of apparent color includes suspended matter in the water as well as dissolved color. When true color is measured, the suspended matter is filtered out.

The commenter should be aware that the other three stations identified above as having similar apparent color levels are in different subcoregions than is the Pigeon at the stateline. Thus clean water goals cannot be assumed to be the same. Both the Nolichucky and French Broad are known to be impacted by elevated silt levels reflected in the apparent color results and the historical 303(d) assessments of these waters.

The color in the Pigeon River is completely different and is not caused by silt. We have no doubt that until it is diluted by tributary flow, the color in the upper part of the Pigeon in Tennessee persists further downstream to Newport. At one time, color throughout the Tennessee portion of the Pigeon violated the color criterion. However, the downstream color is not considered objectionable at this time. The Pigeon as it enters the state of Tennessee continues to violate the criterion for objectionable color.

Comment B-21. *True color levels have averaged less than 20 color units in the Pigeon River near the stateline since 2001 according to data collected by the commenter.*

Response: The criterion for color in Tennessee is based on the presence of objectionable conditions rather than average levels over time. Objectionable color is most frequently noted in the Pigeon during the summer and fall months when recreational activities are most likely to occur. Data provided by the commenter confirm the elevated levels from July through November each year, particularly in 2007 and 2008.

Comment B-22. *A recent study concluded that the impacts to water quality in the Pigeon River are the result of sources and tributaries in Tennessee rather than sources in North Carolina.*

Response: There are Tennessee sources of some of the pollutants impacting the Pigeon. Our assessments reflect this information. However, we strongly disagree that the objectionable color at the stateline has a Tennessee source.

Comment B-23. *Pigeon River segment TN06010106001_4000 is not impacted by color therefore, a TMDL is not necessary.*

Response: As stated previously, we disagree with the commenter regarding the impairment status of this segment. Our longstanding position regarding a color TMDL for the Pigeon is that it would help identify permit limits necessary to protect downstream uses, but such a TMDL should be developed by either the state of North Carolina or EPA.

Comment B-24. *As evidence of the improving water quality in the Tennessee portion of the Pigeon (from the stateline downstream to Denton), it has been designated as both an Exceptional Tennessee Water and an Outstanding National Resource Water (ONRW).*

Response: As stated by the commenter, the referenced section of the Pigeon is an Exceptional Tennessee Water due to the presence of the Tuskaseegee darter, a fish with special status. However, the Pigeon River is not now, nor has it ever been an Outstanding National Resource Water. Perhaps the commenter has confused this stream with the nearby Little Pigeon River, which has much better water quality and is an officially designated ONRW.

Comment B-25. *Knob Fork (TN06010207011_0600) needs a TMDL priority for habitat loss.*

Response: We will make this revision.

Comment B-26. *Murphy Creek and Whites Creek (TN06010201080_0100) in Knox County should be listed for siltation.*

Response: Murphy Creek is a small tributary to Whites Creek. Whites Creek is already listed for siltation. Since Murphy Creek is included in the Whites Creek segment, it is also listed for silt.

Comment B-27. *The department has said that the pollutants in the lower Emory River derive from the ash spill and that a TMDL would not help resolve these pollution issues. However, the mercury and PCBs in this segment do not have the ash spill as a source and a TMDL should be done.*

Response: The draft identifies TMDL priorities for these pollutants.

Comment B-28. *Summers Branch (TN06010208004_0400) is indentified as being impacted by abandoned mining. Reclamation efforts have taken place along this stream so is it appropriate to continue to identify this segment as impacted by that source?*

Response: Until the state's clean water goals have been met, it is appropriate to identify the stream as being impacted by the source of the pollutants.

Comment B-29. *The assessment for Long Branch (TN06010208015_0510) is strange in that the source of the pollutants impacting the stream was changed from abandoned mining to sand/gravel/rock mining, yet the number of impaired miles did not change.*

Response: The commenter is correct that the source changed, which we consider to be a refinement of the existing assessment. As stated in a previous

response, changing the source does not necessarily impact the size of the segment.

Comment B-30. *The draft identifies both Whiteoak Creek and Melton Branch, streams on the DOE Oak Ridge Reservation, as being impacted by strontium. Additionally, Whiteoak Creek is listed for cesium. Because a Record of Decision (ROD) in the CERCLA program is in place for both Whiteoak Creek and Melton Branch, these streams should be considered for category 4B (impaired, but with control strategy in place) for these pollutants rather than Category 5 (impaired with TMDL needed).*

Response: Category 4B is for sites where an agreed-upon control strategy will cause the water quality standard to be met in a reasonable time frame. We agree with the commenter's logic that the ROD, an enforceable agreement, will bring about compliance with Tennessee's water quality standards in a reasonable time-frame and that a TMDL would not be helpful.

Our position regarding this TMDL historically was that it should be developed by EPA since a federal facility is the source of the pollutants. We will recommend that 4B status is appropriate for these streams, but should EPA disagree, it will continue to be our position that EPA should develop the TMDL.

Comment B-31. *Elemental mercury has been discovered in Beech Creek in Wayne County. Contact and fishery advisories have been issued by the department. Does this stream need to be added to the 303(d) List?*

Response: Due to the presence of mercury in sediment near Leatherwood, which was confirmed visually and by laboratory analysis (1600 mg/kg), we will add all three Beech Creek segments to the 303(d) List as being impacted by mercury. We will indicate that the source of mercury is currently unknown.

Comment B-32. *Baxter Bottom (TN08010209016_0410) appears in Appendix A as a delisting for dissolved oxygen. However, DO is still listed as a pollutant for this segment.*

Response: The commenter is correct. We will revise this listing.

Comment B-33. *There is an obvious typo on Cypress Creek (TN08010210032) in Shelby County. There are two segments listed with different pollutants on each, but the segment numbers and miles impacted are the same.*

Response: The commenter is correct. We will revise these listings. These should be segments 1000 and 2000 with different mileages.

Comment B-34. *There have been several observations of low dissolved oxygen on the lower section of Nonconnah Creek (TN08010211000711_1000). Should that be listed as a pollutant?*

Response: The commenter is correct. We will revise this listing.

Comment B-35. *The habitat of the Unnamed Tributary to Nonconnah Creek (TN08010211000720_0100) has been dramatically altered. Should that be added to the assessment?*

Response: The commenter is correct. We will revise this listing and add “Other Anthropogenic Habitat Alterations.”

Comment B-36. *During the most recent monitoring of the Unnamed Tributary to Nonconnah Creek (TN08010211000720_0500), suspended solids levels were lower than previously. Can this stream be delisted for that pollutant?*

Response: We will revise this listing and add “Siltation” as a proposed delisting in Appendix A.

C. EPA REVIEW COMMENTS REGARDING TMDL PRIORITIES

Comment C-1. *EPA reviewed the draft list and had comments/questions regarding TMDL priorities.*

Response: The attached table that follows documents EPA’s specific comments. The far right-hand column provides TDEC’s responses and proposed resolution. The Proposed Final Version of the List has been modified as shown in the attachment.

Issue: After viewing all Final TMDL documents on TDEC website, Reviewer could not identify approved TMDLs for the following waters as indicated on the Draft List **Suggested Resolution:** TDEC needs to indicate where waterbody is included in approved TMDL or revise Draft list to indicate priority ranking for TMDL Development and make sure waterbody is identified in correct IR Category

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	TDEC Response **
Obey River Basin	TN05130105	019-1400	Big Piney Creek	Siltation	No TMDL
Obey River Basin	TN05130105	019-2000	East Fork Obey	Siltation	No TMDL
Obey River Basin	TN05130105	019-3000	East Fork Obey	Siltation	No TMDL
Collins River Watershed	TN05130107	002-1000	Mountain Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0403
Caney Fork River	TN05030108	002-0200	Goose Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0807
Caney Fork River	TN05030108	033-0410	Mill Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0202
Caney Fork River	TN05030108	043-0100	Cherry Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0503
Caney Fork River	TN05030108	045-0100	Cane Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0704
Cheatham Reservoir Watershed	TN05130202	007-2000	Mill Creek	Siltation	No TMDL
Cheatham Reservoir	TN05130202	007-3000	Mill Creek	Low DO	No TMDL
Cheatham Reservoir	TN05130202	023-0200	Middle Fork Browns	E. Coli	Done - part of DA for 023-2000
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	010-0100	Rocky Fk Branch	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0304
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	023-0210	UT to Bushman Cr	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0105
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	029-0300	UT to Bradley Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0106
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	035-0100	Scotts Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0307
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	035-0300	Dry Fork Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0307
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	036-0100	East Branch Hurricane Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0301a
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	036-0200	West Branch Hurricane Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0301a
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	232-0100	North Fk Suggs Cr.	Siltation	No TMDL
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	002-0400	Will Hall Creek	E. Coli	Done - part of HUC-12 0601
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	002-0410	Creech Hollow Cr	E. Coli	Done - part of HUC-12 0601
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	002-0600	UT to Jones Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0601
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	009-0400	Flat Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0301
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	009-0500	Cartwright Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0301
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	009-0700	Brown Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0301
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	010-1300	Hunting Camp Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0401
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	013-0100	Hatcher Spring Cr	Siltation	No TMDL
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	013-0300	UT to West Harpeth	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0201
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	013-0400	UT to West Harpeth	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0201
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	013-0600	UT to West Harpeth	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0201
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	016-0210	South Prong Spencer	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0105
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	016-1400	UT to Harpeth River	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0105
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	016-1500	Sharps Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0105

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	TDEC Response **
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	016-4000	Harpeth River	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0104
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	018-0220	UT to Concord Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0101
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	021-0200	UT to Little Harpeth River	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0302
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	021-2000	Little Harpeth River	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0302
South Fk Holston River Basin	TN06010102	012-0820	Woods Branch	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0402
South Fk Holston River Basin	TN06010102	0231.0-2000	Beaverdam Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL
South Fk Holston River Basin	TN06010102	0250-0700	Corum Branch	Siltation	No TMDL
South Fk Holston River Basin	TN06010102	0250-0800	Flatwood Branch	Siltation	No TMDL
South Fk Holston River Basin	TN06010102	0250-1300	Waters Branch	Siltation	No TMDL
South Fk Holston River Basin	TN06010102	041-0100	Paperville Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0401
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	001-1000	Watauga Embayment of Boone Reservoir	PCBs and Chlordane	Done - was part of Boone Reservoir
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	005-0500	Gregg Branch	E. Coli	Done - part of DA for 005-2000
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	007-0100	Little Meadow Creek	E. Coli	Done - part of DA for 007-1000
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	010-0600	Ripley Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	030-0100	Cedar Creek	E. Coli	Done - part of DA for 030-1000
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	035-1800	Pyborn Creek	Siltation	Done - in HUC-12 0701
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	035-2600	Grassy Creek	E. Coli	Done - part of DA for 035-6000
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	035-3100	Wolf Creek	Siltation	Done - in HUC-12 0701
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	042-0610	Whitehorn Creek	Siltation	Done - in HUC-12 0603
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	088-1000	Horse Creek	E. Coli	Done - part of DA for 035-7000
Upper Tennessee River	TN06010201	001T-0100	Wolf Creek	All	No EC TMDL; S/HA done - part of HUC-12 0302 (Town)
Upper Tennessee River	TN06010201	015-0100	Bacon Creek	Siltation	Done - in HUC-12 0403
Upper Tennessee River	TN06010201	015-2000	Sweetwater Creek	E. Coli	Done - was part of 015-1000
Upper Tennessee River	TN06010201	031-1000	Hesse Creek	E. Coli	Done - part of HUC-12 0103
Upper Tennessee River	TN06010201	032-0700	Dry Branch	E. Coli	Done - part of HUC-12 0103
Upper Tennessee River	TN06010201	032-0800	Short Creek	Nitrate + Nitrite	No TMDL
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	038-1000	Town Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0302

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	TDEC Response **
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	067-0100	East Fk Third Creek	All	Done - part of DA for 067-1000
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	1149-1000	Polecat Creek	Siltation	No TMDL
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	029-2000	Coal Creek	E. Coli	No EC TMDL - diff HUC-12 from 029-1000
Emory River	TN06010208	004-0400	Summers Branch	Siltation	Done - in HUC-12 0405
Emory River	TN06010208	013-0200	Little Obed River	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0101
Emory River	TN06010208	020-0400	Golliher Creek	Manganese and Iron	No TMDL - only pH
Emory River	TN06010208	020-0500	Fag(o)n Mill Creek	Manganese	No TMDL - only pH
Emory River	TN06010208	020-3000	Crab Orchard Creek	Manganese	No TMDL - only pH
Lower Tennessee Basin	TN06020001	007-0200	UT to South Chickamauga Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0804
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	001-0200	Gunstocker Creek	All	No TMDL
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	002-0100	Sugar Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	005-0100	Black Fox Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0902
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	009-0100	Little South Mouse Creek	Siltation	Done - part of HUC-12 0603
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	009-1000	South Mouse Creek	E. Coli	Done - in HUC-12 0603
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	018-0300	Sicowee Branch	E. Coli	No TMDL
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	018-0550	Spring Creek	Siltation	No TMDL
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	084-1000	North Mouse Creek	Siltation	No TMDL
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	084-2000	North Mouse Creek	Siltation	No TMDL
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	088-1000	Price Creek	Siltation	No TMDL
Elk River Basin	TN0603003	004-0700	Caldwell Creek	Siltation	Done - in HUC-12 0103
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	010-0300	Harts Branch	Siltation	Done - in HUC-12 0304
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	026-0430	Culton Creek	E. Coli	Done - in HUC-12 0107
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	034-0260	Coleman Branch	Siltation	No TMDL - HUC8 s/b 06040003
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	034-0410	Grassy Branch	Siltation	Done - in 0201 - HUC8 s/b 06040003
Elk River Basin	TN0603003	063-1000	Swan Creek	Siltation and E. Coli	No TMDL
Elk River Basin	TN6030004	017-0700	UT to Richland Creek	Siltation	Done - in HUC-12 0206
Elk River Basin	TN6030004	017-0800	Pleasant Run Creek	Siltation	Done - in HUC-12 0206
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	002-0310	East Fk of Globe Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	032-0310	Muddy Branch	Siltation and E. Coli	EC Done - in DA for 032-0300; S/HA not done
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	033-1000	Wartrace Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	039-1000	North Fork Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	039-2000	North Fork Creek	Nutrients and E. Coli	No EC TMDL - Nutrient is S2/3
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	047-0300	Lick Creek	E. Coli	Done - in HUC-12 0503
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	023-2000	Sugar Fork	E. Coli	Done - was part of 023-1000
Mississippi River Basin	TN08010100	001-1000	Mississippi River	PCBs, Dioxins and Chlordane	Done - Approved 7/25/08
Mississippi River Basin	TN08010100	001-2000	Mississippi River	PCBs, Dioxins and Chlordane	Done - Approved 7/25/08

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	TDEC Response **
Mississippi River Basin	TN08010100	001-3000	Mississippi River	PCBs, Dioxins and Chlordane	Done - Approved 7/25/08
Mississippi River Basin	TN08010100	001-4000	Mississippi River	PCBs, Dioxins and Chlordane	Done - Approved 7/25/08
Mississippi River Basin	TN08010100	001-5000	Mississippi River	PCBs, Dioxins and Chlordane	Done - Approved 7/25/08
Obion River Basin	TN08010202	001-3000	Obion River	E. Coli	No TMDL
North Fk Forked Deer River	TN08010204	010-2000	Middle Fk Forked Deer River	E. Coli	No TMDL
Loosahatchie River Basin	TN08010209	002-0400	Oliver Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL - revised TMDL ready for PN
Loosahatchie River Basin	TN08010209	002-0500	Buckhead Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL - revised TMDL ready for PN
Wolf River Basin	TN08010210	001-1000	Wolf River	Dioxin	No TMDL
Wolf River Basin	TN08010210	002-1000	Wolf River	Dioxin	No TMDL
Nonconnah Creek Basin	TN08010211	00720-0100	UT to Nonconnah Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL - revised TMDL ready for PN
Nonconnah Creek Basin	TN08010211	00720-0200	UT to Nonconnah Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL - revised TMDL ready for PN
Nonconnah Creek Basin	TN08010211	00720-0400	UT to UT to Nonconnah	E. Coli	No TMDL - revised TMDL ready for PN
Nonconnah Creek Basin	TN08010211	00720-0410	UT to UT to Nonconnah	E. Coli	No TMDL - revised TMDL ready for PN
Nonconnah Creek Basin	TN08010211	00720-0500	UT to Nonconnah Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL - revised TMDL ready for PN
Nonconnah Creek Basin	TN08010211	00720-1000	Nonconnah Creek*	E. Coli	Done - Nonconnah Ck (mouth to headwaters)
Nonconnah Creek Basin	TN08010211	00720-2000	Nonconnah Creek*	E. Coli	

*Based on the Waterbody IDs in the 12/18/01, Reviewer was unable to determine if this segment was included in the approved TMDL or not

** HUC-12s identified match HUC-12s used in TMDL; HUC-12s were re-numbered in 2008/2009.

ADDITIONAL TMDLS NOT ON LIST

Issue: After viewing all Final TMDL documents on TDEC website, Reviewer identified approved TMDL(s) for the Related Cause(s), which the List shows as still requiring TMDLs

Suggested Resolution: TDEC needs to revise the Final 2010 List-- "TMDL Priority" to indicate "NA" and "Comment" field to indicate TMDL(s) completed

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	TDEC Response
Caney Fork River	TN05030108	036-0100	Clifty Creek	pH & Iron	Done
Cheatham Reservoir Watershed	TN05130202	007-1410	Shasta Branch	E. Coli	Done
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	001-0100	McCrorry Creek	Nitrate + Nitrite	Done
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	001-0150	McCrorry Creek	Nitrate + Nitrite	Done
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	018-0100	Sinking Creek	E. Coli	Done
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	018-7000	West Fk Stones River	Low DO	Done
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	022-0100	Town Creek	Low DO	Done
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	023-0310	Bear Branch	Nutrients	Done
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	029-0100	Jarman Branch	Nutrients	Done
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	029-0200	UT to Bradley Creek	Nutrients	Done
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	036-0200	West Branch Hurricane Creek	Nutrients	Done
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	036-1000	Hurricane Creek	Nutrients	Done
Barkley Reservoir Watershed	TN05130205	015T-1100	Wall Branch	E. Coli	Done
Barkley Reservoir Watershed	TN05130205	002-0400	Buzzard Creek	E. Coli	Done - HUC8 s/b 05130206
Barkley Reservoir Watershed	TN05130205	002-0700	Seven Springs	E. Coli	Done - HUC8 s/b 05130206
Barkley Reservoir Watershed	TN05130205	024-0150	Summers Branch	E. Coli	Done - HUC8 s/b 05130206
South Fk Holston River Basin	TN06010102	237-0100	Booher Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	006-0100	Carroll Creek	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	006-1000	Boones Creek	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	006-1000	Boones Creek	E. Coli	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	008-0200	Campbell Branch	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	008-0200	Campbell Branch	E. Coli	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	006-0400	Davis Branch	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	006-0800	Gap Branch	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	009-1000	Brush Creek	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	020T-0200	Sink Branch	Siltation	No, stream not impaired for silt.
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	020T-0200	Sink Branch	E. Coli	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	034-0300	Town Creek	Siltation	No, stream not impaired for silt.
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	034-0320	Furnace Creek	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	034-1000	Roan Creek	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	034-2000	Roan Creek	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	061-1000	Reedy Creek	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	635-0100	Cash Hollow Creek	Siltation	No, stream not impaired for silt.
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	635-0200	Cobb Creek	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	635-1000	Knob Creek	Siltation	Done
Watauga River Basin	TN06010103	635-1000	Knob Creek	E. Coli	Done
Holston River Basin	TN06010104	001-0500	Roseberry Creek	E. Coli	Done
Holston River Basin	TN06010104	001-0800	Lost Creek	E. Coli	Done
Holston River Basin	TN06010104	001-0900	Beaver Creek	E. Coli	Done
Holston River Basin	TN06010104	001-1400	Swanpond Creek	E. Coli	Done
Lower French Broad River Basin	TN06010107	010-1000	West Prong Little Pigeon River	Siltation	Done

ADDITIONAL TMDLS NOT ON LIST

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	TDEC Response
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	030-0200	Jockey Creek	Nitrate + Nitrite	Done
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	030-0220	Carson Creek	Nitrate + Nitrite	Done
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	035-0200	Potter Creek	Low DO	Done
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	035-0900	Puncheon Camp Creek	NO2+NO3	Done
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	035-9000	Lick Creek	NO2+NO3	Done
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	102-2000	Richland Creek	NO2+NO3	Done
Nolichucky River Watershed	TN06010108	510-0400	Hominy Creek	NO2+NO3	Done
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	026-1000	Little River	PCBs	Done
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	026-2000	Little River	Siltation	No, stream not impaired for silt.
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	040-0600	Black Creek	Siltation	No, stream not impaired for silt.
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	621-1000	Caney Creek	Siltation	Done
Little Tennessee River Basin	TN06010204	002-1000	Fork Creek	E. Coli	Done
Little Tennessee River Basin	TN06010204	004-1000	Bat Creek	E. Coli	Done
Little Tennessee River Basin	TN06010204	043-1000	Baker Creek	E. Coli	Done
Little Tennessee River Basin	TN06010204	045-1000	Notchy Creek	E. Coli	Done
Upper Clinch River	TN06010205	013-0500	Greasy Rock Creek	E. Coli	Done
Upper Clinch River	TN06010205	013-0620	East Fk Pa(i)nther Creek	E. Coli	Done
Upper Clinch River	TN06010205	064-0110	Thompson Creek	pH	Done
Powell river	TN06010206	006-0250	Gap Creek	E. Coli	Done
Powell river	TN06010206	007-0100	Little Creek	E. Coli	Done
Powell river	TN06010206	007-0700	Mulberry Creek	E. Coli	Done
Powell river	TN06010206	007-0710	Little Mulberry Creek	E. Coli	Done
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	004-0100	Grable Branch	Siltation	Done
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	011-0500	Hines Branch	Siltation	No, stream not impaired for silt.
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	011-0600	Knob Fork	Siltation	Done
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	011-0700	Grassy Creek	Siltation	Done
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	011-1000	Beaver Creek	Siltation	Done
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	011-2000	Beaver Creek	Siltation	Done
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	011-3000	Beaver Creek	Siltation	Done
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	014-0100	Williams Branch	Siltation	Done
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	014-1000	Bullrun Creek	Siltation	Done
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	026-1000	East Fk Poplar Creek	Siltation	Done
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	026-2000	East Fk Poplar Creek	Siltation	Done
Emory River	TN06010208	001-1000	Watts Bar Reservoir, Emory River Arm	PCBs and Chlordane	Done
Emory River	TN06010208	001-2000	Watts Bar Reservoir, Emory River Arm*	PCBs and Chlordane	Done
Emory River	TN06010208	001-3000	Watts Bar Reservoir, Emory River Arm*	PCBs and Chlordane	Done
Lower Tennessee Basin	TN06020001	1244-1000	Chattanooga Creek	PCBs/Dioxins	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	001-0600	UT to Sequatchie River	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	001-0910	UT to Shelton Creek	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	001-1100	UT to Sequatchie River	E. Coli	Done

ADDITIONAL TMDLS NOT ON LIST

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	TDEC Response
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	001-1300	Peck Branch	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	001-2000	Sequatchie River	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	005-0500	McWilliams Creek	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	005-1000	Sequatchie River	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	007-0400	Hall Creek	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	007-0600	Little Creek	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	007-0630	Browns Creek	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	007-0800	Swafford Branch	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	007-0900	Stephens Branch	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	007-1000	Sequatchie River	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	007-1100	Grassy Cove Creek	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	007-1200	Manning Spring	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	007-1400	UT to Sequatchie River	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	007-2200	Skilern Creek	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	007-2800	UT to Sequatchie River	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	008-0200	Maise Creek	E. Coli	Done
Sequatchie River	TN06020004	014-0100	Daniel Creek	E. Coli	Done
Guntersville Reservoir Basin	TN06030001	057-0611	UT to Laurel Lake	E. Coli	Done
Guntersville Reservoir Basin	TN06030001	057-0921	Hedden Branch	E. Coli	Done
Guntersville Reservoir Basin	TN06030001	057-0922	Clouse Hill Branch	E. Coli	Done
Guntersville Reservoir Basin	TN06030001	057-0925	Little Fiery Gizzard Creek	E. Coli	Done
Elk River Basin	TN06030004	017-0300	Everly Branch	Siltation and E. Coli	Both Done
Elk River Basin	TN06030004	043-1000	Richland Creek	E. Coli	No TMDL - different Richland Creek from 017-2000
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	012-3000	Big Rock Creek	Siltation	Done
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	027-1000	Duck River	Siltation	Done
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	027-0100	UT to Little Bigby Creek	Siltation	No, stream not impaired by silt.
North Fk Forked Deer River	TN08010204	004-0200	Bethel Branch	E. Coli	Done - was 004-0100
South Fk Forked Deer River	TN08010205	036-1000	Halls Creek	E. Coli	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	001-0800	Wade Creek	Siltation	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	001-1700	Gamble Branch	Siltation	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	007-0200	Catron Creek	E. Coli	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	009-1000	Poplar Creek	Siltation	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	011-2000	Bear Creek	Siltation	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	017-0100	Potters Creek	Siltation	No, stream not impaired by silt.
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	029-0100	Dry Creek	Siltation	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	030-0100	Turkey Branch	Siltation	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	031-1000	Sugar Creek	Siltation	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	032-1000	Cypress Creek	Siltation	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	033-1000	Camp Creek	Siltation	No, stream not impaired by silt.
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	034-0100	Old Channel of Nelson Cr	E. Coli	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	034-0300	Hyde Creek	Siltation and E. Coli	Both Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	034-2000	Cane Creek	Siltation/ Habitat Alteration	No TMDL - impairment due to channelization; not addressed by sediment tool

ADDITIONAL TMDLS NOT ON LIST

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	TDEC Response
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	034-3000	Cane Creek	Siltation/ Habitat Alteration	Impairment due to channelization.
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	056-1000	Flat Creek	Siltation and E. Coli	Both Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	062-1000	Jeffers Creek	Siltation	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	065-1000	Mathis Creek	Siltation	No, stream not impaired by silt.
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	072-1000	Richland Creek	Siltation	Done
Hatchie River Basin	TN08010208	073-1000	Richland Creek	Siltation and E. Coli	Both Done
Wolf River Basin	TN08010210	020-0310	May Creek	E. Coli	Done
Wolf River Basin	TN08010210	020-0400	North Fork Creek	E. Coli	Done
Wolf River Basin	TN08010210	020-2000	North Fk Wolf River	E. Coli	Done

*Reviewer identified approved TMDL(s) for the Related Cause(s), assuming this waterbody is part of the 1258.7 acre segment in the TMDL approved on 3/18/10 (waterbody ID ending 001-1000)

ID OR NAME ISSUES

Issue: After viewing all Final TMDL documents on TDEC website, Reviewer found discrepancies between Waterbody Names, IDs and segment lengths between Final TMDLs and the List

Suggested Resolution: TDEC needs to confirm if information on the List is correct and revise any information that is not accurate

Draft 2010 303(d) Listing Information				Issue	TDEC Response
Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name		
North Fk Forked Deer River	TN08010204	003-0300	Tucker Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0100" in an approved Siltation TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	021-0300	Beech Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0200" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	082-0900	Little Chestuee Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0200" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Elk River Basin	TN0603003	056-0250	East Fk Mulberry Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0300" in an approved Siltation TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Elk River Basin	TN6030004	017-0600	UT to Richland Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0300" in an approved Siltation TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Caney Fork River	TN05030108	043-0300	Blue Spring Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0300" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	010-0310	Rock Spring Branch	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0300" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	016-0400	Watson Branch	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0300" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	066-0300	Grandview Branch	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0300" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	013-0710	Rattlesnake Branch	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0310" in siltation TMDL and "-0610 in nutrients TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	018-0300	Kelley Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0400" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Lower Tennessee Basin	TN06020001	067-0600	Standifer Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0400" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Guntersville Reservoir Basin	TN06030001	057-0611	UT to Laurel Lake	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0511" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Duck River Basin	TN06040002	034-3000	Rutherford Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0610" in an approved Siltation TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
South FK Obion River	TN08010203	001-0900	Clear Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0700" in an approved Siltation TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Lower Kentucky Reservoir	TN06040005	032-0720	Little Beaver Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0710" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Caney Fork River	TN05030108	036-0920	Flynn Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0810" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	032-0820	Tipton Branch	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0810" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Guntersville Reservoir Basin	TN06030001	057-0921	Hedden Branch	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0811" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Guntersville Reservoir Basin	TN06030001	057-0922	Clouse Hill Branch	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0812" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Guntersville Reservoir Basin	TN06030001	057-0925	Little Fiery Gizzard Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0815" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved

ID OR NAME ISSUES

Draft 2010 303(d) Listing Information				Issue	TDEC Response
Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name		
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	005-1100	Beaverdam Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-0900" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Caney Fork River	TN05030108	033-3000	Bee Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-1000" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	003T-0100	Finch Branch	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-1000" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	018-2000	Harpeth River	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-1000" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	016-1200	Fivemile Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-1100" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	005-1200	UT to Candies Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-1100" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Holston River Basin	TN06010104	004T1250	Caney Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-1150" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Holston River Basin	TN06010104	004T-1300	Crockett Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-1200" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	005-1300	UT to Candies Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-1200" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	005-1400	UT to Candies Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-1300" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	697-1000	Fourth Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "1697-1000" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	719-1000	Williams Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "1719-1000" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	721-1000	Baker Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "1721-1000" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	723-1000	Goose Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "1723-1000" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	983-1000	Polecat Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "1983-1000" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Harpeth River Watershed	TN05130204	018-3000	Harpeth River	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-2000" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
North Fk Forked Deer River	TN08010204	004-0200	Bethel Branch	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-2100" in an approved Siltation TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Holston River Basin	TN06010104	004T-2200	Turkey Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-2100" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Holston River Basin	TN06010104	004T-2500	Mossy Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-2400" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Caney Fork River	TN05030108	036-0700	UT to Caney Fk River	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-3000" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Lower Clinch River	TN06010207	016-1000	Hinds Creek	Waterbody is identified with ID ending "-3000" in TMDL	Waterbody ID changed after TMDL approved
Upper Clinch River	TN06010205	013-0620	East Fk Pa(i)nther Creek	Waterbody is identified as "east fork paInter creek" instead of "east...panther..." in the approved TMDL	s/b "PANTHER" per topo 170SW
Emory River	TN06010208	020-0500	Fag(o)n Mill Creek	Waterbody is identified as "fagAn mill creek" instead of "fagOn mill creek" in the approved TMDL	listing is correct; s/b "FAGAN" per topo 123NW

ID OR NAME ISSUES

Draft 2010 303(d) Listing Information				Issue	TDEC Response
Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name		
South Fk Holston River Basin	TN06010102	0540-0800	Painter (?) Spring Branch	Waterbody is identified as "paintER spring branch" on the List; there is no "ER" in the name in either of the TMDL documents	s/b "PAINTER SPRING" per topo 206SE; listed as "PAINT SPRING" in previous 303(d) list
Obion River Basin	TN08010202	009-0700	Hurricane Creek	This waterbody is identified as "Biggs Creek" in the approved Pathogens TMDL	correct; listed as "BIGGS" in previous 303(d) list
Emory River	TN06010208	020-0600	Little Laurel Creek	The pH TMDL approved on 12/17/01 identifies the waterbody ending "-0600" as a 2.7 mile segment of Laurel Creek; the List identifies this waterbody as a 1.32 mile segment of Little Laurel Creek	020-0600 identified as "Laurel Creek" in 2004/2006/2008 approved 303(d) list; Waterbody ID renumbered on 2010 list.
Emory River	TN06010208	020-0700	Laurel Creek	The pH TMDL approved on 12/17/01 identifies the waterbody ending "-0700" as a 12.5 mile segment of Mill Creek, which is Fully Supporting uses for pH (i.e., no TMDL needed); the List identifies this waterbody as a 3.7 mile segment of Laurel Creek with an approved TMDL	020-0600 identified as "Laurel Creek" in 2004/2006/2008 approved 303(d) list; Waterbody ID renumbered on 2010 list. Also, mileage s/b 2.7 miles, not 3.7.

MISCELLANEOUS

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	Issue	Suggested Resolution	TDEC Response
Caney Fork River	TN05030108	043-4000	Calfkiller River	none	"Comment" column indicates that a habitat alteration TMDL has been approved; there are no approved TMDLs for this waterbody	Revise "Comment" field to indicate "Category 5. TMDL needed."	Agreed
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	026-2000	East Fk Stones River	E. Coli	"Comment" column indicates that a pathogens TMDL has been approved; there is no approved pathogens TMDL for this waterbody	Revise "Comment" field to indicate "Category 5. TMDL needed."	Agreed
Obey River Basin	TN05130105	019-1400	Big Piney Creek	pH	"Comment" column indicates that a TMDL has been approved for <i>iron</i> instead of <i>pH</i>	Revise "Comment" field to refer to correct cause	Agreed
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	001-2000	Upper Watts Bar Reservoir	none	"Comment" field indicates waterbody is in Category 4a; however, a TMDL is still needed for Low DO	Revise "Comment" field to indicate "Category 5."	Agreed
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	015-0100	Bacon Creek	none	"Comment" field indicates waterbody is in Category 4a; however, a TMDL is still needed for Nitrate=Nitrite	Revise "Comment" field to indicate "Category 5."	Agreed. Also, S/HA TMDL done (part of HUC-12 0304); should also be "NA"
Upper Tennessee River Basin	TN06010201	013-1000	Pond Creek	none	"Comment" field indicates waterbody is in Category 5; however, all causes have addressed by TMDLs	Revise "Comment" field to indicate "Category 4a. Impaired but EPA approved a pathogen TMDL for the known pollutant."	Agreed
Cheatham Reservoir Watershed	TN05130202	314-3000	Richland Creek	E. Coli	A TMDL was completed for this segment on 4/15/08, yet this doesn't appear on the List.	Please verify the segment is meeting standards for E. coli or indicate the segment as 4a for E. Coli.	segment de-listed in 2008
Elk River Basin	TN0603003	012-0400	Robinson Creek	Siltation	Reviewer identified discrepancy between miles impaired reported in the TMDL (23) and on the List (11.46); the waterbody does not appear as a partial delisting in Appendix A	Indicate why the segment length provided on the List is correct or revise the List to show the correct length as provided in the TMDL	Length changed from 2008 303(d) list

MISCELLANEOUS

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	Issue	Suggested Resolution	TDEC Response
Lower Kentucky Reservoir	TN06040005	032-0900	Mud Creek	none	Reviewer identified discrepancy between miles impaired reported in the TMDL (24.9) and on the List (8.53); the waterbody does not appear as a partial delisting in Appendix A	Indicate why the segment length provided on the List is correct or revise the List to show the correct length as provided in the TMDL	Length changed from 2004 303(d) list (2002 list used in TMDL)
South Fk Forked Deer River Basin	TN08010205	012-1200	Cub Creek	none	Reviewer identified discrepancy between miles impaired reported in the TMDL (27.0) and on the List (2.07); the waterbody does not appear as a partial delisting in Appendix A	Indicate why the segment length provided on the List is correct or revise the List to show the correct length as provided in the TMDL	Length changed from 2008 303(d) list
Hiwassee River	TN06020002	001-0100	Agency Creek	E. Coli	Reviewer identified discrepancy between miles impaired reported in the TMDL (32.7) and on the List (18.46); the waterbody does not appear as a partial delisting in Appendix A	Indicate why the segment length provided on the List is correct or revise the List to show the correct length as provided in the TMDL	Length changed from 2008 303(d) list
North Fk Forked Deer River	TN08010204	023-0200	Jones Creek	none	Reviewer identified discrepancy between miles impaired reported in the TMDL (50.6) and on the List (21.05); the waterbody does not appear as a partial delisting in Appendix A	Indicate why the segment length provided on the List is correct or revise the List to show the correct length as provided in the TMDL	Length changed from 2008 303(d) list
North Fk Forked Deer River	TN08010204	010-1200	Beech Creek	E. Coli	The Pathogens TMDL approved on 8/11/06 states "...no TMDL, waste load allocation, or load allocation was determined for Beech Creek at this time." Reviewer could not identify any subsequent TMDLs for this waterbody.	Revise Draft list to indicate priority rankings for TMDL Development	Agreed
Wolf River Basin	TN08010210	032-1000	Cypress Creek	none	There are two entries for segments with this ID, the same waterbody name and segment length; however the "Causes" are different. This appears to be a duplicate or errant listing.	Revise the list to provide the correct "Cause/TMDL Priority" information for the waterbody and remove the additional entry.	Agreed

MISCELLANEOUS

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	Issue	Suggested Resolution	TDEC Response
Powell river	TN06010206	006-0250	Gap Creek	Unknown Toxicity	There is no TMDL Priority given for the Related Cause	Provide a TMDL Priority for the Related Cause	Agreed; priority set to Low
Upper Clinch River	TN06010205	013-0610	West Fk Panther Creek	E. Coli	This waterbody does not appear on the List; however, as indicated in the TMDL approved on 5/13/10 it was determined to be impaired	Add waterbody to the List with "TMDL Priority" of "NA" and "Comment" field indicating TMDL complete and waterbody is in Category 4a	Agreed
Loosahatchie River Basin	TN08010209	021-3000	Big Creek	E. Coli	This waterbody is identified as requiring a TMDL; however a TMDL was approved on 11/16/01 for a 117.5 mile segment of Big Creek with the waterbody ID TN08010209021. The sum of river miles for segments of Big Creek with approved TMDLs according to the List is much less than 117.5.	Please confirm whether or not this segment was addressed in the 11/16/01 TMDL; if so, revise "TMDL Priority" to indicate "NA" and revise "Comment" field to indicate TMDL(s) completed, if not, no action is required	TMDL approved in 2001 covered Big Creek (from mouth to Big Crooked Creek). This portion of Big Creek was not included. Revised TMDL ready for PN.
Loosahatchie River Basin	TN08010209	021-4000	Big Creek	E. Coli	This waterbody is identified as requiring a TMDL; however a TMDL was approved on 11/16/01 for a 117.5 mile segment of Big Creek with the waterbody ID TN08010209021. The sum of river miles for segments of Big Creek with approved TMDLs according to the List is much less than 117.5.	Please confirm whether or not this segment was addressed in the 11/16/01 TMDL; if so, revise "TMDL Priority" to indicate "NA" and revise "Comment" field to indicate TMDL(s) completed, if not, no action is required	TMDL approved in 2001 covered Big Creek (from mouth to Big Crooked Creek). This portion of Big Creek was not included. Revised TMDL ready for PN.
Little Tennessee River Basin	TN06010204	042-1000	Ninemile Creek	E. Coli	This waterbody is not identified on the List; however, it is unclear why it does not appear as a Category 4a water, as none of the other waters in the same TMDL document were identified as having completed E. Coli TMDLs on the List	Confirm whether the waterbody is meeting water quality standards or add the waterbody to the List in Category 4a, as appropriate	Agreed

MISCELLANEOUS

Basin/Watershed	8 Digit HUC	Waterbody ID	Waterbody Name	Related Cause(s)	Issue	Suggested Resolution	TDEC Response
Stones River Basin	TN05130203	003T-0100	Finch Branch	E. Coli	Waterbody is identified as having completed TMDL; however, TMDL specifically states TMDL could not be developed for this waterbody	Revise Draft list to indicate priority ranking for TMDL and "Comment" field to remove "pathogen" from list of TMDLs approved	Agreed

MISCELLANEOUS

	EPA Issues	TDEC - WSM Response			Unresolved
		303(d) changes	renumbered or renamed	confirmed correct	
Misc Comments	20	11	0	4	5
Unable to identify approved TMDL	112	43	0	69	0
Identified approved TMDL not on List	132	128	0	4	0
ID or name Discrepancies	48	1	47	0	0
Total	312	183	47	77	5