## **Grand Glaize Creek 319** Watershed Plan

Stakeholder Update



11/5/2021

## **Objectives**

- 319 plan in place by Spring 2023 to grant funding
- Collecting data for the next iteration
- Source inventory
- Baseline loading results
- Management measures

# Watershed plan will incorporate the 9 element framework

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Characterize the Watershed
  - i. Geology, Physiology and Soils
  - ii. Rainfall and Climate
  - iii. Population
  - iv. Land Cover
- 3. Nine Element Plan
  - A. Identification of Causes of Impairment and Pollutant Sources
  - B. Estimated Pollutant Loadings and Expected Load Reductions
  - C. Nonpoint Source Management Measures
  - D. Technical and Financial Assistance
  - E. Information and Education
  - F. Implementation Schedule
  - G. Milestones
  - H. Assessment Criteria
  - I. Monitoring

Grand Glaize Creek Nine Element Watershed Plan for Bacteria and Nutrients

2021

Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District



Metropolitum St. Louis Sever District Grand Glatue Creek Nine Element Watershed Plan

## Grand Glaize is a highly urbanized watershed

- Size 61.9 km<sup>2</sup>
- Population 55,211 (2019 5-yr ACS)
- Soils Predominantly Class C (clay soils with slow infiltration)
- Average Precipitation 41.3 in/yr
- Land Use
  - Developed, Low Intensity 44.8%
  - Developed, Med Intensity 9.8%
  - Developed, High Intensity 4.8%
  - Developed, Open Space 19.9%
  - Deciduous Forest 18.6%



## Plan will address *E. coli* and TP

Waterbody (WBID)	Waterbody Size	Pollutant (year listed)	Impaired Use	Source of Impairment
		E.coli (2008)	Whole Body Contact- B	Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers
Grand Glaize Creek (2184)	4 miles	Chloride (2006)	Warm Water Aquatic Life	Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers
		Mercury in Fish Tissue (2002)	Human-Health Protection (Fish Consumption)	Atmospheric Deposition – Toxics
Simpson Park Lake	64 acres	Chl-a (2020)	Warm Water Aquatic life	NA



#### Grand Glaize Creek at Valley Park



#### Simpson Park Lake

Year	Chlorophyll a, ug/L	Total Phosphorus, ug/L	Total Nitrogen, ug/L
2015	46	86	795
2016	28	82	804
2017	21	57	700
2018	24	61	804
2019	34	102	904
Impairment Threshold	22		
Screener	13	40	733

## E. coli baseline derived using data after 2016



#### Notes:

- Data from Valley Park station
- Limited E. coli data to after 2016 when final constructed SSO was removed
- Flow scaled up by a factor of 1.11

					Percent Reduction
	<b>Flow Duration</b>	Median	Geomean Conc.	Annualized Load	to Meet <i>E. coli</i>
Flow Regime	Interval	Flow, cfs	(#/100 mL)	(counts/year)	Criterion
High Flows	0-10%	112	1,673	1.68E+14	87.7%
<b>Moist Conditions</b>	10-40%	14	1,134	4.38E+13	81.8%
Mid-Range Flows	40-60%	6	401	4.49E+12	48.6%
Dry Conditions	60-90%	3	477	3.69E+12	56.8%
Low Flows	90-100%	1	230	2.28E+11	10.4%
			Weighted	T-+-1 2 20T-14	Weighted Average <sup>2</sup>
			Geomean <sup>1</sup> = 630	10tal = 2.20E + 14	= 61%

<sup>1.</sup> Weighted geomean = 1,673^0.1\*1,134^0.3\*401^0.2\*477^0.3\*230^0.1

<sup>2.</sup> Weighted average = 0.877\*0.1+0.818\*0.3+0.486\*0.2+0.568\*0.3+0.104\*0.1

## TP baseline accounts for MS4 measures and target reduction based on modeling



Existing Loads (geomean of observed data)

Observed

Notes:

- Data from Valley Park station
- TP not available after 2011
- Assumed 5% reduction to account for watershed improvements
- Flow scaled up by a factor of 1.11
- Target TP modeled in BATHTUB

Flow Regime   Interval   Flow,cfs   Conc.(mg/L)   (lbs/day)   Load (lbs/yr)   (lbs/yr)     High Flows   0-10%   112   0.294   177   6,476   2,867     Moist Conditions   10-40%   14   0.196   15   1,669   1,107     Mid-Range Flows   40-60%   6   0.166   5.6   411   321     Dry Conditions   60-90%   3   0.153   2.4   261   221     Low Flows   90-100%   1   0.143   0.9   31   28		<b>Flow Duration</b>	Median	Geomean	<b>Observed Load</b>	Annualized	Target Load <sup>1</sup>
High Flows   0-10%   112   0.294   177   6,476   2,867     Moist Conditions   10-40%   14   0.196   15   1,669   1,107     Mid-Range Flows   40-60%   6   0.166   5.6   411   321     Dry Conditions   60-90%   3   0.153   2.4   261   221     Low Flows   90-100%   1   0.143   0.9   31   28     Total (lbs/year)   8,848   4,545     Percent Reduction to Meet Target Load <sup>2</sup> 46%	<b>Flow Regime</b>	Interval	Flow, cfs	Conc. (mg/L)	(lbs/day)	Load (lbs/yr)	(lbs/yr)
Moist Conditions   10-40%   14   0.196   15   1,669   1,107     Mid-Range Flows   40-60%   6   0.166   5.6   411   321     Dry Conditions   60-90%   3   0.153   2.4   261   221     Low Flows   90-100%   1   0.143   0.9   31   28     Total (lbs/year)   8,848   4,545     Percent Reduction to Meet Target Load <sup>2</sup> 46%	High Flows	0-10%	112	0.294	177	6,476	2,867
Mid-Range Flows   40-60%   6   0.166   5.6   411   321     Dry Conditions   60-90%   3   0.153   2.4   261   221     Low Flows   90-100%   1   0.143   0.9   31   28     Total (lbs/year)   8,848   4,545     Percent Reduction to Meet Target Load <sup>2</sup> 46%	Moist Conditions	10-40%	14	0.196	15	1,669	1,107
Dry Conditions   60-90%   3   0.153   2.4   261   221     Low Flows   90-100%   1   0.143   0.9   31   28     Total (lbs/year)   8,848   4,545     Percent Reduction to Meet Target Load <sup>2</sup> 46%	Mid-Range Flows	40-60%	6	0.166	5.6	411	321
Low Flows   90-100%   1   0.143   0.9   31   28     Total (lbs/year)   8,848   4,545     Adjusted baseline load (lbs/year) <sup>1</sup> 8,406   4,545     Percent Reduction to Meet Target Load <sup>2</sup> 46%	Dry Conditions	60-90%	3	0.153	2.4	261	221
Total (lbs/year)8,8484,545Adjusted baseline load (lbs/year)18,40646%Percent Reduction to Meet Target Load246%	Low Flows	90-100%	1	0.143	0.9	31	28
Adjusted baseline load (lbs/year) <sup>1</sup> 8,406 4,545   Percent Reduction to Meet Target Load <sup>2</sup> 46%					Total (lbs/year)	8,848	
Percent Reduction to Meet Target Load <sup>2</sup> 46%	Adjusted baseline load (lbs/year) <sup>1</sup> 8,406					4,545	
				Pe	rcent Reduction to M	leet Target Load <sup>2</sup>	46%

<sup>1.</sup> Total load reduced by 5% to account for watershed improvements since data were collected (e.g., removal of constructed SSOs and implementation of MS4 BMPs).

 $^{\rm 2.}$  Target load is based on an instream concentration of 0.13 mg/L.

### **Element B – Estimated Source Contribution**



Source	EC Load, cfu/yr	Percent
Pet waste	7.37E+13	34%
Failing septic	5.46E+13	25%
Private laterals	7.39E+13	34%
Background	1.76E+13	8%
Total	2.20E+14	

**Total Phosphorus** 



Source	TP Load, lbs/yr	Percent
Pet waste	158	1.9%
Failing septic	612	7.3%
Streambank erosion	3,084	37%
Lawn fertilizer & yard waste	3,039	36%
Background	1,513	18%
Total	8,406	

## Pollutant sources addressed in watershed plan

- Point Sources
  - Municipal and Domestic Wastewater Permits
  - Site-Specific Industrial and Non-Domestic Wastewater Permits
  - Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits
  - General Wastewater and Non-MS4 Stormwater Permits
  - Illicit Straight Pipe Discharges
- Nonpoint Sources
  - Agricultural Runoff
  - Urban Runoff (non-MS4 permitted areas)
  - Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems
  - Other

Source	E. coli	ТР
Pet waste	Х	Х
Private sewer (failing septic and laterals)	Х	Х
Streambank erosion		Х
Lawn fertilizer & yard waste		Х
Internal loading		Х
Background/Non-anthropogenic	Х	Х

## Management measures addressed in the watershed plan

- Consent Decree Requirements
- Phase II Stormwater Management Plan
- Additional Management Measures
  - Enhanced Education & Outreach
  - Sewer Lateral Program
  - Septic Tank Replacement & Cleanout
  - Streambank Stabilization
    - Armored Stabilization
    - Biostabilization
  - Simpson Park Lake Enhancements



## **Next Steps**

- 1. Contact Information
  - i. Jay Hoskins: 436-8757, jshosk@stlmsd.com
  - ii. Jason Peterein: 436-8714, jtpete@stlmsd.com
  - iii. Thomas Sottile: 335-2111, tsottile@stlmsd.com

#### 2. Nine Element Plan

- A. Identification of Causes of Impairment and Pollutant Sources
- B. Estimated Pollutant Loadings and Expected Load Reductions
- C. Nonpoint Source Management Measures
- D. Technical and Financial Assistance
- E. Information and Education
- F. Implementation Schedule
- G. Milestones
- H. Assessment Criteria
- I. Monitoring

Grand Glaize Creek Nine Element Watershed Plan for Bacteria and Nutrients

2021

Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District



Metropolitum St. Louis Sever District Grand Glatue Creek Nine Element Watershed Plan

## Questions