

Status of the Watershed

A Report from the Upper White River Basin Foundation

(Doing business as Ozarks Water Watch)

On Water Quality in the Ozarks

October 2009



Picture by Barb Kerbox

Upper White River Basin Foundation

P.O. Box 6218

Branson, MO 65615

www.uwrbb.org

Status of the Watershed

A Report from the Upper White River Basin Foundation,

Ozarks Water Watch

On Water Quality in the Ozarks

October, 2009

Why this Study

The rivers, lakes and streams in southwest Missouri and northwest Arkansas establish a foundation for the region's economic prosperity and attractive lifestyle. That's why the quality of these distinctive water resources is so important. If these waters become polluted or spoiled by unconstrained growth and development, they will diminish the vibrant economy, discourage visitors and tourism, and compromise the enjoyment so many in the region now find in these natural assets.

This second annual report is based on a region-wide assessment of the quality of Ozark waters. It is intended to provide a general answer to the question, "How is the water?" As importantly, by raising flags this study can point directions for focused measures to safeguard our rivers, lakes and streams.

The report is based on sound scientific studies of water quality conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and science faculty from the University of Arkansas and Missouri State University. This report contains a brief summary of the study process and the key findings. The full research reports are available on the Foundation's website at uwr.org.

Measures of Water Quality

This year's report includes the results of several assessments of water quality in the upper White River basin. The first assessment is based on the analysis of water quality samples conducted by USGS. The samples drawn were analyzed for chemical, physical and biological parameters. This evaluation is substantially similar to the first report prepared a year ago and is summarized in a "Water Quality Index" or "WQI" score with a letter grade assigned.

A second assessment has involved stream surveys of macroinvertebrates, the little creatures that live under the rocks in streams and act like canaries in the mine. Their presence or absence is a strong indicator of the ecological health of the stream and constitutes a second dimension of water quality in a "Stream Condition Index" or "SCI." Rather than a letter grade, each site evaluated is rated according to an index scale and characterized as "unimpaired," "impaired" and "very impaired."

As further support for the Water Quality and Stream Condition Indices, a study of fluvial geomorphology was conducted at consistent test sites. This study focused on why streams look as they do and the analysis of channel characteristics and riparian conditions to evaluate channel form, sedimentation and stream stability. By evaluating the amount of fine sediment deposited in stream channels and coarse sediment embedded in stream bottoms, insights can be obtained about the impact on aquatic habitat and upstream conditions affecting water quality. The detailed report on the Geomorphic Channel Assessment can be found on the Foundation's website at uwrp.org.

What We Found

This year's report again finds that water quality in the region is threatened by development. The biological assessment of stream ecology resulting in the SCI finds every stream site surveyed to be classified as "impaired," with scores ranging from 8 ("very impaired") to a high of 14 ("impaired") out of a possible 20. Scores of 16 and above are considered "unimpaired."

The results of the sample analysis contained in the WQI received index scores ranging from 30 to 87.8 on the 100 point scale as in the prior year report. The analysis of longer term trends in water quality showed no statistical change for 60% of the sites, although six parameters showed a significant decrease in trend and seven showed a significant increase. The trend analysis overall indicates some stability in water quality but at a low level (see full report on the website for all details).

The map of the upper White River region below indicates the location of the sampling sites identified for the study. Following the map is a table listing the survey sites and the assessments applicable to each. Tables summarizing the Water Quality Index (WQI) and the Stream Condition Index (SCI) scores are then shown in tabular form below. A full discussion of the procedures used in developing the indices is contained in the reports available on the Foundation's website at uwrp.org.



Upper White River Basin




Table 1 below shows stream water quality monitoring sites in the Upper White River Basin and the studies that were conducted at each site.

Site #	Sub-basin	Site name	Water Quality Index	Water Quality Trend analysis	Biological Index	Geomorphic Assessment
07052152	James	Wilson Creek near Brookline, MO	X	X		
07052250	James	James River near Boaz, MO	X	X	X	X
07052345	James	Finley Creek below Riverdale, MO	X	X	X	X
07052500	James	James River at Galena, MO	X	X	X	X
07052820	James	Flat Creek below Jenkins, MO	X		X	X
07053810*	Bull Shoals	Bull Creek near Walnut Shade, MO				
07053900	Bull Shoals	Swan Creek near Swan, MO	X		X	X
07054080*	Bull Shoals	Beaver Creek at Bradleyville, MO				
07054285*	Bull Shoals	Pond Creek near Longrun, MO				
07048600	Beaver	White River near Fayetteville, AR	X	X	X	X
07048800	Beaver	Richland Creek at Goshen, AR	X			
07049000	Beaver	War Eagle Creek near Hindsville, AR	X	X	X	X
07048550	Beaver	West Fork White River east of Fayetteville, AR	X	X	X	X
07053250	Beaver	Yocum Creek near Oak Grove, AR	X		X	X
07050500*	Beaver	Kings River near Berryville, AR		X	X	X
07053207*	Beaver	Long Creek at Denver, AR				

* Not currently monitored by the USGS

Table 2 below shows flow-adjusted parameter scores and the overall Water Quality Index (WQI) scores for sites in the Upper White River Basin. Maximum score is 100. Preponderance of scores is in the 40's and 50's. (Bowles and Greene 2009)

Site	Site Number	Dissolved Oxygen	<i>E. coli</i>	TN	TP	Turbidity	WQI Score	Assigned Grade
West Fork White River – Fayetteville, AR	07048550	92.3	37.9	22.7	19.6	50	44.5	D+
White River – Fayetteville, AR	07048600	93.8	79.2	30.9	0	60.7	52.9	C
War Eagle Creek – Hindsville, AR	07049000	83.3	80	0	0	89.2	50.5	C
Wilson Creek – Brookline, MO	07052152	10	56.9	0	0	83.3	30.0	D
James River – Boaz, MO	07052250	96.4	96.1	0	3.8	n/a	49.1	C-
Finley Creek – Riverdale, MO	07052345	63.3	89.2	0	28.2	95	55.2	C
James River – Galena, MO	07052500	44.6	97.8	0	13.6	93.7	50.0	C
Flat Creek – Jenkins, MO	07052820	49.6	92.1	16.7	53.9	100	62.5	B-
Yocum Creek – Oak Grove, AR*	07053250	85.7	91.7	0	0	100	55.5	C
Swan Creek – Swan, MO	07053900	88.3	69.3	81.4	100	100	87.8	A-

*Gage height was used to estimate discharge

Table 3 below shows metric scores and the Stream Condition Index (SCI) scores calculated from the benthic invertebrate samples. The metric scores are presented with standard errors. Scores of 16 and above are considered “unimpaired,” 10-14 “impaired,” and below 10 “very impaired.” (Bowles and Greene 2009)

Site	USGS Site Number	Taxa Richness	EPT Richness	Shannon’s Diversity	Biotic Index	SCI Score
James River near Boaz, MO	07052250	13 ± 3.6	8.7 ± 2.3	0.6 ± 0.2	5.9 ± 0.0	10 impaired
Finley Creek below Riverdale, MO	07052345	12.3 ± 2.4	10 ± 1.7	1.3 ± 0.3	5.0 ± 0.3	10 impaired
James River at Galena, MO	07052500	14 ± 2.5	10 ± 1.2	1.6 ± 0.4	4.8 ± 0.6	12 impaired
Flat Creek below Jenkins, MO	07052820	16.3 ± 1.5	10 ± 1	1.6 ± 0.2	4.6 ± 0.3	12 impaired
Swan Creek near Swan, MO	07053900	14.7 ± 2.0	9.3 ± 0.7	1.9 ± 0.1	4.9 ± 0.1	14 impaired
White River near Fayetteville, AR	07048600	18.7 ± 3.3	9.3 ± 1.8	1.8 ± 0.2	5.8 ± 0.1	12 impaired
War Eagle Creek near Hindsville, AR	07049000	17.3 ± 0.9	11 ± 1.5	1.6 ± 0.4	5.3 ± 0.3	12 impaired
West Fork White River east of Fayetteville, AR	07048550	14.7 ± 1.5	10 ± 1	1.6 ± 0.0	5.7 ± 0.1	12 impaired
Yocum Creek near Oak Grove, AR	07053250	15 ± 1	9.7 ± 1.7	1.7 ± 0.0	5.3 ± 0.1	12 impaired
Kings River near Berryville, AR	07050500*	11 ± 4.5	8.7 ± 3.9	1.0 ± 0.5	5.6 ± 0.2	8 Very impaired

What Do These Scores Mean?

The overall assessment of water quality during the past year again earns what in our judgment is a middling “C” grade. Our waters generally are neither very bad nor very good.

For the most part our rivers, lakes and streams are adequate for their general intended uses for swimming, fishing, boating and with proper treatment, human consumption. From an aesthetic perspective our rivers and lakes continue to be attractive to the many people who use and enjoy them.

At the same time, these water resources continue to be far from pristine. They suffer from threats indicated in the WQI and SCI ratings. According to the measures we have employed in evaluating water quality, our waters are degraded although the tests indicate some degree of stability, albeit at a mediocre level, in long term trends.

This report is something like the evaluation of a patient with a persistent fever. Taking the person's temperature, essentially what we've done in this study, reveals the symptom but not the cause of the problem. A good physician will usually have some insight into the cause of a patient's problem. And in the case of our rivers and lakes we know what most of the causes are and what can be done to assure better water quality.

People's developments and activities lie at the root of water quality problems in most places. The elevated levels of nutrients and sediment caused by runoff are at the bottom of many current problems. Storm water from developed areas, sediment from unpaved roads and plowed fields, leaking septic tanks and improperly fertilized yards, fields, and golf courses all contribute to excessive nutrients and sediment in the watersheds. These "non-point" sources today cause much of the mischief in degraded water quality.

What Can and Should Be Done?

It's not enough to give a grade of "C" to our rivers and lakes and to worry about their long-term health. There are a number of measures that can be taken to address the causes of the fever affecting this environmental patient. The following recommendations can help treat the underlying problems:



- The results contained in this report need to be publicized. They need to be discussed in public meetings and forums. Groups with a direct stake in water quality---groups like chambers of commerce, city and county governing bodies, farm, watershed and civic organizations---can help raise red flags, make the public aware of the problem and support measures to keep our rivers, lakes and streams clean.
- Public bodies like health departments, city and county councils, commissions, quorum courts, and state agencies can review their regulatory responsibilities to the extent this may be relevant. These bodies can consider how effective their efforts are to assure compliance with regulatory standards for matters like development, storm water, septic systems, nutrient management and road maintenance. Regulations are not much good if they are not clearly communicated and enforced.

- Ways can and should be found to support watershed organizations in the region working, generally without sustainable funding, to educate and involve citizens in efforts to sustain clean rivers and lakes. Individuals and organizations should join and support the organization working on their local watershed.
- Citizens, once informed, can take measures on their property as well as support good public policy intended to keep rivers, lakes and streams wholesome. A new publication from this Foundation and the watershed groups working in the region offers practical, hands-on advice for landowners about being good stewards. Entitled “Living with Land and Water in the Ozarks: A Landowner’s Guide to Streamside Living,” this attractive publication is available without charge through any of the watershed organizations in the region or on the Foundation’s website at uwr.org.

Water quality is a continuing challenge and with population growth and economic development in the Ozarks it will not go away. Heightened awareness and sensitivity to this issue may be the most essential prerequisites to long-term solutions. This annual report is intended to help provide these essential things.

**Research for this Report Supported by the
Water Watch Alliance**

Marshfield Investment Co.

College of the Ozarks

Empire Bank

White River Valley Electric

Allied Waste Services

Commerce Bank

Taney County Commissioner

Drury University

Springfield Remanufacturing Corp
(In memory of Chuck Bachus)

