


Environmental Integrity Index Phase I & II (2011-2012) Watershed Summary Report



*Short Report SR-13-18 October 2013
Andrew Clamann, Aaron Richter and Emily Yeoman
City of Austin, Watershed Protection Department*

On the cover: EII sampled watersheds are shown outlined with dark bold lines with internal subwatersheds color-coded to reflect the EII total score from 2011 and 2012. Subwatershed scores are derived from the site(s) within each reach that are indicated on the map. Additional information regarding these scores and facets of these scores can be found in the watershed summary sections of this report.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Methods	4
Results	7
Recommendations and Acknowledgments	15
Watershed Summaries	16
Barton Creek	17
Bear Creek	29
Bee Creek	41
Blunn Creek	53
Boggy (North) Creek	65
Bull Creek	77
Buttermilk Branch	89
Carson Creek	101
Cottonmouth Creek	113
Country Club (East and West) Creek	125
Decker Creek	137
Dry Creek East	149
Dry (North) Creek	161
Eanes Creek	173
East Bouldin Creek	185
Elm Creek	197
Fort Branch	209
Gilleland Creek	221
Harpers Branch	233
Harris Branch	245
Hucks Slough	257
Johnson Creek	263
Lake Austin tributaries (Commons Ford, Cuernavaca, Running Deer, Turkey, Panther Hollow, Bear West)	275
Lake Creek	287
Little Barton Creek	299
Little Bear Creek	311
Little Bee Creek	323
Little Walnut Creek	335
Marble Creek	347
North Fork Dry Creek	359
Onion Creek	371
Rattan Creek	383
Rinard Creek	395
Shoal Creek	407
Slaughter Creek	419
South Boggy Creek	431
South Fork Dry Creek	443
Tannehill Branch	455
Taylor Slough North	467
Taylor Slough South	479
Waller Creek	491
Walnut Creek	503
West Bouldin Creek	515
West Bull Creek	527
Williamson Creek	539

Appendices

Appendix A: Benthic Macroinvertebrate Data by Site

Appendix B: Diatom Data by Site

Appendix C: Data Summary Tables by Watershed

This page left intentionally blank

EII Phase I & II (2011-2012) Watershed Report

Andrew Clamann, Aaron Richter, Emily Yeoman

Environmental Resource Management Division

Watershed Protection Department

City of Austin

Environmental Integrity Index (EII) Phase I & II data collected during 2011 and 2012 are presented and evaluated within the context of historical EII data collected since 1996. Fifty watersheds throughout the greater Austin area were sampled to assess environmental conditions. These values are in use as part of the Citywide Watershed Protection Department masterplan in prioritizing subwatersheds to address through Capital Improvement Projects, regulations and/or other programs. The values are also used in the WPD Business Plan as performance measures for water quality maintenance.

Introduction

Since 1990, City of Austin staff have conducted water quality monitoring on the lakes, creeks and streams in and around the Austin area. With the rapid growth of the Austin metropolitan area, this sampling has enabled tracking of changes in environmental quality in Austin area streams. Originally, city-wide monitoring of surface water relied largely on citizen volunteer support under a program called Water Watchdogs, which primarily targeted Austin's urban streams.

The Environmental Integrity Index (EII) was developed and tested in the urban watersheds in 1994 and 1995 and initiated citywide monitoring in 1996, absorbing and collaborating with the Water Watchdog program. During this transition the EII was expanded for use as part of technical assessments used in the citywide Watershed Protection and Development Review Department (WPDRD) masterplan. By the end of 2000, water quality monitoring frequency became a quarterly event and the biological and habitat surveys were completed once per year. 50 City of Austin planning watersheds were grouped into three phases and sampled on a three-year rotating basis with approximately 50 sites sampled per year. Phase 1 primarily included the urban watersheds sampled under the original Water Watchdog program while Phase 2 and Phase 3 included primarily suburban and developing watersheds (Figure 1 and Table 1). Phase 1 watersheds were sampled in 2000, 2003, 2006, Phase 2 watersheds were sampled in 2001, 2004, 2007 and Phase 3 watersheds were sampled in 2002, 2005 and 2008.

In 2009, following the completion of three full cycles of the three-phase rotation (2000-2008), the watersheds were regrouped into two phases for sampling on a two-year rotating schedule (Figure 2 and Table 2). The result of regrouping includes an increased frequency of site visits to improve the resolution of temporal trend evaluation, and will facilitate meeting the frequency requirements of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) for potential evaluation in the Clean Rivers Program. The current two-phase cycle involves the monitoring of 122 sample sites within 50 watersheds in the City's planning area.

This report presents data collected for the EII monitoring program in 2011 and 2012 and covers the associated water quality, habitat, and biological data. Data from the previous decade of EII sampling events are included for comparison within the watershed summary sections of the report. Biological data including diatom and benthic macroinvertebrate species lists and metrics are presented in Appendix A and B respectively. Raw water chemistry data is presented in Appendix C.

Methods

During the 2011-2012 Phase I & II sampling periods there were a total of 122 water quality sampling sites in 45 watersheds (Table 3 and 4). All data was collected adhering to the Water Resource Evaluation Standard Operating Procedures Manual. As part of these procedures, the collection of quarterly water quality sample at any given site is contingent upon there being baseflow conditions. This reduces the influence of recent stormwater or drought conditions. Annual biological samples collected in the late Spring or Summer may be collected from intermittent pools under drought conditions if it is the only available habitat.

Field measurements are collected with a multiprobe instrument (Hach Hydrolab) during the quarterly water quality and annual biological sampling events:

- Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)
- Specific Conductivity ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$)
- pH (Standard Units)
- Water Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)

Water samples submitted to the LCRA lab were analyzed for:

- Ammonia as N (mg/L)
- Nitrate as N (mg/L)
- Orthophosphorus as P (mg/L) (for Barton, Bull, Onion and Walnut sites only)
- Total Suspended Solids (mg/L) (for Barton, Bull, Onion and Walnut sites only)
- *Escherichia coli* bacteria (col/100ml) (for Barton, Bull, Onion and Walnut sites only)

Water samples were analyzed at the COA lab for:

- Turbidity (NTU)
- *Escherichia coli* bacteria (col/100ml)
- Orthophosphorus as P (mg/L) (for sites other than Barton, Bull, Onion and Walnut)
- Total Suspended Solids (mg/L) (for sites other than Barton, Bull, Onion and Walnut)

The physical and biological evaluations follow the methods described in the Water Resource Evaluation Standard Operating Procedures Manual, and monitoring occurs annually in the summer including:

- Benthic macroinvertebrate and diatom surveys
- Stream and reach stability assessment
- Non-contact recreational assessment
- Habitat assessment
- Flow measurement

Data from all sampling events (quarterly water quality events and one biological event) for a given year are analyzed, in part, through the use of eight sub-index categories, and one overall watershed score that are calculated for each watershed and normalized relative to the other watersheds for that year. Detailed description of the calculation methods are provided in the EII Methodology Report. Index reporting categories are:

- Aquatic Life Use Score
- Benthic Macroinvertebrate Score
- Diatom Score
- Water Quality Score
- Contact Recreation Score
- Non-Contact Recreation Score
- Sediment Quality Score
- Physical Integrity Score
- Overall Watershed Score

EII monitoring sites were selected to represent stream reaches within each watershed. Reach boundaries were determined based on patterns in geomorphology, hydrology and land use. This provides the ability to evaluate trends over time, while providing the flexibility to move site locations as necessary. Sample site and the corresponding reach designations are listed in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3. 2011 EII Phase I Monitoring Schedule*

Watershed	Site #	Site Name	2011			
			Mar	Jun	Jun	Sep
			WQ	WQ	Bio	WQ
Barton	44	Barton Creek @ Stark Pool	B	B	B	n
Barton	46	Barton Creek @ Shield Ranch Pool	B	B	B	n
Barton	48	Barton Creek @ Hwy71 below Little Barton	B	B	B	B
Barton	49	Barton Creek @ Ogletree	B	B	B	n
Barton	51	Barton Creek @ Lost Creek	B	B	B	n
Barton	879	Barton Creek between dams u/s BSP	B	B	n	n
Blunn	362	Blunn @ Long Bow	B	B	B	n
Blunn	364	Blunn upstream of Stacy Pool	B	n	n	n
Blunn	180	Blunn @ Riverside Dr	B	n	n	n
Boggy	2754	Boggy Creek @ Manor Rd	B	B	B	B
Boggy	837	Boggy Creek @ Nile Rd	B	B	B	B
Boggy	493	Boggy Creek @ Delwau	B	n	n	n
Buttermilk	3861	Buttermilk @ Victory Christian Center	B	n	n	n
Buttermilk	782	Buttermilk @ Providence Avenue	n	n	n	n
Buttermilk	851	Buttermilk @ Little Walnut Creek	B	B	B	B
Country Club East	1475	East Country Club @ ACC	n	n	n	n
Country Club West	850	West Country Club @ East Oltorf	B	B	B	n
Country Club West	1474	West Country Club @ Kreig Field	n	n	n	n
Decker Creek	1196	Decker Creek @ Lindell	n	n	n	n
Decker Creek	1974	Decker Creek @ Gilbert	B	B	B	B
East Bouldin	121	East Bouldin Creek @ Alpine Road	n	n	n	n
East Bouldin	119	East Bouldin Creek @ Elizabeth St	B	B	B	n
East Bouldin	1338	East Bouldin Creek @ Post Oak	B	n	n	n
Elm	1204	Elm Creek @ FM 973	n	n	n	n
Elm	3614	Elm Creek @ Austins Colony	n	n	n	n
Fort Branch	126	Fort Branch @ Glencrest	B	n	n	n
Fort Branch	125	Fort Branch upstream of Manor Rd	n	n	B	n
Fort Branch	898	Fort Branch @ Carson Hill Rd	n	n	n	n
Fort Branch	123	Fort Branch @ North Boggy Creek	n	n	n	n
Gilleland	1193	Gilleland Creek @ South Railroad Ave	B	B	B	B
Gilleland	1914	Gilleland Creek @ Cameron Rd	B	B	B	B
Gilleland	1194	West Gilleland Creek @ Cameron Rd	B	n	n	n
Gilleland	1191	Gilleland Creek @ West Parsons St	B	B	B	B
Gilleland	1192	Gilleland Creek @ FM973	B	B	B	B
Gilleland	886	Gilleland Creek @ FM969	B	B	B	B
Harper's Branch	844	Harper's Branch @ Woodland	B	n	n	n
Harris	1199	Harris Branch Creek @ Crystal Bend Dr	B	n	n	n
Harris	1201	Harris Branch Creek @ Boyce Ln	B	B	B	B
Johnson Creek	897	Johnson Creek @ Woodmont	n	n	n	n
Little Walnut	838	Little Walnut Creek @ Golden Meadow Rd	B	n	B	n
Little Walnut	3860	Little Walnut Creek @ Georgian	B	B	B	n
Little Walnut	3857	Little Walnut Creek @ Cameron Rd	B	B	B	B
Little Walnut	634	Little Walnut Creek @ US183	B	B	B	B
Shoal	118	Shoal Creek downstream of Crosscreek	B	n	n	n
Shoal	117	Shoal Creek @ Shoal Edge Courtt	B	n	n	n
Shoal	116	Shoal Creek @ 24th St	B	B	B	B
Shoal	122	Shoal Creek upstream of 1st St	B	B	B	B
Tannehill	3858	Tannehill Creek @ Berkman Dr	B	n	n	n
Tannehill	843	Tannehill Creek @ Lovell Dr	B	B	B	n
Tannehill	1476	Tannehill Creek @ Desirable Dr	B	n	n	n
Waller	780	Waller Creek @ 51st St	B	n	n	n
Waller	624	Waller Creek @ 23rd St (USGS)	B	B	B	B
Waller	38	Waller downstream of Cesar Chavez	B	B	B	B
Walnut	463	Wells Branch @ Walnut Metro Park	B	B	B	n
Walnut	895	Walnut Creek downstream of Metric	B	B	B	B
Walnut	464	Walnut Creek downstream of IH35	B	n	n	n
Walnut	502	Walnut Creek @ Old Manor	B	B	B	n
Walnut	503	Walnut Creek @ SP Railroad Bridge	B	n	n	n
West Bouldin	3856	West Bouldin Creek @ Cardinal & Locke	B	n	n	n
West Bouldin	3854	West Bouldin Creek @ Oltorf	B	B	B	B
West Bouldin	2794	West Bouldin Creek @ Post Oak	n	n	n	n
Williamson	490	Williamson Creek @ Hwy71	n	n	n	n
Williamson	491	Williamson Creek @ IH35	n	n	n	n
Williamson	223	Williamson Creek @ McKinney Falls	B	B	B	B

* B = baseflow n = no flow S = storm flow blue = Samples were taken grey = Samples were not taken blank = site not visited

Table 4. 2012 EII Phase II Monitoring Schedule*

Watershed	Site #	Site Name	2011	2012				
			Dec	Mar	Apr-May	Jul	Sep	
			WQ	WQ	Bio	WQ	WQ	
Bear	4112	Bear Creek @ Bear Creek Pass	B	B	B	B	n	
Bear	3935	Bear Creek @ Escondido	n	n	n	n	n	
Bear	1087	Bear Creek @ Twin Creeks Rd	n	B	B	B	n	
Bee	1104	Bee @ Loop 360	B	B	B	B	B	
Bee	322	Bee @ Roadrunner Rd	B	B	B	B	B	
Bee	319	Bee @ Lake Austin	B	B	B	B	n	
Bull	151	Trib 6 @ Bull Creek	B	B	B	B	B	
Bull	1164	Bull Creek Trib 5 d/s Hanks Tract Prop. Line	B	B	B	B	B	
Bull	349	Bull Creek above Trib 7 (Franklin)	B	B	B	B	B	
Bull	920	Bull Creek @ St Edwards Park above Dam	B	B	B	n	B	
Bull	350	Bull Creek @ Loop 360	B	B	B	B	B	
Carson	1096	Carson Creek @ Hoecke Ln	B	B	B	n	n	
Carson	1094	Carson Creek @ Shady Springs Subdivision	B	B	B	B	B	
Cottonmouth	1206	Cottonmouth Creek @ Dee Gabriel-Collins	n	B	B	n	B	
Dry Creek South	1211	Dry Creek South @ Pearce Rd	B	B	B	n	B	
Dry Creek South	1210	Dry Creek South @ Wolf Ln	B	B	B	n	B	
Dry North	1109	Dry Creek North @ FM 2222	B	B	B	n	n	
Dry North	1108	Dry Creek North @ Mt Bonnel Rd	B	B	B	B	n	
Eanes	1106	Eanes Creek @ Camp Craft Rd	B	B	n	n	n	
L.A.Bear West	1224	Bear Creek (West) @ Fritz Hughes Park Rd.	B	B	B	B	B	
L.A.Commons Ford	1048	Commons Ford Trib in C. F. Metro Park	B	B	B	n	n	
L.A.Cuernevaca	1222	Cuernevaca @ River Hills Rd.	B	B	B	n	n	
L.A.Panther Hollow	1223	Panther Hollow Creek @ Big View Rd.	B	B	B	n	n	
L.A.Running Deer	316	Running Deer @ Running Deer Trail	B	B	B	n	n	
L.A.Turkey Creek	1221	Turkey Creek @ City Park Rd	n	B	B	n	n	
Lake Creek	1100	Lake Creek below Meadowheath Dr	B	B	B	B	B	
Lake Creek	3978	Lake Creek @ Shadowbrook Club	B	B	n	n	n	
Lake Creek	1098	Lake Creek @ Sugar Berry Cove	B	B	n	n	n	
Little Barton	1115	Little Barton @ Hamilton Pool Rd	B	B	B	n	n	
Little Barton	1114	Little Barton @ Great Divide Dr	B	B	B	B	n	
Little Barton	77	Little Barton @ Barton Creek	B	B	B	B	B	
Little Bear	3374	Little Bear @ Ashmun Property	n	B	B	n	n	
Little Bear	1101	Little Bear @ Bear Creek	n	B	B	B	n	
Marble	232	Marble Creek @ Thaxton	n	B	B	n	n	
Marble	231	Marble Creek above Onion Creek	B	B	B	B	B	
North Fork Dry	1217	North Fork Dry Creek @ FM 812	n	B	n	n	n	
Onion	4595	Onion Creek @ Hudson tract	n	B	B	B	B	
Onion	612	Onion Creek nr Driftwood (Hwy 150)	n	B	B	B	B	
Onion	236	Onion Creek @ Twin Creeks Rd	B	B	B	B	B	
Onion	241	Onion Creek above Footbridge	B	B	B	B	B	
Onion	255	Onion Creek @ Mckinney Falls d/s Lower Falls	B	B	B	B	B	
Onion	1366	Onion Creek @ South Austin Regional	B	B	B	B	B	
Rattan	1009	Rattan Creek above Parmer	n	n	n	n	n	
Rattan	1097	Rattan Creek @ Shadowbrook Circle	n	n	n	n	n	
Rinard	1220	Rinard Creek @ FM 1327	n	B	n	n	n	
Rinard	1219	Rinard Creek @ Fm 1327 & Bradshaw Rd						
Rinard	5398	Rinard Creek Below SH 45	n	n	n	n	B	
Rinard	233	Rinard Creek @ Bradshaw	B	B	B	B	B	
Slaughter	623	Slaughter Creek @ FM 1826 (USGS)	B	B	B	n	n	
Slaughter	1082	Slaughter @ Pine Valley Dr	B	B	n	n	n	
South Fork Dry	1215	South Fork Dry Creek @ US183	n	B	n	n	n	
South Fork Dry	1216	South Fork Dry Creek @ FM 812	B	B	B	B	n	
Taylor Slough (N)	3969	Taylor Slough North @ Mayfield Pk	B	B	B	B	B	
West Bull	148	West Bull Creek @ Bell Mt. Rd	B	B	B	n	B	
West Bull	343	West Bull Creek above Bull Creek	B	B	B	n	n	

* B = baseflow n = no flow S = storm flow blue = Samples were taken grey = Samples were not taken blank = site not visited

Results

As described in the Methods section, data is normalized and scored by sub-index categories in order to rate the environmental integrity of each watershed or sub-watershed. The scores of the eight sub-index categories are averaged to provide an overall EII total watershed score. The total score can vary from year to year based on climatic influences, development within the watershed, minor changes in methods and other variables. Figure 3 lists the each watershed from the lowest to the highest ten-year average total score (2000-2010 shown in blue), for comparison to the current total scores (2011-2012). The ten year average is based on a total of four scores per watershed (three cycles on a three-year rotation and one cycle on the current two-year rotation).




Figure 3. Overall EII total watershed scores. Watersheds are listed in ascending order of their corresponding ten year average total score. The current (2011-2012) total score indicates that most watershed scores were similar to average score.

As shown by the graph, most watersheds are similar to their ten-year average with several notable exceptions. Three of the watersheds (L.A.Cuernavaca, L.A.Panther Hollow and North Fork Dry Creek) exhibited a significant increase in the current EII score above their 10 year average score (Fig 3). The two Lake Austin watersheds (Cuernavaca and Panther Hollow) exhibited the same higher-than-average scores in 2010. Some of these score improvements can be attributed to improved benthic macroinvertebrate and non-contact recreation scores, and lower concentrations of *E.coli*. In general, 2009-2010 total scores were consistent with the ten year average score. Watersheds that had significantly lower current scores than their ten-year average were small watersheds that are more susceptible to significant impacts during the drought conditions occurring in the current cycle.

Water chemistry data for each watershed for the 2011-2012 sample events are presented as box and whisker graphs in Figures 4a – 4i. The whiskers indicate the minimum/maximum values and the boxes indicate the interquartile range. The median and mean of each data set are shown as stars and horizontal lines respectively. The graphs indicate the general range of these data among watersheds and allows for easy comparison and identification of outliers. A more detailed evaluation of spatial and temporal trends within a watershed can be facilitated by reviewing the box and whisker graphs by reach and year in the watershed summary sections of this report.




Figure 4a. pH data from quarterly samples collected from 2011 and 2012 for all watersheds




Figure 4b. Conductivity data from quarterly samples collected from 2011 and 2012 for all watersheds




Figure 4c. Dissolved oxygen data from quarterly samples collected from 2011 and 2012 for all watersheds




Figure 4d. Orthophosphorus data from quarterly samples collected from 2011 and 2012 for all watersheds




Figure 4e. Ammonia data from quarterly samples collected from 2011 and 2012 for all watersheds




Figure 4f. Nitrate data from quarterly samples collected from 2011 and 2012 for all watersheds




Figure 4g. TSS data from quarterly samples collected from 2011 and 2012 for all watersheds




Figure 4h. Turbidity data from quarterly samples collected from 2011 and 2012 for all watersheds




Figure 4i. Bacteria data from quarterly samples collected from 2011 and 2012 for all watersheds

As shown in Figure 4a, pH levels were all within expected range. Baseflow and spring flow in Austin-area streams are typically weakly basic (between 7.5 and 8.5) due to the geology and soil which are dominated by limestone.

Conductivity (Figure 4b) was also generally within expected range (500-1000) with a few notable exceptions. Bee Creek sites had very high conductivity. Additional samples appear to indicate the source is residential (salt water pool), and the lower-than-normal dilution (due to drought-induced low baseflow) exacerbates the downstream conductivity levels. At the time of this report production, attempts are being made to address the issue. The other watershed with chronically high conductivity is Gilleland Creek. Gilleland Creek typically has high conductivity due to the treated wastewater-dominated baseflow.

Dissolved oxygen levels (Figure 4c) are largely affected by flow rate, temperature and nutrient input. Although low flow and high temperatures tend to lower the ability for water to maintain dissolved oxygen, stagnant pools with nutrient inputs can reach high daytime dissolved oxygen levels. While the majority of concentrations were between the expected range of 5.0 and 10.0 mg/L, a few watersheds were typically above or below this range. Williamson, Lake and Little Walnut were generally above 10.0 mg/L while East Bouldin, Fort Branch, Harpers Branch and Little Bear were below 5.0 mg/L. During the abnormally extreme drought conditions experienced during the 2011-2012 sample years, it is not surprising that observed dissolved oxygen levels were of a wide range.

Nutrient concentration is assessed by Nitrate as N, Ammonia as N, and orthophosphorus as P as shown in Figures 4d, 4e and 4f. Elevated nutrients were apparent in several watersheds. Gilleland and Harris Branch have historically chronically higher nutrient concentrations than the other EII watersheds, and the 2011-2012 sample years were no different. The baseflow of both streams are largely influenced by treated municipal wastewater. Also influenced by treated wastewater, Lake Creek has chronically high orthophosphorus. East Bouldin, Waller and Shoal Creek both appear to have elevated nutrients in addition to several other streams in the urban core.

As shown in Figures 4g and 4h, suspended sediment is shown to be elevated in several Austin watersheds based on both turbidity and total suspended solids (TSS) concentrations. The changing gradient and soil composition from the Balcones Escarpment of west Austin to the Blackland Prairie of east Austin must be taken into consideration. Higher sediment load should be expected to occur in the Blackland Prairie than the Balcones Escarpment. Watersheds that were high in turbidity and TSS during the previous sample years and are still high in 2011-2012 include Gilleland, Harris Branch, Decker, Dry Creek (east) and North Fork Dry. Some sites in other watersheds had unexpected turbidity and/or TSS including Barton, Harpers Branch, and Bear West (a tributary of Lake Austin).

Elevated bacteria levels (as indicated by *E.coli* concentrations) may indicate potential health risk from contact recreation in Austin’s streams. The source of bacteria in surface water is diverse and often difficult to isolate. Aging wastewater line infrastructure, episodic wastewater overflows and lift station problems and failing septic systems are all a reality of urban and suburban life. Other sources include mammalian waste both direct and carried by storm runoff from pets, wildlife, livestock and humans. Watersheds with elevated *E.coli* concentrations whose median sample values met or exceeded 500 MPN/dL for the 2011-2012 sample events included Boggy, Buttermilk, Dry East, Harris Branch, Shoal, South Fork Dry, and West Bouldin. With the exception of South Fork Dry, all of these watersheds were noted in the previous biennial EII report to have concerns for elevated bacteria, and all of these watersheds had discreet samples that exceeded 1,000 MPN/dL. Some watersheds, such as Country Club West, East Bouldin, Bull, Lake and Walnut had single samples that were in excess of 1,000 MPN/dL, but may not indicate a chronic problem.

Results of benthic macroinvertebrate sampling for the 2011-2012 summer events indicate that despite the impacts of the recent drought, most sites were similar to, or better than, their historic averages (Fig 5). This can be explained in part because prior to 2008, benthic macroinvertebrates were not sampled at sites that did not have flow. Sites without flow had received a score of “0”, which artificially lowered historic scores. Starting in 2008, benthic macroinvertebrates were sampled from pools when baseflow was not observed in order to document and evaluate the aquatic life that these reaches support even during drought conditions.




Figure 5. Benthic macroinvertebrate sub-index score for EII watersheds. Watersheds are listed in ascending order of their corresponding ten year average benthic macroinvertebrate sub-index score. The current (2011-2012) sub-index score shows that most watersheds scored higher than their average score. Watersheds with an asterisk (*) indicate sites that were dry during 2011-2012, therefore they should not be interpreted as a score of zero.

Notable improvements included Cottonmouth, Marble, Dry North, and Williamson which increased more than 20 points above their historic average. Detailed results of the individual metric parameters and species lists for each site can be reviewed in Appendix A of this report. Sites that score well for the benthic macroinvertebrate sub-index generally have good diversity (>20 taxa), an average pollution tolerance value higher than 6, a moderate to low percentage of predators (<25%) and several (>4) tax of mayflies, stoneflies and caddisflies. Watersheds with reliable flow and lower impervious cover generally maintain benthic macroinvertebrate communities with higher integrity.

A consequence of the ongoing drought, several sites were not sampled due to dry conditions. Some watersheds which normally have baseflow had stopped flowing during the sample season, but maintained water in pools. These pools contained a concentration of life (from both riffle and pool habitats) and the higher-than-normal scores reflected the increased diversity captured in kicknets. This appears to be true for several of the eastern watersheds such as Fort Branch, Marble, Rinard, Cottonmouth, Dry, Buttermilk and Carson.

Similar to the benthic macroinvertebrate scores, the diatom community generally showed 2011-2012 scores that were the same or better than the respective historic average (Fig 6). This is consistent with a general increase of scores in the 2009-2010 sample years. Similarity of current scores to historic average is likely due to a more consistent sample protocol than benthic macroinvertebrates. Detailed results of the individual diatom metrics and species lists for each site can be found in Appendix B of this report.




Figure 6. Diatom sub-index score for EII watersheds. Watersheds are listed in ascending order of their corresponding ten year average diatom sub-index score. The current (2011-2012) sub-index score shows that all but five watersheds scored higher than their average score. Watersheds with an asterisk (*) indicate sites that either the site was dry, or had inadequate diatom habitat in 2011-2012, therefore they should not be interpreted as a score of zero.

In both diatom and benthic sub-index scores, the aquatic life scores are generally higher in watersheds that are sub-urban and/or less intensely developed indicating a correlation between historic development practices and stream integrity.

Recommendations

The 2009-2010 EII report indicated concerns for bacteria in Johnson and Taylor Slough South, nutrients in Harris Branch, and conductivity/nutrients/sediment load in Dry Creek East. Based on the 2011-2012 data presented in this report and the historical and reach-based data presented in the individual watershed summaries, additional evaluation and/or follow-up monitoring may be warranted. The following watersheds have been identified accordingly:

- **Bee Creek:** Conductivity levels are elevated at the middle reach and downstream reach. The increase in conductivity was exacerbated under the 2012 drought conditions. During a routine follow-up of the 2012 EII event, the source was identified to be a salt-water pool discharging to the creek. Attempts are underway to address the conductivity inputs.
- **Boggy Creek:** All *E.coli* concentrations for Boggy Creek (east) were above 1,500 MPN (several above 2,000) MPN. Observations for at least one location indicated human contamination. Since other parameters (i.e. conductivity, nutrients, turbidity) did not appear high, the source of the bacteria may be localized and preventable. Follow up with Austin Water Utility and appropriate stakeholders is ongoing as well as a variety of restoration activities in this watershed.
- **Buttermilk, Shoal, South Fork Dry, and West Bouldin:** Additional evaluation is necessary to identify location and magnitude of chronically elevated *E.coli* concentrations in these urbanized or urbanizing creeks.
- **Dry Creek East:** Chronically elevated conductivity, nutrients, TSS, and turbidity are coupled with increasing *E.coli* concentrations in the downstream reach. The specific source of these issues is unclear. Soil disturbance due to development, agricultural inputs and waste water infrastructure should be evaluated in the context of the location and temporal patterns that have been established. There is also a City of Austin wastewater discharge facility that will merit attention for both pre- and post- implementation monitoring and assessment.
- **Harris Branch:** All three nutrients assessed in the EII program (orthophosphorous, ammonia, nitrate) were chronically elevated in the 2011-2012 sample events and appear to be increasing since 2002. A review of the reach data indicates nutrient concentrations in the bottom half of the watershed are significantly higher than the headwaters. There are two permitted wastewater discharges in the downstream reach. This watershed also shows elevated *E.coli* which may be a result of episodic wastewater spills. Current efforts of the Austin Water Utility are underway to take smaller wastewater facilities, such as package plants and lift stations, off-line in Harris and Gilleland watersheds. Future sampling should verify whether these efforts reduce nutrient and bacteria concentrations.
- **Johnson Creek:** Mean values of *E.coli* for Johnson Creek have historically been high, and were included as a topic of concern in the previous EII report. Unfortunately Johnson Creek was dry during the recent sample events due to drought, so no new information has been acquired. Therefore, although there was an illicitly connected lateral wastewater line that was corrected in 2010, Johnson Creek is still being scrutinized for potential non-point bacteria sources.
- **Taylor Slough South:** Mean values for *E.coli* have historically been high, and was included as a topic of concern in the previous EII report. Bacteria concentrations in Taylor Slough South are still elevated and this creek is one of four that are part of a TCEQ Total Maximum Daily Load analysis and Implementation Plan, which includes additional scrutiny a range of proposed solutions that should be put into place late in FY2014.

Acknowledgments

This report was produced by the COA Watershed Protection Department, Water Resource Evaluation section led by Ed Peacock. Report sections and appendices were assembled by Andrew Clamann and Emily Yeoman. GIS maps were created by Kathryn Murray. Field support for water quality sampling in 2011 through 2012 was primarily provided by Mateo Scoggins, Mary Gilroy, Andrew Clamann, Staryn Wagner, Todd Jackson, Alex Duncan of the Surface Water team. Data management, EII scores, summary graphs and assistance in the field were supported by Chris Herrington, Robert Clayton and Aaron Richter of the Watershed Modeling and Analysis team. The cumulative efforts of these teams provide a large, comprehensive, and quality assured dataset that resides within a database that has high utility and flexibility.

Watershed Summaries

The following summaries present a review of each watershed listed in alphabetical order. Each watershed section is eleven pages in length and includes: a summary sheet, a land use map, an aerial photograph, data summary graphs (box and whisker graph), score summary graphs (line graphs) and two pages of site photographs. Details of each section are described below:

Summary sheet – This sheet includes a brief list of watershed facts that describe the physical and development characteristics of the watershed. An overview map is located at the top right-hand corner of the page which shows the corresponding Phase watersheds relative to the featured watershed. The flow presence graphic for all sites in the watershed sampled over the span of the past decade is presented in the middle of the page. A table with an overview of the physicochemical, nutrient, sediment and biological data from the current sampling year is located in the middle of the summary sheet. The mean, minimum and maximum values for each parameter are presented with comments which discuss the results in general terms. The complete data set for the site data from 2011 and 2012 is provided in Appendix C. The last table on the summary sheet shows EII scores by reach, from downstream to upstream, and year for each sub-index and total reach score.

Land use and aerial photograph maps – The land use map shows both current and historical sampling sites within the featured watershed. Property parcels are color coded to reflect land use designations as determined by current COA GIS date (2006 with updates). Dark bold outlines indicate the watershed boundaries, and the interior sub-watershed reach boundaries. The aerial photograph map uses 2011 aerial photography (winter “leaf-off”) with both current and historical sampling sites, in addition to other development related features within the watershed.

Data summary graphs – The five pages following the maps present the water quality parameter in box-and-whisker graphs by reach and by year (Fig. 7) to facilitate evaluation of both temporal and spatial trends. The most downstream site is the first reach (i.e. BER1), and increase in number toward the headwaters. Reach data for a given year is presented left to right, downstream to upstream (i.e. mouth to headwater) in order to facilitate the evaluation of spatial trends within the watershed. Reach data are clustered by sample year from historical to current (left to right). A thin solid line through each graph indicates the median value for each parameter for all EII data since 1999 to provide context to conceptualize what may be above or below “average”.




Figure 7. Legend for box-and-whisker plots

Summary graphs – EII sub-index and total scores for each reach over the past decade are presented as line graphs. Smaller watersheds with only a single reach will appear as a single set of points, while larger watersheds with multiple reaches will appear as multiple line graphs which can be evaluated for spatial trends within the watershed from upstream to downstream (left to right).

Site photographs – Photographs for each site were selected from previous site visits based on their ability to represent the characteristics of the site. The photo title indicates the site number, transect number, perspective (upstream/downstream or upriffle/downriffle) and date. For example, a photo title of 44_t03-us-09_17_2008 indicates that the photo was taken at site number 44 at transect 3, of the upstream reach on Sep 17, 2008.