# Below is an Electronic Version of an Out-of-Print Publication

You can scroll to view or print this publication here, or you can borrow a paper copy from the Texas State Library, 512/463-5455. You can also view a copy at the TCEQ Library, 512/239-0020, or borrow one through your branch library using interlibrary loan.

The TCEQ's current print publications are listed in our catalog at http://www.tceq.state.tx.us/publications/.

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

***Note: It is possible that these water bodies may be included on the 1998 List for other parameters.***

*Water bodies which are on the 1998 list for other parameters are denoted with an asterisk (✻). Water bodies de-listed from the 1996 List are denoted with a star (★).*

This list identifies water quality parameters for water bodies that were considered for inclusion in the 1998 List, but were excluded for the reasons shown below. Where the decision not to list is based on lack of sufficient data, additional monitoring will be conducted in conjunction with the next data collection phase of the basin management cycle for that water body to verify attainment of uses.

**Legend for coded column (3):**

Basin Group: Letter code (A - E) indicates which group of river basins the segment is associated with in the TNRCC basin management cycle.

- Group A - Canadian River, Red River, Sulphur River, Cypress Creek, Sabine River, Sabine Pass, Neches River
- Group B - Trinity River
- Group C - San Jacinto River, Neches-Trinity Coastal, Trinity-San Jacinto Coastal, San Jacinto-Brazos Coastal, Bays and Estuaries
- Group D - Brazos River, Brazos-Colorado Coastal, Lavaca River, Colorado River, Bays and Estuaries
- Group E - Guadalupe River, San Antonio River, Rio Grande, Nueces River, San Antonio-Nueces Coastal, Colorado-Lavaca Coastal, Lavaca-Guadalupe Coastal, Nueces-Rio Grande Coastal, Bays and Estuaries, Gulf of Mexico

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0102 | Lake Meredith | A | Initial data screening showed that the mean sulfate, chloride, and total dissolved solids concentrations exceed the secondary drinking water standards in finished water. Exceedance of these criteria at the levels detected do not pose a risk to public health or safety. |
| 0203 | Lake Texoma | A | Elevated levels of dissolved solids in source water have been observed. However, water systems are meeting the secondary drinking water standards through demineralization treatment and levels of dissolved solids in source water are not high enough to exceed surface water quality standards. |
| 0205 ✻ | Red River below Pease River | A | This water body was included in the 1996 CWA 303(d) list for exceedance of the chronic criterion for average cadmium in water. Because a question arose about the accuracy of the cadmium listing, the cadmium criteria were recalculated using hardness data collected from the water body. This raised the site-specific cadmium criterion and the aquatic life use is supported. |
| 0222 ★ | Salt Fork Red River | A | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies.<br>Water temperatures are also occasionally elevated; however, the temperature variation is seasonal and does not contribute to use impairment. |
| 0304 ★ | Days Creek | A | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 0403 ✻ | Lake O' the Pines | A | Only one out of 4 samples showed concentrations of copper in water above the acute criterion established to ensure the safety of aquatic life. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. |

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0409 ✻ | Little Cypress Creek | A | One sample (out of 10 total samples) for free ionic silver exceeded the acute criterion established to ensure the safety of aquatic life. This percentage of silver samples is below the amount that would constitute use impairment. |
| 0503 ✻ | Sabine River below Toledo Bend Reservoir | A | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. A small number of samples (4) indicate a concern for dissolved lead in water in the upper 25 miles. However, this is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. (Only 4 samples for dissolved lead; 1 detects; mean exceeds the chronic criterion.)<br>In the upper 25 miles of the segment, concentrations of dissolved cadmium in water appeared to exceed the criterion established to protect aquatic life. However, more recent data was submitted during the public comment period, and the average cadmium level, computed using this new data, was below the criterion for use impairment. |
| 0505 ✻ | Sabine River Above Toledo Bend Reservoir | A | This water body was included on the 1996 303(d) List for occasional depressed dissolved oxygen concentrations in a portion of the water body. Because a question arose about the accuracy of the dissolved oxygen listing, additional data was reviewed. Only 6.2% of dissolved oxygen readings were less than the segment criterion and the lowest value was only 0.1 mg/L below the criterion. EPA guidance suggests that partial impairment may exist if 10% or more of the dissolved oxygen readings are less than the criterion.<br>In the lower 25 miles of the segment, concentrations of dissolved cadmium in water appeared to exceed the criteria established to protect aquatic life. However, more recent data was submitted during the public comment period, and the average cadmium level, computed using this new data, was below the criterion for use impairment. |
| 0513 ✻ | Big Cow Creek | A | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. Only 4 samples were available for fecal coliform; 2 exceed criterion. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. |
| 0601 ★ | Neches River Tidal | A | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 0602 ★ | Neches River below B.A. Steinhagen Lake | A | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. Only 4 samples were available for cadmium and for lead at one monitoring station, and only 2 samples were available at a second station. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. |
| 0604 ★ | Neches River below Lake Palestine | A | The 1996 List indicated a concern for cadmium in water in an area near Rockland. However, correction of a error discovered in the database indicates no acute or chronic exceedances in 10 samples. Therefore, cadmium does not cause nonsupport of the aquatic life use. |
| 0606 ✻ | Neches River above Lake Palestine | A | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. Only 7 samples were available for sulfate. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. |
| 0607 ★ | Pine Island Bayou | A | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. Only 6 samples for dissolved oxygen and fecal coliform were available. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. A use attainability analysis by the TNRCC has been scheduled for this segment to evaluate applicability of the high aquatic life use and the causes of depressed dissolved oxygen. |

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0610 ✻ | Sam Rayburn Reservoir | A | One sample (out of 3 total samples) indicated a concern for dissolved lead in water in the lower 25 miles. However, this is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. |
| 0610-A | Paper Mill Creek | A | There is a concern for ambient toxicity. However, further assessment is necessary to determine use impairment, thus listing is not supported. Ambient toxicity data and other information will be considered in a comprehensive assessment targeted for this water body in the next two years as defined by the statewide watershed management schedule to determine if subsequent listing is necessary. |
| 0611 ★ | Angelina River above Sam Rayburn Reservoir | A | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. Only 7 samples for dissolved oxygen and 4 for aluminum were available. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions. The TNRCC has updated the wasteload evaluation for the segment and advanced waste treatment was recommended at major dischargers in order to maintain the dissolved oxygen criteria. |
| 0701-A | Privately-owned reservoir in Taylor Bayou watershed | C | Elevated levels of dissolved solids in source water have been observed. However, water systems are meeting the secondary drinking water standards through demineralization treatment and levels of dissolved solids in source water are not high enough to exceed surface water quality standards. |
| 0702-A ✻ | Alligator Bayou | C | There are some concerns for chlorophyll *a* and ammonia in water and for chromium, copper, lead, mercury, selenium, and zinc in sediments in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 0704 ✻ | Hillebrandt Bayou | C | There is some concern for ammonia in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for this parameter have not been developed. |
| 0801 ★ | Trinity River Tidal | B | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation in the lower 7 miles, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 0803 ✻ | Lake Livingston | B | There is a concern for orthophosphorus in water in 18.6% of the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 0804 ✻ | Trinity River Above Lake Livingston | B | There is some concern for nitrite + nitrate in water in 25 miles of the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0805 * | Upper Trinity River | B | There is some concern for nitrite + nitrate in water in 90 miles of the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 0806 * | West Fork Trinity River Below Lake Worth | B | There is some concern for chlorophyll *a* in water in 17 miles of the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 0821 * | Lavon Lake | B | There is some concern for nitrite + nitrate in water in 23.9% of the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 0822 * | Elm Fork Trinity below Lewisville Lake | B | Initial screening indicated that dissolved zinc concentrations exceed the acute aquatic life criterion. However, correction of a problem discovered in the database revealed the actual percentage of zinc concentrations exceeding the acute criterion was less than 10%. Therefore, listing for zinc is unwarranted. |
| 0824 * | Elm Fork Trinity River Above Lake Ray Roberts | B | There are some concerns for nitrite + nitrate and orthophosphorus in water in 8 miles of the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 0828 | Lake Arlington | B | Initial screening indicated that temperature exceeds the segment criterion in the middle portion of the reservoir due to thermal effects of power plant effluent. However, further examination of station locations indicates that some samples were collected in the discharge canal and mixing zone where water quality standards do not apply. |
| 0838 * | Joe Pool Lake | B | There are some concerns for cadmium and chromium in sediment in 40% of the segment, and for nickel in sediment in 80% of the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 0841 * | Lower West Fork Trinity River | B | There are some concerns for nitrite + nitrate, total phosphorus, and chlorophyll *a* in water in 21 miles of the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 1001 * | San Jacinto River Tidal | C | There are some concerns for manganese and mercury in sediment in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1003 ★ | East Fork San Jacinto River | C | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation in the lower 20 miles of the segment, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1004 ★ | West Fork San Jacinto River | C | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1005 ✻ | Houston Ship Channel/San Jacinto River Tidal | C | There is some concern for nickel in sediment in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 1006 ✻ | Houston Ship Channel Tidal | C | There are some concerns for arsenic, manganese, mercury, and nickel in sediment in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 1006-A ✻ | Patrick Bayou | C | Though data from the Houston Ship Channel Toxicity Study Project Report (July 1995) indicate a concern for dioxin, supporting data are insufficient to support a listing for dioxin. |
| 1007 ✻ | Houston Ship Channel/Buffalo Bayou Tidal | C | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. While the 1996 List showed copper in water exceeded the chronic criterion, some of the data were not collected using clean methods. The criterion was recalculated using more recent data, and copper did not exceed the criterion.<br>There are concerns for nitrite + nitrate in water; arsenic, zinc, flouranthene, bis-2 ethylhexyl phthalate, and benzo-b-flouranthene in sediment; however, no aquatic life impairments are observed. There are also concerns for chlordane and dieldrin in fish tissue in the segment; however, no human health impacts are observed, nor are any implied by Texas Department of Health consumption advisories. Available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 1009 ✻ | Cypress Creek | C | There are some concerns for nitrite + nitrate, orthophosphorus, and total phosphorus in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 1010 ★ | Caney Creek | C | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1012 ✻ | Lake Conroe | C | There is some concern for chlorophyll *a* in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 1013 ✻ | Buffalo Bayou Tidal | C | There is some concern for nitrite + nitrate in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 1014 ✻ | Buffalo Bayou Above Tidal | C | There is some concern for nitrite + nitrate in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 1016 ✻ | Greens Bayou Above Tidal | C | There is some concern for nitrite + nitrate, orthophosphorus, and total phosphorus in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 1017 ✻ | White Oak Bayou Above Tidal | C | There is some concern for nitrite + nitrate in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 1102 ✻ | Clear Creek Above Tidal | C | There is some concern for nitrite + nitrate and orthophosphorus in water in 25 miles of the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed.<br>Initial screening indicated that in the lower 25 miles, one in six water samples of 1,1,2-trichloroethane exceeded the acute criterion for aquatic life use. However, subsequent review of data revealed an error in screening for organic substances in water. This error caused the segment to be improperly listed for exceedance of the 1,1,2-trichloroethane acute criterion. |
| 1105 ★ | Bastrop Bayou Tidal | C | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. Bacteria levels appeared sometimes to exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation. Assessment of new data lowered the exceedance to less that 25% of samples, which is less than the level constituting nonsupport of the contact recreation use. |
| 1107 ★ | Chocolate Bayou Tidal | C | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1113 ✻ | Armand Bayou Tidal | C | There is some concern for chlorophyll *a* in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1201 ★ | Brazos River Tidal | D | The 1996 List was re-evaluated for fish consumption advisories. This segment was listed in 1996 for a restricted consumption advisory for the general population and a no consumption advisory for children and women of child bearing age, which were issued by the Texas Department of Health September 1990 due to elevated dioxin levels in fish tissue. The affected reach is south of FM 521 to the mouth of the Brazos River in Brazoria County. However, the TDH fish consumption advisory due to organics was rescinded in 1997.<br>While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation in the lower-most seven miles of the segment, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1205 | Lake Granbury | D | Elevated levels of dissolved solids in source water have been observed. However, water systems are meeting the secondary drinking water standards through demineralization treatment and levels of dissolved solids in source water are not high enough to exceed surface water quality standards. |
| 1207 | Possum Kingdom Lake | D | Elevated levels of dissolved solids in source water have been observed. However, water systems are meeting the secondary drinking water standards through demineralization treatment and levels of dissolved solids in source water are not high enough to exceed surface water quality standards. |
| 1208 ★ | Brazos River above Possum Kingdom Lake | D | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. Only 6 samples for fecal coliform were available. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. |
| 1209-A | Bryan Municipal Lake | D | There is a concern for ambient toxicity. However, further assessment is necessary to determine use impairment, thus listing is not supported. Ambient toxicity data and other information will be considered in a comprehensive assessment targeted for this water body in the next two years as defined by the statewide watershed management schedule to determine if subsequent listing is necessary. |
| 1210 ★ | Lake Mexia | D | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. Only 4 measurements were available for dissolved oxygen. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. |
| 1224-A | Lake Olden | D | Elevated levels of dissolved solids in source water have been observed. However, water systems are meeting the secondary drinking water standards through demineralization treatment and levels of dissolved solids in source water are not high enough to exceed surface water quality standards. |
| 1235 | Lake Stamford | D | Initial data screening showed that the mean sulfate, chloride, and total dissolved solids concentrations exceed the secondary drinking water standards in finished water. Exceedance of these criteria at the levels detected do not pose a risk to public health or safety. |
| 1237 | Lake Sweetwater | D | Initial data screening showed that the mean sulfate concentration exceed the secondary drinking water standards in finished water. Exceedance of these criteria at the levels detected do not pose a risk to public health or safety. |
| 1239 ★ | White River | D | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. Only 4 samples were available for average chloride, sulfate, and total dissolved solids. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. |

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1241 ★ | Double Mountain Fork Brazos River | D | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1242 ✻ | Brazos River Below Whitney Lake | D | Elevated levels of dissolved solids in source water have been observed. However, water systems are meeting the secondary drinking water standards through demineralization treatment and levels of dissolved solids in source water are not high enough to exceed surface water quality standards. |
| 1401 ★ | Colorado River Tidal | D | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1402 | Colorado River below La Grange | D | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1412 ★ | Colorado River below Lake JB Thomas | D | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation in the lower 25 miles, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies.<br>Elevated salinity levels, although not in excess of numeric standards, contribute to water use problems in E.V. Spence Reservoir downstream. This elevated salinity can be considered in the TMDL scheduled for E.V. Spence Reservoir. |
| 1412-A | Moss Lake | D | Initial data screening showed that the mean sulfate, chloride, and total dissolved solids concentrations exceed the secondary drinking water standards in finished water. However, exceedance of these criteria at the levels detected do not pose a risk to public health or safety. |
| 1412-B | Lake Colorado City | D | Initial data screening showed that the mean sulfate, chloride, and total dissolved solids concentrations exceed the secondary drinking water standards in finished water. However, exceedance of these criteria at the levels detected do not pose a risk to public health or safety. |
| 1413 | Lake J.B. Thomas | D | Initial data screening showed that the mean sulfate, chloride, and total dissolved solids concentrations exceed the secondary drinking water standards in finished water. However, exceedance of these criteria at the levels detected do not pose a risk to public health or safety. |
| 1415 ★ | Llano River | D | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation in the lower part of the segment below Llano, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1421 ✻ | Concho River | D | Initial data screening showed that the mean sulfate, chloride, and total dissolved solids concentrations exceed the secondary drinking water standards in finished water. However, exceedance of these criteria at the levels detected do not pose a risk to public health or safety. There is a concern for ambient toxicity. However, further assessment is necessary to determine use impairment, thus listing is not supported. Ambient toxicity data and other information will be considered in a comprehensive assessment targeted for this water body in the next two years as defined by the statewide watershed management schedule to determine if subsequent listing is necessary. |

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1426-A | Oak Creek Reservoir | D | Initial data screening showed that the sulfate concentration exceeds the secondary drinking water standards in finished water. However, exceedance of these criteria at the levels detected do not pose a risk to public health or safety. |
| 1426-B | Mountain Creek Reservoir | D | Initial data screening showed that the mean sulfate and chloride concentrations exceed the secondary drinking water standards in finished water. However, exceedance of these criteria at the levels detected do not pose a risk to public health or safety. |
| 1429 ✻ | Town Lake | D | There is a concern for ambient toxicity. However, further assessment is necessary to determine use impairment, thus listing is not supported. Ambient toxicity data and other information will be considered in a comprehensive assessment targeted for this water body in the next two years as defined by the statewide watershed management schedule to determine if subsequent listing is necessary. |
| 1434 ★ | Colorado River above La Grange | D | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1501 ★ | Tres Palacios Creek Tidal | E | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. Insufficient samples (<9) were available for fecal coliform bacteria and dissolved oxygen. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. |
| 1502 ★ | Tres Palacios Creek above Tidal | E | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. Insufficient samples (<9) were available for fecal coliform bacteria and dissolved oxygen. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. |
| 1803 ★ | Guadalupe River below San Marcos | E | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation in a five-mile portion of the segment, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1805 | Canyon Lake | E | Initial screening indicated that the mean sulfate concentration exceeds the secondary drinking water standards in finished water. However, further examination of the data indicates that drinking water samples were taken from a distribution system that mixed lake water with high TDS groundwater. Sulfate concentrations in the lake are low. |
| 1808 ★ | Lower San Marcos River | E | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation in a 50-mile portion of the segment, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1814 ★ | Upper San Marcos River | E | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 1903 ★ | Medina River Below Medina Diversion Lake | E | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. While the 1996 List showed that diazinon concentrations sometimes exceed the criterion established to protect aquatic life in the lower 5.5 miles. Subsequent review of data revealed an error in screening for organic substances in water. This error caused the segment to be improperly listed for exceedance of the diazinon criterion. |

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1910 ✻ | Salado Creek | E | While the 1996 List showed that diazinon concentrations sometimes exceed the criterion established to protect aquatic life in the lower 35 miles, subsequent review of data (the 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing) revealed an error in screening for organic substances in water. This error caused the segment to be improperly listed for exceedance of the diazinon criterion. |
| 1911 ✻ | Upper San Antonio River | R | While the 1996 List showed that diazinon concentrations sometimes exceed the criterion established to protect aquatic life in a 25-mile portion beginning at the Medina River confluence, subsequent review of data (the 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing) revealed an error in screening for organic substances in water. This error caused the segment to be improperly listed for exceedance of the diazinon criterion. |
| 1912 ★ | Medio Creek | E | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 2004 ✻ | Aransas River above Tidal | E | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. There are only 8 samples for fecal coliform. This is not enough samples to accurately characterize water quality conditions for use impairment. |
| 2102 ★ | Nueces River below Lake Corpus Christi | E | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 2104 ★ | Nueces River above Frio River | E | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 2201 ✻ | Arroyo Colorado Tidal | E | There is a concern for ambient toxicity. However, further assessment is necessary to determine use impairment, thus listing is not supported. Ambient toxicity data and other information will be considered in a comprehensive assessment targeted for this water body in the next two years as defined by the statewide watershed management schedule to determine if subsequent listing is necessary. |
| 2202 ✻ | Arroyo Colorado Above Tidal | E | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. While the 1996 List showed that concentrations of nitrobenzene, isophorone, and bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in water occasionally exceed the criteria established to protect aquatic life in the lower 4 miles, subsequent review of data revealed an error in screening for organic substances in water. This error caused the segment to be improperly listed for exceedance of the nitrobenzene, isophorone, and bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate criteria. |
| 2301 ★ | Lower Pecos River | E | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 2302 ✻ | Rio Grande Below Falcon Reservoir | E | Initial data screening showed that the mean sulfate and total dissolved solids concentrations exceed the secondary drinking water standards in finished water. Exceedance of these criteria at the levels detected do not pose a risk to public health or safety. |

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2304 ✻ | Rio Grande Below Amistad Reservoir | E | There is a concern for ambient toxicity. However, further assessment is necessary to determine use impairment, thus listing is not supported. Ambient toxicity data and other information will be considered in a comprehensive assessment targeted for this water body in the next two years as defined by the statewide watershed management schedule to determine if subsequent listing is necessary. |
| 2307 ✻ | Rio Grande below Riverside Diversion | E | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation in the upper third of the segment, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies. |
| 2308 | Rio Grande Below International Dam | E | There is a concern for ambient toxicity. However, further assessment is necessary to determine use impairment, thus listing is not supported.Ambient toxicity data and other information will be considered in a comprehensive assessment targeted for this water body in the next two years as defined by the statewide watershed management schedule to determine if subsequent listing is necessary. |
| 2314 ★ | Rio Grande above International Dam | E | While bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of contact recreation, there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Consequently, EPA eliminated the category of partial support for the contact recreation use and no longer requires listing of these water bodies.<br>There is a concern for ambient toxicity. However, further assessment is necessary to determine use impairment, thus listing is not supported. Ambient toxicity data and other information will be considered in a comprehensive assessment targeted for this water body in the next two years as defined by the statewide watershed management schedule to determine if subsequent listing is necessary. |
| 2411 | Sabine Pass | A | While the TDH classifies Sabine Pass as a prohibited area that does not support the oyster waters use, this is an administrative listing based on TDH's inability to regulate shell fishing in the waters shared with Louisiana. There is no sanitary survey for this water body. Therefore, nonsupport of the oyster waters use is not due to poor water quality conditions. Available data indicate that other uses and criteria for this water body are attained. |
| 2412 ★ | Sabine Lake | A | While the TDH classifies Sabine Lake as a prohibited area that does not support the oyster waters use, this is an administrative listing based on TDH's inability to regulate shell fishing in the waters shared with Louisiana. There is no sanitary survey for this water body. Therefore, nonsupport of the oyster waters use is not due to poor water quality conditions. There is a concern for manganese in sediment in 11.6% of the segment. |
| 2421 ✻ | Upper Galveston Bay | C | There is some concern for nitrite + nitrate in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 2422 ✻ | Trinity Bay | C | There is some concern for nitrite + nitrate in water in 75% of the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |

# List of Water Bodies and Constituents Considered But Not Listed on the 1998 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies (6/15/98)

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2425 ★ | Clear Lake | C | There are concerns for nitrite + nitrate, chlorophyll a, orthophosphorus, and total phosphorus in water in the segment, because those parameters exceeded the 85th percentile screening levels. However, no other evidence of actual use impairment due to nutrient concentrations is available. The current data is interpreted as indicating that Clear Lake continues to serve as a highly productive estuary, not that it is impaired by its trophic state.<br>Examination of fecal coliform data for preparation of the 1998 305(b) Inventory and 303(d) List found that fewer than 25% of the samples exceeded the screening criterion for contact recreation. EPA criteria for listing contact recreation use impairments changed and no longer require listing of segments that partially support contact recreation due to elevated fecal coliform bacteria levels, because there is no demonstrated correlation between these levels and a threat to human health. Thus, Clear Lake is no longer listed for contact recreation impairment. New data on localized nonsupport of the contact recreation use described on the 1996 303(d) List found that the bacteria criterion is not exceeded, and the use is supported.<br>Dissolved oxygen data indicate that concentrations are sometimes lower than the standard established to assure optimum habitat conditions for aquatic life in or near marinas. Low dissolved oxygen concentrations are most likely to occur in marinas and dead-end canals that were not designed in accordance with minimum criteria delineated in EPA guidance for marina design. The existing effects of marinas on dissolved oxygen are very localized and have not resulted in impairment of aquatic life outside marinas. Existing programs for regulating marina development are adequate to minimize such impacts, and TMDL development is not warranted unless a significant impairment outside the scope of existing programs becomes apparent. Targeted monitoring will be conducted in this water body to better assess dissolved oxygen effects on aquatic life use. |
| 2426 ✻ | Tabbs Bay | C | There are some concerns for nitrite + nitrate, ammonia, orthophosphorus, and total phosphorus in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 2427 ✻ | San Jacinto Bay | C | There are some concerns for nitrite + nitrate, ammonia, orthophosphorus, and total phosphorus in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 2429 ✻ | Scott Bay | C | There are some concerns for nitrite + nitrate, chlorophyll *a*, orthophosphorus, and total phosphorus in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 2430 ✻ | Burnett Bay | C | There are some concerns for nitrite + nitrate, chlorophyll *a*, orthophosphorus, and total phosphorus in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |

| Segment Number | Segment Name | Basin Group | Reason water body/ constituent was not listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2433 ★ | Bastrop Bay/Oyster Lake | E | The 1996 List showed that bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of oyster/shellfish harvesting. However, based on more recent Texas Department of Health shellfish maps, the entire bay is open for harvesting and thus fully supports the oyster water use. |
| 2435 ★ | Drum Bay | E | The 1996 List showed that bacteria levels occasionally exceed the criterion established to assure the safety of oyster/shellfish harvesting. However, based on more recent Texas Department of Health shellfish maps, the entire bay is open for harvesting and thus fully supports the oyster water use. |
| 2437 ✻ | Texas City Ship Channel | C | There is some concern for ammonia in water in the segment. However, available information is insufficient to determine if a designated use is impaired; thus listing is not supported. Numeric criteria in the Surface Water Quality Standards for these parameters have not been developed. |
| 2455 ★ | Keller Bay | E | Based on TDH shellfish maps, 13.4% of the bay (1.0 $mi^2$ near the Keller Creek confluence) does not support the oyster water use. The remaining 86.6% (6.5 $mi^2$) of the bay fully supports the oyster water use. Nonsupporting areas are restricted for the growing and harvesting of shellfish or prohibited due to potential microbial contamination. However, closed areas fall within the 1,000 foot buffer zone [TSWQS 307.7 (B)(I) and (ii)]. Shellfish standards do not apply in the buffer zone. |
| 2461 | Espiritu Santo Bay | E | Based on TDH shellfish maps, 1.0% of the bay (0.6 $mi^2$ near Port O'Connor and Intracoastal Waterway) does not support the oyster water use. The remaining 99.0% (60.2 $mi^2$) of the bay fully supports the oyster water use. Nonsupporting areas are restricted for the growing and harvesting of shellfish or prohibited due to microbial contamination. However, closed areas fall within the 1,000 foot buffer zone [TSWQS 307.7 (B)(I) and (ii)]. Shellfish standards do not apply in the buffer zone. |
| 2463 | Mesquite Bay | E | Based on TDH shellfish maps, 5.0% of the bay (0.6 $mi^2$ near the Intracoastal Waterway) does not support the oyster water use. The remaining 95.0% (12.0 $mi^2$) of the bay fully supports the oyster water use. Nonsupporting areas are restricted for the growing and harvesting of shellfish or prohibited due to potential microbial contamination. However, closed areas fall within the 1,000 foot buffer zone [TSWQS 307.7 (B)(I) and (ii)]. Shellfish standards do not apply in the buffer zone. |
| 2483 | Redfish Bay | E | Based on TDH shellfish maps, 100% of the bay (28.8 $mi^2$) is classified as a prohibited area and does not support the oyster waters use. The prohibited classification is due to lack of a current sanitary survey by the TDH. Therefore, nonsupport of the oyster waters use is not due to poor water quality conditions. |
| 2484 ✻ | Corpus Christi Inner Harbor | E | The 1996 List was reassessed to determine if all listed constituents had enough samples to support listing. The 1996 List indicated that the aquatic life use was not supported because the mean dissolved copper concentration in water exceeds the chronic criterion. However, dissolved copper in water was elevated (12$\mu$/L) in only one of six samples. This one sample was obtained near the bottom and clean methods were not utilized in its collection. The mean concentration of the remaining five samples is less than the criterion.<br>While EPA comments expressed concern for zinc in sediment, TNRCC supporting data are insufficient to support listing of zinc. |

# Water Bodies Removed from the List

4/21/98

A total of 39 segments were removed.

Twenty-six segments were removed (de-listed) from the list because because of changes in the screening methodology to determine contact recreation use or shellfish use due to elevated fecal coliform bacteria levels, or because new data for fecal coliform data lowered the criteria exceedance below the level of nonsupport of the contact recreation use. One of the 27 segments (#1201) was also removed from the list because TDH fish consumption advisory due to organics was lifted.

Segments removed:

222, Salt Fork Red River
304, Days Creek
601, Neches River Tidal
801, Trinity River Tidal
1003, East Fork San Jacinto River
1004, West Fork San Jacinto River
1010, Caney Creek
1107, Chocolate Bayou Tidal
1201, Brazos River Tidal
1241, Double Mountain Fork Brazos River
1401, Colorado River Tidal
1402, Colorado River below La Grange
1412, Colorado River Below Lake J.B. Thomas
1415, Llano River
1434, Colorado River above La Grange
1803, Guadalupe River Below San Marcos
1808, Lower San Marcos River
1814, Upper San Marcos River
1912, Medio Creek
2102, Nueces River below Lake Corpus Christi
2104, Nueces River above Frio River
2301, Lower Pecos River
2314, Rio Grande above International Dam
2425, Clear Lake
2433, Bastrop Bay/Oyster Lake
2435, Drum Bay

Thirteen additional segments were deleted because of additional qualitative assessments of data sets, programmatic considerations, and/or other information received through public comments.

Segments removed:

0602, Neches River below B.A. Steinhagen Lake, insufficient samples of cadmium
0604, Neches River below Lake Palestine, further data analysis indicates no chronic exceedances
0607, Pine Island Bayou, insufficient samples for fecal coliform bacteria and dissolved oxygen
0611, Angelina River above Sam Rayburn Reservoir, insufficient data for dissolved oxygen and aluminum
1105, Bastrop Bayou Tidal, new data shows contact recreation use supported
1208, Brazos River above Possum Kingdom Lake, insufficient samples for fecal coliform bacteria
1210, Lake Mexia, insufficient samples for dissolved oxygen

1239, White River, insufficient samples for average chloride, sulfate, and total dissolved solids
1501, Tres Palacios Creek Tidal, insufficient samples for fecal coliform bacteria and dissolved oxygen
1502, Tres Palacios Creek above Tidal, insufficient samples for fecal coliform bacteria and dissolved oxygen
1903, Medina River below Medina Diversion Lake, subsequent review of data shows data screening error
2412, Sabine Lake, administrative TDH closing—no water quality data
2455, Keller Bay, lies within 1000-foot buffer zone of coastal waters where shellfish standards do not apply