

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 1999 List of Impaired and Threatened Water Bodies

Note: It is possible that these water bodies may be included on the 1999 List for other pollutants. Water bodies which are on the 1999 List for other pollutants are denoted with an asterisk ().*

This list identifies water quality parameters for water bodies that were considered for inclusion in the 1999 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 to verify attainment of uses in conjunction with the next data collection phase of the basin management cycle for that water body.

Legend for coded column (3):

- Basin Group (3): Letter code (A-E) indicates which group of river basins the segment is associated with in the TNRCC basin planning 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/Pollutant Was Not Listed
1201	Brazos River Tidal	D	Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentration of mercury in water exceeds the human health criterion, further investigation indicates that mercury measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.
1209C *	Carters Creek (unclassified water body)	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters. Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentration of mercury in water exceeds the human health criterion, further investigation indicates that mercury measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.

Segment Number	Segment Name	Basin Group	Reason Water Body/Pollutant Was Not Listed
1209D *	Unnamed tributary to Bryan Municipal Lake	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters. Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentration of mercury in water exceeds the human health criterion, further investigation indicates that mercury measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.
1212A	Middle Yegua Creek	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1221A	Resley Creek (unclassified water body)	D	There is not enough information available to determine the appropriate aquatic life use and dissolved oxygen standard for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of the aquatic life use cannot be evaluated from dissolved oxygen data.
1221B	South Leon River (unclassified water body)	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1222B	Rush-Copperas Creek (unclassified water body)	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1222C	Sabana River (unclassified water body)	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1226B	Green Creek (unclassified water body)	D	There is not enough information available to determine the appropriate aquatic life use and dissolved oxygen standard for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of the aquatic life use cannot be evaluated from dissolved oxygen data.
1233A	Big Sandy Creek (unclassified water body)	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1233B	Hubbard Creek (unclassified water body)	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.

Segment Number	Segment Name	Basin Group	Reason Water Body/Pollutant Was Not Listed
1238	Salt Fork Brazos River	D	Although the initial data scan suggested that this segment was partially supporting the temperature criterion, further investigation determined that some samples were taken at flows below 7Q2. When the percentage of criterion exceedance was recalculated without the exceedance observed at below 7Q2, the aquatic life use was fully supported. In addition, elevated water temperatures in this segment are due to natural conditions. The temperature standard for this stream will be reevaluated for the upcoming Triennial Standards Review.
1245 *	Upper Oyster Creek	D	Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentration of mercury in water exceeds the human health criterion, further investigation indicates that mercury measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.
1252	Lake Limestone	D	The first draft listing was due to a data entry error. The sulfate criterion is not exceeded.
1302 *	San Bernard River Above Tidal	D	Although the initial data screen showed nonsupport of aquatic life due to low dissolved oxygen, further investigation determined that some samples were taken at flows below 7Q2. When the percentage of criterion exceedance was recalculated without the exceedances observed at below 7Q2, the aquatic life use was fully supported.
1304A *	Linville Bayou (unclassified water body)	D	The original assessment of the aquatic life use support was based on the high aquatic life use/dissolved oxygen standard for the downstream segment. However, further investigation indicated that the standard for Linville Bayou is limited aquatic life use. Dissolved oxygen concentrations are adequate to support a limited aquatic life use. Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentration of mercury in water exceeds the human health criterion, further investigation indicates that mercury measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.
1402A	Cummins Creek	D	Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentration of mercury in water exceeds the human health criterion, further investigation indicates that mercury measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.
1403A *	Bull Creek (unclassified water body)	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.

Segment Number	Segment Name	Basin Group	Reason Water Body/Pollutant Was Not Listed
1415A	Johnson Fork Creek	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1416A	Brady Creek	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1424A	West Rocky Creek (unclassified water body)	D	The assessment for this water body was reviewed in response to a comment from the Lower Colorado River Authority. Although initial assessment indicated that bacteria levels sometimes exceed the safety of contact recreation, further investigation revealed a lab error in reading some of the data. Using the correct data values, a new assessment found that the water body fully supports the contact recreation use.
1428C *	Gilleland Creek (unclassified water body)	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1429A *	Shoal Creek (unclassified water body)	D	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1501 *	Tres Palacios Creek Tidal	E	Although initial assessment indicated that bacteria levels sometimes exceed the safety of contact recreation, further investigation revealed a calculation error in the assessment. The number of exceedances was counted incorrectly. When the mean was recalculated using the correct number of exceedances, bacteria levels were well within the safety margin for contact recreation.
1803	Guadalupe River Below San Marcos River	E	Although the initial data scan suggested that the average concentration of total dissolved solids exceeded the criterion to protect general water quality uses, additional investigation determined that the method used to calculate the average was incorrect. When the average concentration was recalculated using the correct method, the criterion for total dissolved solids was not exceeded.
1803B *	Sandies Creek (unclassified water body)	E	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.

Segment Number	Segment Name	Basin Group	Reason Water Body/Pollutant Was Not Listed
1804A	Geronimo Creek (unclassified water body)	E	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1806A *	Camp Meeting Creek (unclassified water body)	E	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1806B	Cypress Creek (unclassified water body)	E	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1806D	Quinlan Creek (unclassified water body)	E	An incorrect aquatic life use was used in the initial assessment of this water body. Further investigation determined that the standard for this water body is no significant aquatic life use. There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1806E	Town Creek (unclassified water body)	E	An incorrect aquatic life use was used in the initial assessment of this water body. Further investigation determined that the standard for this water body is no significant aquatic life use.
1806G *	Verde Creek (unclassified water body)	E	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for chloride, sulfate, or total dissolved solids for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
1810	Plum Creek	E	Although the initial data screen showed nonsupport of aquatic life due to low dissolved oxygen, further investigation determined that some samples were taken at flows below 7Q2. When the percentage of criterion exceedance was recalculated without the exceedances observed at below 7Q2, the aquatic life use was fully supported.
1811A	Dry Comal Creek (unclassified water body)	E	An incorrect aquatic life use was used in the initial assessment of this water body. Further investigation determined that the standard for this water body is limited aquatic life use. The water body fully supports this lower aquatic life use.
1813	Upper Blanco River	E	Although the initial data scan suggested that the average concentration of sulfate exceeded the criterion to protect general water quality uses, additional investigation determined that the method used to calculate the average was incorrect. When the average concentration was recalculated using the correct method, the criterion for sulfate was not exceeded.

Segment Number	Segment Name	Basin Group	Reason Water Body/Pollutant Was Not Listed
2201 *	Arroyo Colorado Tidal	E	Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentration of mercury in water exceeds the human health criterion, further investigation indicates that mercury measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.
2202 *	Arroyo Colorado Above Tidal	E	Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentration of mercury in water exceeds the human health criterion, further investigation indicates that mercury measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.
2203	Petronila Creek Tidal	E	Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentrations of mercury and copper in water exceed the human health criteria, further investigation indicates that mercury and copper measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.
2302 *	Rio Grande Below Falcon Reservoir	E	Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentration of mercury in water exceeds the human health criterion, further investigation indicates that mercury measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.
2304 *	Rio Grande Below Amistad Reservoir	E	Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentration of mercury in water exceeds the human health criterion, further investigation indicates that mercury measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.
2309	Devils River	E	Although the initial data screen showed nonsupport of numeric criteria for TDS, further investigation identified a lab error in one of the samples. When the average TDS value was recalculated without the erroneous sample, the segment showed full support of the numeric criteria for TDS.
2312	Red Bluff Reservoir	E	Although the initial data scan indicated that the average concentration of mercury in water exceeds the human health criterion, further investigation indicates that mercury measurements were of unknown quality. New methods are being developed that will improve the accuracy of monitoring for metals in water.

Segment Number	Segment Name	Basin Group	Reason Water Body/Pollutant Was Not Listed
2481 *	Corpus Christi Bay	E	Although the initial assessment indicated that dissolved copper concentrations exceed the criterion established to protect aquatic life from chronic exposure, further investigation identified that one of the samples used in the assessment was not handled properly, and the data was therefore not quality-assured. Without that sample, there is insufficient information to assess the chronic copper criterion.

Water Bodies Removed from the List (April 9, 1999)

This following list identifies 1998-listed water bodies removed from the 1999 303(d) List, with the rationale for delisting. There were 14 water bodies delisted in 1999.

Legend for coded columns (3, 4, 5):

- Basin Group (3): Letter code (A-E) indicates which group of river basins the segment is associated with in the TNRCC basin planning 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
- Type of delisting (4,5): A "Y" indicates whether the water body was completely removed from the 303(d) List (complete delist) or only certain pollutants in a particular water body were delisted (pollutant de-list).

Segment Number	Segment Name	Basin Group	Complete Delist	Pollutant Delist	Reason for Delisting
0229	Upper Prairie Dog Town Fork Red River	A		Y	A total maximum daily load (TMDL) allocation that addresses dissolved oxygen received final approval from the Environmental Protection Agency Region 6 on September 17, 1998, and has been incorporated into the State Water Quality Management Plan. The TMDL will assure that wastewater discharges do not harm the dissolved oxygen regime of water bodies within the watershed of Segment 0229. However, it is still possible that dissolved oxygen concentrations lower than the daily average standard may occur at times in some areas due to the hydraulic character of channels and/or natural variations in climatic conditions.
0702A	Alligator Bayou (unclassified water body)	C		Y	There is not enough information available to determine appropriate criteria for sulfate for this unclassified water body. Therefore, support of general water quality uses cannot be evaluated from those parameters.
0704	Hillebrandt Bayou	C		Y	The 1998 listing of pH in Hillebrandt Bayou was a clerical error. The pH values in this segment are within the norm.

Segment Number	Segment Name	Basin Group	Complete Delist	Pollutant Delist	Reason for Delisting
0804	Trinity River Above Lake Livingston	B		Y	Although the 1998 assessment indicated that cadmium sometimes exceeds the criteria established to protect aquatic life from chronic exposure, that assessment was based on basin-specific hardness. When the chronic criterion for cadmium was recalculated using segment-specific hardness derived from the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards, the mean is below the criterion for chronic exposure.
0814	Chambers Creek Above Richland-Chambers Reservoir	B	Y		A total maximum daily load (TMDL) allocation that addresses dissolved oxygen received final approval from the Environmental Protection Agency Region 6 on September 17, 1998, and has been incorporated into the State Water Quality Management Plan. The TMDL will assure that wastewater discharges do not harm the dissolved oxygen regime of water bodies within the watershed of Segment 0814. However, it is still possible that dissolved oxygen concentrations lower than the daily average standard may occur at times in some areas due to the hydraulic character of channels and/or natural variations in climatic conditions.
0824	Elm Fork Trinity River Above Ray Roberts Lake	B		Y	Although the 1998 assessment indicated that cadmium sometimes exceeds the criteria established to protect aquatic life from chronic exposure, that assessment was based on basin-specific hardness. When the chronic criterion for cadmium was recalculated using segment-specific hardness derived from the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards, the mean is below the criterion for chronic exposure.

Segment Number	Segment Name	Basin Group	Complete Delist	Pollutant Delist	Reason for Delisting
0902	Cedar Bayou Above Tidal	C		Y	A total maximum daily load (TMDL) allocation that addresses dissolved oxygen received final approval from the Environmental Protection Agency Region 6 on September 17, 1998, and has been incorporated into the State Water Quality Management Plan. The TMDL will assure that wastewater discharges do not harm the dissolved oxygen regime of water bodies within the watershed of Segment 0902. However, it is still possible that dissolved oxygen concentrations lower than the daily average standard may occur at times in some areas due to the hydraulic character of channels and/or natural variations in climatic conditions.
1202	Brazos River Below Navasota River	D	Y		Although this segment was identified on the 1998 303(d) List as not supporting the contact recreation use, more current data indicate that the contact recreation use is fully supported.
1213	Little River	D	Y		Although this segment was identified on the 1998 303(d) List as not supporting the contact recreation use in the lower part of the segment, more current data indicate that the contact recreation use is fully supported in this part of the segment.
1301	San Bernard River Tidal	D		Y	Although this segment was identified on the 1998 303(d) List as not supporting its aquatic life use due to low levels of dissolved oxygen, more recent data indicate that dissolved oxygen levels support the aquatic life use. This segment is still listed for nonsupport of the contact recreation use.
1414	Pedernales River	D		Y	This segment was identified on the 1998 303(d) List as not supporting the aquatic life use due to low levels of dissolved oxygen and high levels of fecal coliform bacteria. However, more recent intensive sampling during critical low flow conditions indicate that dissolved oxygen levels support the aquatic life use.

Segment Number	Segment Name	Basin Group	Complete Delist	Pollutant Delist	Reason for Delisting
1421	Concho River	D		Y	This segment was identified on the 1998 303(d) List as not supporting the aquatic life use due to low dissolved oxygen in some portions of the river, and not supporting the contact recreation use throughout the segment. However, more recent data indicate that both of these uses are supported. The 1999 303(d) List identifies a portion of the segment as partially supporting the aquatic life use due to toxicity in water.
1429	Town Lake	D		Y	Although this segment was identified on the 1998 303(d) List as not supporting the contact recreation use, more recent data indicate full support of the use. Town Lake is still listed in 1999 for partial support of the fish consumption use.
1602	Lavaca River Above Tidal	D		Y	Although this segment was identified on the 1998 303(d) List as not supporting the contact recreation use, more recent data indicate full support of the use. Segment 1602 appears on the 1999 303(d) List for nonsupport of general water quality criteria due to elevated temperatures in one reach, during the summer months.
1906	Lower Leon Creek	D		Y	Although this segment was identified on the 1998 303(d) List as not supporting the aquatic life use due to levels of dissolved cadmium in water, more recent data indicate that the use is fully supported. Segment 1906 is still identified on the 1999 303(d) List as not supporting the contact recreation use. A new listing for partial support of the aquatic life use due to low dissolved oxygen levels was also identified in the 1999 assessment.
2002	Mission River Above Tidal	E	Y		Although this segment was identified on the 1998 303(d) List as not supporting the contact recreation use, more recent data indicate that the contact recreation use is fully supported.
2106	Nueces/Lower Frio River	E	Y		Although this segment was identified on the 1998 303(d) List as not supporting the contact recreation use, more recent data indicate that the contact recreation use is fully supported.

Segment Number	Segment Name	Basin Group	Complete Delist	Pollutant Delist	Reason for Delisting
2484	Corpus Christi Inner Harbor	E	Y		Although this segment was identified on the 1998 303(d) List as partially supporting the aquatic life use due to low levels of dissolved oxygen in the Avery and Viola Turning Basins, more current data indicate dissolved oxygen levels support the aquatic life use throughout the Harbor.