



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 7

11201 Renner Boulevard
Lenexa, Kansas 66219

DEC 22 2014

RECEIVED

JAN 06 2015

WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

Mr. John Madras
Director, Water Protection Program
Missouri Department of Natural Resources
1101 Riverside Drive
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Dear Mr. Madras:

The U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7, has completed its review of public comments regarding proposed changes made by the EPA to Missouri's 2014 Clean Water Act, Section 303(d) List, as described in the August 26, 2014, decision letter to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources.

The EPA reviewed Missouri's 2014 § 303(d) List of impaired waters, and had previously determined that Missouri's list of water quality limited segments still requiring Total Maximum Daily Loads did not include certain waters and pollutants required to be listed. The EPA partially approved and partially disapproved Missouri's § 303(d) List and provided its rationale for this action in its letter to the MDNR dated August 26, 2014. The EPA then issued a public notice on August 26, 2014, seeking written comments on the EPA's proposed decision to add/restore 12 water body/pollutant pairs to Missouri's 2014 § 303(d) List. The 60-day public comment period closed on October 27, 2014. Pursuant to Region 7's revised method for public noticing decisions on § 303(d) lists (as described in the September 12, 2008 Federal Register Vol. 23, No. 178 p. 52928), the EPA placed its public notice and the associated decision letter on the EPA Region 7 website. The record supporting the EPA's decision was available upon request. The EPA's request for public comments was limited to decisions to add or restore the specific water body/pollutant pairs to the 2014 Missouri § 303(d) List.

After review of the comments received during this public notice period, the EPA, Region 7 is making one modification to its proposed decision. The EPA is withdrawing its proposed listing of Jones Branch in Greene County, as the threshold for § 303(d) listing followed by the state's assessment of its narrative water quality standards was not exceeded. The enclosures to this letter provide a detailed responsiveness summary to public comments the Agency received and a consolidated list summarizing the EPA's decisions on the 2014 Missouri § 303(d) List.



The EPA would like to discuss this decision further with the MDNR as you prepare your 2016 § 303(d) List for submission. Please contact me at (913) 551-7782, or John DeLashmit, Chief of the Water Quality Management Branch, at (913) 551-7821.

Sincerely,



Karen A. Flournoy
Director
Water, Wetlands and Pesticides Division

Enclosures: Comments responsiveness summary
Final 2014 Missouri § 303(d) List

cc: Missouri Department of Natural Resources:
→ Ms. Trish Rielly
Mr. John Hoke
Mr. Refaat Mefrakis

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Mr. John Havard, HQ
Mr. Eric Monschein

RECEIVED

JAN 06 2015

WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY – REGION 7

PUBLIC NOTICE of the

**PROPOSED DECISION on the
2014 MISSOURI SECTION 303(d) LIST –**

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND EPA RESPONSES

Table of Contents

Commenter: City of Springfield – Errin Kemper.....	3
Comment #1 Data Request.....	3
Comment #2 Additional information and assessment procedure questions.....	3
Commenter: Missouri Department of Natural Resources.....	3
Comment #1 Big River (WBID 2080) and Turkey Creek (WBID 3217).....	3
Comment #2 Blackberry Creek (WBID 3184) and Drywood Creek (WBID 1314).....	4
Comment #3 Jones Branch (3968) and North Branch Wilson Creek (WBID 3811).....	4
Comment #4 Brush Creek (3986), Jordan Creek (WBID 3374) and Wilson Creek (WBID 2375)....	4
Comment #5 East Whetstone Creek (WBID 3964)	4
Comment #6 Troublesome Creek (WBID 0074).....	5
Comment #7 Pearson Creek (WBID 2373).....	5
Commenter: City of Springfield – Steve Meyer, Director of Environmental Services	5
Comment #1 General Delisting of Small Streams	5
Comment #2 Pearson Creek (WBID 2373).....	5
Comment #3 Jones Branch (WBID 3968), Jordan Creek (WBID 3374), North Branch Wilsons Creek (WBID 3811) and Wilsons Creek (WBID 2375).....	6
Commenter: The city of Kansas City, Missouri – Mark Young, Stormwater Division Manager	7
Comment #1 Brush Creek (WBID 3986).....	7

Commenter: City of Springfield – Errin Kemper – The city of Springfield commented by email on September 11, 2014, and an email sent on September 23, 2014.

Comment #1 Data Request

Mr. Kemper asked for the data assessments used by the U.S Environmental Protection Agency as a basis for the proposed listings in the Springfield area waters. These waters include Jones Branch, Jordan Creek, North Branch Wilsons Creek, Pearson Creek and Wilsons Creek. In response, the data was sent to Mr. Kemper as an email attachment on September 11, 2014.

Comment #2 Additional information and assessment procedure questions

Mr. Kemper asked for the data supporting the original state listing of Pearson Creek. He also brought to the EPA's attention that the data for the Jones Branch indicated that the geometric mean for the data did not exceed the state's narrative translator for toxic sediment. This was also true for Wilsons Creek according to the city's analysis. There was also a question as to how samples below the limit of detection were assessed in the EPA analysis. Further, questions were submitted on how the results of split samples between the city and the EPA would be assessed and the reason for samples with estimated results in the EPA data report.

In response, the EPA sent the 1998 Missouri information sheet which contained the data used in the original listing of Pearson Creek. Further clarification was provided on the state's listing methodology and the use of geometric means, the use of a Kaplan-Meier methodology for assessing non-detect results, a request for the city's quality assurance data for the analysis of the split samples and the EPA laboratory data on the analysis of samples which were coded as estimates.

To be consistent with the state's listing methodology, the EPA is withdrawing its proposed listing of Jones Branch. However, the EPA recommends continued monitoring of this water body to determine its status.

Commenter: Missouri Department of Natural Resources – John Hoke, Chief, Watershed Protection Section, commented in a letter dated October 27, 2014, as an attachment to an email and via the US mail.

Comment #1 Big River (WBID 2080) and Turkey Creek (WBID 3217)

The state commented that the state averaged all data to assess the entire water body segment. It stated that the EPA has previously followed a segment by segment approach to listing. It also stated that the EPA seems to be abandoning that approach in this case as the reason for the proposed addition of these two waters is based on data from specific sites. If such is the case, the state feels it should be allowed to list only portions of segments rather than the segment in its entirety.

The EPA does not agree that this is a change in the approach taken with previous proposals. While not all reaches of the impacted water bodies are impacted by the toxic sediments, a specific reach is impacted. As it has done in previous cases, the EPA considers that if part of a water body segment is impaired, the whole water body segment is impaired. The result of delisting a water body for an overall average condition would result in a portion of the segment being impaired with no recognition that a pollutant was present anywhere in the segment. The EPA's approach is that if the entire segment is not meeting water quality standards, the assessment unit – defined by the state – is not meeting water quality standards.

The EPA is not making revisions to its decision based on this comment.

Comment #2 Blackberry Creek (WBID 3184) and Drywood Creek (WBID 1314)

The state commented that it assessed these water body segments against the state's numeric criteria for sulfate plus chloride. It further states that the reason used to identify the pollutant as total dissolved solids was because there was no national water quality standard for sulfate plus chloride and that pollutant pair cannot be selected in the national reporting database. The state further says it will revise the pollutant pair when it is available in the national database.

Under Section 303(d), the state is required to assess its waters against its EPA-approved water quality standards. In this case, the EPA does not understand the state's contention that the pollutant pair is not available to select in the national database. A review of these water bodies in the national reporting database identifies sulfate plus chloride as an impairment cause.

The EPA is not making revisions to its decision based on this comment.

Comment #3 Jones Branch (3968) and North Branch Wilson Creek (WBID 3811)

The state commented that it did not consider this data as readily available in time for the 2014 Section 303(d) list.

The EPA brought this data to the state's attention during the public notice period for its Section 303(d) list. This data was also shared with the state as the sampling and analyses were being conducted. The EPA expects the state to consider data submitted during public notice when making its final decisions on which waters do not meet water quality standards.

The EPA is not making revisions to its decision based on this comment.

Comment #4 Brush Creek (3986), Jordan Creek (WBID 3374) and Wilson Creek (WBID 2375)

The state commented that it did not consider this data as readily available in time for the 2014 Section 303(d) list.

The EPA brought this data to the state's attention during the public notice period for its Section 303(d) list. Additional data was available on the EPA's STORET database which is available to the public. Some of this data was also shared with the state as the sampling and analyses were being conducted. The EPA expects the state to consider data located on STORET and that submitted during public notice when making its final decisions on which waters do not meet water quality standards.

The EPA is not making revisions to its decision based on this comment.

Comment #5 East Whetstone Creek (WBID 3964)

The state agreed with the EPA contention that the TMDL did not cover the unclassified segment of the water body. The state will prioritize the water body for follow-up monitoring to determine if the segment is still impaired.

The EPA is not making revisions to its decision based on this comment.

Comment #6 Troublesome Creek (WBID 0074)

The state reiterated its contention made in response to the EPA's comments during the state public notice period that this water body segment was impaired by habitat condition.

In its original assessment, when identifying the cause of impaired habitat the state identified sediment as a cause. In response to the EPA's comments that sediment was a pollutant, the state identified that the ecological drainage use in which this stream was located was in an area with high sediment conditions. While this may be true, the state does have ecological reference sites located in this EDU which are used to develop the thresholds for assessing macroinvertebrate populations for meeting aquatic life use.

As sediment is a pollutant and not a general background condition of all waters in this EDU, the EPA is not making revisions to its decision based on this comment.

Comment #7 Pearson Creek (WBID 2373)

The state identified that watershed size was an important factor in the assessment of water bodies for biological thresholds and that the assessment against established reference streams identified in its water quality standards is not appropriate.

While the EPA may agree that watershed size is an appropriate factor in which to make biological comparisons, the state outlines the use of specific reference streams in its EPA-approved water quality standards. A course the state may take to alleviate this requirement would be to submit new and improved water quality standards to the EPA which identify how this watershed size specific targeting is scientifically protective of the aquatic life use.

In addition, Pearson Creek was not originally listed for not meeting the state's Missouri Stream Condition Index. It was listed, along with Wilsons Creek for a documented decline in biotic diversity.

The EPA is not making revisions to its decision based on this comment.

Commenter: City of Springfield – Steve Meyer, Director of Environmental Services

Comment #1 General Delisting of Small Streams

The city supported the EPA's approval of Missouri's delisting of Beaver Branch, Dry Fork and Hays Creek for inappropriate comparison of biological scores with larger biological reference streams.

The EPA is not taking comments on approved actions but recognizes the cities comments.

Comment #2 Pearson Creek (WBID 2373)

The city made note that the proposed addition of this water body is not for failure to achieve a passing Missouri Stream Condition Index score but for a decline in biotic diversity as was the original 1998 listing. The city contents that the listing would be inappropriate because of the age and quality of the data, and that 40 CFR 131.12(a)(1) does not require the protection of existing uses from before November 28, 1975.

In response to these contentions, the EPA has consistently stated that age itself is not good cause for failure to use all readily available data. In the case of the quality of the data used in the assessment, the state has already determined that the data is of sufficient quality when it used it to list Pearson Creek in 1998. The EPA further performed analyses which showed impairment based on the state's MSCI score and statistically significant difference in diversity between upstream and downstream reaches of the water body.

The EPA is not making revisions to its decision based on this comment.

Comment #3 Jones Branch (WBID 3968), Jordan Creek (WBID 3374), North Branch Wilsons Creek (WBID 3811) and Wilsons Creek (WBID 2375)

The city notes that these streams should be compared against appropriate reference streams rather than the biocriteria reference streams listed in the Missouri water quality standards. It interprets that the EPA's listing of these streams for sediment quality, the EPA agrees with the state's original assessment as to the appropriateness of target reference streams comparisons.

The EPA is proposing to list these water body segments for pollutants rather than solely for decline in biotic diversity as Wilsons and Jordan creeks were originally listed. The EPA established TMDL for storm water as a surrogate for pollutants was withdrawn by the EPA in response to a law suit by the city of Springfield. In part this withdrawal was done so the EPA could investigate the water bodies in question to find specific pollutants which could be allocated to address the biological impairment. As a result of this investigation of the ecological conditions in the urban streams of the city of Springfield, the EPA measured concentrations of toxins in stream sediments which exceeded the numeric translators identified in the Missouri listing methodology. As such the EPA did not propose to relist Wilsons or Jordan creeks for a decline in biotic diversity because of the discovery of toxins. While the EPA agrees that water bodies should be compared to reference streams of the same size as is required by the Missouri water quality standards, these two water bodies were not originally listed based on Missouri Stream Condition Index scores but on a degradation of the biotic diversity.

The city also commented on the use of geometric means rather than arithmetic averages for assessment against the state's narrative translators for toxic sediment, the actual toxicity of these translators and their use as screening tools, and the inherent variability of sediment quality data.

The city further commented on the use of the state's narrative translators for listing of these water bodies without additional information which would result in a weight of evidence leading to an assessment of impairment. However, in the table cited by the city, the footnote identifying the numeric translators mentions the need for convincing evidence of a healthy biological community for the translators to not result in a listing. In this case the original decline in biotic diversity along with the concentration of chemicals in the sediment lead to a weight of evidence that the biological community is impaired. In Table B-1. Description of Analytical Tools for Determining if Waters are Impaired, the decision rule/hypothesis states "-Waters are judged to be impaired if sample mean Exceeds 150% of PEL or 75% of PEO²⁰." Further, footnote 20 states "Where there is convincing evidence of a healthy biological community (fish and/or aquatic invertebrate monitoring data) or convincing evidence of a lack of toxicity (two species bioassay tests of sediment elutriate water or sediment pore water), this evidence will be evaluated in conjunction with the sediment PEL data." Footnote 22 to the table for delisting (B-2. Description of Analytical Tools for Determining When Waters are no Longer Impaired) states that sediment PEL data will not be the sole justification for an assessment of impairment, where there is evidence of a healthy aquatic life use.

In the case of Jones Branch, no geometric mean sediment concentrations exceeded the Missouri translator of 150% of the Probable Effects Level. The EPA's original analysis had compared the arithmetic average to the translator. While the state's listing methodology does not define the statistical test and the state for earlier section 303(d) lists used an arithmetic average in its analysis, for the 2014 Section 303(d) analysis the state has used a geometric average. As such, to be consistent with the state's procedures the EPA is withdrawing its proposal to add Jones Branch to the 2014 Missouri Section 303(d) List.

The EPA made no other changes to its proposed actions in the case of these waters.

Commenter: The city of Kansas City, Missouri – Mark Young, Stormwater Division Manager

Comment #1 Brush Creek (WBID 3986)

The city commented that the narrative translators for sediment are not water quality standards and cannot be used as a basis for Section 303(d) listing. It also opined that the development of the numeric translators is relegated to a footnote addressing a narrative standard and should not be used as the sole determinant of impairment. The city further commented that the Missouri listing methodology rule (10 CSR 20-7.050) does not allow for the quantification of a value for sediment only for general criteria.

A review of Missouri's rules shows the use of a numeric (quantitative) translator is outlined in the Missouri rules. At 10 CSR 20-7.050(2)(C)4. ...*including chemical sampling of sediments...* Further at 10 CSR 20-7.050(3)(B)1. "*Missouri's narrative water quality criteria as described in 10 CSR 20-7.031, section (3) may be used to evaluate waters when a quantitative value can be applied to the pollutant.*"

The applicable EPA-approved water quality standard in this case is found at 10 CSR 20-7.031(3) General Criteria, section (A) "*Waters shall be free from substances in sufficient amounts to cause the formation of putrescent, unsightly, or harmful bottom deposits or prevent full maintenance of beneficial uses;*"

In the case of Brush Creek, the EPA is not proposing to list the water body for the exceedance of one numeric translator but four different translators. Additionally, the Missouri listing methodology states that sediment Probable Effect Level data will not be the sole justification for listing **if there is convincing evidence that the aquatic life use is being met** (*emphasis added*). In this case, the EPA is not aware of any such data.

The EPA is not making revisions to its proposed decision based on this comment.

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry should be supported by a valid receipt or invoice. This ensures transparency and allows for easy verification of the data. The second part of the document outlines the procedures for handling discrepancies. It states that any differences between the recorded amounts and the actual amounts should be investigated immediately. The third part of the document provides a detailed list of the items that are included in the records. It includes a breakdown of the various categories of expenses and revenues. The fourth part of the document discusses the frequency of the reports. It states that reports should be generated on a regular basis, typically on a monthly or quarterly basis. The fifth part of the document discusses the security of the records. It states that all records should be stored in a secure location and that access should be restricted to authorized personnel only. The sixth part of the document discusses the retention period of the records. It states that records should be retained for a minimum of five years. The seventh part of the document discusses the format of the records. It states that records should be maintained in both paper and electronic formats. The eighth part of the document discusses the responsibility of the personnel involved in the process. It states that all personnel involved in the process should be held accountable for their actions. The ninth part of the document discusses the consequences of non-compliance. It states that any personnel found to be in violation of the policies will be subject to disciplinary action. The tenth part of the document discusses the overall goal of the process. It states that the goal is to ensure that all transactions are accurately recorded and that the records are used to support the organization's financial goals.

Financial Reporting and Record Keeping

The purpose of this document is to provide a comprehensive overview of the financial reporting and record keeping process. It covers the various aspects of the process, from the initial recording of transactions to the final reporting of the results. The document is intended for use by all personnel involved in the process, as well as by those who are interested in the organization's financial performance.

Introduction

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry should be supported by a valid receipt or invoice. This ensures transparency and allows for easy verification of the data. The second part of the document outlines the procedures for handling discrepancies. It states that any differences between the recorded amounts and the actual amounts should be investigated immediately. The third part of the document provides a detailed list of the items that are included in the records. It includes a breakdown of the various categories of expenses and revenues. The fourth part of the document discusses the frequency of the reports. It states that reports should be generated on a regular basis, typically on a monthly or quarterly basis. The fifth part of the document discusses the security of the records. It states that all records should be stored in a secure location and that access should be restricted to authorized personnel only. The sixth part of the document discusses the retention period of the records. It states that records should be retained for a minimum of five years. The seventh part of the document discusses the format of the records. It states that records should be maintained in both paper and electronic formats. The eighth part of the document discusses the responsibility of the personnel involved in the process. It states that all personnel involved in the process should be held accountable for their actions. The ninth part of the document discusses the consequences of non-compliance. It states that any personnel found to be in violation of the policies will be subject to disciplinary action. The tenth part of the document discusses the overall goal of the process. It states that the goal is to ensure that all transactions are accurately recorded and that the records are used to support the organization's financial goals.

Recording Transactions

The first part of this section discusses the importance of recording transactions accurately. It states that every transaction should be recorded in a timely and accurate manner. The second part of this section discusses the procedures for recording transactions. It states that all transactions should be recorded in a journal, and that the journal should be maintained in a secure location. The third part of this section discusses the format of the records. It states that records should be maintained in both paper and electronic formats. The fourth part of this section discusses the responsibility of the personnel involved in the process. It states that all personnel involved in the process should be held accountable for their actions. The fifth part of this section discusses the consequences of non-compliance. It states that any personnel found to be in violation of the policies will be subject to disciplinary action. The sixth part of this section discusses the overall goal of the process. It states that the goal is to ensure that all transactions are accurately recorded and that the records are used to support the organization's financial goals.

Reporting Results

The first part of this section discusses the importance of reporting results accurately. It states that all results should be reported in a timely and accurate manner. The second part of this section discusses the procedures for reporting results. It states that all results should be reported in a journal, and that the journal should be maintained in a secure location. The third part of this section discusses the format of the records. It states that records should be maintained in both paper and electronic formats. The fourth part of this section discusses the responsibility of the personnel involved in the process. It states that all personnel involved in the process should be held accountable for their actions. The fifth part of this section discusses the consequences of non-compliance. It states that any personnel found to be in violation of the policies will be subject to disciplinary action. The sixth part of this section discusses the overall goal of the process. It states that the goal is to ensure that all transactions are accurately recorded and that the records are used to support the organization's financial goals.

Security and Retention

The first part of this section discusses the importance of security and retention. It states that all records should be stored in a secure location and that access should be restricted to authorized personnel only. The second part of this section discusses the procedures for security and retention. It states that all records should be backed up regularly and that the backups should be stored in a secure location. The third part of this section discusses the format of the records. It states that records should be maintained in both paper and electronic formats. The fourth part of this section discusses the responsibility of the personnel involved in the process. It states that all personnel involved in the process should be held accountable for their actions. The fifth part of this section discusses the consequences of non-compliance. It states that any personnel found to be in violation of the policies will be subject to disciplinary action. The sixth part of this section discusses the overall goal of the process. It states that the goal is to ensure that all transactions are accurately recorded and that the records are used to support the organization's financial goals.

Conclusion

The purpose of this document is to provide a comprehensive overview of the financial reporting and record keeping process. It covers the various aspects of the process, from the initial recording of transactions to the final reporting of the results. The document is intended for use by all personnel involved in the process, as well as by those who are interested in the organization's financial performance.

Attachment 2

Final 2014 Missouri § 303(d) List. The designation (W) in the pollutant column refers to the pollutant being determined in water, (S) in sediment and (T) in fish tissue.

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
1	Antire Cr.	2188	P	1.9	1.9	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
2	Antire Cr.	2188	P	1.9	1.9	St. Louis	pH (W)
3	Bass Cr.	0752	C	4.4	4.4	Boone	Escherichia coli (W)
4	Baynham Br.	3240	P	4.0	4	Newton	Escherichia coli (W)
5	Bee Fk.	2760	C	1.4	8.7	Reynolds	Lead (W)
6	Bee Tree Lake	7309	L3	10	10	St. Louis	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
7	Beef Br.	3224	P	2.5	2.5	Newton	Cadmium (W)
8	Beef Br.	3224	P	2.5	2.5	Newton	Cadmium (S)
9	Beef Br.	3224	P	2.5	2.5	Newton	Lead (S)
10	Beef Br.	3224	P	2.5	2.5	Newton	Zinc (W)
11	Beef Br.	3224	P	2.5	2.5	Newton	Zinc (S)
12	Belcher Branch Lake	7365	L3	55.0	55	Buchanan	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
13	Bens Br.	3980	US	5.8	5.8	Jasper	Cadmium (S)
14	Bens Br.	3980	US	5.8	5.8	Jasper	Lead (S)
15	Bens Br.	3980	US	5.8	5.8	Jasper	Zinc (S)
16	Big Cr.	0444	P	1.0	22	Harrison	Ammonia, Total (W)
17	Big Cr.	0444	P	6.0	22	Harrison	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
18	Big Cr.	1250	P	70.5	70.5	Jackson/Henry	Escherichia coli (W)
19	Big Cr.	2916	P	1.8	34.1	Iron	Cadmium (S)
20	Big Cr.	2916	P	1.8	34.1	Iron	Lead (S)
21	Big Piney R.	1578	P	4.0	8	Texas	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
22	Big R.	2080	P	18.6	68	St. Francois	Cadmium (S)
23	Big R.	2080	P	18.6	68	St. Francois	Lead (S)
24	Big R.	2080	P	18.6	68	St. Francois	Zinc (S)
25	Black Cr.	0111	C	19.4	19.4	Shelby	Escherichia coli (W)
26	Black Cr.	0111	C	19.4	19.4	Shelby	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
27	Black Cr.	3825	P	1.6	1.6	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
28	Black Cr.	3825	P	1.6	1.6	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
29	Black R.	2769	P	47.1	47.1	Butler	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
30	Black R.	2784	P	39.0	39.0	Wayne/Butler	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
31	Blackberry Cr.	3184	C	3.5	6.5	Jasper	Chloride (W)
32	Blackberry Cr.	3184	C	3.5	6.5	Jasper	Sulfate plus Chloride (W)
33	Blue R.	0417	P	4.0	4	Jackson	Escherichia coli (W)
34	Blue R.	0418	P	9.0	9	Jackson	Escherichia coli (W)
35	Blue R.	0419	P	9.0	9	Jackson	Escherichia coli (W)
36	Blue R.	0421	C	11.0	11	Jackson	Escherichia coli (W)
37	Bonhomme Cr.	1701	C	2.5	2.5	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
38	Bonhomme Cr.	1701	C	2.5	2.5	St. Louis	pH (W)
39	Bonne Femme Cr.	0750	P	7.8	7.8	Boone	Escherichia coli (W)
40	Bonne Femme Cr.	0753	C	7.0	7	Boone	Escherichia coli (W)
41	Bourbeuse R.	2034	P	136.7	136.7	Phelps/Franklin	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
42	Bowling Green (Old) Lake	7003	L1	28.2*	28.2*	Pike	Chlorophyll-a (W)
43	Bowling Green (Old) Lake	7003	L1	28.2*	28.2*	Pike	Nitrogen, Total (W)
44	Bowling Green (Old) Lake	7003	L1	28.2*	28.2*	Pike	Phosphorus, Total (W)
45	Brazeau Cr.	1796	C	10.8	10.8	Perry	Escherichia coli (W)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
46	Brush Cr.	3986	C	---	5.4	Jackson	Benzo(a)pyrene (S)
47	Brush Cr.	3986	C	---	5.4	Jackson	Chrysene (S)
48	Brush Cr.	3986	C	---	5.4	Jackson	Phenanthrene (S)
49	Brush Cr.	3986	C	---	5.4	Jackson	Pyrene (S)
50	Brush Cr.	1371	P	4.0	4	Polk/St. Clair	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
51	Buffalo Cr.	3273	P	8.0	8	Newton/McDonald	Fishes Bioassessments (W)
52	Burgher Br.	1865	C	2.0	2	Phelps	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
53	Busch Lake #35	7057	L3	51.0	51	St. Charles	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
54	Busch Lake #37	7627		34.0	34	St. Charles	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
55	Capps Cr.	3234	P	5.0	5	Barry	Escherichia coli (W)
56	Castor R.	2288	P	7.5	7.5	Bollinger	Escherichia coli (W)
57	Cedar Cr.	0737	C	7.9	37.4	Boone	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
58	Cedar Cr.	1344	P	10.0	31	Cedar	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
59	Cedar Cr.	1344	P	10.0	31	Cedar	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
60	Cedar Cr.	1357	C	16.2	16.2	Cedar	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
61	Cedar Cr.	1357	C	16.2	16.2	Cedar	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
62	Center Cr.	3203	P	19.0	26.8	Jasper	Cadmium (S)
63	Center Cr.	3203	P	19.0	26.8	Jasper	Cadmium (W)
64	Center Cr.	3203	P	19.0	26.8	Jasper	Lead (S)
68	Center Cr.	3203	P	19.0	26.8	Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
66	Center Cr.	3210	P	21.0	21	Newton/Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
67	Center Cr.	3214	P	4.9	4.9	Lawrence/Newton	Escherichia coli (W)
68	Chaumiere Lake	7634	UL	3.4	3.4	Clay	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
69	Cinque Hommes Cr.	1781	C	8.3	17.1	Perry	Escherichia coli (W)
70	Clear Cr.	1333	P	15.5	15.5	Vernon/St.Clair	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
71	Clear Cr.	1336	C	15.0	15	Vernon	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
72	Clear Cr.	3238	P	11.1	11.1	Barry/Newton	Escherichia coli (W)
73	Clear Cr.	3239	C	3.5	3.5	Barry/Newton	Nutrient/Eutrophication Biol. Indicators (W)
74	Clear Cr.	3239	C	3.5	3.5	Barry/Newton	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
75	Clear Fk.	0935	P	3.1	25.8	Johnson	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
76	Clearwater Lake	7326	L2	1635.0	1635	Reynolds/Wayne	Chlorophyll-a (W)
77	Clearwater Lake	7326	L2	1635.0	1635	Reynolds/Wayne	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
78	Coldwater Cr.	1706	C	5.5	5.5	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
79	Coldwater Cr.	1706	C	5.5	5.5	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
80	Coonville Cr.	2177	C	1.3	1.3	St. Francois	Lead (W)
81	Courtois Cr.	1943	P	2.6	32	Washington	Lead (S)
82	Courtois Cr.	1943	P	2.6	32	Washington	Zinc (S)
83	Crane Cr.	2382	P	13.2	13.2	Stone	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
84	Craven Ditch	2816	C	11.6	11.6	Butler	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
85	Creve Coeur Cr.	1703	C	2.0	2	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
86	Creve Coeur Cr.	1703	C	2.0	2	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
87	Creve Coeur Cr.	1703	C	2.0	2	St. Louis	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
88	Crooked Cr.	1928	P	3.5	3.5	Dent/Crawford	Cadmium (S)
89	Crooked Cr.	1928	P	3.5	3.5	Dent/Crawford	Cadmium (W)
90	Crooked Cr.	1928	P	3.5	3.5	Dent/Crawford	Lead (S)
91	Crooked Cr.	3961	U	5.2	n/a	Iron/Dent	Cadmium (W)
92	Crooked Cr.	3961	U	5.2	n/a	Iron/Dent	Copper (W)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
93	Current R.	2636	P	124.0	124	Shannon/Ripley	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
94	Dardenne Cr.	0219	P1	7.0	7	St. Charles	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
95	Dardenne Cr.	0221	P	15.0	15	St. Charles	Inorganic sediment
96	Dardenne Cr.	0221	P	15.0	15	St. Charles	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessment (W)
97	Deer Cr.	3826	P	1.6	1.6	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
98	Deer Cr.	3826	P	1.6	1.6	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
99	Deer Ridge Lake	7015	L3	48.0	48	Lewis	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
100	Ditch # 36	3109	P	7	7	Dunklin	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
101	Douger Br.	3810	C	3.1	3.1	Lawrence	Lead (S)
102	Douger Br.	3810	C	3.1	3.1	Lawrence	Zinc (S)
103	Dousinbury Cr.	1180	P	3.5	3.5	Dallas	Escherichia coli (W)
104	Dry Fk.	3189	C	10.2	10.2	Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
105	Drywood Cr.	1314	P	3.8	29.9	Barton/Vernon	Sulfate plus Chloride
106	Dutro Carter Cr.	3569	P	0.6	1.5	Phelps	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
107	East Fk. Crooked R.	0372	P	14.0	14	Ray	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
108	East Fk. Grand R.	0457	P	25.0	25	Worth/Gentry	Escherichia coli (W)
109	East Fk. Locust Cr.	0608	P	13.0	13	Sullivan	Escherichia coli (W)
110	East Fk. Locust Cr.	0610	C	12.6	13	Sullivan	Escherichia coli (W)
111	East Fk. Locust Cr.	0610	C	13	13	Sullivan	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
112	East Fk. Tebo Cr.	1282	C	10.4	14.5	Henry	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
113	Eaton Br.	2166	C	0.9	1.2	St. Francois	Cadmium (S)
114	Eaton Br.	2166	C	0.9	1.2	St. Francois	Cadmium (W)
115	Eaton Br.	2166	C	0.9	1.2	St. Francois	Lead (S)
116	Eaton Br.	2166	C	0.9	1.2	St. Francois	Zinc (S)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
117	Eaton Br.	2166	C	0.9	1.2	St. Francois	Zinc (W)
118	Eleven Point R.	2593	P	22.7	22.7	Oregon	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
119	Eleven Point R.	2597	P	11.4	11.4	Oregon	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
120	Eleven Point R.	2601	P	22.3	22.3	Oregon	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
121	Elm Br.	1283	C	3.0	3	Henry	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
122	Fee Fee (new) Cr.	1704	P	1.5	1.5	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
123	Fee Fee (new) Cr.	1704	P	1.5	1.5	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
124	Fellows Lake	7237	L1	800.0	800	Greene	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
125	Fenton Cr.	3595	P	0.5	0.5	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
126	Fishpot Cr.	2186	P	2.0	2	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
127	Fishpot Cr.	2186	P	2.0	2	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
128	Flat River Cr.	2168	C	5.0	9	St. Francois	Cadmium (W)
129	Forest Lake	7151	L1	573.0	573	Adair	Chlorophyll-a (W)
130	Forest Lake	7151	L1	573.0	573	Adair	Nitrogen, Total (W)
131	Forest Lake	7151	L1	573.0	573	Adair	Phosphorus, Total (W)
132	Fowler Cr.	0747	C	6	6	Boone	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
133	Fox Cr.	1842	P	7.2	7.2	St. Louis	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
134	Fox R.	0038	P	42.0	42.0	Clark	Escherichia coli (W)
135	Fox Valley Lake	7008	L3	89.0	89	Clark	Chlorophyll-a (W)
136	Fox Valley Lake	7008	L3	89.0	89	Clark	Nitrogen, Total (W)
137	Fox Valley Lake	7008	L3	89.0	89	Clark	Phosphorus, Total (W)
138	Foxboro Lake	7382	L3	22.0	22	Franklin	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
139	Frisco Lake	7280	L3	5.0	5	Phelps	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
140	Gans Cr.	1004	C	5.5	5.5	Boone	Escherichia coli (W)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
141	Gasconade R.	1455	P	249.0	249	Gasconade/Wright	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
142	Grand Glaize Cr.	2184	C	4.0	4	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
143	Grand Glaize Cr.	2184	C	4.0	4	St. Louis	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
144	Grand Glaize Cr.	2184	C	4.0	4	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
145	Grand R.	0593	P	60.0	60	Livingston/Chariton	Escherichia coli (W)
146	Gravois Cr.	1712	P	2.0	2	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
147	Gravois Cr.	1712	P	2.0	2	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
148	Gravois Cr.	1713	C	4.0	4	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
149	Gravois Cr.	1713	C	4.0	4	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
150	Grindstone Cr.	1009	C	1.5	1.5	Boone	Escherichia coli (W)
151	Harrison County Lake	7386	L1	280	280	Harrison	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
152	Hazel Creek Lake	7152	L1	151.0	151	Adair	Chlorophyll-a (W)
153	Hazel Creek Lake	7152	L1	151.0	151	Adair	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
154	Heath's Cr.	0848	P	21.0	21.0	Pettis	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
155	Hickory Br.	0596	C	6.8	6.8	Chariton	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
156	Hickory Cr.	3226	P	4.9	4.9	Newton	Escherichia coli (W)
157	Hinkson Cr.	1008	C	18.0	18	Boone	Escherichia coli (W)
158	Hominy Br.	1011	C	1.0	1.0	Boone	Escherichia coli (W)
159	Honey Cr.	3169	P	16.5	16.5	Lawrence	Escherichia coli (W)
160	Honey Cr.	3170	C	2.7	2.7	Lawrence	Escherichia coli (W)
161	Horse Cr.	1348	P	27.7	27.7	Cedar	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
162	Horse Cr.	1348	P	27.7	27.7	Cedar	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
163	Horseshoe Cr.	3413	C	5.8	5.8	Lafayette/Johnson	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
164	Hough Park Lake	7388	L3	7.0	7	Cole	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
165	Hunnewell Lake	7029	L3	228.0	228	Shelby	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
166	Indian Cr.	0420	C	3.0	3	Jackson	Chloride (W)
167	Indian Cr.	0420	C	3.0	3	Jackson	Escherichia coli (W)
168	Indian Cr.	1946	P	1.9	1.9	Washington	Lead (S)
169	Indian Cr.	1946	P	1.9	1.9	Washington	Zinc (S)
170	Indian Cr.	3256	P	9.7	30.8	Newton/McDonald	Escherichia coli (W)
171	Indian Creek Lake	7389	L3	192.0	192	Livingston	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
172	Jacobs Br.	3223	P	1.6	1.6	Newton	Cadmium (S)
173	Jacobs Br.	3223	P	1.6	1.6	Newton	Cadmium (W)
174	Jacobs Br.	3223	P	1.6	1.6	Newton	Lead (S)
175	Jacobs Br.	3223	P	1.6	1.6	Newton	Zinc (S)
176	Jacobs Br.	3223	P	1.6	1.6	Newton	Zinc (W)
177	Jenkins Cr.	3207	P	2.8	2.8	Newton/Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
178	Jenkins Cr.	3208	C	4.8	4.8	Newton/Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
179	Jones Cr.	3205	P	7.5	7.5	Newton/Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
180	Jordan Cr.	3374	P	---	3.8	Greene	Benzo(a)anthracene (S)
181	Jordan Cr.	3374	P	---	3.8	Greene	Benzo(a)pyrene (S)
182	Jordan Cr.	3374	P	---	3.8	Greene	Chrysene (S)
183	Jordan Cr.	3374	P	---	3.8	Greene	Phenanthrene (S)
184	Jordan Cr.	3374	P	---	3.8	Greene	Pyrene (S)
185	Kiefer Cr.	3592	P	1.2	1.2	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
186	Kiefer Cr.	3592	P	1.2	1.2	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
187	L. St. Francis R.	2854	P	24.2	32.4	Madison	Lead (S)
188	Lake Bueto	7469	L3	7	7	Johnson	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
189	Lake of the Woods	7436	L3	3.0	3	Boone	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
190	Lake of the Woods	7629	U	7.0	7	Jackson	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
191	Lake St. Louis	7054	L3	525.0	525	St. Charles	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
192	Lake Ste. Louise	7055	L3	71	71	St. Charles	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
193	Lake Winnebago	7212	L3	350.0	350	Cass	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
194	Lamine R.	0847	P	54.0	54	Morgan/Cooper	Escherichia coli (W)
195	Lat. #2 Main Ditch	3105	P	11.5	11.5	Stoddard	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
196	Lat. #2 Main Ditch	3105	P	11.5	11.5	Stoddard	Temperature, water (W)
197	Lee Rowe Ditch	3137	C	2.3	6	Mississippi	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
198	Lewistown Lake	7020	L1	29.0	29	Lewis	Atrazine (W)
199	Line Cr.	3575	C	7.0	7	Platte	Escherichia coli (W)
200	Little Beaver Cr.	1529	C	3.4	3.5	Phelps	Escherichia coli (W)
201	Little Beaver Cr.	1529	C	3.4	3.5	Phelps	Sedimentation/Siltation (S)
202	Little Blue R.	0422	P	35.1	35.1	Jackson	Escherichia coli (W)
203	Little Bonne Femme Cr.	1003	P	9.0	9	Boone	Escherichia coli (W)
204	Little Dry Fk.	1863	P	1.0	5	Phelps	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
205	Little Dry Fk.	1864	C	4.5	4.5	Phelps	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
206	Little Drywood Cr.	1325	P	17	17	Vernon	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
207	Little Drywood Cr.	1326	C	10.0	10	Barton/Vernon	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
208	Little Lost Cr.	3279	P	5.8	5.8	Newton	Escherichia coli (W)
209	Little Medicine Cr.	0623	P	40.0	40	Mercer/Grundy	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
210	Little Medicine Cr.	0623	P	20.0	40	Mercer/Grundy	Escherichia coli (W)
211	Little Niangua R.	1189	P	20.0	43	Dallas/Camden	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
212	Little Osage R.	3652	C	16.0	16	Vernon	Escherichia coli (W)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
213	Little Whitewater Cr.	2229	P	24.2	24.2	Cape Girardeau/Bollinger	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
214	Locust Cr.	0606	P	36.4	84	Putnam/Sullivan	Escherichia coli (W)
215	Logan Cr.	2763	P	6.1	36.0	Reynolds	Lead (S)
216	Long Branch Cr.	0696	C	2.0	13	Macon	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
217	Longview Lake	7097	L2	930.0	930	Jackson	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
218	Lost Cr.	3278	P	8.5	8.5	Newton	Escherichia coli (W)
219	M. Fork Salt Cr.	0123	C	11.4	25.4	Macon	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
220	Main Ditch	2814	C	13.0	13.0	Butler	pH (W)
221	Main Ditch	2814	C	13.0	13.0	Butler	Temperature, water (W)
222	Maline Cr.	1709	C	0.6	0.6	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
223	Maline Cr.	3839	C	0.5	0.5	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
224	Maple Slough Ditch	3140	C	16.0	16	Mississippi/New Madrid	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
225	Mark Twain Lake	7033	L2	18600.0	18600	Monroe/Ralls	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
226	Mattese Cr.	3596	P	1.1	1.1	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
227	Mattese Cr.	3596	P	1.1	1.1	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
228	Medicine Cr.	0619	P	36.0	36	Putnam/Grundy	Escherichia coli (W)
229	Meramec R.	2183	P	22.0	22	St. Louis	Lead (S)
230	Meramec R.	2185	P	15.7	26	St. Louis	Lead (S)
231	Miami Cr.	1299	P	18	18	Bates	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
232	Middle Fk. Grand R.	0468	P	25.0	25	Worth/Gentry	Escherichia coli (W)
233	Middle Indian Cr.	3262	C	3.5	3.5	Newton	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
234	Middle Indian Cr.	3263	P	2.2	2.2	Newton	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
235	Middle Indian Cr.	3263	P	2.2	2.2	Newton	Escherichia coli (W)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
236	Mississippi R.	1707.03	P	46.6	46.6	St. Louis/St. Genevieve	Escherichia coli (W)
237	Missouri R.	0226	P	179.0	179	Atchison/Jackson	Escherichia coli (W)
238	Missouri R.	0356	P	129.0	129	Jackson/Saline	Escherichia coli (W)
239	Missouri R.	1604	P	100.0	100	Gasconade/St. Charles	Escherichia coli (W)
240	Monroe City Lake	7031	L1	94	94	Ralls	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
241	Mozingo Lake	7402	L1	1000.0	1000	Nodaway	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
242	Muddy Cr.	0853	P	1.8	1.8	Pettis	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
243	Mussel Fk.	0674	C	29.0	29	Sullivan/Macon	Escherichia coli (W)
244	Niangua R.	1170	P	51.0	51	Webster/Dallas	Escherichia coli (W)
245	Nishnabotna R.	0227	P	10.2	10.2	Atchison	Escherichia coli (W)
246	No Cr.	0550	P	22.5	22.5	Grundy/Livingston	Escherichia coli (W)
247	No Cr.	0550	P	22.5	22.5	Grundy/Livingston	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
248	Noblett Lake	7316	L3	26.0	26	Douglas	Chlorophyll-a (W)
249	Noblett Lake	7316	L3	26.0	26	Douglas	Phosphorus, Total (W)
250	Noblett Lake	7316	L3	26.0	26	Douglas	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
251	Nodaway R.	0279	P	60.0	60	Nodaway	Escherichia coli (W)
252	North Bethany Lake	7109	L3	78.0	78	Harrison	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
253	North Branch Wilsons Cr.	3811	P	---	3.8	Greene	Zinc (S)
254	North Fk. Cuivre R.	0170	C	8	8	Pike	Fecal Coliform (W)
255	North Fk. Spring R.	3186	P	17.4	17.4	Barton	Escherichia coli (W)
256	North Fk. Spring R.	3188	C	1.1	55.9	Barton	Ammonia, Total (W)
257	North Fk. Spring R.	3188	C	55.9	55.9	Dade/Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
258	North Fk. Spring R.	3188	C	55.9	55.9	Dade/Jasper	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
259	North Indian Cr.	3260	P	5.2	5.2	Newton	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
260	North Indian Cr.	3260	P	5.0	5	Newton	Escherichia coli (W)
261	Osage R.	1293	P	39.3	39.3	Vernon/St.Clair	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
262	Panther Cr.	1373	C	7.8	7.8	St.Clair/Polk	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
263	Pearson Cr.	2373	P	8.0	8	Greene	Escherichia coli (W)
264	Pearson Cr.	2373	P	8.0	8	Greene	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
265	Perry Phillips Lake	7628	U	32.0	32	Boone	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
266	Peruque Cr.	0215	P1	9.6	9.6	St. Charles	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
267	Peruque Cr.	0216	P	0.3	10.3	St. Charles	Cause Unknown (W)
268	Peruque Cr.	0217	P	4	4	St. Charles	Fish Bioassessment (W)
269	Peruque Cr.	0218	C	8	8	St. Charles	Fish Bioassessment (W)
270	Pickle Cr.	1755	P	7.0	7	Ste. Genevieve	pH (W)
271	Pike Cr.	2815	C	6.0	6.0	Butler	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
272	Platte R.	0312	P	138.0	138	Worth/Platte	Escherichia coli (W)
273	Pleasant Run Cr.	1327	C	7.6	7.6	Vernon	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
274	Pole Cat Slough	3120	P	12	12	Dunklin	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
275	Pole Cat Slough	3120	P	12	12	Dunklin	Temperature (W)
276	Pomme de Terre R.	1440	P	69.1	69.1	Webster/Polk	Escherichia coli (W)
277	Red Oak Cr.	2038	C	10.0	10	Gasconade	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
278	River des Peres	1710	C	2.6	2.6	St. Louis City	Chloride (W)
279	River des Peres	1710	C	2.6	2.6	St. Louis City	Escherichia coli (W)
280	River des Peres	1710	C	2.6	2.6	St. Louis City	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
281	River des Peres	3972	US	6.5	6.5	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
282	Salt Cr.	0594	C	14.0	14.0	Livingston/Chariton	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
283	Salt Fk.	0893	P	13.3	26.7	Saline	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
284	Salt Pine Cr.	2113	C	1.2	1.2	St. Francois	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
285	Salt R.	0091	P	29.0	29	Ralls/Pike	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
286	Salt R.	0103	P1	9.3	9.3	Ralls	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
287	Salt R.	0103	P1	9.3	9.3	Ralls	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
288	Shibboleth Br.	2119	P	1	1	Washington	Lead (S)
289	Shibboleth Br.	2119	P	1	1	Washington	Zinc (S)
290	Shoal Cr.	3222	P	41.1	41.1	Newton	Escherichia coli (W)
291	Slater Br.	3754	C	3.7	3.7	Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
292	Sni-a-bar Cr.	0399	P	32	32	Jackson/Lafayette	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
293	South Blackbird Cr.	0655	C	5	13	Putnam	Ammonia, Un-ionized (W)
294	South Fabius R.	0071	P	80.6	80.6	Knox/Marion	Escherichia coli (W)
295	South Fk. Salt R.	0142	C	20.1	32	Callaway/Audrain	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
296	South Grand R.	1249	P	62.5	62.5	Cass/Henry	Escherichia coli (W)
297	South Indian Cr.	3259	P	8.7	8.7	McDonald/Newton	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
298	South Indian Cr.	3259	P	8.7	8.7	Newton/McDonald	Escherichia coli (W)
299	Spencer Cr.	0224	C	1.5	1.5	St. Charles	Chloride (W)
300	Spring R.	3160	C	61.7	61.7	Lawrence/Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
301	Spring R.	3164	P	8.8	8.8	Lawrence	Escherichia coli (W)
302	Spring R.	3165	P	11.9	11.9	Lawrence	Escherichia coli (W)
303	St. Francis R.	2835	P	8.4	93.1	St. Francois	Temperature, water (W)
304	St. John's Ditch	3138	P	15.3	15.3	New Madrid	Escherichia coli (W)
305	St. John's Ditch	3138	P	15.3	15.3	New Madrid	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
306	Stevenson Bayou	3135	C	14	14	Mississippi	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
307	Straight Fk.	0959	C	2.5	6	Morgan	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
308	Strother Cr.	2751	P	6.0	6.0	Iron	Lead (S)
309	Strother Cr.	2751	P	6.0	6.0	Iron	Lead (W)
310	Strother Cr.	2751	P	6.0	6.0	Iron	Nickel (S)
311	Strother Cr.	2751	P	6.0	6.0	Iron	Zinc (S)
312	Strother Cr.	2751	P	6.0	6.0	Iron	Zinc (W)
313	Strother Cr.	2751	P	6.0	6.0	Iron	Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments (W)
314	Strother Cr.	3965	U	0.9	n/a	Reynolds/Iron	Arsenic (S)
315	Strother Cr.	3965	U	0.9	n/a	Reynolds/Iron	Lead (S)
316	Strother Cr.	3965	U	0.9	n/a	Reynolds/Iron	Nickel (S)
317	Strother Cr.	3965	U	0.9	n/a	Reynolds/Iron	Zinc (S)
318	Strother Cr.	3965	U	0.9	n/a	Reynolds/Iron	Zinc (W)
319	Sugar Cr.	0686	P	6.8	6.8	Randolph	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
320	Sugar Creek Lake	7166	L1	308	308	Randolph	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
321	Sunset Lake	7399	L3	6.0	6	Cole	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
322	Table Rock Lake	7313	L2	24507.0	24507	Barry/Taney/Stone	Nutrient/Eutrophication Biol. Indicators (W)
323	Table Rock Lake	7313	L2	17240.0	17240	Barry/Taney	Chlorophyll (W)
324	Table Rock Lake	7313	L2	17240.0	17240	Barry/Taney	Nitrogen (W)
325	Terre Du Lac Lakes **	7297	L3	103.0	103	St. Francois	Chlorophyll-a (W)
326	Terre Du Lac Lakes **	7297	L3	103.0	103	St. Francois	Nitrogen, Total (W)
327	Thompson R.	0549	P	5.0	65	Harrison	Escherichia coli (W)
328	Thurman Cr.	3243	P	3.0	3	Newton	Escherichia coli (W)
329	Trib. To Chat Cr.	3963	U	0.9	0.9	Lawrence	Cadmium (W)
330	Trib. To Chat Cr.	3963	U	0.9	0.9	Lawrence	Zinc (W)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
331	Trib. To Coon Cr.	0133	C	1.0	1	Randolph	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
332	Trib. To Flat River Cr.	3938	U	0.3	0.3	St. Francois	Zinc (W)
333	Trib. To Goose Cr.	1420	C	3.0	3.0	Lawrence	Escherichia coli (W)
334	Trib. To Little Muddy Cr.	3490	C	1.0	1.0	Pettis	Chloride (W)
335	Trib. To Old Mines Cr.	2114	C	1.5	1.5	St. Francois	Sedimentation/Siltation (S)
336	Trib. To Red Oak Cr.	3360	C	0.5	0.5	Gasconade	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
337	Trib. To Red Oak Cr.	3361	C	1.9	1.9	Gasconade	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
338	Trib. To Shoal Cr.	3981	US	1.6	1.6	Jasper/Newton	Cadmium (W)
339	Trib. To Shoal Cr.	3981	US	1.6	1.6	Jasper/Newton	Zinc (W)
340	Trib. To Shoal Cr.	3982	US	2.2	2.2	Jasper/Newton	Zinc (W)
341	Trib. To Turkey Cr.	3983	US	2.9	2.9	Jasper	Cadmium (S)
342	Trib. To Turkey Cr.	3983	US	2.9	2.9	Jasper	Lead (S)
343	Trib. To Turkey Cr.	3983	US	2.9	2.9	Jasper	Zinc (S)
344	Trib. To Turkey Cr.	3983	US	2.9	2.9	Jasper	Zinc (W)
345	Trib. To Turkey Cr	3984	US	2.2	2.2	Jasper	Zinc (W)
346	Trib. To Turkey Cr	3985	US	1.6	1.6	Jasper	Zinc (W)
347	Trib. To Willow Fk.	0956	C	0.5	0.5	Moniteau	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
348	Trib. To Wolf Cr.	3589	C	1.5	1.5	St. Francois	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
349	Troublesome Cr.	0074	C	6.1	41.3	Knox	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
350	Troublesome Cr.	0074	C	35.3	41.3	Knox/Marion	Sedimentation/Siltation (S)
351	Truitt Cr.	3175	C	6.4	6.4	Lawrence	Escherichia coli (W)
352	Turkey Cr.	0751	C	6.3	6.3	Boone	Escherichia coli (W)
353	Turkey Cr.	3216	P	7.7	7.7	Jasper	Cadmium (S)
354	Turkey Cr.	3216	P	7.7	7.7	Jasper	Cadmium (W)

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
355	Turkey Cr.	3216	P	7.7	7.7	Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
356	Turkey Cr.	3216	P	7.7	7.7	Jasper	Lead (S)
357	Turkey Cr.	3216	P	7.7	7.7	Jasper	Zinc (S)
358	Turkey Cr.	3217	P	6.1	6.1	Jasper	Cadmium (S)
359	Turkey Cr.	3217	P	6.1	6.1	Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
360	Turkey Cr.	3217	P	6.1	6.1	Jasper	Lead (S)
361	Turkey Cr.	3217	P	6.1	6.1	Jasper	Zinc (S)
362	Turkey Cr.	3282	P	2.4	2.4	St. Francois	Cadmium (W)
363	Turkey Cr.	3282	P	2.4	2.4	St. Francois	Lead (W)
364	Turkey Cr.	3282	P	1.2	2.4	St. Francois	Zinc (W)
365	Turnback Cr.	1414	P	14.0	14.0	Lawrence/Dade	Escherichia coli (W)
366	Warm Fk. Spring R.	2579	P	13.8	13.8	Oregon	Fecal Coliform (W)
367	Watkins Cr.	1708	C	3.5	3.5	St. Louis	Chloride (W)
368	Watkins Cr.	1708	C	3.5	3.5	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
369	Weatherby Lake	7071	L3	194.0	194	Platte	Chlorophyll-a (W)
370	Weatherby Lake	7071	L3	194.0	194	Platte	Mercury in Fish Tissue (T)
371	Weatherby Lake	7071	L3	194.0	194	Platte	Nitrogen, Total (W)
372	Weatherby Lake	7071	L3	194.0	194	Platte	Phosphorus, Total (W)
373	Weldon R.	0560	P	42	42	Mercer/Grundy	Escherichia coli (W)
374	West Fk. Black R.	2755	P	2.1	32.3	Reynolds	Lead (S)
375	West Fk. Black R.	2755	P	2.1	32.3	Reynolds	Nickel (S)
376	West Fk. Drywood Cr.	1317	C	8.1	8.1	Vernon	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
377	Whetstone Cr.	1504	P	12.2	12.2	Wright	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
378	Whetstone Cr.	3964	C	---	---	Wright	Ammonia

No.	Water Body Name	WBID	Class	MDNR Proposed Impairment Size	MDNR Water Body Size	County Upstream/Downstream	Pollutant
379	White Oak Cr.	3182	C	18.0	18	Lawrence/Jasper	Escherichia coli (W)
380	Wildhorse Cr.	1700	C	3.9	3.9	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
381	Williams Cr.	3171	P	1.0	1	Lawrence	Escherichia coli (W)
382	Williams Cr.	3172	P	8.5	8.5	Lawrence	Escherichia coli (W)
383	Williams Cr.	3594	P	1.0	1.0	St. Louis	Escherichia coli (W)
384	Willow Br.	3280	P	2.2	2.2	Newton	Cadmium (S)
385	Willow Br.	3280	P	2.2	2.2	Newton	Escherichia coli (W)
386	Willow Br.	3280	P	2.2	2.2	Newton	Lead (S)
387	Willow Br.	3280	P	2.2	2.2	Newton	Zinc (S)
388	Willow Fk.	0955	C	6.5	6.5	Moniteau	Oxygen, Dissolved (W)
389	Wilsons Cr.	2375	P	11.9	14	Greene/Christian	Escherichia coli (W)
390	Wilsons Cr.	2375	P	11.9	14	Greene/Christian	Benzo(a)anthracene (S)
391	Wilsons Cr.	2375	P	11.9	14	Greene/Christian	Benzo(a)pyrene (S)
392	Wilsons Cr.	2375	P	11.9	14	Greene/Christian	Chrysene (S)
393	Wilsons Cr.	2375	P	11.9	14	Greene/Christian	Phenanthrene (S)
394	Wilsons Cr.	2375	P	11.9	14	Greene/Christian	Pyrene (S)
395	Woods Fk.	2429	C	5.5	5.5	Christian	Fish Bioassessment (W)

* Misidentified in WQ Standards as Bowling Green New Lake. Acres shown on list are the actual acres.

** Lac Capri is the only one of the Terre du Lac lakes on the list

