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## Executive Summary

Background - Multi-parameter water quality sampling for the Lower Cape Fear River Program (LCFRP) http://www.uncw.edu/cms/aelab/LCFRP/index.htm, has been ongoing since June 1995. Scientists from the University of North Carolina Wilmington's (UNCW) Aquatic Ecology Laboratory perform the sampling effort. The LCFRP currently encompasses 32 water sampling stations throughout the lower Cape Fear, Black, and Northeast Cape Fear River watersheds (Table 1.1; Fig. 1.1). The LCFRP sampling program includes physical, chemical, and biological water quality measurements and analyses of the benthic and epibenthic macroinvertebrate communities, and has in the past included assessment of the fish communities. Principal conclusions of the UNCW researchers conducting these analyses are presented below, with emphasis on water quality of the period January - December 2020. There were no data collected in April 2020 due to restrictions from the Covid-19 pandemic. The opinions expressed are those of UNCW scientists and do not necessarily reflect viewpoints of individual contributors to the Lower Cape Fear River Program.

The mainstem lower Cape Fear River is a $6^{\text {th }}$ order stream characterized by periodically turbid water containing moderate to high levels of inorganic nutrients. It is fed by two large $5^{\text {th }}$ order blackwater rivers (the Black and Northeast Cape Fear Rivers - Fig. 1.1) that have low levels of turbidity, but highly colored water with less inorganic nutrient content than the mainstem. While nutrients are reasonably high in the river channels, major algal blooms are normally rare because light is attenuated by water color or turbidity, and flushing in the estuary is usually high (Ensign et al. 2004). During periods of low flow algal biomass as chlorophyll a increases in the Cape Fear River because lower flow causes settling of more solids and improves light conditions for algal growth. Periodically major algal blooms are seen in the tributary stream stations, some of which are impacted by point source discharges. Below some point sources, nutrient loading can be high and fecal coliform contamination occurs. Other stream stations drain blackwater swamps or agricultural areas (traditional agriculture and/or industrialized animal production), and some sites periodically show elevated pollutant loads or effects (Mallin et al. 2015). This region has been hit by hurricanes several times in the past three decades and such storms have a marked impact on water quality and organisms.

GenX Issues - During the past four years there has been considerable controversy in the lower Cape Fear River watershed regarding a family of manufactured chemical compounds popularly known as GenX. To briefly summarize, DuPont constructed a facility known as Fayetteville Works near the river downstream of Fayetteville, where it manufactured fluoropolymers since 1971. DuPont manufactured a chemical called PFOA at Fayetteville Works beginning in 2001, than later stopped its manufacture due to health concerns surrounding this chemical. They then developed a substitute chemical called GenX, which they began manufacturing there, along with GenX's parent compound, called HFPO-DA fluoride. Both compounds hydrolize in water to a third compound called HFPO-DA, CAS; the toxicity of this group of chemicals is unclear. Subsequently, DuPont spun-off a company called Chemours, which assumed plant operations in 2015. In the past few years researchers from US EPA, North Carolina

State University, and the University of North Carolina Wilmington have found HFPO-DA and related fluoroethers (which tend to be lumped under the blanket term GenX) in river water, river sediments, well water near the plant, in air samples, aquatic organism tissue, bird tissue, and in finished drinking water at the Wilmington water treatment facility, which obtains its water near Lock and Dam \#1. Fayetteville Works says they have stopped the GenX discharge, and in 2019 built a thermal oxidizer to heat waste gases and reduce $>99 \%$ of the chemicals from escaping; however these chemicals are still found in river water that enters the Cape Fear Public Utility Authority water treatment plant. Legal actions were initiated against the company from NC Attorney General, NCDEQ and Cape Fear River Watch to provide financial compensation for the pollution and for installation of pollution-reduction equipment. Sampling and analysis of GenX and related compounds is outside of the purview of the scientific staff of the Lower Cape Fear River Program and will not be discussed in this report.

Summary of water quality data results from 2020 - Hurricane Isaias impacted southeastern North Carolina August 3rd with rain and tornadoes, and made landfall at Ocean Isle Beach. The Category 1 hurricane passed rapidly with little impact to water quality in the Cape Fear region (Chapter 2).

Year after year there is a dissolved oxygen sag in the main river channel that begins at Station DP below a paper mill discharge and near the Black River input, and persists into the mesohaline portion of the estuary. Mean oxygen levels are highest at the upper river stations NC11 and ANC and in the low-to-middle estuary at stations M35 to M18 (Fig. 1.1). Lowest mainstem mean DO levels normally occur at the river and upper estuary stations NAV, HB, BRR and M61. The Northeast Cape Fear and Black Rivers are classified as blackwater systems because of their tea colored water. The Northeast Cape Fear and Black Rivers generally have lower DO levels than the mainstem Cape Fear River.

DO concentrations in the tributary streams were briefly impacted by the hurricane, but some sites are chronically bad year-after-year. In 2020 GS (Goshen Swamp) was below standard 45\% of occasions samples; ANC (Angola Creek), SR (upper South River), NCF117 and NCF6 (both on the Northeast Cape Fear River) were below standard $27 \%$ of the time sampled, but all of the other stream stations were below standard less than $25 \%$ of the time. Considering all sites sampled in 2020, we rated $28 \%$ as poor for dissolved oxygen, $6 \%$ as fair, and $66 \%$ as good.

Annual mean turbidity levels for 2020 were lower than the long-term average at all stations. Highest mean riverine turbidities (18-16 NTU) were at NC11-DP (Fig. 1.1) with turbidities generally low in the middle to lower estuary. The estuarine stations did not exceed the estuarine turbidity standard on our sampling trips. Turbidity was considerably lower in the Northeast Cape Fear River and Black River than in the mainstem river. Turbidity levels were low in the freshwater streams, with all streams rated as good for 2020. Suspended solids were generally low except at NC11 and AC, the upper river sites.

Average chlorophyll a concentrations across most sites were low in 2020. The standard of $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ was exceeded once each at Stations GS and SR, and there were several smaller algal blooms as well. We note the highest chlorophyll a levels in the river and estuary typically occur late spring to late-summer. Nuisance cyanobacterial blooms did not occur in the river and upper estuary in 2020. For the 2020 period UNCW rated $100 \%$ of the stations as good in terms of chlorophyll a.

Fecal bacteria counts in the estuary and at many of the stream stations were elevated in 2020. Sites with the highest counts in general were BRN (Browns Creek), PB (Panther Branch), HAM (Hammond Creek), LCO (Little Coharie Creek), 6RC (Six Runs Creek), ROC (Rockfish Creek), NC403 (uppermost Northeast Cape fear river site) and LRC (Little Rockfish Creek). However, the main river and estuary sites were generally in good condition in 2020. For bacterial water quality overall, 32\% of the sites rated as poor, $10 \%$ as fair, and $58 \%$ as good..

In addition, according to our experimentally-derived key concentrations, excessive nitrate and phosphorus concentrations were problematic at a number of stations. Sites with high nutrient concentrations included point-source locations NC403 and PB, and non-point locations ROC, 6RC, and GCO (Great Coharie Creek).

A 20-year analysis of nitrate concentrations found several stream stations with both high concentrations and continuing upward trends, especially Six Runs Creek (6RC), Rockfish Creek (ROC), Great Coharie Creek (GCO) and Little Coharie Creek (LCO). Note that all of these creeks have no point sources but their watersheds contain numerous swine CAFOs, as well as a considerable number of poultry CAFOs.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary ..... 1
1.0 Introduction .....  .5
1.1 Site Description. ..... 6
1.2 Report Organization ..... 7
2.0 Physical, Chemical, and Biological Characteristics of the Lower Cape Fear River and Estuary ..... 10
Physical Parameters ..... 13
Chemical Parameters ..... 16
Biological Parameters ..... 20

### 1.0 Introduction

Michael A. Mallin<br>Aquatic Ecology Laboratory<br>Center for Marine Science<br>University of North Carolina Wilmington

The Lower Cape Fear River Program is a unique science and education program that has a mission to develop an understanding of processes that control and influence the ecology of the Cape Fear River, and to provide a mechanism for information exchange and public education. This program provides a forum for dialogue among the various Cape Fear River user groups and encourages interaction among them. Overall policy is set by an Advisory Board consisting of representatives from citizen's groups, local government, industries, academia, the business community, and regulatory agencies. This report represents the scientific conclusions of the UNCW researchers participating in this program and does not necessarily reflect opinions of all other program participants. This report focuses on the period January through December 2020.

The scientific basis of the LCFRP consists of the implementation of an ongoing comprehensive physical, chemical, and biological monitoring program. Another part of the mission is to develop and maintain a data base on the Cape Fear basin and make use of this data to develop management plans. Presently the program has amassed a 26-year (1995-2020) data base that is available to the public, and is used as a teaching tool. Using this monitoring data as a framework the program goals also include focused scientific projects and investigation of pollution episodes. The scientific aspects of the program are carried out by investigators from the University of North Carolina Wilmington Center for Marine Science. The monitoring program was developed by the Lower Cape Fear River Program Technical Committee, which consists of representatives from UNCW, the North Carolina Division of Environmental Quality, The NC Division of Marine Fisheries, the US Army Corps of Engineers, technical representatives from streamside industries, the Cape Fear Public Utility Authority, Cape Fear Community College, Cape Fear River Watch, the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service, the US Geological Survey, forestry and agriculture organizations, and others. This integrated and cooperative program was the first of its kind in North Carolina. The physical, chemical and biological data are state-certified and submitted to the US EPA.

Broad-scale monthly water quality sampling at 16 stations in the estuary and lower river system began in June 1995 (UNCW Aquatic Ecology Laboratory, directed by Dr. Michael Mallin). Sampling was increased to 34 stations in February of 1996, 35 stations in February 1998, and 36 stations in 2005, then lowered to 33 in 2011; currently it stands at 32 water quality stations. The Lower Cape Fear River Program added another component concerned with studying the benthic macrofauna of the system in 1996. This component is directed by Dr. Martin Posey and Mr. Troy Alphin of the UNCW Biology Department and includes the benefit of additional data collected by the

Benthic Ecology Laboratory under various grant-funded projects in the Cape Fear Estuary. These data are collected and analyzed depending upon the availability of funding. The third major biotic component (added in January 1996) was an extensive fisheries program directed by Dr. Mary Moser of the UNCW Center for Marine Science Research, with subsequent (1999) overseeing by Mr. Michael Williams and Dr. Thomas Lankford of UNCW-CMS. This program involved cooperative sampling with the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries and the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission. The fisheries program ended in December 1999, but was renewed with additional funds from the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation from spring - winter 2000.

### 1.1. Site Description

The mainstem of the Cape Fear River is formed by the merging of the Haw and the Deep Rivers in Chatham County in the North Carolina Piedmont. However, its drainage basin reaches as far upstream as the Greensboro area (Fig. 1.1). The mainstem of the river has been altered by the construction of several dams and water control structures. In the Coastal Plain, the river is joined by two major tributaries, the Black and the Northeast Cape Fear Rivers (Fig. 1.1). These $5^{\text {th }}$ order blackwater streams drain extensive riverine swamp forests and add organic color to the mainstem. The watershed (about 9,164 square miles) is the most heavily industrialized in North Carolina with 203 permitted wastewater discharges with a permitted flow of approximately 429 million gallons per day, and (as of 2010) over 2.07 million people residing in the basin (NCDENR Basinwide Information Management System (BIMS) \& 2010 Census). Approximately $23 \%$ of the land use in the watershed is devoted to agriculture and livestock production (2006 National Land Cover Dataset), with livestock production dominated by swine and poultry operations. Thus, the watershed receives considerable point and non-point source loading of pollutants. However, the estuary is a well-flushed system, with flushing time ranging from 1 to 22 days with a median flushing time of about seven days, much shorter than the other large N.C. estuaries to the north (Ensign et al. 2004).

Water quality is monitored by boat at eight stations in the Cape Fear Estuary (from Navassa to Southport) and one station in the Northeast Cape Fear Estuary (Table 1.1; Fig. 1.1). We note that after July 2011 sampling was discontinued at estuarine stations M42 and SPD, per agreement with the North Carolina Division of Water Quality; and in 2012 sampling was expanded at Smith Creek at the Castle Hayne Road bridge (Table 1.1) and initiated at a new site along the South River (SR-WC). Riverine stations sampled by boat include NC11, AC, DP, IC, and BBT (Table 1.1; Fig. 1.1). NC11 is located upstream of any major point source discharges in the lower river and estuary system, and is considered to be representative of water quality entering the lower system (we note that the City of Wilmington and portions of Brunswick County get their drinking water from the river just upstream of Lock and Dam \#1). Station BBT is located on the Black River between Thoroughfare (a stream connecting the Cape Fear and Black Rivers) and the mainstem Cape Fear, and is influenced by both rivers. We consider B210 and NCF117 to represent water quality entering the lower Black and Northeast Cape Fear Rivers, respectively. Data has also been collected at stream and
river stations throughout the Cape Fear, Northeast Cape Fear, and Black River watersheds (Table 1.1; Fig. 1.1; Mallin et al. 2001).

### 1.2. Report Organization

Section 1 of this report provides a summary and introduction, and Section 2 of this report presents a detailed overview of physical, chemical, and biological water quality data from the 32 individual stations, and provides tables of raw data as well as figures showing spatial or temporal trends. LCFRP data are freely available to the public. The LCFRP has a website that contains maps and an extensive amount of past water quality, benthos, and fisheries data gathered by the Program available at: www.uncw.edu/cms/aelab/LCFRPI. Additionally, there is an on-line data base. http://lcfrp.uncw.edu/riverdatabase/
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Table 1.1 Description of sampling locations for the Lower Cape Fear River Program, 2020.

| Collected by Boat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AEL Station | DWR Station \# | Description | Comments | County | Lat | Lon | Stream Class. | HUC |
| NC11 | B8360000 | Cape Fear River at NC 11 nr East Arcadia | Below Lock and Dam 1, Represents water entering lower basin | Bladen | 34.3969 | -78.2675 | W S-IV Sw | 03030005 |
| AC | B8450000 | Cape Fear River at Neils Eddy Landing nr Acme | 1 mile below IP, DWR ambient station | Columbus | 34.3555 | -78.1794 | C Sw | 03030005 |
| DP | B8465000 | Cape Fear River at Intake nr Hooper Hill | AT DAK intake, just above confluence with Black R. | Brunswick | 34.3358 | -78.0534 | C Sw | 03030005 |
| BBT |  | Black River below Lyons Thorofare | UNCW AEL station | Pender | 34.3513 | -78.0490 | C Sw ORW+ | 0303005 |
| IC | B9030000 | Cape Fear River ups Indian Creek nr Phoenix | Downstream of several point source discharges | Brunswick | 34.3021 | -78.0137 | C Sw | 0303005 |
| NAV | B9050025 | Cape Fear River dns of RR bridge at Navassa | Downstream of several point source discharges | Brunswick | 34.2594 | -77.9877 | SC | 0303005 |
| HB | B9050100 | Cape Fear River at S. end of Horseshoe Bend nr Wilmington | Upstream of confluence with NE Cape Fear River | Brunswick | 34.2437 | -77.9698 | SC | 0303005 |
| BRR | B9790000 | Brunswick River dns NC 17 at park nr Belville | Near Belville discharge | Brunswick | 34.2214 | -77.9787 | SC | 03030005 |
| M61 | B9800000 | Cape Fear River at Channel Marker 61 at Wilmington | Downstream of several point source discharges | New Hanover | 34.1938 | -77.9573 | SC | 03030005 |
| M54 | B9795000 | Cape Fear River at Channel Marker 54 | Downstream of several point source discharges | New Hanover | 34.1393 | -77.946 | SC | 03030005 |
| M35 | B9850100 | Cape Fear River at Channel Marker 35 | Upstream of Carolina Beach discharge | Brunswick | 34.0335 | -77.937 | SC | 03030005 |
| M23 | B9910000 | Cape Fear River at Channel Marker $23$ | Downstream of Carolina Beach discharge | Brunswick | 33.9456 | -77.9696 | SA HQW | 03030005 |
| M18 | B9921000 | Cape Fear River at Channel Marker 18 | Near mouth of Cape Fear River | Brunswick | 33.913 | -78.017 | SC | 03030005 |
| NCF6 | B9670000 | NE Cape Fear nr Wrightsboro | Downstream of several point source discharges | New Hanover | 34.3171 | -77.9538 | C Sw | 0303007 |

Collected by Land

| lecte |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 RC | B8740000 | Six Runs Creek at SR 1003 nr Ingold | Upstream of Black River, CAFOs in watershed | Sampson | 34.7933 | -78.3113 | C Sw ORW+ | 03030006 |
| LCO | B8610001 | Little Coharie Creek at SR 1207 nr Ingold | Upstream of Great Coharie, CAFOs in watershed | Sampson | 34.8347 | -78.3709 | CSw | 03030006 |
| GCO | B8604000 | Great Coharie Creek at SR 1214 nr <br> Butler Crossroads | Downstream of Clinton, CAFOs in watershed | Sampson | 34.9186 | -78.3887 | CSw | 03030006 |
| SR | B8470000 | South River at US 13 nr Cooper | Downstream of Dunn | Sampson | 35.156 | -78.6401 | CSw | 03030006 |
| BRN | B8340050 | Browns Creek at NC87 nr Elizabethtown | CAFOs in watershed | Bladen | 34.6136 | -78.5848 | C | 03030005 |
| HAM | B8340200 | Hammond Creek at SR 1704 nr Mt. Olive | CAFOs in watershed | Bladen | 34.5685 | -78.5515 | C | 03030005 |
| COL | B8981000 | Colly Creek at NC 53 at Colly | Pristine area | Bladen | 34.4641 | -78.2569 | CSw | 03030006 |
| B210 | B9000000 | Black River at NC 210 at Still Bluff | 1st bridge upstream of Cape Fear River | Pender | 34.4312 | -78.1441 | C Sw ORW+ | 03030006 |
| NC403 | B9090000 | NE Cape Fear River at NC 403 nr Williams | Downstream of Mt. Olive Pickle, <br> CAFOs in watershed | Duplin | 35.1784 | -77.9807 | C Sw | 0303007 |
| PB | B9130000 | Panther Branch (Creek) nr Faison | Downstream of Bay Valley Foods | Duplin | 35.1345 | -78.1363 | CSw | 0303007 |
| GS | B9191000 | Goshen Swamp at NC 11 and NC 903 nr Kornegay | CAFOs in watershed | Duplin | 35.0281 | -77.8516 | CSw | 0303007 |
| SAR | B9191500 | NE Cape Fear River SR 1700 nr Sarecta | Downstream of several point source discharges | Duplin | 34.9801 | -77.8622 | CSw | 0303007 |
| ROC | B9430000 | Rockfish Creek at US 117 nr Wallace | Upstream of Wallace discharge | Duplin | 34.7168 | -77.9795 | CSw | 0303007 |
| LRC | B9460000 | Little Rockfish Creek at NC 11 nr Wallace | DWR Benthic station | Duplin | 34.7224 | -77.9814 | CSw | 0303007 |
| ANC | B9490000 | Angola Creek at NC 53 nr Maple Hill | DWR Benthic station | Pender | 34.6562 | -77.7351 | CSw | 0303007 |
| SR WC | B8920000 | South River at SR 1007 (Wildcat/Ennis Bridge Road) | Upstream of Black River | Sampson | 34.6402 | -78.3116 | C Sw ORW+ | 03030006 |
| NCF117 | B9580000 | NE Cape Fear River at US 117 at Castle Hayne | DWR ambient station, Downstream of point source discharges | New Hanover | 34.3637 | -77.8965 | B Sw | 0303007 |
| SC-CH | B9720000 | Smith Creek at US 117 and NC 133 at Wilmington | Urban runoff, Downstream of Wilmington Northside WWTP | New Hanover | 34.2586 | -77.9391 | CSw | 0303007 |

Figure 1.1. Map of the Lower Cape Fear River system and the LCFRP sampling stations.

## Lower Cape Fear River Program Monitoring Stations



# 2.0 Physical, Chemical, and Biological Characteristics of the Lower Cape Fear River and Estuary 

Michael A. Mallin and Matthew R. Mclver<br>Aquatic Ecology Laboratory<br>Center for Marine Science<br>University of North Carolina Wilmington

## 2.1-Introduction

This section of the report includes a discussion of the physical, chemical, and biological water quality parameters, concentrating on the January-December 2020 Lower Cape Fear River Program monitoring period. These parameters are interdependent and define the overall condition of the river. Physical parameters measured during this study included water temperature, dissolved oxygen, field turbidity and laboratory turbidity, total suspended solids (TSS), salinity, conductivity, pH and light attenuation. The chemical makeup of the Cape Fear River was investigated by measuring the magnitude and composition of nitrogen and phosphorus in the water, and metals as requested by NCDEQ. Selected biological parameters including fecal coliform bacteria (in freshwater) or Enterococcus bacteria (in the estuary) and chlorophyll a were examined.

## 2.2 - Materials and Methods

Samples and field parameters collected for the estuarine stations of the Cape Fear River (NAV down through M18) were gathered (when possible) on an ebb tide. This was done so that the data better represented the river water flowing downstream through the system rather than the tidal influx of coastal ocean water. Sample collection and analyses were conducted according to the procedures in the Lower Cape Fear River Program Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) manual. Technical Representatives from the LCFRP Technical Committee and representatives from the NC Division of Environmental Quality inspect UNCW laboratory procedures and periodically accompany field teams to verify proper procedures are followed. By agreement with N.C. Division of Environmental Quality, changes have periodically occurred in the sampling regime. Station SC-CH (lower Smith Creek) was added October 2004; sampling was discontinued at Stations M42 and SPD (June 2011); sampling at Stations BCRR and BC117 was discontinued (December 2012); sampling was added at Station SR-WC on the South River (March 2013); and sampling was discontinued at Station LVC2 (July 2015). Special sampling for dissolved metals was initiated at selected stations by NCDEQ in 2015 and is ongoing.

Physical Parameters
Water Temperature, pH, Dissolved Oxygen, Turbidity, Light, Salinity, Conductivity
Field parameters other than light attenuation were measured at each site using a YSI EXO3 or YSI Pro D55. Each parameter is measured with individual probes on the sonde. At stations sampled by boat (see Table 1.1) physical parameters were measured at 0.1 m
and at the bottom (up to 12 m ); only surface data are reported within. Occasionally, high flow prohibited the sonde from reaching the actual bottom and measurements were taken as deep as possible. At the terrestrially sampled stations (i.e. from bridges or docks) the physical parameters were measured at a depth of 0.1 m . The Aquatic Ecology Laboratory at the UNCW CMS is State-certified by the N.C. Division of Environmental Quality to perform field parameter measurements. The light attenuation coefficient $k$ was determined from data collected on-site using vertical profiles obtained by a Li-Cor LI-1000 integrator interfaced with a Li-Cor LI-193S spherical quantum sensor.

## Chemical Parameters

## Nutrients

A local State-certified analytical laboratory was contracted to conduct all chemical analyses except for orthophosphate, which is performed at CMS. The following methods detail the techniques used by CMS personnel for orthophosphate analysis.

## Orthophosphate $\left(\mathrm{PO}_{4}^{-3}\right)$

Water samples were collected ca. 0.1 m below the surface in triplicate in amber 125 mL Nalgene plastic bottles and placed on ice. In the laboratory 50 mL of each triplicate was filtered through separate 1.0 micron pre-combusted glass fiber filters, which were frozen and later analyzed for chlorophyll a. The triplicate filtrates were pooled in a glass flask, mixed thoroughly, and approximately 100 mL was poured into a 125 mL plastic bottle to be analyzed for orthophosphate. Samples were frozen until analysis.

Orthophosphate analyses were performed in duplicate using an approved US EPA method for the Bran-Lubbe AutoAnalyzer (Method 365.5). In this technique the orthophosphate in each sample reacts with ammonium molybdate and anitmony potassium tartrate in an acidic medium (sulfuric acid) to form an anitmony-phospho-molybdate complex. The complex is then reacted with ascorbic acid and forms a deep blue color. The intensity of the color is measured at a wavelength of 880 nm by a colorimeter and displayed on a chart recorder. Standards and spiked samples were analyzed for quality assurance.

## Biological Parameters

## Fecal Coliform Bacteria / Enterococcus

Fecal coliform bacteria were analyzed by a State-certified laboratory contracted by the LCFRP. Samples were collected approximately 0.1 m below the surface in sterile plastic bottles provided by the contract laboratory and placed on ice for no more than eight hours before analysis. After August 2011 the fecal coliform analysis was changed to Enterococcus bacteria in the estuarine stations downstream of NAV and HB (Stations BRR, M61, M35, M23 and M18).

## Chlorophyll a

The analytical method used to measure chlorophyll a is described in Welschmeyer (1994) and US EPA (1997) and was performed by UNCW Aquatic Ecology Laboratory personnel. Chlorophyll a concentrations were determined utilizing the 1.0 micron filters used for filtering samples for orthophosphate analysis. All filters were wrapped individually in foil, placed in airtight containers and stored in the freezer. During analysis each filter was immersed in 10 mL of $90 \%$ acetone for 24 hours, which extracts the chlorophyll a into solution. Chlorophyll a concentration of each solution was measured on a Turner 10-AU fluorometer. The fluorometer uses an optimal combination of excitation and emission bandwidth filters which reduces the errors inherent in the acidification technique. The Aquatic Ecology Laboratory at the CMS is State-certified by the N.C. Division of Environmental Quality for the analysis of chlorophyll a (chlorophyll at three LCFRP stations are required by NCDEQ to be analyzed by state-certified methods); the rest of the large amount of chlorophyll a data presented here were not State-certified.

## Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)

Five sites were originally chosen for BOD analysis. One site was located at NC11, upstream of International Paper, and a second site was at AC, about 3 miles downstream of International Paper (Fig.1.1). Two sites were located in blackwater rivers (NCF117 and B210) and one site (BBT) was situated in an area influenced by both the mainstem Cape Fear River and the Black River. For the sampling period May 2000-April 2004 additional BOD data were collected at stream stations 6RC, LCO, GCO, BRN, HAM and COL in the Cape Fear and Black River watersheds. In May 2004 those stations were dropped and sampling commenced at ANC, SAR, GS, N403, ROC and BC117 in the Northeast Cape Fear River watershed for several years. BOD analysis was stopped in August 2015 due to insufficient funding; previous BOD results are published (Mallin et al. 2006).

| Parameter | Method | NC DEQ Certified |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Water Temperature | SM 2550B-2000 | Yes |
| Dissolved Oxygen | SM 45000 G-2001 | Yes |
| pH | SM 4500 H+B-2011 | Yes |
| Specific Conductivity | SM 2510 B-2011 | Yes |
| Lab Turbidity | SM 2130 B-2001 | Yes |
| Field Turbidity | SM 2130 B-2001 | No |
| Chlorophyll a | EPA 445.0 Rev. 1.2 | Yes |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand | SM 5210 B-2001 | No |


| Parameter | Method | NC DEQ Certified |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nitrogen | By addition |  |
| Nitrate + Nitrite | EPA 353.2 Rev 2.0 1993 | Yes |
| Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen | EPA 351.2 Rev 2.0 1993 | Yes |
| Ammonia Nitrogen | SM 450.1 Rev 2.0 1993 | Ye-2012 |
| Total Phosphorus | EPA 365.5 | Yes |
| Orthophosphate | SM 9222 D-1997 | No |
| Fecal Coliform | Enterolert IDEXX | Yes |
| Enterococcus | Yes |  |

## 2.3 - Results and Discussion

This section includes results from monitoring of the physical, biological, and chemical parameters at all stations for the time period January-December 2020. Discussion of the data focuses both on the river channel stations and stream stations, which sometimes reflect poorer water quality than the channel stations. The contributions of the two large blackwater tributaries, the Northeast Cape Fear River and the Black River, are represented by conditions at NCF117 and B210, respectively. The Cape Fear region experienced minor impacts from Hurricane Isaias in early August 2020; therefore this report reflects its impacts that summer.

## Physical Parameters

## Water temperature

Water temperatures at all stations ranged from 5.7 to $30.9^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and individual station annual averages ranged from 17.9 to $20.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Table 2.1). Highest temperatures occurred during July and lowest temperatures during December. Stream stations were generally cooler than river stations, most likely because of shading and lower nighttime air temperatures affecting the shallower waters.

## Salinity

Salinity at the estuarine stations (NAV through M18; also NCF6 in the Northeast Cape Fear River) ranged from 0.0 to 31.3 practical salinity units (psu) and station annual means ranged from 0.0 to 19.8 psu (Table 2.2). Lowest salinities occurred in late spring and early summer of 2020 and again in November. The annual mean salinities for 2020 were somewhat lower than the twenty-five year average for 1995-2019 (Figure 2.1). Two stream stations, NC403 and PB, had occasional oligohaline conditions due to discharges from pickle production facilities. SC-CH is a blackwater tidal creek that enters the

Northeast Cape Fear River just upstream of Wilmington and salinity there ranged from 0.0 to 7.0 psu .

## Conductivity

Conductivity at the estuarine stations ranged from 0.07 to $48.26 \mathrm{mS} / \mathrm{cm}$ and from 0.05 to $1.65 \mathrm{mS} / \mathrm{cm}$ at the freshwater stations (Table 2.3). Temporal conductivity patterns followed those of salinity. Dissolved ionic compounds increase the conductance of water, therefore, conductance increases and decreases with salinity, often reflecting river flow conditions due to rainfall. Stations PB and NC403 are below industrial discharges, and often have elevated conductivity. Smith Creek (SC-CH) is an estuarine tidal creek and the conductivity values reflect this (Table 2.3).

```
pH
```

System pH values ranged from 3.3 to 8.1 and station annual means ranged from 3.8 (at COL) to 7.8 (Table 2.4). pH was typically lowest upstream due to acidic swamp water inputs and highest downstream as alkaline seawater mixes with the river water. Low pH values at COL predominate because of naturally acidic blackwater inputs in this wetlandrich rural watershed.

## Dissolved Oxygen

Dissolved oxygen (DO) problems have long been a major water quality concern in the lower Cape Fear River and its estuary, and several of the tributary streams. There is an annual dissolved oxygen sag in the main river channel that begins at DP below a paper mill discharge and persists into the mesohaline portion of the estuary (Fig. 2.2). Working synergistically to lower oxygen levels are two factors: lower oxygen carrying capacity in warmer water and increased bacterial respiration (or biochemical oxygen demand, BOD), due to higher temperatures in summer. Unlike other large North Carolina estuaries (the Neuse, Pamlico and New River) the Cape Fear estuary rarely suffers from dissolved oxygen stratification. This is because, despite salinity stratification, the oxygen remains well mixed due to strong estuarine gravitational circulation and high freshwater inputs (Lin et al. 2006). Thus, hypoxia in the Cape Fear is present throughout the water column. Surface concentrations for all sites in 2020 ranged from 2.0 to $11.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (both at GS) and station annual means ranged from 5.5 to $8.6 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (Table 2.5). Overall, average dissolved oxygen levels for 2020 were slightly lower compared with the long-term average (Fig. 2.2). River dissolved oxygen levels were low during the summer and early fall (Table 2.5), often falling below the state standard of $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ at several river and upper estuary stations. Although Hurricane Isaias impacted the area in early August, it had little impact on dissolved oxygen levels.

NAV, IC, HB, and BRR were below $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ on $36 \%$ of occasions sampled, and M61 was below $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ on $46 \%$ of occasions. Based on number of occasions the river stations were below $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ dissolved oxygen UNCW rated NAV, HB, IC, BRR and M61 as poor for 2020; the lower estuary stations were rated as good. On a year-to-year basis, discharge
of BOD waste from the paper/pulp mill just above the AC station, as well as inflow of blackwater from the Northeast Cape Fear and Black Rivers, helps to decrease oxygen in the lower river and upper estuary. Additionally, algal blooms periodically form behind Lock and Dam \#1 (including the blue-green algal blooms from 2009-2012), and the chlorophyll a they produce is strongly correlated with BOD at Station NC11 (Mallin et al. 2006); thus algal blooms do contribute to lower DO in the river. As the water reaches the lower estuary higher algal productivity, mixing and ocean dilution help alleviate oxygen problems.

Most tributary Stations were rated fair or good in 2020, except ANC and GS, rated poor (Table 2.5). Some hypoxia can be attributed to low summer water conditions and some potentially to CAFO runoff; however point-source discharges also likely contribute to low dissolved oxygen levels at NC403 and possibly SR, especially via nutrient loading (Mallin et al. 2004). Hypoxia is thus a continuing problem but improved with only $34 \%$ of stations impacted compared to $50 \%$ of the sites impacted in 2019.

## Field Turbidity

Field turbidity levels ranged from 0 to 37 Nephelometric turbidity units (NTU) and station annual means ranged from 2 to 18 NTU (Table 2.6). The State standard for estuarine turbidity is 25 NTU. Highest mean turbidities were at the upper river sites NC11-DP (18 NTU), with turbidities generally low in the middle to lower estuary (Figure 2.3). The estuarine stations did not exceed the estuarine turbidity standard on our 2020 sampling trips. As in the previous year, mean turbidity levels for 2020 were well below the long-term average at all estuary sites (Fig. 2.3). Turbidity was considerably lower in the blackwater tributaries (Northeast Cape Fear River and Black River) than in the mainstem river. Average turbidity levels were low in the freshwater streams. The State standard for freshwater turbidity is 50 NTU.

Note: In addition to the laboratory-analyzed turbidity that are required by NCDEQ for seven locations, the LCFRP uses nephelometers designed for field use, which allows us to acquire in situ turbidity from a natural situation. North Carolina regulatory agencies are required to use turbidity values from water samples removed from the natural system, put on ice until arrival at a State-certified laboratory, and analyzed using laboratory nephelometers. Standard Methods (APHA 1995) notes that transport of samples and temperature change alters true turbidity readings. Our analysis of samples using both methods shows that lab turbidity is nearly always lower than field turbidity; thus we do not discuss lab turbidity in this report.

## Total Suspended Solids (TSS)

An altered monitoring plan was developed for the LCFRP in September 2011. These changes were suggested by the NC Division of Environmental Quality (then DWQ). NCDEQ suggested the LCFRP stop monitoring TSS at Stations ANC, GS, 6RC, LCO, SR, BRN, HAM, COL, SR-WC and monitor turbidity instead. DWQ believed turbidity would be more useful than TSS in evaluating water quality at these stations because there are water
quality standards for turbidity. TSS is used by the NCDEQ NPDES Unit to evaluate discharges. No LCFRP subscribers discharge near these sites.

Total suspended solid (TSS) values system wide ranged from 1.3 to $38.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ with station annual means from 3.0 to $17.6 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (Table 2.7). The overall highest river values were at NC11, DP and AC. In the stream stations TSS was generally considerably lower than the river and estuary. Although total suspended solids (TSS) and turbidity both quantify suspended material in the water column, they do not always go hand in hand. High TSS does not mean high turbidity and vice versa. This anomaly may be explained by the fact that fine clay particles are effective at dispersing light and causing high turbidity readings, while not resulting in high TSS. On the other hand, large organic or inorganic particles may be less effective at dispersing light, yet their greater mass results in high TSS levels. While there is no NC ambient standard for TSS, many years of data from the lower Cape Fear watershed indicates that $25 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ can be considered elevated (reached on several occasions but only at NC11 and AC in the 2020 data). The fine silt and clay in the upper to middle estuary sediments are most likely derived from the Piedmont and carried downstream to the estuary, while the sediments in the lowest portion of the estuary are marine-derived sands (Benedetti et al. 2006).

## Light Attenuation

Due to instrumentation problems, compounded by the Covid-19 pandemic, light attenuation values will not be reported for 2020.

## Chemical Parameters - Nutrients

## Total Nitrogen

Total nitrogen (TN) is calculated from TKN (see below) plus nitrate; it is not analyzed in the laboratory. TN ranged from 50 (detection limit) to $7,780 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (at ROC) and station annual means ranged from 639 to $2,017 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (at ROC; Table 2.8). Previous research (Mallin et al. 1999) has shown a positive correlation between river flow and TN in the Cape Fear system. In the main river total nitrogen concentrations were highest at NC11, then declining into the lower estuary, most likely reflecting uptake of nitrogen into the food chain through algal productivity and subsequent grazing by planktivores as well as through dilution and marsh denitrification. The highest median TN value at the stream stations was at NC403 with $1,640 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$; other sites with elevated TN were ROC, PB, ANC, 6RC and LRC.

## Nitrate + Nitrite

Nitrate+nitrite (henceforth referred to as nitrate) is the main species of inorganic nitrogen in the Lower Cape Fear River. Concentrations system wide ranged from 10 (detection limit) to $6,160 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (at ROC) and station annual means ranged from 23 to $912 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (at 6RC; Table 2.9). The highest average riverine nitrate levels were at NC11 through DP (344-211 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ ) indicating that much of this nutrient is imported from upstream. Moving downstream,
nitrate levels decrease most likely as a result of uptake by primary producers, microbial denitrification in riparian marshes and tidal dilution. Despite this, the rapid flushing of the estuary (Ensign et al. 2004) permits sufficient nitrate to enter the coastal ocean in the plume and contribute to offshore productivity (Mallin et al. 2005). Nitrate can limit phytoplankton production in the lower estuary in summer (Mallin et al. 1999). The blackwater rivers carried lower concentrations of nitrate compared to the mainstem Cape Fear stations; i.e. the Northeast Cape Fear River (NCF117 mean $=149 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ ) and the Black River (B210 $=215 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L})$. Lowest river nitrate occurred during August-September.

Several stream stations showed high levels of nitrate on occasion including NC403, PB, ROC and 6RC. ROC and 6RC primarily receive non-point agricultural or animal waste drainage, while point sources contribute to NC403 and PB. In general, the stream stations showed elevated nitrate in late winter and early spring. A considerable number of experiments have been carried out by UNCW researchers to assess the effects of nutrient additions to water collected from blackwater streams and rivers (i.e. the Black and Northeast Cape Fear Rivers, and Colly and Great Coharie Creeks). These experiments have collectively found that additions of nitrogen (as either nitrate, ammonium, or urea) significantly stimulate phytoplankton production and BOD increases. Critical levels of these dissolved nutrients were in the range of 200 to $500 \mu \mathrm{~g}-\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{L}$ (Mallin et al. 2004; Mallin and Cahoon 2020). Thus, we conservatively consider nitrate concentrations exceeding $500 \mu \mathrm{~g}-\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{L}$ in Cape Fear watershed streams to be potentially problematic to stream environmental health.

We performed a 20-year (2000-2019) analysis of nitrate changes at select stations (Fig. 2.4). Prior to 2000 there were several large hurricanes impacting water quality of the Lower Cape Fear River system, so we wanted to factor out impacts of those acute events. Results showed several statistical increases in nitrate concentrations, especially at 6RC, ROC, GCO and LCO (Fig. 2.4). All of those watersheds contain numerous swine CAFOs, as well as many poultry CAFOs. We note that Colly Creek (COL) which as very few CAFOs but abundant wetlands showed no increase over that same period. Angola Creek (ANC) which has several CAFOs but a considerable amount of wetlands coverage showed a significant increase in nitrate, but concentrations were very low (Fig. 2.4). Overall, there has been a significant nitrate increase in several stations which is likely a result of watershed livestock production and the type of waste disposal from those operations.

## Ammonium/ammonia

Ammonium concentrations ranged from 10 (detection limit) to $1,680 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ and station annual means ranged from 36 to $399 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (Table 2.11). River areas with the highest mean ammonium levels this monitoring period included AC and DP, which are downstream of a pulp mill discharge, and M54, M23 and M18 in the mid-to-lower estuary. At the stream stations Colly Creek (COL) showed two occasions of high ammonium, an improvement from 2019 (Table 2.10). This station is in a wetland-rich watershed that has a low level of human development. Most previous years have showed generally low levels of ammonium; however, beginning in 2005 a few unusual peaks began to occur, which increased in magnitude and frequency after 2012, particularly in 2016, 2017 and 2018.

We do not have a solid explanation for this increase in ammonium. We are aware that White Lake, located in the upper Colly Creek watershed has had problems with eutrophication (NC DEQ 2017), with nearby upper groundwater and surface runoff showing elevated nutrient concentrations (especially ammonium; potentially from failing local sewage infrastructure in the densely-developed area immediately surrounding the lake). General nutrient concentrations in the lake increased over time as well (NCDEQ 2017). Thus, possibly ammonium-rich drainage from this area has made its way down to the COL station. Additional areas with periodic elevated ammonium in 2020 included 6RC, N403, ANC, ROC and PB (Table 2.11).

## Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen

Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) is a measure of the total concentration of organic nitrogen plus ammonium. TKN ranged from 50 (detection limit) to $3,850 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (at LRC) and station annual means ranged from 469 to $1,493 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (Table 2.11). TKN concentration decreases ocean-ward through the estuary, likely due to ocean dilution and food chain uptake of nitrogen. Stations with highest median concentrations included COL, ANC and ROC. As with ammonium, upper groundwater in the White Lake drainage contained high TKN (NC DEQ 2017), some of which may have gone downstream.

## Total Phosphorus

Total phosphorus (TP) concentrations ranged from 10 (detection limit) to $1,530 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (at LRC) and station annual means ranged from 120 to $560 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (LRC; Table 2.12). For the mainstem and upper estuary, average TP for 2020 was considerably higher than the 19952019 average (Figure 2.5).

The experiments discussed above in the nitrate subsection also involved additions of phosphorus, either as inorganic orthophosphate or a combination of inorganic plus organic $P$. The experiments showed that additions of $P$ exceeding $500 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ led to significant increases in bacterial counts, as well as significant increases in BOD over control. Thus, we consider concentrations of phosphorus above $500 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ to be potentially problematic to blackwater streams (Mallin et al. 2004; Mallin and Cahoon 2020). Streams frequently exceeding this critical concentration included ANC and ROC. SAR, GS, and SC-CH each yielded two values exceeding $500 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$. Stations NC403 and PB are downstream of wastewater discharges, while ROC, GS and ANC are in non-point agricultural areas.

## Orthophosphate

Orthophosphate ranged from 5 to $550 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (at ROC) and station annual means ranged from 7 to $188 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (Table 2.13). Much of the main river orthophosphate load is imported into the Lower Cape Fear system from upstream areas, as NC11 or AC typically have high levels; there are also inputs of orthophosphate from the paper mill above AC (Table 2.14. Orthophosphate can bind to suspended materials and is transported downstream via particle attachment; thus high levels of turbidity at the uppermost river stations may be an important factor in the high orthophosphate levels. Turbidity declines toward the lower
estuary because of settling, and orthophosphate concentration also declines. In the estuary, primary productivity helps reduce orthophosphate concentrations by assimilation into biomass. Orthophosphate levels typically reach maximum concentrations during summertime, when anoxic sediment releases bound phosphorus. Also, in the Cape Fear Estuary, summer algal productivity is limited by nitrogen, thereby allowing the accumulation of orthophosphate (Mallin et al. 1999). In spring, productivity in the estuary is usually limited by phosphorus (Mallin et al. 1999).

ROC, ANC and GCO had the highest stream station orthophosphate concentrations. All of those sites are in non-point source areas.

## Chemical Parameters - EPA Priority Pollutant Metals

The LCFRP had previously sampled for water column metals (EPA Priority Pollutant Metals) on a bimonthly basis. However, as of 2007 this requirement was suspended by the NC Division of Water Quality and these data are no longer regularly collected by the LCFRP. Revised metals sampling (dissolved, not total metals) was re-initiated in late 2015 and has continued periodically upon request from NCDEQ. Results showed that for stations M35 and M23, concentrations of $\mathrm{As}, \mathrm{Cd}, \mathrm{Cr}, \mathrm{Cu}, \mathrm{Pb}, \mathrm{Ni}$ and Zn were below detection limits on all sampling occasions. Iron (Fe) concentrations were measurable but not at harmful levels. M35 and M23 were previously on the 303(d) list being impaired for Copper Arsenic and Nickel. The DWR determined that these sites could be de-listed using the new dissolved metals criteria.

There were two metals samples collected in December 2018 at IC and NAV, with no unusual or adversely high concentrations. Samples were also collected at those two sites in June and December 2019. Most metals were below detection limits. Mercury at IC was $3.39 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{L}$ in June and $2.39 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{L}$ in December, and Hg at NAV was 2.79 in December 2019. Zinc was $0.012 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ at IC in December 2019. LCFRP has voluntarily collected samples on 10 occasions using EPA Method 1669. Metals were not collected in 2020, but sampling was reinitiated in summer 2021.

## Biological Parameters

## Chlorophyll a

During this monitoring period, chlorophyll a was low in the river and estuary locations (Table 2.14). The state standard was not exceeded in the river or estuary samples in 2020 but approached it ( $38 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ at M35) in August. We note that at the upper site NC11 it has been demonstrated that chlorophyll a biomass is significantly correlated with biochemical oxygen demand (BOD5 - Mallin et al. 2006). Multiple statistical approaches demonstrated that chlorophyll a near Lock and Dam \#1 is strongly associated with nitrate generated upstream about 100 km , in an area of point source dischargers downstream of Fayetteville (Saul et al. 2019). System wide, chlorophyll a ranged from undetectable to $111 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$, and station annual means ranged from 1-16 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$, generally low because of high river discharge in 2020 (see below). Production of chlorophyll a biomass is usually low to
moderate in the rivers and estuary primarily because of light limitation by turbidity in the mainstem (Dubbs and Whalen 2008) and high organic color and low inorganic nutrients in the blackwater tributary rivers.

Spatially, along the river mainstem highest values are normally found in the mid-to-lower estuary stations because light becomes more available downstream of the estuarine turbidity maximum (Fig. 2.6). On average, flushing time of the Cape Fear estuary is rapid, ranging from 1-22 days with a median of 6.7 days (Ensign et al. 2004). This does not allow for much settling of suspended materials, leading to light limitation of phytoplankton production. However, under lower-than-average flows there is generally clearer water because of less suspended material and less blackwater swamp inputs. We note that there were a series of problematic cyanobacterial (blue-green algae) blooms of Microcyctis aeruginosa on the mainstem river in summers of 2009-2012 (Isaacs et al. 2014). For the growing season May-September, long-term (1995-2020) average monthly flow at Lock and Dam \#1 was approximately 3,685 CFS; however, for cyanobacterial bloom years 20092012 the growing season average flow was 1,698 CFS (USGS data; (http://nc.water.usgs.gov/realtime/real time cape fear.html). For 2020, discharge in MaySeptember was 7,584 CFS, much higher than the 2009-2012 average, and nuisance cyanobacterial blooms did not occur in the river and upper estuary in 2020.

As noted, the blooms in 2009-2012 all occurred when average river discharge for MaySeptember was below 1,900 CFS. Algal bloom formation was probably suppressed by elevated river flow in 2013-2014 and 2016-2020. Flow in 2015 was well within the range when blooms can occur, yet blooms did not occur in 2015. Clearly other factors are at work in bloom formation.

Phytoplankton blooms occasionally occur at the stream stations, with a few occurring at various months in 2020 (Table 2.14). These streams are generally shallow, so vertical mixing does not carry phytoplankton cells down below the critical depth where respiration exceeds photosynthesis. In areas where the forest canopy opens up large blooms can occur. When blooms occur in blackwater streams they can become sources of BOD upon death and decay, reducing further the low summer dissolved oxygen conditions common to these waters (Mallin et al. 2004; 2015; 2020; 2015). A stream station bloom exceeding the state standard of $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ occurred on one occasion at Station GS ( $44 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ ) and on one occasion at SR (111 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ ), and lesser blooms occurred on occasion at PB, SC-CH and ANC (Table 2.15).

## Biochemical Oxygen Demand

Beginning in 2015 samples for BOD5 and BOD20 are no longer collected for the program due to insufficient funds.

## Fecal Coliform Bacteria/ Enterococcus bacteria

Fecal coliform (FC) bacterial counts ranged from 5 to 30,000 CFU/100 mL and station annual geometric means ranged from 27 to 352 CFU/100 mL (Table 2.15). The state
human contact standard ( $200 \mathrm{CFU} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) was exceeded in the mainstem river in only one month (January) in 2020 (Table 2.15). During 2020 some stream stations showed elevated fecal coliform pollution levels. HAM, PB and LRC exceeded 200 CFU/100 mL $50 \%$ of the time sampled and ROC and BRN $45 \%$ of the time sampled. Other stations had periodic elevated counts particularly May-August - August may have been influenced by Hurricane Isaias. NC403 and PB are located below point source discharges and the other sites are primarily influenced by non-point source pollution. Beginning in 2015 but especially in 2017 COL had a number of unusually high fecal coliform counts; but counts had no exceedences of the standard in 2020.

Enterococcus counts were initiated in the estuary in mid-2011, as this test is now the standard used by North Carolina regulators for swimming in salt waters. Sites covered by this test include BRR, M61, M54, M35, M23 and M18. The State has a single-sample level for Tier II swimming areas in which the enterococci level in a Tier II swimming area shall not exceed a single sample of 276 enterococci per 100 milliliter of water (15A NCAC 18A .3402); the LCFRP is using this standard for the Cape Fear estuary samples in our rating system. As such, in 2020 this standard was exceeded in the estuary samples once each at M23 and M18. Geometric mean enterococci counts for 2020 were lower than those of the 2012-2019 period for the lower Cape Fear Estuary (Fig. 2.7). Overall, elevated fecal coliform and Enterococcus counts are problematic in this system, with 42\% of the stations rated as fair or poor in 2020, the same as 2019.
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Table 2.1 Water temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program stations.

|  | NC11 | AC | DP | BBT | IC | NCF6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 9.6 | 9.7 | 9.9 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 12.2 |
| FEB | 11.4 | 11.5 | 11.7 | 12.2 | 12.0 | 12.8 |
| MAR | 16.6 | 16.7 | 16.6 | 16.8 | 16.6 | 16.6 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 21.6 | 21.7 | 22.6 | 22.6 | 22.4 | 23.8 |
| JUN | 23.0 | 22.9 | 23.0 | 21.7 | 23.2 | 22.6 |
| JUL | 28.3 | 28.3 | 28.9 | 26.7 | 27.8 | 27.5 |
| AUG | 26.6 | 26.5 | 26.4 | 26.3 | 26.4 | 26.7 |
| SEP | 26.3 | 26.4 | 26.2 | 26.2 | 26.3 | 26.7 |
| OCT | 19.3 | 19.5 | 19.7 | 19.8 | 23.0 | 21.5 |
| NOV | 16.5 | 16.7 | 17.4 | 16.3 | 16.9 | 18.8 |
| DEC | 9.6 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 9.0 | 9.8 | 10.8 |
| mean | $\mathbf{1 9 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 0}$ |
| std dev | 6.8 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 6.2 |
| median | 19.3 | 19.5 | 19.7 | 19.8 | 22.4 | 21.5 |
| max | 28.3 | 28.3 | 28.9 | 26.7 | 27.8 | 27.5 |
| min | 9.6 | 9.7 | 9.9 | 9.0 | 9.8 | 10.8 |



Table 2.2 Salinity (psu) during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program estuarine stations.

|  | NAV | HB | BRR | M61 | M54 | M35 | M23 | M18 | NCF6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SC-CH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JAN | 0.1 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 10.9 | 17.0 | 21.2 | 0.3 |
| FEB | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 5.7 | 12.7 | 15.7 | 0.0 |
| MAR | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 4.3 | 8.0 | 19.9 | 0.1 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 8.8 | 10.8 | 0.0 |
| JUN | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 6.1 | 11.2 | 0.0 |
| JUL | 0.1 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 3.0 | 6.6 | 12.8 | 26.1 | 30.5 | 0.1 |
| AUG | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 10.4 | 17.1 | 20.7 | 0.1 |
| SEP | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 2.8 | 7.4 | 14.4 | 26.0 | 31.3 | 7.0 |
| OCT | 0.1 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 3.8 | 9.1 | 19.8 | 27.9 | 0.1 |
| NOV | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 7.7 | 6.2 | 2.1 |
| DEC | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 7.5 | 17.3 | 22.7 | 0.1 |
| mean | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0}$ | 7.2 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9}$ |
| std dev | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 4.7 | 7.1 | 8.2 | 2.1 |
| median | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 7.5 | 17.0 | 20.7 | 0.1 |
| max | 0.1 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 6.3 | 7.4 | 14.4 | 26.1 | 31.3 | 7.0 |
| min | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 0.0 |


Table 2.3 Conductivity ( $\mathrm{mS} / \mathrm{cm}$ ) during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program stations.

|  | NC11 | AC | DP | BBT | IC | NCF6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.61 |
| FEB | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.09 |
| MAR | 0.09 | 0.21 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.12 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| JUN | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.10 |
| JUL | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| AUG | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.11 |
| SEP | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 12.20 |
| OCT | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.15 |
| NOV | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 3.98 |
| DEC | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.12 |
| mean | $\mathbf{0 . 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 0}$ |
| std dev | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 3.70 |
| median | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.12 |
| max | 0.13 | 0.21 | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 12.20 |
| min | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |



Table 2.4 pH (su) during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program stations.

|  | NC11 | AC | DP | BBT | IC | NCF6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 5.5 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 6.7 |
| FEB | 6.0 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 6.1 |
| MAR | 6.7 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.3 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 6.3 | 6.4 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 5.7 |
| JUN | 6.9 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 6.7 | 6.4 |
| JUL | 6.5 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 6.8 | 6.0 |
| AUG | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| SEP | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.8 |
| OCT | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.8 |
| NOV | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.6 |
| DEC | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 6.3 |
| mean | $\mathbf{6 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 4}$ |
| std dev | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| median | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.3 |
| max | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.8 |
| min | 5.5 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 5.7 |



Table 2.5 Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program stations.

|  | NAV | HB | BRR | M61 | M54 | M35 | M23 | M18 |  | NC11 | AC | DP | BBT | IC | NCF6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 9.8 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.2 | 9.7 | 10.0 | 10.1 | 9.8 | JAN | 10.2 | 10.0 | 9.8 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 8.9 |
| FEB | 10.4 | 10.2 | 10.3 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 9.7 | 9.7 | FEB | 9.3 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 7.8 | 8.1 | 6.9 |
| MAR | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 9.7 | 9.8 | 9.4 | MAR | 8.8 | 8.6 | 8.4 | 7.7 | 8.0 | 7.2 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 5.7 | 6.4 | 6.1 | MAY | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.5 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 3.9 |
| JUN | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 6.5 | JUN | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 4.9 | 6.3 | 4.0 |
| JUL | 4.0 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 6.3 | JUL | 6.1 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 3.8 |
| AUG | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 6.3 | AUG | 6.4 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 3.1 |
| SEP | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 5.4 | 5.7 | 6.1 | 6.6 | SEP | 6.6 | 6.3 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| OCT | 6.0 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 6.6 | OCT | 8.2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 4.5 |
| NOV | 7.0 | 6.9 | 6.8 | 6.4 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 7.6 | 7.7 | NOV | 8.9 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 6.3 |
| DEC | 9.0 | 8.9 | 9.3 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 8.3 | DEC | 10.5 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 9.4 | 10.1 | 8.2 |
| mean | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 7.1 | 7.6 | 7.6 | mean | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 5.6 |
| std dev | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.5 | std dev | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| median | 6.0 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 6.6 | median | 8.2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 4.6 |
| max | 10.4 | 10.2 | 10.3 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 10.1 | 9.8 | max | 10.5 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 10.1 | 8.9 |
| min | 4.0 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 6.1 | min | 5.9 | 5.6 | 4.8 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 3.1 |


|  | B210 | COL | SRWC | 6RC | LCO | GCO | SR | BRN | HAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 7.7 | 5.7 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.2 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| FEB | 10.1 | 9.5 | 10.5 | 10.7 | 10.5 | 10.3 | 10.1 | 10.5 | 10.7 |
| MAR | 6.3 | 5.7 | 6.8 | 7.1 | 6.7 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 9.3 | 8.9 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 6.2 | 5.2 | 7.3 | 7.0 | 6.8 | 6.3 | 6.7 | 8.0 | 6.7 |
| JUN | 4.9 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 3.7 | 7.3 | 6.3 |
| JUL | 4.1 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.1 | 4.1 | 7.0 | 6.1 |
| AUG | 5.0 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 3.7 | 7.1 | 5.8 |
| SEP | 4.6 | 5.5 | 6.6 | 6.2 | 6.7 | 5.8 | 3.2 | 7.5 | 5.9 |
| OCT | 5.2 | 6.1 | 7.3 | 7.0 | 7.7 | 6.3 | 4.8 | 8.4 | 7.3 |
| NOV | 6.1 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 6.3 | 7.8 | 8.2 | 7.2 | 9.7 | 9.4 |
| DEC | 10.8 | 10.5 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 11.6 | 10.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| mean | $\mathbf{6 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 4}$ | 7.3 | $\mathbf{7 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 6}$ | 7.9 |
| std dev | 2.2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 |
| median | 6.1 | 5.7 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 5.9 | 8.0 | 7.3 |
| max | 10.8 | 10.5 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 11.6 | 10.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| min | 4.1 | 4.7 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 3.2 | 7.0 | 5.8 |



Table 2.6 Field Turbidity (NTU) during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program stations.

|  | NAV | HB | BRR | M61 | M54 | M35 | M23 | M18 |  | NC11 | AC | DP | BBT | IC | NCF6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 12 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 13 | JAN | 36 | 34 | 36 | 29 | 29 | 14 |
| FEB | 17 | 18 | 21 | 13 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 5 | FEB | 35 | 37 | 31 | 14 | 21 | 4 |
| MAR | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 5 | MAR | 6 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 4 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 15 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 18 | 14 | 7 | 6 | MAY | 33 | 31 | 22 | 8 | 12 | 4 |
| JUN | 9 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 9 | JUN | 27 | 24 | 21 | 8 | 15 | 5 |
| JUL | 6 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 | JUL | 8 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| AUG | 11 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | AUG | 13 | 13 | 21 | 6 | 10 | 4 |
| SEP | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | SEP | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| OCT | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 6 | OCT | 14 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 5 |
| NOV | 13 | 13 | 12 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 6 | Nov | 8 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| DEC | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 4 | DEC | 18 | 18 | 18 | 10 | 16 | 4 |
| mean | 11 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 6 | mean | 18 | 18 | 16 | 9 | 12 | 5 |
| std dev | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | std dev | 12 | 12 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 3 |
| median | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | median | 14 | 13 | 18 | 8 | 10 | 4 |
| max | 17 | 18 | 21 | 14 | 18 | 14 | 8 | 13 | max | 36 | 37 | 36 | 29 | 29 | 14 |
| min | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | min | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |




Table 2.7 Total Suspended Solids (mg/L) during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program stations.

|  | NC11 | AC | DP | IC | NCF6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 35.8 | 38.8 | 19.6 | 35.5 | 20.0 |
| FEB | 26.8 | 29.6 | 24.6 | 14.3 | 3.7 |
| MAR | 3.3 | 3.9 | 6.4 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 30.0 | 30.7 | 24.0 | 14.6 | 5.0 |
| JUN | 29.8 | 31.6 | 21.9 | 17.2 | 7.5 |
| JUL | 5.6 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 8.2 |
| AUG | 14.0 | 15.2 | 19.6 | 9.2 | 5.6 |
| SEP | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 5.7 | 10.2 |
| OCT | 15.1 | 13.9 | 6.5 | 3.6 | 9.1 |
| NOV | 9.8 | 7.2 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 4.7 |
| DEC | 13.7 | 15.6 | 17.3 | 15.9 | 4.7 |
| mean | $\mathbf{1 7 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 5}$ | 11.5 |
| std dev | 11.7 | 13.0 | 9.0 | 9.7 | 9.7 |
| median | 14.0 | 15.2 | 17.3 | 8.9 | 9.2 |
| max | 35.8 | 38.8 | 24.6 | 5.4 | 35.5 |
| min | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 8.9 | 1.3 |





|  | ANC | SAR | GS | NC403 | PB | LRC | ROC | NCF117 | SC-CH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 1,500 | 1,100 | 500 | 2,660 | 1,110 | 1,200 | 1,520 | 900 | 340 |
| FEB | 1,880 | 2,550 | 1,850 | 5,870 | 5,410 | 2,410 | 2,980 | 1,780 | 1,710 |
| MAR | 1,220 | 930 | 500 | 2,320 | 2,300 | 740 | 1,010 | 480 | 580 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 850 | 750 | 520 | 1,640 | 2,140 | 810 | 1,150 | 920 | 900 |
| JUN | 1,520 | 710 | 810 | 1,190 | 1,230 | 3,850 | 1,060 | 900 | 920 |
| JUL | 2,110 | 950 | 1,930 | 1,780 | 1,920 | 1,840 | 7,780 | 1,560 | 1,260 |
| AUG | 1,740 | 1,050 | 910 | 1,900 | 980 | 1,000 | 1,790 | 1,420 | 840 |
| SEP | 2,020 | 900 | 1,040 | 1,140 | 1,160 | 1,210 | 1,320 | 1,060 | 980 |
| OCT | 1,800 | 900 | 940 | 840 | 980 | 1,500 | 1,130 | 910 | 980 |
| NOV | 1,570 | 820 | 790 | 1,100 | 1,860 | 960 | 1,630 | 760 | 1,320 |
| DEC | 1,430 | 620 | 1,050 | 1,390 | 1,090 | 1,410 | 820 | 670 | 950 |
| mean | $\mathbf{1 , 6 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 9 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 0}$ |
| std dev | 364 | 525 | 491 | 1,401 | 1,283 | 907 | 1,999 | 395 | 364 |
| median | 1,570 | 900 | 910 | 1,640 | 1,230 | 1,210 | 1,320 | 910 | 950 |
| max | 2,110 | 2,550 | 1,930 | 5,870 | 5,410 | 3,850 | 7,780 | 1,780 | 1,710 |
| min | 850 | 620 | 500 | 840 | 980 | 740 | 820 | 480 | 340 |



Figure 2.4. 20-year changes in nitrate at selected non-point source sites in the Lower Cape Fear basin; note general increasing trend except for wetland-rich Colly Creek. CAFO numbers are approximates.
Table 2.9 Nitrate/Nitrite ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{l}$ ) during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River stations.

|  | NC11 | AC | DP | IC | NCF6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 90 | 90 | 90 | 0 | 30 |
| FEB | 530 | 540 | 540 | 490 | 140 |
| MAR | 740 | 740 | 790 | 430 | 380 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 430 | 360 | 380 | 340 | 210 |
| JUN | 50 | 100 | 290 | 270 | 70 |
| JUL | 80 | 100 | 180 | 60 | 10 |
| AUG | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| SEP | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| OCT | 540 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| NOV | 670 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| DEC | 620 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| mean | $\mathbf{3 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 1}$ |
| std dev | 293 | 253 | 264 | 193 | 119 |
| median | 430 | 90 | 90 | 10 | 10 |
| max | 740 | 740 | 790 | 490 | 380 |
| min | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 10 |


|  | B210 | COL | SR-WC | 6RC | LCO | GCO | SR | BRN | HAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 200 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| FEB | 590 | 40 | 380 | 1,750 | 460 | 1,070 | 380 | 770 | 1,030 |
| MAR | 260 | 10 | 100 | 680 | 460 | 190 | 110 | 620 | 290 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 80 | 10 | 210 | 1,240 | 510 | 60 | 480 | 490 | 280 |
| JUN | 100 | 10 | 80 | 780 | 370 | 60 | 70 | 540 | 420 |
| JUL | 220 | 30 | 330 | 920 | 560 | 370 | 180 | 480 | 370 |
| AUG | 220 | 50 | 140 | 510 | 280 | 40 | 30 | 310 | 200 |
| SEP | 10 | 30 | 150 | 1,190 | 320 | 30 | 50 | 370 | 90 |
| OCT | 10 | 10 | 130 | 320 | 420 | 10 | 60 | 10 | 10 |
| NOV | 10 | 10 | 40 | 810 | 490 | 10 | 60 | 740 | 1,060 |
| DEC | 670 | 40 | 260 | 1,820 | 1,380 | 470 | 310 | 770 | 1,130 |
| mean | $\mathbf{2 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 5}$ |
| std dev | 225 | 16 | 117 | 558 | 332 | 325 | 160 | 272 | 426 |
| median | 200 | 10 | 140 | 810 | 460 | 60 | 70 | 490 | 290 |
| max | 670 | 50 | 380 | 1,820 | 1,380 | 1,070 | 480 | 770 | 1,130 |
| min | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |


|  | ANC | SAR | GS | NC403 | PB | LRC | ROC | NCF117 | SC-CH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 10 | 100 | 10 | 460 | 310 | 10 | 120 | 10 | 40 |
| FEB | 280 | 1,350 | 850 | 4,670 | 3,910 | 1,110 | 1,180 | 680 | 410 |
| MAR | 20 | 130 | 10 | 1,720 | 1,500 | 240 | 510 | 180 | 80 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 50 | 250 | 120 | 940 | 1,540 | 310 | 550 | 420 | 400 |
| JUN | 10 | 10 | 10 | 130 | 60 | 10 | 40 | 10 | 10 |
| JUL | 180 | 10 | 310 | 580 | 480 | 610 | 6,160 | 290 | 250 |
| AUG | 10 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 30 | 10 | 210 | 10 | 40 |
| SEP | 130 | 10 | 40 | 90 | 30 | 290 | 80 | 10 | 190 |
| OCT | 140 | 10 | 70 | 10 | 100 | 540 | 30 | 10 | 220 |
| NOV | 80 | 10 | 10 | 90 | 970 | 120 | 70 | 10 | 180 |
| DEC | 340 | 90 | 360 | 130 | 100 | 340 | 10 | 10 | 240 |
| mean | $\mathbf{1 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 7}$ |
| std dev | 114 | 395 | 260 | 1,379 | 1,174 | 330 | 1,808 | 226 | 137 |
| median | 80 | 10 | 40 | 130 | 310 | 290 | 120 | 10 | 190 |
| max | 340 | 1,350 | 850 | 4,670 | 3,910 | 1,110 | 6,160 | 680 | 410 |
| min | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |


|  | NAV | HB | BRR | M61 | M54 | M35 | M23 | M18 |  | NC11 | AC | DP | IC | NCF6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 10 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 10 | 170 | 170 | JAN | 70 | 40 | 50 | 50 | 40 |
| FEB | 10 | 70 | 30 | 40 | 110 | 70 | 70 | 120 | FEB | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| MAR | 10 | 10 | 50 | 60 | 80 | 70 | 60 | 160 | MAR | 50 | 160 | 90 | 60 | 30 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | APR |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 40 | 40 | 40 | 50 | 80 | 60 | 70 | 110 | MAY | 70 | 70 | 50 | 60 | 60 |
| JUN | 60 | 50 | 40 | 80 | 50 | 50 | 60 | 10 | JUN | 110 | 130 | 110 | 100 | 70 |
| JUL | 60 | 60 | 30 | 70 | 160 | 40 | 140 | 60 | JUL | 70 | 70 | 150 | 60 | 20 |
| AUG | 40 | 50 | 50 | 70 | 130 | 80 | 120 | 250 | AUG | 40 | 70 | 50 | 50 | 40 |
| SEP | 80 | 90 | 50 | 100 | 70 | 10 | 300 | 330 | SEP | 90 | 90 | 100 | 90 | 40 |
| OCT | 50 | 60 | 50 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 10 | 10 | OCT | 30 | 60 | 50 | 50 | 40 |
| NOV | 60 | 50 | 90 | 70 | 230 | 50 | 10 | 20 | NOV | 100 | 90 | 90 | 80 | 90 |
| DEC | 80 | 60 | 100 | 80 | 70 | 10 | 40 | 10 | DEC | 80 | 120 | 120 | 150 | 100 |
| mean | 45 | 52 | 49 | 63 | 97 | 42 | 95 | 114 | mean | 66 | 83 | 79 | 69 | 49 |
| std dev | 26 | 21 | 26 | 22 | 57 | 28 | 85 | 107 | std dev | 29 | 42 | 41 | 36 | 28 |
| median | 50 | 50 | 50 | 70 | 80 | 50 | 70 | 110 | median | 70 | 70 | 90 | 60 | 40 |
| max | 80 | 90 | 100 | 100 | 230 | 80 | 300 | 330 | max | 110 | 160 | 150 | 150 | 100 |
| min | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 10 | min | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |


|  | ANC | SAR | GS | NC403 | PB | LRC | ROC | NCF117 | SC-CH |  | B210 | COL | SR-WC | 6RC | LCO | GCO | SR | BRN | HAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 190 | 10 | 10 | 1,680 | 20 | 70 | 10 | 20 | 30 | JAN | 100 | 50 | 80 | 60 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 40 | 70 |
| FEB | 30 | 40 | 10 | 80 | 60 | 50 | 130 | 20 | 20 | FEB | 20 | 10 | 10 | 120 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 20 |
| MAR | 40 | 20 | 10 | 90 | 30 | 20 | 40 | 20 | 40 | MAR | 10 | 80 | 10 | 40 | 20 | 10 | 60 | 50 | 30 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 170 | 30 | 10 | 310 | 100 | 70 | 100 | 60 | 40 | MAY | 30 | 160 | 30 | 220 | 30 | 60 | 110 | 40 | 50 |
| JUN | 110 | 60 | 50 | 170 | 130 | 90 | 170 | 60 | 70 | JUN | 80 | 280 | 60 | 190 | 80 | 70 | 140 | 70 | 70 |
| JUL | 160 | 60 | 100 | 110 | 100 | 180 | 90 | 30 | 70 | JUL | 40 | 340 | 40 | 70 | 50 | 60 | 50 | 30 | 40 |
| AUG | 60 | 50 | 20 | 860 | 100 | 60 | 80 | 50 | 70 | AUG | 110 | 100 | 40 | 90 | 60 | 430 | 40 | 60 | 420 |
| SEP | 180 | 50 | 50 | 80 | 70 | 130 | 40 | 70 | 100 | SEP | 60 | 80 | 50 | 390 | 80 | 50 | 80 | 80 | 60 |
| OCT | 110 | 100 | 40 | 70 | 80 | 70 | 60 | 70 | 90 | OCT | 30 | 80 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 20 |
| NOV | 110 | 40 | 40 | 110 | 210 | 50 | 460 | 70 | 80 | NOV | 50 | 80 | 40 | 60 | 40 | 50 | 30 | 160 | 70 |
| DEC | 200 | 60 | 70 | 830 | 90 | 120 | 90 | 90 | 60 | DEC | 10 | 70 | 70 | 100 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 150 | 70 |
| mean | 124 | 47 | 37 | 399 | 90 | 83 | 115 | 51 | 61 | mean | 49 | 121 | 40 | 123 | 36 | 72 | 57 | 70 | 84 |
| std dev | 61 | 24 | 29 | 517 | 51 | 45 | 123 | 25 | 25 | std dev | 35 | 101 | 24 | 108 | 28 | 121 | 40 | 45 | 113 |
| median | 110 | 50 | 40 | 110 | 90 | 70 | 90 | 60 | 70 | median | 40 | 80 | 40 | 90 | 30 | 50 | 50 | 60 | 60 |
| max | 200 | 100 | 100 | 1,680 | 210 | 180 | 460 | 90 | 100 | max | 110 | 340 | 80 | 390 | 80 | 430 | 140 | 160 | 420 |
| $\min$ | 30 | 10 | 10 | 70 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | min | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 20 |

Table 2.11 Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{l}$ ) during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program stations.

|  | NC11 | AC | DP | IC | NCF6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 1,500 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |
| FEB | 1,200 | 1,000 | 900 | 700 | 1,400 |
| MAR | 300 | 300 | 50 | 300 | 500 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 500 | 500 | 400 | 500 | 500 |
| JUN | 800 | 700 | 600 | 600 | 800 |
| JUL | 890 | 780 | 930 | 790 | 880 |
| AUG | 810 | 840 | 830 | 940 | 1,110 |
| SEP | 1,030 | 820 | 860 | 860 | 810 |
| OCT | 950 | 790 | 700 | 840 | 900 |
| NOV | 640 | 500 | 620 | 550 | 920 |
| DEC | 890 | 700 | 870 | 900 | 1,060 |
| mean | $\mathbf{8 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 4}$ |
| std dev | 326 | 214 | 275 | 215 | 296 |
| median | 890 | 700 | 700 | 700 | 880 |
| max | 1,500 | 1,000 | 930 | 940 | 1,400 |
| min | 300 | 300 | 50 | 300 | 400 |


|  | B210 | COL | SR-WC | 6RC | LCO | GCO | SR | BRN | HAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 700 | 1,300 | 700 | 1,100 | 1,100 | 600 | 700 | 1,200 | 1,900 |
| FEB | 1,600 | 1,800 | 1,200 | 1,100 | 1,000 | 800 | 1,500 | 1,800 | 1,100 |
| MAR | 1,000 | 1,000 | 700 | 500 | 1,000 | 50 | 800 | 1,100 | 1,000 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 600 | 1,700 | 1,100 | 1,300 | 1,000 | 1,200 | 1,100 | 700 | 700 |
| JUN | 990 | 1,930 | 720 | 960 | 910 | 780 | 890 | 880 | 850 |
| JUL | 940 | 1,760 | 860 | 800 | 770 | 790 | 850 | 920 | 940 |
| AUG | 1,030 | 1,340 | 1,050 | 530 | 1,160 | 960 | 950 | 730 | 780 |
| SEP | 1,240 | 1,350 | 1,170 | 1,290 | 1,060 | 1,030 | 1,240 | 770 | 820 |
| OCT | 1,100 | 2,230 | 830 | 920 | 680 | 820 | 660 | 740 | 1,980 |
| NOV | 930 | 1,170 | 840 | 360 | 600 | 680 | 840 | 1,020 | 810 |
| DEC | 550 | 690 | 670 | 940 | 730 | 540 | 600 | 910 | 630 |
| mean | $\mathbf{9 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 4 6}$ |
| std dev | 297 | 449 | 200 | 315 | 186 | 299 | 268 | 316 | 461 |
| median | 990 | 1,350 | 840 | 940 | 1,000 | 790 | 850 | 910 | 850 |
| max | 1,600 | 2,230 | 1,200 | 1,300 | 1,160 | 1,200 | 1,500 | 1,800 | 1,980 |
| min | 550 | 690 | 670 | 360 | 600 | 50 | 600 | 700 | 630 |


|  | ANC | SAR | GS | NC403 | PB | LRC | ROC | NCF117 | SC-CH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 1,500 | 1,000 | 500 | 2,200 | 800 | 1,200 | 1,400 | 900 | 300 |
| FEB | 1,600 | 1,200 | 1,000 | 1,200 | 1,500 | 1,300 | 1,800 | 1,100 | 1,300 |
| MAR | 1,200 | 800 | 500 | 600 | 800 | 500 | 500 | 300 | 500 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 800 | 500 | 400 | 700 | 600 | 500 | 600 | 500 | 500 |
| JUN | 1,520 | 710 | 810 | 1,060 | 1,170 | 3,850 | 1,020 | 900 | 920 |
| JUL | 1,930 | 950 | 1,620 | 1,200 | 1,440 | 1,230 | 1,620 | 1,270 | 1,010 |
| AUG | 1,740 | 1,050 | 910 | 1,800 | 950 | 1,000 | 1,580 | 1,420 | 800 |
| SEP | 1,890 | 900 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,130 | 920 | 1,240 | 1,060 | 790 |
| OCT | 1,660 | 900 | 870 | 840 | 880 | 960 | 1,100 | 910 | 760 |
| NOV | 1,490 | 820 | 790 | 1,010 | 890 | 840 | 1,560 | 760 | 1,140 |
| DEC | 1,090 | 530 | 690 | 1,260 | 990 | 1,070 | 820 | 670 | 710 |
| mean | $\mathbf{1 , 4 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 4}$ |
| std dev | 343 | 212 | 334 | 466 | 275 | 913 | 435 | 326 | 294 |
| median | 1,520 | 900 | 810 | 1,060 | 950 | 1,000 | 1,240 | 900 | 790 |
| max | 1,930 | 1,200 | 1,620 | 2,200 | 1,500 | 3,850 | 1,800 | 1,420 | 1,300 |
| min | 800 | 500 | 400 | 600 | 600 | 500 | 500 | 300 | 300 |

Table 2.12 Total Phosphorus ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{l}$ ) during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program stations.

|  | NC11 | AC | DP | IC | NCF6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 250 | 200 | 150 | 230 | 100 |
| FEB | 340 | 120 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| MAR | 260 | 160 | 250 | 100 | 110 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 160 | 160 | 140 | 110 | 160 |
| JUN | 140 | 130 | 140 | 120 | 130 |
| JUL | 170 | 170 | 180 | 130 | 130 |
| AUG | 30 | 10 | 40 | 20 | 90 |
| SEP | 180 | 170 | 240 | 200 | 160 |
| OCT | 150 | 200 | 180 | 130 | 250 |
| NOV | 290 | 470 | 1,400 | 610 | 1,420 |
| DEC | 270 | 320 | 200 | 250 | 270 |
| mean | $\mathbf{2 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 8}$ |
| std dev | 83 | 112 | 362 | 152 | 372 |
| median | 180 | 170 | 180 | 130 | 130 |
| max | 340 | 470 | 1,400 | 610 | 610 |
| min | 30 | 10 | 40 | 20 | 20 |


|  | B210 | COL | SR-WC | 6RC | LCO | GCO | SR | BRN | HAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 110 | 60 | 60 | 160 | 100 | 150 | 70 | 130 | 160 |
| FEB | 120 | 230 | 80 | 140 | 90 | 120 | 80 | 120 | 100 |
| MAR | 100 | 100 | 40 | 130 | 50 | 210 | 100 | 220 | 220 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 250 | 260 | 120 | 260 | 90 | 210 | 380 | 300 | 110 |
| JUN | 100 | 230 | 40 | 150 | 70 | 240 | 190 | 100 | 220 |
| JUL | 150 | 170 | 80 | 10 | 10 | 80 | 10 | 120 | 230 |
| AUG | 190 | 220 | 10 | 70 | 10 | 180 | 10 | 360 | 320 |
| SEP | 230 | 410 | 170 | 240 | 190 | 400 | 170 | 130 | 240 |
| OCT | 420 | 610 | 420 | 440 | 580 | 760 | 650 | 710 | 450 |
| NOV | 310 | 320 | 220 | 50 | 200 | 180 | 220 | 190 | 170 |
| DEC | 70 | 80 | 80 | 100 | 40 | 80 | 50 | 70 | 70 |
| mean | $\mathbf{1 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 8}$ |
| std dev | 103 | 152 | 111 | 114 | 154 | 186 | 182 | 176 | 103 |
| median | 150 | 230 | 80 | 140 | 90 | 180 | 100 | 130 | 220 |
| max | 420 | 610 | 420 | 440 | 580 | 760 | 650 | 710 | 450 |
| min | 70 | 60 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 80 | 10 | 70 | 70 |



Table 2.13 Orthophosphate ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{l}$ ) during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program stations.



Table 2.14 Chlorophyll $a(\mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l})$ during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program stations.




Table 2.15 Fecal Coliform (cfu/100 mL) and Enterococcus (MPN) during 2020 at the Lower Cape Fear River Program stations.

| ENTEROCOCCUS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BRR | M61 | M54 | M35 | M23 | M18 |
| JAN | 5 | 20 | 41 | 20 | 10 | 5 |
| FEB | 31 | 31 | 41 | 10 | 5 | 20 |
| MAR | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 173 | 150 | 134 | 20 | 5 | 5 |
| JUN | 63 | 31 | 20 | 5 | 10 | 5 |
| JUL | 31 | 30 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
| AUG | 19 | 47 | 128 | 262 | 1,300 | 687 |
| SEP | 41 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| OCT | 10 | 20 | 31 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
| NOV | 5 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| DEC | 10 | 31 | 30 | 10 | 41 | 20 |
| mean | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 1}$ |
| std dev | 47 | 37 | 44 | 73 | 371 | 195 |
| max | 173 | 150 | 134 | 262 | 1,300 | 687 |
| min | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Geomeal | 20 | 27 | 22 | 12 | 14 | 11 |


|  | ANC | SAR | GS | NC403 | PB | LRC | ROC | NCF117 | SC-CH |  | B210 | COL | SRWC | 6RC | LCO | GCO | SR | BRN | HAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JAN | 59 | 185 | 82 | 170 | 73 | 175 | 140 | 41 | 50 | JAN | 115 | 160 | 768 | 10,600 | 1,100 | 46 | 205 | 1,650 | 1,180 |
| FEB | 68 | 135 | 32 | 32 | 91 | 295 | 773 | 210 | 155 | FEB | 64 | 5 | 41 | 175 | 32 | 41 | 46 | 64 | 59 |
| MAR | 10 | 59 | 19 | 23 | 77 | 41 | 82 | 55 | 59 | MAR | 46 | 19 | 50 | 64 | 19 | 5 | 37 | 125 | 180 |
| APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | APR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAY | 46 | 190 | 95 | 175 | 265 | 290 | 205 | 41 | 50 | MAY | 23 | 82 | 27,500 | 11,000 | 15,000 | 2,400 | 17,000 | 180 | 250 |
| JUN | 130 | 910 | 455 | 2,050 | 1,250 | 637 | 500 | 115 | 82 | JUN | 37 | 82 | , | 137 | 68 | 140 | 100 | 280 | 235 |
| JUL | 135 | 135 | 1,200 | 955 | 30,000 | 819 | 155 | 73 | 319 | JUL | 43 | 68 | 37 | 43 | 637 | 91 | 100 | 182 | 210 |
| AUG | 110 | 180 | 195 | 1,100 | 591 | 255 | 275 | 23 | 155 | AUG | 41 | 115 | 270 | 175 | 260 | 215 | 110 | 1,800 | 270 |
| SEP | 140 | 210 | 115 | 125 | 773 | 55 | 86 | 37 | 64 | SEP | 46 | 195 | 115 | 135 | 64 | 37 | 28 | 1,100 | 220 |
| OCT | 113 | 135 | 41 | 77 | 205 | 59 | 200 | 32 | 64 | OCT | 77 | 91 | 50 | 319 | 115 | 500 | 145 | 205 | 77 |
| NOV | 59 | 120 | 55 | 46 | 190 | 864 | 100 | 59 | 19 | NOV | 82 | 105 | 73 | 115 | 110 | 105 | 110 | 195 | 145 |
| DEC | 50 | 500 | 32 | 68 | 115 | 86 | 773 | 145 | 59 | DEC | 28 | 19 | 14 | 55 | 46 | 68 | 19 | 41 | 120 |
| mean | 84 | 251 | 211 | 438 | 3,057 | 325 | 299 | 76 | 98 | mean | 55 | 86 | 2,629 | 2,074 | 1,586 | 332 | 1,627 | 529 | 268 |
| std dev | 42 | 235 | 335 | 625 | 8,527 | 293 | 250 | 55 | 81 | std dev | 26 | 56 | 7,868 | 4,115 | 4,254 | 667 | 4,862 | 628 | 296 |
| max | 68 | 910 | 1,200 | 2,050 | 30,000 | 864 | 773 | 210 | 319 | max | 115 | 195 | 27,500 | 11,000 | 15,000 | 2,400 | 17,000 | 1,800 | 1,180 |
| min | 10 | 59 | 19 | 23 | 73 | 41 | 82 | 23 | 19 | min | 23 | 5 | 3 | 43 | 19 | 5 | 19 | 41 | 59 |
| Geomeal | 69 | 188 | 92 | 157 | 352 | 199 | 218 | 60 | 75 | Geomea | 49 | 59 | 98 | 260 | 173 | 98 | 117 | 262 | 191 |



