### **CRWR Online Report 96-1**

# A GIS ASSESSMENT OF NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION IN THE SAN ANTONIO-NUECES COASTAL BASIN

by

William Kelley Saunders, B.S.E.P., M.S.C.E. Graduate Research Assistant

and

David R. Maidment, PhD. Principal Investigator

**August 1996** 

#### CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN WATER RESOURCES

Bureau of Engineering Research • The University of Texas at Austin J.J. Pickle Research Campus • Austin, TX 78712-4497

This document is available online via World Wide Web at http://www.ce.utexas.edu/centers/crwr/reports/online.html

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This research was sponsored by the Clean Waters Program of the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission (TNRCC) in Austin, TX. Particular thanks for support, information, and guidance are extended to Angela Miller and Richard Kiesling at TNRCC. Information provided by Darwin Ockerman and Marshall Jennings at the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Charles Baird and Timothy Dybala at the Natural Resource Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS), and Drs. Neal Armstrong, George Ward, and Daene McKinney at the University of Texas Center for Research in Water Resources is also appreciated.

For months of consultation, support and encouragement, many thanks are due to Dr. David Maidment, Jennifer Benaman, Ferdinand Hellweger, John McLeod, Pawel Mizgalewicz, Francisco Olivera, Jerome Patoux, Seann Reed, Peter Smith, and Zichuan Ye in the GIS Research Group at the University of Texas Center for Research in Water Resources.

Finally, my heartfelt thanks go to my wife, Elizabeth, for her unending love, patience, and understanding during the last two years.

#### ABSTRACT

An Arc/Info Geographic Information System (GIS) method has been developed for the assessment of nonpoint source pollution in a watershed. This method makes use of publicly available elevation, stream network, rainfall, discharge, and land use data sets and uses a digital discretization, or grid representation, of a watershed for the approximation of average annual pollutant loads and concentrations.

The San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin in south Texas is identified as the test site for execution of the method.

A digital grid replica of the basin stream network is first created, employing a "burn-in" process to affix the USGS Digital Line Graph stream network to the Digital Elevation Model of the basin. Precipitation is then compared with historical discharge at five gauge locations in the basin and a mathematical relationship between rainfall and runoff is established, using a regression analysis. Literature-based Expected Mean Concentrations (EMC's) of pollutant constituents are associated with land uses in the watershed. The products of these spatially distributed EMC's and the runoff in each digital basin grid cell are calculated and then summed in the downstream direction to establish spatially distributed grids of average annual pollutant loads in the basin. Finally, grids of nonpoint source pollutant concentrations are created by dividing the average annual pollutant load grids by a grid of total annual cumulative runoff.

In an effort to refine the process, a method of simulating suspected nutrient point sources in the basin is investigated and an optimization routine is used with pollutant measurement data at four major sampling points to adjust the literature-based Expected Mean Concentration values for phosphorus.

The GIS nonpoint source pollution assessment method is performed for four pollutant constituents: phosphorus, nitrogen, cadmium, and Fecal Coliform. Predicted concentrations for phosphorus and nitrogen, when determined with the simulated point sources, match closely with average observed concentrations in the basin. Predicted Fecal Coliform concentrations did not match well with average observed values, but Expected Mean Concentration values for the pollutant were highly variable between land uses and should be investigated further. Insufficient heavy metal measurement data exist to make conclusive assessments of predicted cadmium concentrations.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iii
Table Of Contents	iv
List of Tables.	v
List of Figures	vi
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Objectives	3
1.3 Study Area	4
1.4 Research Approach.	
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Nonpoint Source Pollution Models	
2.2 GIS-Based Nonpoint Source Pollution Models	
2.3 Earlier Studies in the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	
3 DATA DESCRIPTION	29
3.1 Map Projection	
3.2 Establishing a Digital Database	
3.3 Scales of Analysis	60
4 METHODOLOGY	
4.1 Grid-Based Watershed Modeling Using Digital Elevation Data	
4.2 Determination of a Rainfall/Runoff Relationship	
4.3 Linking Expected Mean Concentration of Pollutants to Land Use	
4.4 Estimating Annual Loadings Throughout the Watershed	95
4.5 Predicting Downstream Pollutant Concentrations in Watershed	
Stream Networks	
4.6 Considering and Simulating Point Sources	118
4.7 Using an Optimization Routine to Provide Estimates of EMC	
Values	
5 RESULTS	
5.1 Nonpoint Source Pollution Assessment	
5.2 Assessment of Basin Pollution Including Point Sources	144
5.3 Expected Mean Concentration Values from the Optimization	
Routine	
6 CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS	
Appendix A: Data Dictionary	
Appendix B: Programs/AMLs	
Appendix C: List of Acronyms	
References	
Vita	222

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Populations of Major Cities within the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	7
Table 3.1: Texas State Mapping System-Albers Projection Parameters	30
Table 3.2: Internet Addresses for Data Sources	31
Table 3.3: Hydrologic Unit Codes Approximating the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal	
Basin	34
Table 3.4: USGS Streamflow Gauge Information	47
Table 3.5: ASCII Header Formats for PRISM files in GRASS and Arc/Info	51
Table 3.6: Relationship Between Land Use and Expected Pollutant Concentrations	55
Table 4.1: Comparison of Digitally Delineated and USGS Drainage Areas	72
Table 4.2: Comparison of Methods for Determining Average Annual Precipitation	
for each Gauged San Antonio-Nueces Drainage Area	82
Table 4.3: Annual Volume (m <sup>3</sup> ) of Recorded Streamflow (1961-1990) for the Five	
USGS Gauges in the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	83
Table 4.4: Equivalent Depth (mm) of Recorded Streamflow (1961-1990) for the Five	
USGS Gauges in the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	84
Table 4.5 : Projected 30-Year Average Annual Depth of Streamflow for the Five	
USGS Gauges in the San Antonio-Nueces Basin	87
Table 4.6: Summary Statistics for Total Phosphorus	105
Table 4.7: Expected Mean Concentration Values Calculated Using the Microsoft	
Excel Solver Optimization Routine	130
Table 5.1: Predicted Annual Pollutant Loads to Copano Bay	133

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: San Antonio - Nueces Coastal Basin	5
Figure 1.2: Major Hydrologic Features of the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	6
Figure 2.1: Levels of Integration of GIS and Simulation Models	
Figure 2.2: Conceptual Illustration of the Discretization of a Bay	23
Figure 2.3: Nueces and Mission-Aransas Estuaries	26
Figure 3.1: Hydrologic Unit Codes of the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	33
Figure 3.2: USGS 1:100,000-Scale Mapsheets Covering the San Antonio-Nueces	
Coastal Basin	36
Figure 3.3: 1:100,000-Scale Hydrography Digital Line Graphs in the San Antonio-	
Nueces Coastal Basin	39
Figure 3.4: Digital Elevation Model of the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	43
Figure 3.5: Land Uses in the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	46
Figure 3.6: Digital Coordinate Data File for San Antonio-Nueces Stream Gauges	47
Figure 3.7: Gauge Number and Name Data File for San Antonio-Nueces Stream	
Gauges	
Figure 3.8: USGS Stream Gauges in the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	50
Figure 3.9: Average Annual Precipitation in the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	54
Figure 3.10: TNRCC Water Quality Measurement Locations in the San Antonio-	
Nueces Coastal Basin	
Figure 3.11: Linking Water Quality Measurement Data Files	
Figure 3.12: Scales of Analysis	
Figure 4.1: Processing of Digital Elevation Data	64
Figure 4.2: Comparison of GRID-Delineated Streams with 1:100,000-Scale	
Hydrography Digital Line Graphs	66
Figure 4.3: Final Edited Digital Line Graph Stream Coverage for the San Antonio-	
Nueces Coastal Basin	68
Figure 4.4: Comparison of Burned-In Streams with 1:100,000-Scale Hydrography	
Digital Line Graphs	
Figure 4.5: Digital Drainage Areas Delineated from USGS Streamflow Gauges	
Figure 4.6: Drainage Area Delineated from the Copano Creek USGS Stream Gauge	74
Figure 4.7: Digitally Delineated Subwatersheds of the San Antonio-Nueces Basin	
Compared with USGS Hydrologic Unit Codes	
Figure 4.8: Creating the Basin Boundary through use of ArcView Shapefiles	78
Figure 4.9: USGS Recorded Annual Streamflows for Five Gauges in the San	
Antonio-Nueces Basin	85
Figure 4.10: Regression Tool Output for Best Linear Fit Relationship Between	~-
Average Annual Precipitation and Depth of Streamflow	87
Figure 4.11: Relationship Between Rainfall and Streamflow in the San Antonio-	0.5
Nueces Coastal Basin (Linear)	
Figure 4.12: Estimated Runoff in the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	90

Figure 4.13: Conversion of Tabulated Expected Mean Concentration Values to an	
Arc/Info Data File	93
Figure 4.14: Expected mean concentrations for Total Phosphorus in the San Antonio-	
Nueces Coastal Basin	94
Figure 4.15: Average Annual Total Phosphorus Loads in the San Antonio-Nueces	
Coastal Basin	98
Figure 4.16: Average Annual Stream Flows in the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal	
Basin	101
Figure 4.17: Estimated Total Phosphorus Concentrations in the San Antonio-Nueces	
Coastal Basin	103
Figure 4.18: Total Phosphorus Concentration Measurements at TNRCC SWQM	
Station # 12948 (Aransas River)	107
Figure 4.19: Total Nitrogen Component Concentration Measurements at TNRCC	
SWQM Station # 12948 (Aransas River)	109
Figure 4.20: Total Nitrogen Component Concentration Measurements at TNRCC	
SWQM Station # 12944 (Mission River)	110
Figure 4.21: Percentile Distribution of Total Nitrogen Components Measured at Two	
Locations in the San Antonio-Nueces Basin	
Figure 4.22: Text-Delimited File of Water Quality Measurement Radii	114
Figure 4.23: Comparison of Estimated and Average Observed Total Phosphorus	
Concentrations in the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	116
Figure 4.24: Estimated vs. Observed Total Phosphorus Concentrations Just	
Downstream of Beeville, TX	117
Figure 4.25a: Predicted vs. Measured Total Phosphorus Concentrations (Beeville	
Point Source Included) Just Downstream of Beeville, TX	122
Figure 4.25b: Predicted vs. Measured Total Phosphorus Concentrations (Beeville	
Point Source Included) for Middle Aransas River	123
Figure 4.25c: Predicted vs. Measured Total Phosphorus Concentrations (Beeville	
Point Source Included) for Lower Aransas River	124
Figure 5.1: Total Nitrogen Estimated Mean Concentrations in the San Antonio-	
Nueces Coastal Basin	134
Figure 5.2: Average Annual Total Nitrogen Loads in the San Antonio-Nueces	
Coastal Basin	135
Figure 5.3: Comparison of Estimated and Average Observed Total Nitrogen	
	137
Figure 5.4: Total Cadmium Estimated Mean Concentrations in the San Antonio-	
Nueces Coastal Basin	138
Figure 5.5: Average Annual Total Cadmium Loads in the San Antonio-Nueces	
Coastal Basin	140
Figure 5.6: Comparison of Estimated and Average Observed Total Cadmium	
Concentrations in the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	141
Figure 5.7: Fecal Coliform Estimated Mean Concentrations in the San Antonio-	
Nueces Coastal Basin	143

Figure 5.8: Average Annual Fecal Coliform Loads in the San Antonio-Nueces	
Coastal Basin	145
Figure 5.9: Comparison of Estimated and Average Observed Fecal Coliform	
Concentrations in the San Antonio-Nueces Coastal Basin	146
Figure 5.10a: Predicted vs. Observed Total Nitrogen Concentrations (Beeville Point	
Source Included) Just Downstream of Beeville, TX	150
Figure 5.10b: Predicted vs. Observed Total Nitrogen Concentrations (Beeville Point	
Source Included) for Middle Aransas River	151
Figure 5.10c: Predicted vs. Observed Total Nitrogen Concentrations (Beeville Point	
Source Included) for Lower Aransas River	152