Are our creeks safe? Investigating the presence of bacteria in Village Creek, Everman, TX. Isabella Moreno, Faculty Advisor Dr. Gehendra Kharel i.n.moreno@tcu.edu, g.kharel@tcu.edu Department of Environmental and Sustainability Sciences

Introduction

cheria coli (E. coli) contributes heavily.



Figure I. Model of E. coli USGS)



Objective

Methodology



Figure 3a.



Figure 3b.



Figure 3c.

I. Take two I00 mL water samples every month from the middle of the river for minimal sediment (Figure 3a).

2. At the lab, add Colilert reagent to sample; dilute sample if E. coli levels are high (Figure 3b).

3. Move the sample with reagent into Colilert Quanti-Tray, used when quantifying coliform. Seal with Quanti-Tray Sealer (Figure 3c)



Figure 3d.

4. Place samples in the incubator and let incubate for 24 hours at 35 °C (Figure 3d).

5. Determine if the sample is more yellow than the comparator and fluoresces; this indicates presence of total coliform and E. coli (Figure 3e).

6. Use the MPN chart to determine how many E. coli CFU are in the sample (Figure 3f).

To investigate the relationship between streamflow changes and the prevalence of E. coli in Village Creek.



Figure 3e.

Figure 3f.

Colilert Tests use Defined Substrate Technology (DST) to detect total coliforms and E. coli.

Nutrient indicators ONPG and MUG are major sources of carbon; coliform and E. coli enzymes metabolize them during incubation.



Figure 4c.



Figure 4b.



Figure 4d.



Results

Table I. Descriptive Statistics

Sample statistics	Streamflow (ft ³ /s)	E. coli (CFU)	
No. observations	36.0	36.0	
Min	0.0	0.0	
Max	31.0	1620.0	
Mean	4.8	215.0	
Std. error	1.1	63.I	
Stand. dev	6.6	378.5	
Median	2.0	78.6	
25 th percentile	0.6	16.1	
75 th percentile	8.7	196.6	
Skewness	2.2	2.8	
Kurtosis	6.2	7.6	
Coeff. var	137.2	176.1	

Table 2. Normality Test

Normality Tests No. of observations		Streamflow (ft ³ /s)		E. coli (CFU)	
		36.0		36.0	
Shapiro-Wilk		0.7		0.6	
•	þ-value		0.000		0.000
Anderson-Darling		3.1		5.8	
	þ-value		0.000		0.000
Lilliefors		0.3		0.3	
	þ-value		0.000		0.000
Jarque-Bera		67.6		105.6	
	þ-value		0.000		0.000



Figure 6. Observations of E. coli and Streamflow

p-value = 0.00007, $r^2 = 0.38$).

The strength of the relationship indicates that only about 38% of the variability in E. coli concentration in Village Creek can be explained by streamflow.

Conclusion

Out of 36 samples, 13 (or about 36%) exceeded the safe threshold level for E. coli levels per the US EPA and TCEQ standards for water.

The next step is to identify the sources for e coli and what effects its levels. By exploring different variables and how they affect E. coli levels, we can better understand how to stop the input of contaminants.

Through this research in the Water and Society Lab at TCU, more information about the causes of E. coli levels in Village Creek can help mitigate impairment.

Acknowledgements & References

Firstly, I would like to thank Grace Turner, who created this project, and Morgan Washington for introducing me as well as showing me how to continue it. I would also like to thank the Department of Environmental and Sustainability Sciences and especially Dr. Kharel for being great resources during this project. Finally, I would like Megan Boneck for her work as a fellow student researcher during this project.



Figure 5. Regression Line

The relationship between streamflow and E. coli concentration in Village Creek was tested. Pearson's correlation indicated a significant moderate positive relationship between the two variables $(r_{(34)} = 0.61)$,

