Lake Powell Pipeline Project

Final Study Report 17
Surface Water Quality

April 2016

Table of Contents

Executive Summary **1**

Chapter 1 Introduction **1-1**

1.1 Introduction 1-1
1.2 Summary Description of LPP Project Alignment Alternatives 1-1
1.2.1 South Alternative 1-1
1.2.2 Existing Highway Alternative 1-8
1.2.3 Southeast Corner Alternative 1-8
1.2.4 Transmission Line Alignments 1-10
1.2.5 Natural Gas Pipeline and Generators Alternative 1-13
1.3 Summary Description of No Lake Powell Water Alternative 1-18
1.3.1 WCWCD No Lake Powell Water Alternative 1-19
1.3.2 KCWCD No Lake Powell Water Alternative 1-23
1.4 Summary Description of the No Action Alternative 1-23
1.4.1 WCWCD No Action Alternative 1-23
1.4.2 KCWCD No Action Alternative 1-24
1.5 Study Objectives 1-24

Chapter 2 Methodology **2-1**

2.1 Data Sources 2-1
2.2 Evaluation Methodology 2-1
2.2.1 Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria 2-1
2.2.2 Historical Water Quality Data 2-2
2.2.3 Significance Criteria 2-2
2.2.4 Impact Assessment 2-2
2.2.5 Mitigation Measures 2-2

Chapter 3 Affected Environment (Baseline Conditions) **3-1**

3.1 Beneficial Use Designations - Utah 3-1
3.2 Historical Water Quality Conditions - Utah 3-2
3.2.1 Kanab Creek 3-3
3.2.2 Paria River 3-8
3.2.3 Virgin River 3-13
3.3 Beneficial Use Designations - Arizona 3-28
3.4 Historical Water Quality Conditions - Arizona 3-29
3.4.1 Kanab Creek 3-29
3.4.2 Paria River 3-29
3.5 Lake Powell 3-37
3.6 Sand Hollow Reservoir 3-38

Chapter 4 Environmental Consequences (Impacts) **4-1**

4.1 Significance Criteria 4-1
4.2 LPP Project Alternatives 4-2
4.2.1 Construction Phase 4-2
4.2.2 Operations Phase 4-5
4.2.3 Water Quality Impacts on Sand Hollow Reservoir 4-7
4.2.4 Water Quality Impacts on Lake Powell and the Lower Colorado River 4-10
4.2.5 Water Quality Impacts on the Virgin River 4-14
4.3 No Lake Powell Water Alternative 4-14

4.4 No Action Alternative 4-15

Chapter 5 Mitigation and Monitoring 5-1

5.1 Compliance With NPDES Permitting 5-1
5.1.1 Erosion Control 5-1
5.1.2 Sediment Control 5-3
5.1.3 Hazardous Material Control 5-4
5.1.4 Final Site Stabilization 5-4
5.2 Compliance Monitoring 5-4

Chapter 6 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts 6-1

6.1 Highway Alternative 6-1
6.2 Existing Highway Alternative 6-1
6.3 Southeast Corner Alternative 6-1
6.4 Transmission Line Alignments 6-1
6.5 Natural Gas Pipeline and Generators Alternative 6-1
6.6 No Lake Powell Water Alternative 6-2
6.7 No Action Alternative 6-2

Chapter 7 Cumulative Impacts 7-1

7.1 South Alternative 7-1
7.2 Existing Highway Alternative 7-2
7.3 Southeast Corner Alternative 7-2
7.4 Transmission Line Alignments 7-2
7.5 Natural Gas Pipeline and Generators Alternative 7-2
7.6 No Lake Powell Water Alternative 7-2
7.7 No Action Alternative 7-2

References Cited R-1

List of Preparers LP-1

Appendix A Lake Powell Pipeline Project Water Quality Modeling Doocumentation A-1

List of Tables

Table Number	Table Title	Page
Table 1-1	Water Conveyance System Natural Gas Generator Annual Fuel Consumption	1-18
Table 1-2	Available Supplies and Projected Demands Under the No Lake Powell Water and Lake Powell Pipeline Project Alternatives	1-21
Table 3-1	Beneficial Use Protection Classifications for Surface Waters of the State of Utah	3-1
Table 3-2	Beneficial Use Protection Classifications Designated for Major Rivers and Reservoirs in the LPP Vicinity, UAC R317-2-13	3-2
Table 3-3	Kanab Creek Water Quality Sample Station Locations	3-3
Table 3-4	Numeric Water Quality Criteria for Kanab Creek	3-4
Table 3-5	Summary of Historical Water Quality at Kanab Creek (Station ID 4951810)	3-5
Table 3-6	Summary of Historical Water Quality at Kanab Creek (Station ID 4951830)	3-6
Table 3-7	Summary of Historical Water Quality at Kanab Creek (Station ID 4951750)	3-7
Table 3-8	Paria River Water Quality Sample Station Locations	3-8
Table 3-9	Numeric Criteria for Paria River	3-8
Table 3-10	Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (4951850)	3-9
Table 3-11	Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (4951860)	3-11

Table 3-12 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria Station ID (5994550) 3-12
Table 3-13 Virgin River Water Quality Sample Station Locations 3-13
Table 3-14 Numeric Criteria for Virgin River (Below Quail Creek Diversion) 3-14
Table 3-15 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950010) 3-15
Table 3-16 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950020) 3-16
Table 3-17 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950120) 3-16
Table 3-18 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950130) 3-19
Table 3-19 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950200) 3-21
Table 3-20 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950260) 3-23
Table 3-21 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950300) 3-24
Table 3-22 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950320) 3-25
Table 3-23 Summary of Virgin River Water Quality – All Stations 3-27
Table 3-24 Beneficial Use Protection Classifications for Surface waters of the State of Arizona (R18-11-105) 3-28
Table 3-25 Beneficial Use Protection Classifications Designated for Major Rivers and Reservoirs in the Vicinity of the LPP, AAC R317-2-13) 3-28
Table 3-26 Kanab Creek water Quality Sample Station Locations 3-29
Table 3-27 Numeric Criteria for Kanab Creek (Arizona) 3-29
Table 3-38 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Kanab Creek Station ID (100576) 3-30
Table 3-29 Paria River Water Quality Sample Station Locations 3-30
Table 3-30 Numeric Criteria for Paria River (Arizona) 3-31
Table 3-31 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (100617) 3-32
Table 3-32 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (100743) 3-33
Table 3-33 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101073) 3-34
Table 3-34 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101074) 3-34
Table 3-35 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101075) 3-35
Table 3-36 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101076) 3-35
Table 3-37 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101077) 3-36
Table 3-38 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101077) 3-37
Table 3-39 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101079) 3-38
Table 3-40 Summary of Raw Water Quality – Lake Powell 3-39
Table 3-41 Summary of Historical Water Quality – Sand Hollow Reservoir 3-40
Table 4-1 Phased Delivery of Raw Water from Lake Powell to Sand Hollow Reservoir 4-8
Table 4-2 Elevation-Area-Capacity Relationship for San Hollow Reservoir 4-9
Table 4-3 Summary Comparison of Lake Powell Water Quality and Water Quality Criteria For Surface Waters in the Project Area 4-13

List of Figures

Figure Number	Figure Title	Page
Figure 1-1	Lake Powell Pipeline Proposed Action	1-2
Figure 1-2	Lake Powell Pipeline Intake and Water Conveyance System	1-4
Figure 1-3	Pipeline and Penstock Right-of-Way	1-5
Figure 1-4	Lake Powell Pipeline Hydro System South Alternative	1-7
Figure 1-5	Lake Powell Pipeline Hydro System Existing Highway Alternative	1-9
Figure 1-6	Lake Powell Pipeline Hydro System Southeast Corner Alternative	1-11
Figure 1-7	Lake Powell Pipeline Proposed Transmission Lines East	1-12
Figure 1-8	Lake Powell Pipeline Proposed Transmission Lines West	1-14
Figure 1-9	Lake Powell Pipeline Natural Gas Supply Line and Generators West Alternatives	1-16
Figure 1-10	Lake Powell Pipeline Natural Gas Supply Line and Generators East Alternative	1-17
Figure 1-11	No Lake Powell Water Alternative Primary Infrastructure	1-20
Figure 3-1	Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations in Sand Hollow Reservoir Near the North Dam	3-41
Figure 3-2	Water Temperature in Sand Hollow Reservoir Near the North Dam	3-42
Figure 3-3	TDS Concentrations in Sand Hollow Reservoir Near the North Dam	3-43
Figure 4-1	TDS Concentration versus Time (Sand Hollow Reservoir)	4-10

Executive Summary

ES-1 Introduction

This study report describes the results and findings of an analysis to evaluate surface water quality impacts along the proposed alternative alignments of the Lake Powell Pipeline Project (LPP Project), No Lake Powell Water Alternative, and No Action Alternative. The purpose of the analysis, as defined in the 2008 Surface Water Quality Study Plan prepared for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission), was to evaluate the impacts on surface water quality caused by the proposed construction and operation of the LPP Project.

ES-2 Methodology

The analysis of impacts on surface water quality follows methodology identified and described in the Preliminary Application Document, Scoping Document No. 1 and the Surface Water Quality Study Plan filed with the Commission.

ES-3 Key Results of the Surface Water Quality Impact Analyses

Impacts on water quality were considered significant if construction, operation or maintenance activities would violate applicable surface water quality standards, substantially degrade surface water quality, or substantially alter existing drainage patterns of the site or area, including through alteration of a stream or river course in a manner resulting in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

ES-3.1 LPP Project Alternatives

Construction of project facilities along any of the proposed alignments could cause temporary and occasional surface water quality impacts. Construction of project features could temporarily alter the existing drainage pattern of streams crossed by pipelines, which could result in erosion and siltation. In addition, temporary water quality impacts may occur at pipeline crossings of perennial streams and ephemeral washes if water is flowing during construction. Implementation of Best Management Practices and standard construction procedures during construction would avoid or minimize temporary water quality impacts, primarily consisting of turbidity and sediment recruitment.

Potential impacts on water quality considered for project operation include sediment transport and introduction of pollutants from pipeline discharges during operation and changes in total dissolved solids from the addition of large volumes of Lake Powell water to Sand Hollow Reservoir. Temporary and occasional discharges of sediment or organics-laden water or disinfected water (if required for quagga mussel control) from the pipeline during maintenance operations could result in exceedance of water quality objectives in receiving waters. With implementation of standard operating procedures to control pipeline discharges, operation of the LPP would not result in the violation of applicable surface water quality standards, would not cause substantial degradation of surface water quality, or would not cause substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area.

ES-3.2 No Lake Powell Water Alternative

This alternative is expected to increase salt loading in surface waters from conservation measures that increase wastewater strength combined with increased wastewater reclamation. Additionally, the reverse osmosis treatment system would generate more than 6,430 acre-feet per year of brine which would require long-term evaporation management. The elimination of residential outdoor watering would significantly reduce shallow subsurface water recharge and reduce return flows of this water to the Virgin River during the summer and fall months. This indirect impact would cause the stream water temperatures to increase compared to baseline conditions because the cooler groundwater discharging to the stream under baseline conditions helps control the water temperature during the summer and fall months. Therefore, the No Lake Powell Water Alternative may result in the violation of applicable surface water quality standards for temperature and cause substantial degradation of surface water quality. This would be a significant impact on water quality in the Virgin River.

ES-3.3 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not result in the violation of applicable surface water quality standards, or cause substantial degradation of surface water quality, or cause substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area.

Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary description of the Lake Powell Pipeline (LPP) Project alignment alternatives, the No Lake Powell Water Alternative, and the No Action Alternative. It introduces the area studied for environmental resources. It provides an overview of the proposed LPP Project, including each alignment alternative and locator maps.

The LPP Project would deliver Utah's Colorado River water from Lake Powell to the service areas of Washington County Water Conservancy District (WCWCD) and Kane County Water Conservancy District (KCWCD). The LPP Project action alternatives studied include various pipeline and penstock system configurations. Each action alternative would deliver 86,249 acre-feet of municipal and industrial (M&I) use water to the following southwest Utah water conservancy district service areas:

- WCWCD would receive 82,249 acre-feet annually.
- KCWCD would receive up to 4,000 acre-feet annually.

One of the LPP systems previously studied included a conveyance system for the Central Iron County Water Conservancy District (CICWCD), which would have delivered approximately 13,249 acre-feet annually to the Cedar Valley area. The various alternatives were under study when the CICWCD decided to withdraw from the LPP Project, and this conveyance system is no longer being considered.

1.2 Summary Description of LPP Project Alignment Alternatives

Three primary pipeline and penstock alignment alternatives are described in this section, along with the electrical power transmission line alignments for providing power to the pump stations and a natural gas supply line alignment alternative. The pipeline and penstock alignment alternatives share common segments between the intake at Lake Powell and delivery at Sand Hollow Reservoir, and they differ spatially in, through and around Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation.

The South Alternative (Proposed Action) extends south around Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation. The Existing Highway Alternative follows an Arizona state highway through Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation. The Southeast Corner Alternative follows the Navajo-McCullough Transmission Line corridor through the southeast corner of Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation. The Electric Transmission Line alignments are common to all the pipeline and penstock alignment alternatives. The Natural Gas Supply Line Alignment Alternative is common to all pipeline and penstock alignment alternatives. The natural gas pipeline alignment would be coincident to the buried waterline and would not have a different alignment, as compared to transmission line alignments. Figure 1-1 shows the overall proposed project from Lake Powell near Page, Arizona to Sand Hollow Reservoir, Utah.

1.2.1 South Alternative

The South Alternative consists of four systems: **Water Intake, Water Conveyance, Hydro,** and **KCWCD** (see Figure 1-1).



Project Pump Station
Project Regulating Tank
Project Hydro Station
Substation
Proposed Substation

Water Conveyance System
Hydro System - South Alternative (Penstock Segment)
KCWCD System
Project Transmission Lines
Existing Transmission Lines

Interstate
US Highway
ST Highway
Hwy
Major Road
Access Roads

Hurricane Cliffs Forebay/Afterbay
Lakes & Reservoirs
Major Rivers & Streams

National Park/Monument
GSENM-Boundary
Tribal Lands
State Boundaries
County Boundaries

FERC Project Number:
12966-001
BLM Serial Numbers:
AZA-34941
UTU-85472

N

0 2.5 5 10 15 20 Miles

Lake Powell Pipeline Project

Spatial Reference: UTM Zone 12N, NAD-83

UDWRe **Figure 1-1** MWH

Lake Powell Pipeline Proposed Action

The **Water Intake System** would pump Lake Powell water via submerged horizontal tunnels and vertical shafts into the LPP. The intake pump station would be constructed and operated adjacent to the west side of Lake Powell, approximately 2,000 feet northwest of Glen Canyon Dam in Coconino County, Arizona. An enclosed pump station building would house vertical turbine pumps with electric motors, electrical controls, and other equipment at a ground level elevation of 3,745 feet above mean sea level (AMSL).

The **Water Conveyance System** would convey water diverted from Lake Powell at the Intake System through a buried 69-inch diameter pipeline for about 51 miles, parallel with Highway 89 in Coconino County, Arizona and Kane County, Utah, to a buried regulating tank (High Point Regulating Tank-2) along Highway 89 at ground level elevation 5,691 feet AMSL. The pipeline would be a line of connected pipes used for carrying water over a long distance. Figure 1-2 shows the LPP Project Water Intake and Water Conveyance systems. The High Point Regulating Tank-2 would be the LPP Project topographic high point (Figure 1-2). The pipeline would be sited within a utility corridor established by Congress in 1998 that extends 500 feet south and 240 feet north of the Highway 89 centerline on public land administered by Bureau of Land Management (BLM) (U.S. Congress 1998). Figure 1-3 shows the typical 100-foot-wide right-of-way and 20-foot-wide temporary construction easement for the water conveyance system pipeline, adjacent to and away from the highway.

Four booster pump stations (BPS) along the pipeline would pump water to the high point regulating tank. Each BPS would house vertical turbine pumps with electric motors, electrical controls, and other equipment. Additionally, each BPS site would have a buried forebay tank, buried surge tanks, pig retrieval and launching stations, and a surface emergency overflow detention basin. BPS-1 would be located within Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (GCNRA) adjacent to an existing Arizona Department of Transportation maintenance facility, along a segment of abandoned highway, west of Highway 89. The BPS-1 site would cover about six acres and be surrounded by security fencing.

BPS-2 would be on land administered by Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) near Big Water, Utah, on the south side of Highway 89. The BPS-2 site would cover about five acres and be surrounded by security fencing.

BPS-3 (Alt.) would be on land administered by BLM Kanab Field Office, near the east boundary of Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (GSENM) on the south side of Highway 89, within the Congressionally-designated utility corridor. The BPS-3 (Alt.) site would cover about five acres and be surrounded by security fencing.

BPS-4 (Alt.) would be located on private land east of Highway 89 and west of the Cockscomb geologic feature (Figure 1-2). The BPS-4 (Alt.) site would cover about six acres and be surrounded by security fencing. The proposed pipeline alignment west of the Cockscomb geologic feature would be situated adjacent to the south boundary of the Congressionally-designated utility corridor.

The proposed pipeline alignment would continue parallel to Highway 89 to the buried High Point Regulating Tank-2 at 5,691 feet AMSL, which would be the topographic high point of the LPP Project (Figure 1-2). The Water Conveyance System would terminate at High Point Regulating Tank-2. The buried High Point Regulating Tank-2 would cover about four acres and be surrounded by security fencing.



- Project Pump Station
- Project Regulating Tank
- Project Hydro Station
- Water Conveyance System
- Hydro System - South Alternative (Penstock Segment)
- KCWCD System
- Interstate
- US Highway
- ST Highway
- Hwy
- Major Road
- Lakes & Reservoirs
- Major Rivers & Streams
- National Park/Monument
- GSENM Boundary
- State Boundaries

FERC Project Number: 12966-001
BLM Serial Numbers: AZA-34941 UTU-85472

N

0 0.5 1 2 3 4 Miles

Lake Powell Pipeline Project

Spatial Reference: UTM Zone 12N, NAD-83

UDWRe **Figure 1-2** MWH

Lake Powell Pipeline Intake and Water Conveyance System

Figure 1-3 shows the typical 100-foot-wide right-of-way and 20-foot-wide temporary construction easement for the hydro system penstock adjacent to, and away from, the highway. Four in-line hydro generating stations (HS-1, HS-2 [South], HS-3, and HS-4 [Alt.]), with substations located along the penstock, would generate electricity and help control water pressure in the penstock. Each in-line hydro station would consist of a building housing the generator units, an afterbay reservoir, retention basin, pig retrieval and launching stations, switchyard, and maintenance parking area, all surrounded by perimeter security fencing.



Figure 1-3
Pipeline and Penstock Right-of-Way

The **Hydro System** would convey the water from High Point Regulating Tank-2, at a topographic high point in the LPP Project with ground level elevation 5,691 feet AMSL, for about 87.5 miles through a buried 69-inch diameter penstock in Kane and Washington counties, Utah, and Coconino and Mohave counties, Arizona, to Sand Hollow Reservoir near St. George, Utah (Figure 1-4). A penstock is an enclosed pipe that delivers water to hydroelectric turbines.

A short penstock segment would convey the water to HS-1. This in-line hydro station would generate up to one megawatt (MW) of electricity at a site along Highway 89 within GSENM, and the penstock would continue west along Highway 89 to the GSENM west boundary. The HS-1 site would cover about five acres.

The penstock alignment would turn south from Highway 89 through private land and BLM-administered public lands into White Sage Wash. It would continue across White Sage Wash and then parallel Navajo-McCullough Transmission Line, crossing Highway 89 Alt. and Forest Highway 22 toward the southeast corner of Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation. The penstock alignment would run parallel to and south of the Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation south boundary, crossing Kanab Creek and Bitter Seeps Wash. It would continue across Moonshine Ridge and Cedar Ridge to Yellowstone Road. At this point, the penstock alignment would run north along Yellowstone Road to Arizona State Route 389 west of Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation. HS-2 (South) would be located west of Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation on private land east of Yellowstone Road. HS-2 (South) would generate up to one MW of electricity. The HS-2 (South) site would cover about five acres. The penstock alignment would continue northwest along the south side of Arizona State Route 389 past Colorado City to Hildale City, Utah, and HS-3. HS-3 would be located on private land west of Hildale City, Utah, north of and adjacent to Uzona Road. HS-3 would generate up to one MW of electricity. The HS-3 site would cover about five acres. A turnout for future delivery of 13,249 acre-feet of WCWCD's allocation of LPP Project water to Apple Valley would be located immediately west of HS-3.

The penstock alignment would follow Uzona Road west through Canaan Gap and south of Little Creek Mountain, turning north to HS-4 (Alt.) above the proposed Hurricane Cliffs forebay reservoir. HS-4 (Alt.) would be located on about three acres of public land administered by the BLM. HS-4 (Alt.) would generate up to 1.7 MW of electricity and would discharge into the forebay reservoir.

The forebay reservoir would be contained in a valley between two dams (south and north), maintaining active storage of 11,255 acre-feet of water. The forebay reservoir and two dams would cover about 500 acres of public land administered by BLM and would be surrounded by security fencing. A low-pressure tunnel would convey the water to a high-pressure vertical shaft in the bedrock forming the Hurricane Cliffs, connected to a high-pressure tunnel near the bottom of the Hurricane Cliffs. The high-pressure tunnel would connect to a penstock conveying the water to a 35-MW-capacity peaking power hydroelectric generating station and a 300-MW-capacity pumped storage hydroelectric generating station.

The Hurricane Cliffs hydroelectric generating stations and tailrace channel would cover about 50 acres of public land administered by BLM and would be surrounded by security fencing. The tailrace channel would discharge into an afterbay reservoir with 3,551 acre-feet of operating capacity, which is contained by a single dam in the valley below the Hurricane Cliffs. The afterbay reservoir and dam would cover about 200 acres of public land administered by BLM and would be surrounded by security fencing.

Water would be released from the forebay reservoir through the hydro generating system to meet peak power demands. Water would be pumped from the afterbay reservoir into the forebay reservoir during periods of off-peak power demand. The forebay and afterbay reservoirs would not be open to public access because the water levels would fluctuate rapidly during daily operations. A low pressure tunnel would convey the water northwest from the afterbay reservoir to a penstock, continuing to the Sand



Project Pump Station
Project Regulating Tank
Project Hydro Station
Hurricane Cliffs Forebay/Afterbay
Lakes & Reservoirs

Water Conveyance System
Hydro System - South Alternative (Penstock Segment)
KCWCD System
Major Rivers & Streams

Interstate
US Highway
ST Highway
Hwy
Major Road

National Park/Monument
GSENM Boundary
Tribal Lands
State Boundaries
County Boundaries

FERC Project Number:
12966-001
BLM Serial Numbers:
AZA-34941
UTU-85472

N

0 1 2 4 6 8 Miles

Lake Powell Pipeline Project

Spatial Reference: UTM Zone 12N, NAD-83

UDWRe **Figure 1-4** MWH

Lake Powell Pipeline Hydro System South Alternative

Hollow Hydro Station, which would generate up to 4.2 MW of electricity. The Sand Hollow Hydro Station would be located on land owned by WCWCD and cover about five acres adjacent to Sand Hollow Reservoir. The LPP Project water would discharge from the Sand Hollow Hydro Station into the existing Sand Hollow Reservoir.

The **KCWCD System** would convey water diverted from Lake Powell through the LPP at the west GSENM boundary for about eight miles through a buried 24-inch diameter pipeline in Kane County, Utah, near the mouth of Johnson Canyon. The pipeline would parallel the south side of Highway 89 across Johnson Wash and then run north for 5000 feet to the mouth of Johnson Canyon (Figure 1-4).

1.2.2 Existing Highway Alternative

The Existing Highway Alternative consists of four systems: **Water Intake, Water Conveyance, Hydro,** and **KCWCD**. The **Water Intake** and **Water Conveyance** systems would be the same as described for the South Alternative. The **Hydro System** would convey water diverted at Lake Powell from High Point Regulating Tank 2 at the LPP Project topographical high point (5,691 feet AMSL) for about 80.5 miles through a buried 69-inch diameter penstock in Kane and Washington counties, Utah, and Coconino and Mohave counties, Arizona, to Sand Hollow Reservoir near St. George, Utah (Figure 1-5). The alternative alignment parallels Highway 89 to the west and south boundary of GSENM and continues along Highway 89 to Lost Spring Gap. Four in-line hydro generating stations (HS-1, HS-2 [Hwy], HS-3, and HS-4 [Alt.]) located along the penstock would generate electricity and help control water pressure in the penstock. The HS-1, HS-3 and HS-4 (Alt.) hydro stations would be the same as described for the South Alternative.

The penstock downstream from the proposed HS-1 would be sited along the south side of Highway 89 within GSENM. The penstock would parallel the south side of Highway 89 west of GSENM, continue past Johnson Wash and follow Lost Spring Gap southwest, crossing Highway 89 Alt. and Kanab Creek in the north end of Fredonia, Arizona. It would continue south, paralleling Kanab Creek to Arizona State Route 389, where it would run west, adjacent to the north side of Route 389 through Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation past Pipe Spring National Monument. The penstock would continue along the north side of Arizona State Route 389 through the west half of Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation to 1.8 miles west of Cedar Ridge (intersection of Yellowstone Road with Highway 89), where it would then follow the same alignment as the South Alternative to Sand Hollow Reservoir. HS-2 (Hwy) would be sited 0.5 miles west of Cedar Ridge along the north side of Arizona State Route 389. HS-2 (Hwy) would generate approximately 0.8MW of electricity and cover 8.7 acres of private land.

The **KCWCD System** would convey water diverted at Lake Powell from the LPP Project along Highway 89 north along Johnson Canyon Road for 5,000 feet through a buried 24-inch diameter pipeline in Kane County, Utah to the mouth of Johnson Canyon (Figure 1-5).

1.2.3 Southeast Corner Alternative

The Southeast Corner Alternative consists of four systems: **Water Intake, Water Conveyance, Hydro,** and **KCWCD**. The **Water Intake**, **Water Conveyance**, and **KCWCD** systems would be the same as described for the South Alternative.

The **Hydro System** would be the same as described for the South Alternative from High Point Regulating Tank 2 at the LPP Project topographical high point (5,691 feet AMSL) to the east boundary of Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation. At the east boundary of Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation, the penstock alignment would parallel the north side of the Navajo-McCullough Transmission Line corridor in Coconino County, Arizona, through the southeast corner of the Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation for



Project Pump Station
Project Regulating Tank
Project Hydro Station
Hurricane Cliffs Forebay/Afterbay
Lakes & Reservoirs

Water Conveyance System
Hydro System - Existing Highway Alternative (Penstock Segment)
KCWCD System
Major Rivers & Streams

Interstate
US Highway
ST Highway
Hwy
Major Road

National Park/Monument
GSENM Boundary
Tribal Lands
State Boundaries
County Boundaries

FERC Project Number: 12966-001
BLM Serial Numbers: AZA-34941 UTU-85472

N

0 1 2 4 6 8 Miles

Lake Powell Pipeline Project

Spatial Reference: UTM Zone 12N, NAD-83

UDWRe **Figure 1-5** MWH

Lake Powell Pipeline Hydro System Existing Highway Alternative

about 3.8 miles. The penstock would then follow the South Alternative alignment south of the south boundary of the Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation, continuing to Sand Hollow Reservoir (Figure 1-6). The Southeast Corner Alternative would be about 85.7 miles long from High Point Regulating Tank-2 to Sand Hollow Reservoir.

1.2.4 Transmission Line Alignments

Transmission line alignments have been identified to transmit electric power to pump stations in the Water Intake and Water Conveyance systems, and to transmit electric power generated by hydroelectric stations in the Hydro System. The transmission lines that would serve the Water Intake and Water Conveyance systems are located in the east half of the LPP Project. The transmission lines that would serve the Hydro System are located in the west half of the LPP Project.

The proposed new **Water Intake Transmission Line** would begin at Glen Canyon Substation and run parallel to Highway 89 for about 2,500 feet to a new switch station, cross Highway 89 at the Intake access road intersection, and continue northeast to a new electrical substation on the Intake Pump Station site. This 69 kV transmission line would be 0.9 mile long in Coconino County, Arizona (Figure 1-7).

The proposed new **BPS-1 Transmission Line** would begin at the new switch station located on the south side of Highway 89 and parallel the LPP Project Water Conveyance System alignment to a new electrical substation on the BPS-1 site west of Highway 89. The 69 kV transmission line would be about one mile long in Coconino County, Arizona (Figure 1-7).

The proposed new **Glen Canyon to Buckskin Transmission Line** would consist of a 230 kV transmission line from the Glen Canyon Substation to the Buckskin Substation, running parallel to the existing 138 kV transmission line. This transmission line upgrade would be about 36 miles long through Coconino County, Arizona, and Kane County, Utah (Figure 1-7).

The existing **Buckskin Substation** would be upgraded as part of the proposed project to accommodate the additional power loads from the new 230 kV Glen Canyon to Buckskin transmission line. The substation upgrade would require an additional five acres of land within GSENM adjacent to the existing substation in Kane County, Utah (Figure 1-7).

The existing **Paria Substation** would be upgraded as part of the proposed project to accommodate the additional power loads to BPS-4 (Alt.). The substation upgrade would require an additional two acres of privately-owned land adjacent to the existing substation in Kane County, Utah (Figure 1-7).

The proposed new **BPS-2 Transmission Line** would consist of a new three-ring switch station along the new 230 kV Glen Canyon to Buckskin Transmission Line, a new transmission line from the switch station to a new substation west of Big Water, and a connection to BPS-2 substation in Kane County, Utah. The new transmission line would parallel an existing distribution line that runs northwest, north, and then northeast to Big Water. This new 138 kV transmission line alignment would be about seven miles long across Utah SITLA-administered land, with a 138 kV connection to a new electrical substation on the BPS-2 site (Figure 1-7).

The proposed new **BPS-3 Alt. Transmission Line South** would consist of a new three-ring switch station along the new 230 kV Glen Canyon to Buckskin Transmission Line, and a new transmission line from the switch station north along an existing BLM road to a new electrical substation on the BPS-3 (Alt.) site near the GSENM east boundary and within the Congressionally-designated utility corridor. This new 138 kV transmission line alignment would be about 5.9 miles long in Kane County, Utah (Figure 1-7).



- Project Pump Station
- Project Regulating Tank
- Project Hydro Station
- Hurricane Cliffs Forebay/Afterbay
- Lakes & Reservoirs
- Water Conveyance System
- Hydro System - Southeast Corner Alternative (Penstock Segment)
- KCWCD System
- Major Rivers & Streams
- Interstate
- US Highway
- ST Highway
- Hwy
- Major Road
- National Park/Monument
- GSENM Boundary
- Tribal Lands
- State Boundaries
- County Boundaries

FERC Project Number:
12966-001
BLM Serial Numbers:
AZA-34941
UTU-85472

N

0 1 2 4 6 8 Miles

Lake Powell Pipeline Project

Spatial Reference: UTM Zone 12N, NAD-83

UDWRe **Figure 1-6** MWH

Lake Powell Pipeline
Hydro System
Southeast Corner Alternative



Project Intake Pump Station
Project Pump Station
Project Hydro Station
Substation
Proposed Substation
Project Transmission Lines
Existing Transmission Lines
Interstate
US Highway
ST Highway
Hwy
Major Road
Lakes & Reservoirs
Major Rivers & Streams
National Park/Monument
GSENM Boundary
State Boundaries

FERC Project Number:
12966-001
BLM Serial Numbers:
AZA-34941
UTU-85472

0 0.5 1 2 3 4 Miles

N

Lake Powell Pipeline Project

Spatial Reference: UTM Zone 12N, NAD-83

UDWRe **Figure 1-7** MWH

Lake Powell Pipeline Proposed Transmission Lines East

The proposed new **BPS-4 Alt. Transmission Line** would begin at the upgraded Paria Substation and run north to a new electrical substation on the BPS-4 Alternative site. This 69 kV transmission line would be about 0.4 mile long in Kane County, Utah (Figure 1-7).

The proposed new **HS-1 Transmission Line** would begin at the new HS-1 and tie into the existing 69 kV transmission line along Highway 89 from the Buckskin Substation to the Johnson Substation. The HS-1 69 kV transmission line would be about 400 feet long in Kane County, Utah (Figure 1-8).

The proposed new **HS-2 (South) Transmission Line** would connect the HS-2 hydroelectric station and substation along the South Alternative to an existing 138 kV transmission line paralleling Arizona State Route 389. This new 34.5 kV transmission line would be about 0.9 mile long in Mohave County, Arizona (Figure 1-8).

The new **HS-2 (Highway) Transmission Line** alternative would directly connect the HS-2 hydroelectric station and substation along the Existing Highway Alternative to an existing 138 kV transmission line paralleling Arizona State Route 389. This new 34.5 kV transmission line would be about 200 feet long in Mohave County, Arizona.

The proposed new **HS-3 Transmission Line** would connect the HS-3 hydroelectric station and substation to the existing Twin Cities Substation in Hildale City, Utah. The new 12.47 kV transmission line would be about 0.6 mile long in Washington County, Utah (Figure 1-8).

The proposed new **HS-4 (Alt.) Transmission Line** would connect the HS-4 (Alt.) hydroelectric station and substation to an existing transmission line parallel to Utah State Route 59. The new 69 kV transmission line would be about 7.5 miles long in Washington County, Utah (Figure 1-8).

The proposed new **Hurricane Cliffs Afterbay to Sand Hollow Transmission Line** would consist of a new 69 kV transmission line, which would run northwest from the Hurricane Cliffs peaking power plant and substation to the Sand Hollow Hydro substation. This new 69 kV transmission line would be about 4.9 miles long in Washington County, Utah (Figure 1-8).

The proposed new **Hurricane Cliffs Afterbay to Hurricane West Transmission Line** would consist of a new 345 kV transmission line, running from the Hurricane Cliffs pumped storage power plant northwest and then north to the planned Hurricane West 345 kV substation. This new 345 kV transmission line would be about 10.9 miles long in Washington County, Utah (Figure 1-8).

The proposed new **Sand Hollow to Dixie Springs Transmission Line** would consist of a new 69 kV transmission line, running from the Sand Hollow Hydro substation around the east side of Sand Hollow Reservoir and north to the existing Dixie Springs Substation. This new 69 kV transmission line would be about 3.4 miles long in Washington County, Utah (Figure 1-8).

1.2.5 Natural Gas Pipeline and Generators Alternative

Natural gas engine-driven generation systems to power electric pumps would be an alternative to powering the LPP Project pump stations by electricity via transmission lines. Recent discussions with Questar Gas Company (local natural gas supplier) indicated that capacity would be available in the Kern River natural gas pipeline, which is located west of St. George, Utah, to supply natural gas for this alternative. Questar Gas Company indicated the company has future plans to extend a high pressure natural gas pipeline from the Kern River line to Hurricane, Utah. The Questar Gas pipeline would be sized to supply natural gas to the LPP Project if it is determined that a single-purpose, dedicated high pressure gas line would be extended to service the LPP pump stations. Based on the preliminary pump



Project Hydro Station
Substation
Proposed Substation
Project Transmission Lines
Existing Transmission Lines
Existing OH Primary Line
Existing UG Primary Line
Hurricane Cliffs Forebay/Afterbay
Lakes & Reservoirs
Major Rivers & Streams
Interstate
US Highway
ST Highway
Hwy
Major Road
National Park/Monument
GSENM Boundary
Tribal Lands
State Boundaries
County Boundaries

FERC Project Number:
12966-001
BLM Serial Numbers:
AZA-34941
UTU-85472

N

0 1 2 4 6 8 Miles

Lake Powell Pipeline Project

Spatial Reference: UTM Zone 12N, NAD-83

UDWRe **Figure 1-8** MWH

Lake Powell Pipeline Proposed Transmission Lines West

selection and fuel requirements, the natural gas supply pipeline would be 12 inches in diameter to provide natural gas supply for the LPP Project pump stations. The pipeline would likely be successively reduced in size as it delivers gas to each of the pump stations.

1.2.1.1 Natural Gas Transmission Line Connection

The natural gas supply line alternative would connect to the proposed Questar Gas Transmission Line from the existing Kern River line to Hurricane City. The natural gas supply line would connect to the high pressure gas transmission line at a proposed gate station southeast of Sand Hollow Reservoir. The proposed gate station would be located adjacent to the alignment of the extension of the Southern Corridor Highway, which is the existing alignment of Sand Hollow Road east of Sand Hollow Reservoir (Figure 1-9).

1.2.1.2 Natural Gas Supply Line

The proposed natural gas supply line would be an intermediate high pressure line and would operate between approximately 250 to 300 psi at the gate station connection. Because of pressure losses in the pipeline it is anticipated that the pressure at each of the LPP pump stations would vary between 50 and 100 psi, which would meet the requirements of the natural gas generators. The pipeline would be constructed of strong carbon steel and have a dielectric coating, such as a fusion bonded epoxy or extruded polyethylene. It would be installed with a minimum four feet of cover and be provided with cathodic protection (a technique that involves inducing an electric current through the pipe to ward off corrosion and rusting). The pipeline would be designed, constructed, tested, and operated at a minimum in accordance with all applicable requirements included in the U.S. DOT regulations in 49 CFR Part 192, “Transportation of Natural Gas and other Gas by Pipeline: Minimum Federal Safety Standards,” and other applicable federal and state regulations.

The natural gas supply line would follow the proposed LPP ROW from the Sand Hollow Gate Station to the intake pump station near Page, Arizona. The line would be about 138.5 miles long and installed a minimum of 10 feet from the edge of the proposed water pipeline in a separately excavated trench within the LPP ROW. Figure 1-9 shows the west alignment of the natural gas supply line as proposed and an alternative alignment along Arizona State Route 389 and through Fredonia, Arizona, parallel to the Existing Highway Alternative alignment, both to the west GSENM boundary. Figure 1-10 shows the east alignment of the natural gas supply line as proposed from the west GSENM boundary to the water intake pump station.

Sectionalizing valves would be required along the natural gas supply line alignment. These valves are safety devices used for emergency shut down or maintenance. The natural gas supply line sectionalizing valves would be required at approximately 20-mile intervals because of the gas line’s remoteness. The main line valve sites would cover a 40-foot by 40-foot area surrounded by a chain link fence within the confines of the permanent LPP pipeline ROW. The valves would be above ground and connected to the buried natural gas supply line. Additionally, pig launching or receiving equipment would be installed within the fenced areas. Pigs are devices that are placed into a natural gas supply line to clean the inside walls or to monitor its internal and external condition. Launching and receiving equipment is connected to the natural gas supply line to enable pigs to be inserted into or removed from the pipeline.

1.2.1.3 Natural Gas Generators

Natural gas generators would be used to supply power to operate the electric pumps at the LPP pump stations. The size of the electric pumps is approximately 18 feet from center to center when configured.



Natural Gas Gate Station
Natural Gas Supply Line Alignment
Hurricane Cliffs Forebay/Afterbay
Lakes & Reservoirs
Major Rivers & Streams
Interstate
US Highway
ST Highway
Hwy
Major Road
National Park/Monument
GSENM Boundary
Tribal Lands
State Boundaries
County Boundaries

FERC Project Number:
12966-001
BLM Serial Numbers:
AZA-34941
UTU-85472

N

0 2 4 6 8 10 Miles

Lake Powell Pipeline Project

Spatial Reference: UTM Zone 12N, NAD-83

UDWRe **Figure 1-9** MWH

Lake Powell Pipeline
Natural Gas Supply Line and Generators West Alternatives



Project Water Intake Pump Station
Gas Generators at Booster Pump Station
Natural Gas Supply Line Alignment

Interstate
US Highway
ST Highway
Hwy
Major Road

Lakes & Reservoirs
Major Rivers & Streams
National Park/Monument
GSENM Boundary
State Boundaries

FERC Project Number:
12966-001
BLM Serial Numbers:
AZA-34941
UTU-85472

N

0 1 2 3 4 Miles

Lake Powell Pipeline Project

Spatial Reference: UTM Zone 12N, NAD-83

UDWRe **Figure 1-10** MWH

Lake Powell Pipeline Natural Gas Supply Line and Generators East Alternative

The overall pump station building size would be 14 feet wider and 18 feet longer than the pump stations which are powered by electricity from transmission lines.

The natural gas generators would be approximately 35 feet long by eight feet wide by nine feet high. The intake pump station building size for the natural gas generators would be approximately 65 feet wide by 170 feet long by 50 feet high, and located adjacent to the pump station electrical room within the five-acre site designated for each pump station. The booster pump station building size for the natural gas generators would be 65 feet wide and 39 feet high, with lengths ranging from 114 feet to 162 feet long. Each natural gas generator would require a 24-inch diameter stack, with guide wires, extending above the building roof to disperse the exhaust gases. The five stacks (four operating natural gas generators plus one standby natural gas generator) at the intake pump station would extend 20 feet above the top of the 55-foot tall building. The stacks at BPS-1, BPS-2, BPS-3 (Alt.), and BPS-4 (Alt.) would extend 61 feet above the top of the buildings to a total height of 100 feet above the ground surface. The natural gas generators at the intake pump station and BPS-4 (Alt.) would require emission control systems to meet air quality standards.

The natural gas generators alternative at the LPP pump stations would require an annual natural gas supply of 2,855,400 million British thermal units (MMBtu). Table 1-1 shows the annual natural gas consumption at the proposed project intake pump station and booster pump stations 1 through 4.

Table 1-1
Water Conveyance System Natural Gas Generator Annual Fuel Consumption

Pump Station	Site Elevation Feet MSL	Number of Pumps	Motor (HP)	Total Motor (kW)	Natural Gas Generator GE Model	# of Units[1]	Emission Control Required	Generator Total kW[2]	Annual Fuel Consumption (MMbtu)[3]
IPS	3,750	5	3000	11,190	JGS 620 F09	4+1	Yes	12,120	729,000
BPS-1	4,111	5	1500	5,595	JGS 620 F09	2+1	No	5,992	364,500
BPS-2	4,311	5	1750	6,530	JGS 620 F09	3+1	No	8,895	425,400
BPS-3 Alt.	4,657	5	2500	9,325	JGS 620 F09	4+1	No	11,652	607,500
BPS-4 Alt.	5,001	5	3000	11,190	JGS 620 F09	5+1	Yes	14,430	729,000
Total		**25**		**43,830**		**18+5**		**53,089**	**2,855,400**

Notes:
[1] Number of operating units plus standby generator
[2] Total generator capacity without standby generator
[3] The annual fuel consumption is based on all pumps operating at rated motor horsepower, 8400 hours/year operation with generators loaded at 87 percent on the average.

1.3 Summary Description of No Lake Powell Water Alternative

The No Lake Powell Water Alternative would involve a combination of developing remaining available surface water and groundwater supplies, developing reverse osmosis treatment of existing low quality water supplies, and eliminating residential outdoor water use in the WCWCD service area. This alternative could provide a total of 86,249 acre-feet of water annually to WCWCD and KCWCD for M&I use without diverting Utah's water from Lake Powell.

1.3.1 WCWCD No Lake Powell Water Alternative

1.3.1.1 Background

The WCWCD LPP allocation would be 82,249 acre-feet per year, and the WCWCD No Lake Powell Water alternative would need to supply 82,249 acre-feet per year to meet the same future water demands. In addition to the direct supply from Utah's Colorado River water, the water supplied by the LPP Project would provide additional wastewater reuse supply provided that sufficient storage is available.

The No Lake Powell Water Alternative would serve the same population as the LPP Project. WCWCD would implement other future water development projects currently planned by the District, develop additional water reuse/reclamation programs, continue to implement new water conservation measures, and convert additional agricultural water use to M&I use as a result of urban development in agricultural areas through 2028. Remaining planned and future water supply projects include the Ash Creek Pipeline (2,840 acre-feet per year), Sand Hollow recharge/recovery (3,000 acre-feet per year), Westside groundwater wells arsenic treatment (5,000 acre-feet per year), and development/yield increase of existing groundwater wells (2,830 acre-feet per year). Along with existing supplies, these future water supplies would yield an estimated 72,842 acre-feet per year of potable water and 8,505 acre-feet per year secondary water by 2028.

Under the No Lake Powell Water Alternative, actions in addition to the currently planned WCWCD projects would be taken to meet the water demand that would have been supplied by the Lake Powell Pipeline, as described below.

1.3.1.2 WCWCD No Lake Powell Water Alternative Features

Beginning in 2025, Washington County residential outdoor potable water use would be permanently re-purposed to indoor potable water use to help meet increasing indoor potable water demands. The WCWCD would develop a reverse osmosis (RO) advanced water treatment facility near the Washington Fields Diversion in Washington County, Utah, to treat up to 50,000 acre-feet per year of diverted Virgin River water, which has a high total dissolved solids (TDS) concentration, mixed with an additional 19,030 acre-feet per year of reuse water. WCWCD would develop the Warner Valley Reservoir to store the reuse water and diverted Virgin River water prior to RO treatment. A water distribution pump station and pipeline would be constructed to convey 13,249 acre-feet of potable water from Quail Creek Water Treatment Plant to the Apple Valley area of Washington County. Figure 1-11 shows the primary conceptual components of the No Lake Powell Water Alternative. Table 1-2 summarizes available supplies and projected demands under the No Lake Powell Water Alternative and the LPP Project alternatives.



WTP Quail Creek WTP (Existing)
WWT St. George Regional Water Reclamation Facility (Existing)
Substation
Substation (Future)
Warner Valley Transmission Line
Existing Transmission Lines
Desilting Facility
RO WTP
Washington Fields Diversion Pump Station
Lakes & Reservoirs
Brine Evaporation Ponds
Access Road
Apple Valley Pipeline 30"
Brine Pipeline 20"
Existing Reuse Water Pipeline 30"
RO Treated Water Pipeline 54"
Major Rivers & Streams
Interstate
US Highway
ST Highway
Hwy
Major Road
Southern Corridor Highway
State Boundaries
County Boundaries

FERC Project Number:
12966-001
BLM Serial Numbers:
AZA-34941
UTU-85472

N

0 0.75 1.5 3 4.5 6 Miles

Lake Powell Pipeline Project

Spatial Reference: UTM Zone 12N, NAD-83

UDWRe **Figure 1-11** MWH

No Lake Powell Water Alternative Primary Infrastructure

Table 1-2 Available Supplies and Projected Demands Under the No Lake Powell Water and Lake Powell Pipeline Project Alternatives		
	No Lake Powell Water Alternative	**Lake Powell Pipeline Project Alternative**
Existing Supplies	67,677	67,677
Planned Projects	13,670	13,670
Lake Powell Pipeline Project	0	82,249
RO Treatment of Virgin River and Reuse Water	57,883	0
Agricultural Conversion	0[1]	10,080
Reuse	17,100[2]	36,130
2060 Total Supply	156,330	209,806
2060 Total Demand	133,119[3]	185,285
Surplus in 2060	**23,211**	**24,521**

Notes:
[1]Agricultural conversion water included in RO treatment.
[2]19,030 acre-feet per year additional reuse included in RO treatment.
[3]Demand reduced 52,166 acre-feet per year from elimination of residential outdoor watering

1.3.1.2.1 Re-Purposing Potable Water Use. The No Lake Powell Water Alternative would permanently eliminate residential outdoor potable water use in Washington County, re-purposing the portion of potable water used for residential outdoor watering to indoor potable use. Projections of future water use through 2060 account for population growth, climate change (projected 6 percent reduction of Virgin River flows by 2050 [Reclamation 2014]), and water conservation (35 percent reduction in per capita water use from 2000 to 2060). Potable water in Washington County is consumed for residential indoor and outdoor uses, commercial uses, institutional uses, and industrial uses. These potable water uses would total 130,245 acre-feet per year by 2052, the year the LPP Project water is anticipated to be fully utilized (UDWRe 2015). Gradually eliminating residential outdoor potable water use starting in 2025 would provide the growing population with potable water for indoor use through 2045; however, re-purposing residential outdoor potable water use to indoor use would not increase the water supply and would have to be accompanied by adding another water supply to meet the growing demand. Re-purposing residential outdoor potable water use to indoor potable use would require converting traditional residential outdoor landscapes and uses to either landscaping requiring no irrigation or desert landscapes compatible with the local climate. Residential water users would be responsible for converting their traditional outdoor landscapes to non-irrigated or desert landscapes. If no additional water supply was added in Washington County after 2025 and potable water use continued to meet residential indoor and outdoor purposes, then the projected population would completely utilize the potable water supply of 72,842 acre-feet per year by 2028.

1.3.1.2.2 Reverse Osmosis Water Treatment. Washington County's additional future water supply under the No Lake Powell Water Alternative would be dependent on two water sources: 1) Virgin River water diverted at the Washington Fields Diversion; and 2) reuse water from an expanded St. George Regional Water Reclamation Facility. WCWCD would develop a RO advanced water treatment facility near Washington Fields Diversion in Washington County, Utah. The RO facility would be designed to treat 50,000 acre-feet of de-silted water per year diverted from the Virgin River at Washington Fields Diversion. St. George Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility would provide an additional 19,030 acre-feet of water per year to be treated at the RO facility. The RO facility would be necessary to remove

the high concentrations of TDS present in both the Virgin River and the effluent from the St. George Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility. The reuse facility has a current capacity of approximately 7,800 acre-feet per year, with a future design capacity of 11,760 acre-feet per year. An additional 7,830 acre-feet per year of future wastewater reclamation capacity would need to be added to meet the total reuse water requirement of 19,030 acre-feet per year for RO processing inflow. The RO process would separate the TDS from the water, resulting in two products: 1) a treated water product; and 2) a brine product consisting of highly concentrated salts. A two-stage RO process would be applied to the brine solution to recover additional water and reduce the brine volume for enhanced evaporation. The RO-treated water product would be pH-adjusted to neutral pH, dosed with sodium silicate, mixed with conventionally-treated water from the Quail Creek Water Treatment Plant, and disinfected for distribution throughout the WCWCD service area. The RO advanced water treatment facility would process up to 64,313 acre-feet per year and produce up to 57,883 acre-feet per year of water suitable for M&I potable indoor use. The two-stage RO process would remove 90 percent of the TDS. The remaining 10 percent rejection (6,430 acre-feet per year) of brine by-product from the RO treatment process would require evaporation and disposal meeting State of Utah water quality regulations. The RO water treatment plant would process approximately 64,313 acre-feet per year of inflow water from Warner Valley Reservoir storage to meet the 2052 water demand under the No Lake Powell Water Alternative.

The RO water treatment plant processes would consist of pressurized, parallel ultra-filtration units, an influent storage tank with acid added to adjust the pH, pressurized cartridge filtration to remove additional particles from the water, high pressure pumping to pass the water through the parallel RO membrane units, a product water storage tank with saturated lime solution added to adjust the pH of the treated product water prior to disinfection and distribution as potable water, and brine storage tanks in series with the two-stage RO process units for further brine reduction. These water treatment processes would be housed in a water treatment building with electrical, mechanical, chemical storage and metering, heating/air conditioning/ventilation, and SCADA systems. A seven-mile long buried 54-inch diameter pipeline would convey the product water from a pump station at the RO water treatment plant to the Quail Creek Water Treatment Plant. The RO water treatment plant would add RO membrane units in phases as necessary to meet the growing water demand. The RO water treatment plant would be powered by electricity, requiring a 2.8-mile long 69-kV power transmission line from the proposed Purgatory Substation.

The concentrated brine product (6,430 acre-feet per year) would be pumped from the brine tanks through a pipeline to an evaporation apron, spray system and double-lined pond, and then pumped into spray headers over a series of double-lined ponds with leak detection and recovery systems. The enhanced evaporation ponds would be located south of Warner Valley Reservoir and would cover approximately 2,000 acres, developed in two phases. A buried brine conveyance pipeline approximately 4.4 miles long would convey the concentrated brine to the enhanced evaporation ponds. A 4.4-mile long 34.5-kV power transmission line would be extended from the RO water treatment plant to the enhanced evaporation ponds to provide electricity for the pumps spraying the brine solution. The brine solids would be evaporated for approximately 25 years in the Phase 1 ponds, and then dried, collected and disposed in an approved solid waste landfill. The Phase 2 enhanced evaporation ponds would be used during the following 25 years to continue evaporating the brine by-product. Additional infrastructure would be required as part of this alternative, including a de-silting facility, pump stations, pipelines, switch stations and substations, blending and storage tanks, and other associated earthwork.

1.3.1.2.3 Secondary Water Storage in Warner Valley Reservoir. WCWCD would develop the Warner Valley Reservoir to store diverted Virgin River water and reuse water from the St. George Regional Water Reclamation Facility, which would be delivered as inflow to the RO advanced water treatment facility. Warner Valley Reservoir would be located south-southwest of the Washington Fields Diversion. An earth-fill embankment with a clay core and rock-riprap facing would be constructed across the north

entrance to the natural valley. The reservoir would have a maximum active storage volume of 69,030 acre-feet and would cover approximately 1,130 acres, including the earth-fill embankment. A large pump station would be constructed at the Washington Fields Diversion to pump the diverted Virgin River water into the Warner Valley Reservoir. The pump station would be powered by electricity via the 69-kV transmission line from the Purgatory Substation to the RO water treatment plant. The reservoir would store Virgin River water diverted at the Washington Fields Diversion (50,000 acre-feet per year) mixed with St. George Regional Water Reclamation Facility effluent (19,030 acre-feet per year), accounting for annual average evaporation (4,717 acre-feet per year), to produce up to 57,883 acre-feet of RO product water (assuming 90 percent recovery). The brine product from RO treatment would total approximately 6,430 acre-feet per year.

1.3.1.2.4 Water Distribution to Apple Valley. The largest remaining contiguous land area available for development in Washington County would be in Apple Valley. WCWCD would develop a pump station and 28-mile long pipeline to deliver 13,249 acre-feet per year of potable water from the Quail Creek Water Treatment Plant near Hurricane City to the Apple Valley area to meet future residential and commercial water demands.

1.3.2 KCWCD No Lake Powell Water Alternative

The KCWCD No Lake Powell Water Alternative would rely on existing water supplies, water conservation measures resulting in reduced water use, and future water development projects consisting of new groundwater production. Reliable water supplies (projected to be 2,170 acre-feet per year in 2035) for the area served by KCWCD (Kanab City and Johnson Canyon), adjusted for projected stream flow reductions (4.2 percent in 2035) resulting from climate change and a planning reserve (10 percent), would be exceeded by projected M&I water demands by 27 acre-feet per year within the KCWCD service area in 2035. KCWCD projected potable water demand in 2060 would be 3,435 acre-feet per year, with a potable water deficit of 1,334 acre-feet per year. Additional groundwater in the Kanab Creek drainage basin could be developed to provide up to 6,615 acre-feet per year of potable water within the aquifer's estimated safe yield. The quality of this water would likely require advanced water treatment. The developed groundwater from the Kanab Creek drainage basin would be pumped and conveyed through an eight-mile long pipeline to the Johnson Canyon drainage basin. The Johnson Canyon drainage basin comprises the potable water supply service area served by KCWCD in the area that could be served by the LPP Project.

1.4 Summary Description of the No Action Alternative

No new intake, water conveyance or hydroelectric features would be constructed or operated under the No Action Alternative. FERC would not issue a license for the LPP Project. The Utah Board of Water Resources' Colorado River water rights consisting of 86,249 acre-feet per year would not be diverted from Lake Powell and would continue to flow into the lake until the water is used for another State of Utah purpose.

1.4.1 WCWCD No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, WCWCD would complete the Ash Creek Project, planned groundwater development and continue to implement planned conservation programs. Wastewater reuse would be utilized to the maximum extent storage allows. Existing and future water supplies totaling 72,840 acre-feet per year potable and 8,505 acre-feet per year secondary would meet projected M&I water demand within the WCWCD service area through approximately 2028, exhausting all water planning reserves.

Each supply source would be phased in to meet the M&I potable and secondary water demand associated with the forecasted population.

The No Action Alternative would not provide WCWCD with any reserve water supply (e.g., water to meet annual shortages because of drought, emergencies, and other losses). The No Action Alternative would not provide adequate water supply to meet projected water demands beyond 2028. There would be a projected water shortage of approximately 102,903 acre-feet per year in 2060 within the WCWCD service area under the No Action Alternative.

1.4.2 KCWCD No Action Alternative

KCWCD would use existing water supplies to meet potable water demands through 2035. Reliable water supplies are projected to be 2,101 acre-feet per year in 2060.

The No Action Alternative would not provide KCWCD with any reserve water supply (e.g., water to meet annual shortages because of drought, emergencies, and other losses). The No Action Alternative would not provide adequate water supply to meet projected water demands beyond 2035. There would be a projected water shortage of approximately 1,334 acre-feet per year in 2060 within the KCWCD service area under the No Action Alternative.

1.5 Study Objectives

The goals of this study are to determine whether the construction and the operation or maintenance of the proposed LPP would negatively impact surface water quality in the project vicinity. Impacts on water quality are considered significant if construction and operation or maintenance activities would result in any of the following conditions:

- Violation of applicable surface water quality standards
- Substantial degradation of surface water quality
- Substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alternation of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site

The major surface water features in the vicinity of the LPP Project include Kanab Creek, Paria River, and the Virgin River. Major surface water reservoirs in the vicinity of the proposed project facilities include Quail Creek Reservoir, Sand Hollow Reservoir, and Lake Powell. There are also several ephemeral and dry washes along the proposed alignments. The primary objectives of this study with regard to surface water quality are:

- Identify what impacts could occur on water quality in lakes and streams, including surface water quality downstream of Glen Canyon Dam, from Project construction, operation, and/or maintenance
- Determine what impacts, if any, may occur on Lake Powell water quality
- Determine how groundwater resources would be quantitatively impacted by recharge associated with Project operation
- Evaluate how water quality and water use would be balanced for hydropower generation, consumption and environmental purposes
- Determine whether any impacts on groundwater quality (addressed in a separate study plan section for groundwater resources) would affect surface water quality
- Identify measures for mitigating impacts on surface water quality

Chapter 2 of this report presents the data used and the methodology adopted to evaluate the impacts of the LPP Project on surface water quality. **Chapter 3** summarizes the historical water quality for the surface water bodies in the vicinity of the LPP Project. **Chapter 4** identifies the potential impacts on the surface water quality caused by the construction, operation, and/or maintenance of the LPP Project. **Chapter 5** identifies measures to mitigate the potential impacts on surface water quality. **Chapter 6** identifies the potential unavoidable adverse impacts on surface water quality. **Chapter 7** identifies the potential cumulative impacts on surface water quality.

Chapter 2
Methodology

This chapter describes the methodology adopted to evaluate the impacts on surface water quality caused by the proposed construction and operation of the LPP Project. The data reviewed and the assumptions made for the evaluation are presented.

2.1 Data Sources

Historical water quality data for the Virgin River, Paria River, Kanab Creek were obtained from the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) STORET (www.epa.gov\storet) data system (EPA 2010). Historical water quality data for the Sand Hollow Reservoir were obtained from a report produced by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) titled *Assessment of Managed Aquifer Recharge at Sand Hollow Reservoir, Washington County, Utah, Updated to Conditions through 2012* (USGS 2012). Historical water quality data for the Lake Powell reservoir were obtained from a report produced by MWH titled *Technical Memorandum 5.13A: A Review of Water Quality and Treatment Issues* (MWH 2008). The Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians were contacted in 2008 to obtain surface water quality data for streams and ephemeral drainages on the Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation. No surface water quality data were provided by the environmental coordinator for the Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians. UDWRe assessed surface water quality conditions on the Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation concurrent with wetland and riparian field studies, approved by the Kaibab Tribe and observed by a Kaibab Tribe monitor. Streams and ephemeral drainages studied in the field were dry and not conveying any surface water during five monitoring visits, except for the final monitoring visit to Sand Wash to remove the scour chain and crest gage. Sand Wash was conveying approximately five gallons a minute of water on December 13, 2011 where the Existing Highway Alternative would cross the stream, with no measurable turbidity.

2.2 Evaluation Methodology

The following tasks were completed to evaluate potential impacts on surface water quality caused by construction and operation of the proposed project:

- Review of beneficial use designations and water quality criteria
- Review of historical water quality data
- Establishment of significance criteria
- Impact assessment
- Identification of mitigation measures

2.2.1 Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria

Designated beneficial uses for the major water bodies in the vicinity of the proposed project in the states of Utah and Arizona were reviewed. Numeric water quality protection criteria associated with each beneficial use for the following water quality parameters were then reviewed: pH, total dissolved solids (TDS), total suspended solids (TSS), temperature, metals, and pollution indicators such as total coliform.

2.2.2 Historical Water Quality Data

Based on review of historical water quality data, the minimum, average, and maximum values are presented for relevant water quality parameters. The historical water quality data for a water body are compared with numeric water quality objectives. Exceedance percentages are based on the number of samples that have concentrations in excess of the numeric objectives.

2.2.3 Significance Criteria

Impacts on water quality are considered significant if construction, operation or maintenance activities would result in any of the following conditions:

- Violation of applicable surface water quality standards
- Substantial degradation of surface water quality
- Substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alternation of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site

2.2.4 Impact Assessment

Potential impacts on surface water quality during construction and the operation of the proposed project would result from clearing and grading for pipeline, booster pump station, hydro generating station, and transmission line construction; the use of open-cut crossings for pipeline installation; changes to site drainage patterns; and maintenance activities such as pipeline flushing or draining. The primary concerns associated with these activities are the transport of sediment and the introduction of construction equipment-related pollutants during construction and maintenance operations into nearby surface water bodies. Assessment of water quality impacts from the inflow of Lake Powell water into Sand Hollow Reservoir is also analyzed. Changes in water quality parameters from baseline conditions are analyzed as impacts. Measurable water quality changes are evaluated for significant impacts by comparison with the significance criteria.

2.2.5 Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures would be applied to any significant water quality impacts as applicable and available to avoid, minimize or reduce the level of impact to below the significance threshold. In compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit for construction activity, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) would be developed and implemented for project construction activities. Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented by the contractor would be specified in the SWPPP. Mitigation measures that may be implemented as BMPs are described as potential mitigation measures to protect water quality. The focus of the BMPs is on control of soil erosion and reduction in sediment recruitment to surface waters.

Chapter 3
Affected Environment (Baseline Conditions)

This chapter describes the historical water quality conditions of the surface water bodies in the states of Utah and Arizona that might be impacted from construction and operation of the LPP Project. The beneficial use protection classifications and historical water quality conditions are summarized for the surface water bodies. The historical water quality conditions for surface water bodies within Utah and Arizona are reviewed in conjunction with the surface water quality numeric criteria. A comprehensive review of the historical water quality data against the surface water quality numeric criteria for all sampled water quality constituents is beyond the scope of this chapter. Therefore, the review of historical water quality is limited to parameters such as pH, total dissolved solids (TDS), total suspended solids (TSS), temperature, metals, and pollution indicators such as total coliform.

3.1 Beneficial Use Designations - Utah

In Utah, water quality protection standards are based on designated state beneficial uses which are defined and classified in the Utah Administrative Code, Rule 317-2 Standards for Quality of Waters of the State (UAC R317-2). Use designations are provided in UAC R317-2-6 and include the classifications shown in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1
Beneficial Use Protection Classifications for Surface Waters of the State of Utah

Classification	Definition
1C	Protected for domestic purposes with prior treatment by treatment processes as required by the Utah Division of Drinking Water.
2A	Protected for frequent primary contact recreation where there is a high likelihood of ingestion of water or a high degree of bodily contact with the water. Examples include, but are not limited to, swimming, rafting, kayaking, diving, and water skiing.
2B	Protected for infrequent primary contact recreation. Also protected for secondary contact recreation where there is a low likelihood of ingestion of water or a low degree of bodily contact with the water. Examples include, but are not limited to, wading, hunting, and fishing.
3A	Protected for cold water species of game fish and other cold water aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain.
3B	Protected for warm water species of game fish and other warm water aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain.
3C	Protected for nongame fish and other aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain.
3D	Protected for waterfowl, shore birds and other water-oriented wildlife not included in Classes 3A, 3B, or 3C, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain.
3E	Severely habitat-limited waters. Narrative standards will be applied to protect these waters for aquatic wildlife.
4	Protected for agricultural uses including irrigation of crops and stock watering.
5	Special category for the waters of the Great Salt Lake.

The portions of the Proposed Action described in Chapter 1 in Utah would involve the following surface water features:

- Proposed Action Intake and Water Conveyance Systems: Paria River
- Proposed Action Hydro System: Kanab Creek and Sand Hollow Reservoir
- Transmission Line Alternatives: Paria River

Beneficial use protection classifications for major rivers and reservoirs in the LPP vicinity are displayed in Table 3-2. Beneficial use designations for several washes in the LPP area of potential effect are not provided in UAC R317.

Table 3-2
Beneficial Use Protection Classifications Designated for Major Rivers and Reservoirs in the LPP Vicinity, UAC R317-2-13

Water Body	Classifications
Colorado River	1C, 2B, 3B, 4
Kanab Creek (lower)	2B, 3C, 4
Lake Powell	1C, 2A, 2B, 3B, 4
Mill Creek	1C, 2B, 3A, 4
Paria River	2B, 3C, 4
Quail Creek Reservoir (Quail Lake)	1C, 2A, 2B, 3B, 4
Virgin River (above Quail Creek Diversion)	1C, 2B, 3C, 4
Virgin River (below Quail Creek Diversion)	2B, 3A, 4

3.2 Historical Water Quality Conditions - Utah

Water quality data for the relevant surface water bodies were obtained from the EPA STORET data system. Water quality data for the water bodies listed in Table 3-2 are summarized in this section. Water quality data should be reviewed in conjunction with factors such as flow rates, the number of samples, and the frequency and period of sampling. Averages were calculated based on an assumed concentration of zero for samples reported as “non-detect” (ND) because of variations in the method detection limits for the reported data. It should be noted that the average concentration values may not be representative of typical conditions because of the presence of outlier events. For example, the average TDS concentration of a water body may be significantly elevated in response to increased runoff during a 100-year storm event (an outlier event).

Historical water quality for the relevant surface waters in Utah is summarized in the following tables. In general, all water bodies exhibited concentrations for total coliform, TDS, and TSS in excess of their numeric water quality criteria. Recorded values for pH were within the specified numeric range for the majority of samples. Metals were detected in all water bodies. For the Virgin and the Paria rivers, metals were detected in concentrations that were in excess of their numeric water quality criteria.

3.2.1 Kanab Creek

In southern Utah, Kanab Creek drains a narrow valley from north to south with peak elevations nearing 8,000 feet. Downstream of Kanab in Kane County, Utah, Kanab Creek flows into Arizona near Fredonia. In Arizona it flows through the Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation of the Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians onto BLM-administered land, and through Kanab Creek Wilderness (on National Forest System land) before its confluence with the Colorado River in Grand Canyon National Park. Peak flows occur in spring and low flows occur during the summer months. The characterization of Kanab Creek water quality is based upon water quality data obtained at three sampling stations (listed in Table 3-3). Key water quality parameters at each of the stations are summarized in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3
Kanab Creek Water Quality Sample Station Locations

Station ID	Station Name	Sampling Period	Latitude	Longitude
4951810	Kanab Creek at US89 Crossing	1978 to 1982, 1993 to 2006	37.10083	-112.547
4951830	Kanab Creek at Falls Crossing East of Glendale	1978 to 1980, 1996 to 2008	37.29111	-112.492
4951750	Kanab Creek below Kanab WWTP at the State Line	1976 to 1993, 2001 to 2003	37.00611	-112.536

Source: Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008)

Numeric water quality criteria for Kanab Creek vary based on the different beneficial uses. Table 3-4 presents the most stringent numeric criteria for Kanab Creek for the relevant water quality parameters.

Table 3-4
Numeric Water Quality Criteria for Kanab Creek

Constituent-Units	**Numeric Criteria**
Aluminum-µg/L	750
Cadmium-µg/L	2
Chromium (VI)-µg/L	16
Copper-µg/L	13
Dissolved Oxygen - mg/L [(1)]	5 3
Iron- µg/L	1,000
pH-Standard Units	6.5-9.0
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	1,200
Temperature, water-deg C	27
Total Coliform- MPN[(2)]/100ml	206
Turbidity - NTU[(3)]/(increase of)	10
Zinc- µg/L	120

(1) 30-day average and minimum
(2) Most Probable Number (MPN)
(3) Nephelometric Turbidity Units

Historical water quality data for the water bodies at the station locations listed in Table 3-3 are summarized in Tables 3-5, 3-6, 3-7.

Table 3-5
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Kanab Creek (Station ID 4951810)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Aluminum-µg/L	ND[1]	880	76	32	The numeric criterion for aluminum (1 hour average of 750 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (3% of samples). Aluminum was detected in 11 samples (34% of samples).
Copper-µg/L	ND	42	3	47	The numeric criterion for copper (1 hour average of 13 µg/L) was exceeded in four samples (9% of samples). Copper was detected in 7 samples (15% of samples).
Iron- µg/L	ND	1,850	102	42	The numeric criterion for iron (1 hour average of 1,000 µg/L) was exceeded in two samples (5% of samples). Iron was detected in 23 samples (55% of samples).
pH-Standard Units	7.3	8.8	8.3	324	All samples were within the 6.5-9.0 range of the criterion.
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	216	1,360	364	174	The numeric criterion for TDS (1,200 mg/L) was exceeded in 1 sample (<1% of samples). Approximately 82% of the samples measured had TDS concentrations less than 400 mg/L. A TDS concentration of 1,000 mg/L was exceeded in two samples (1% of samples).
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	<1	9,744	558	160	Approximately 80% of the samples had TSS concentrations less than 500 mg/L. Approximately, 11% of the samples had concentrations in excess of 1,000 mg/L.
Specific Conductance, umho/cm	197	1,672	570	324	Approximately 81% of the total samples had a specific conductance that ranged between 400 umho/cm and 600 umho/cm. Approximately 8% of the total samples had a specific conductance that was greater than 800 umho/cm.
Temperature, water-deg C	0	31	15	157	The numeric criterion for temperature (27˚C) was exceeded in 9 samples (6% of samples).
Total Coliform- Most Probable No. (MPN)/100ml[2]	23	9,300	2,510	11	The numeric criterion for total coliform (206 MPN/100 ml) was exceeded in 10 samples (91% of samples).
Turbidity-NTU	0.7	10,276	430	172	Numeric criterion is based on an increase as a result of discharge.
Zinc- µg/L	ND	140	19	48	The numeric criterion for zinc (1 hour average of 120 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (2% of samples). Zinc was detected in 15 samples (31% of samples).

Source: Summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

(2) Most Probable Number (MPN); value shown as "average" represents the geometric mean of the samples.

Table 3-6
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Kanab Creek (Station ID 4951830)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Copper-µg/L	ND[(1)]	30	4	15	The numeric criterion for copper (1 hour average of 13 µg/L) was exceeded in three samples (20% of samples). Copper was detected in 5 samples (33% of samples).
pH-Standard Units	7.2	9.2	8.2	200	The numeric criterion for pH was exceeded in one sample (<1% of samples).
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	372	2,262	1,302	111	The numeric criterion for TDS was exceeded in 65 samples (59% of samples). Approximately 25% of the samples had TDS concentrations between 1,000 mg/L and 1,500 mg/L. Approximately 42% of the samples had TDS concentrations greater than 1,500 mg/L.
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	<1	31,980	795	95	Approximately 70% of the measured TSS concentrations were lower than 200 mg/L. All measured concentrations in excess of 1,000 mg/L occurred after year 1999. TSS concentrations in excess of 5,000 mg/L were recorded during the months of July and August in year 2001 and year 2006.
Specific conductance-umho/cm	171	2,495	1,613	204	Approximately 80% of the sampled values were between 1,000 umho/cm and 2,000 umho/cm.
Temperature, water-deg C	0	29	11	93	The numeric criterion for temperature (27˚C) was exceeded in 3 samples (3% of samples).
Turbidity-NTU	1	6,979	256	110	The numeric criterion is based on an increase as a result of discharge.

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

Table 3-7
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Kanab Creek (Station ID 4951750)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Cadmium-µg/L	ND[1]	20	<1	82	The numeric criterion for cadmium (1 hour average of 2 µg/L) was exceeded in five samples (6% of samples). Cadmium was detected in 8 samples (10% of samples).
Chromium(VI)-µg/L	ND	100	8	15	The numeric criterion (1 hour average of 16 µg/L) for chromium was exceeded in one sample (7% of samples). Chromium was detected in 7 samples (47% of samples).
Copper-µg/L	ND	925	22	86	The numeric criterion for copper (1 hour average of 13 µg/L) was exceeded in 18 samples (21% of samples). Copper was detected in 30 samples (35% of samples).
pH	6.2	9.5	8.1	200	The numeric criterion for pH was exceeded in one sample (<1% of samples).
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	230	1,494	988	123	The numeric criterion for TDS (1,200 mg/L) was exceeded in 38 samples (31% of samples).
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	<1	28,700	1,354	118	Approximately 60% of the samples had a TSS concentration lower than 300 mg/L. Approximately 20% of the samples had a TSS concentration that ranged between 1,000 mg/L and 5,000 mg/L. Approximately 6% of the samples had concentrations in excess of 5,000 mg/L.
Specific conductance-umho/cm	13	2,800	1,312	224	Approximately 70% of the measured values varied between 1,000 umho/cm and 2,000 umho/cm. Approximately 42% of the measured values varied between 1,500 umho/cm and 2,000 umho/cm
Temperature, water-deg C	0.7	32.4	13	118	The numeric criterion for temperature (27˚C) was exceeded in 5 samples (4% of samples).
Total Coliform-MPN/100ml[3]	23	724,000	40,719	39	The numeric criterion for total coliform (206 MPN/100 ml) was exceeded in 34 samples (87% of samples).
Turbidity-NTU	0.35	3,164	153	115	The numeric criterion is based on an increase as a result of discharge.

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

(3) Most Probable Number (MPN); value shown as "average" represents the geometric mean of the samples.

3.2.2 Paria River

The Paria River flows from the headwaters in Bryce Canyon National Park and Dixie National Forest through private agricultural lands in Garfield County, Utah and south through GSENM (in Kane County, Utah) into Arizona and the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam. The river flows through the Grand Staircase region, a series of multi-colored cliffs which begin at the rim of the Grand Canyon, and ascend over 5,000 feet across GSENM to the headwaters at the cliffs in Bryce Canyon.

Section 303(d) and EPA's Water Quality Planning and Management Regulations (40 CFR Part 130), require that States report waterbodies (i.e., lakes, reservoirs, rivers, and streams) that do not support their designated beneficial use(s). In compliance with this requirement, segments of the Paria River are categorized as impaired for total dissolved solids, suspended solids, and *E. coli* (EPA 2006 and 2008). The characterization of water quality in the Paria River is based upon water quality data obtained at three sampling stations (listed in Table 3-8). Key water quality parameters at each of the stations are summarized in Table 3-8.

Table 3-8
Paria River Water Quality Sample Station Locations

Station ID	Station Name	Sampling Period	Latitude	Longitude
4951850	Paria River at US 89 Crossing	1976 to 1988, 1998 to 2008	37.1075	-111.906
4951860	Paria River at Kodachrome Basin Road Crossing	2000 to 2004	37.52814	-112.043
5994550	Paria River at Old Town Site	1998 to 2008	37.2505	-111.954

Source: Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008)

Numeric water quality criteria for the Paria River vary based on the different beneficial uses. Table 3-9 presents the most stringent numeric criteria for Paria River for the relevant water quality parameters.

Table 3-9
Numeric Criteria for Paria River

Constituent-Units	Numeric Criteria
Aluminum-µg/L	750
Cadmium-µg/L	2
Chromium (VI)-µg/L	16
Copper-µg/L	13
Dissolved Oxygen-mg/L (1)	5 3
Iron-µg/L	1,000
Lead-µg/L	65
pH-Standard Units	6.5-9.0
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	1,200
Temperature, water-deg C	27
Total Coliform- MPN/100ml	206
Turbidity - NTU (increase of)	10

(1) 30-day average, minimum

Historical water quality data for the water bodies at the station locations listed in Tables 3-8 are summarized in Tables 3-10, 3-11, and 3-12.

Table 3-10
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (4951850)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Aluminum-µg/L	ND[(1)]	708	131	8	The numeric criterion for aluminum (1 hour average of 750 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Aluminum was detected in 4 samples (50% of samples).
Cadmium-µg/L	ND	5	<1	28	The numeric criterion for cadmium (1 hour average of 2 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (4% of samples). Cadmium was detected in 8 samples (29% of samples).
Chromium(VI)-µg/L	ND	25	3	8	The numeric criterion for hexavalent chromium (1 hour average of 16 µg/L) was exceeded in the only sample where chromium was present (13% of samples); all other samples were non-detect.
Copper-µg/L	ND	425	26	29	The numeric criterion for copper (1 hour average of 13 µg/L) was exceeded in 10 samples (34% of samples). Copper was detected in 14 samples (48% of samples).
Iron-µg/L	ND	6,650	742	14	The numeric criterion for iron (1 hour average of 1,000 µg/L) was exceeded in 10 samples (71% of samples). Iron was detected in 9 samples (64% of samples).
Lead-µg/L	ND	250	13	30	The numeric criterion for lead (1 hour average of 65 µg/L) was exceeded in five samples (17% of samples). Aluminum was detected in 12 samples (40% of samples).
pH-Standard Units	7.0	9.7	8.2	131	The numeric criterion for pH (range of 6.5 - 9.0) was exceeded in four samples (3% of samples).
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	504	2,744	1,188	73	The numeric criterion for TDS (1,000 mg/L) was exceeded in 56 samples (77% of samples). Approximately 60% of the collected samples had TDS concentrations that ranged from 1,000 mg/L to 1,500 mg/L.

Table 3-10
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (4951850)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	12	142,500	7,662	75	Approximately 45% of the samples had TSS concentrations lower than 500 mg/L. Approximately 30% of the samples had concentrations in excess of 1000 mg/L. There were several peaks throughout the sampling period where the TSS concentrations exceeded 10,000 mg/L. Approximately, 10% of the samples had TSS concentrations in excess of 10,000 mg/L.
Specific conductance-umho/cm	255	3,070	1,552	136	Specific conductance measured in over 50% of the collected samples ranged from 1,000 umho/cm to 1,500 umho/cm.
Temperature, water-deg C	0	33	14	66	The numeric criterion for temperature (27˚C) was exceeded in 5 samples (8% of samples).
Total Coliform-MPN/100ml[(2)]	23	43,000	7,144	9	The numeric criterion for total coliform (206 MPN/100 ml) was exceeded in seven samples (78% of samples).
Turbidity-NTU	9	52,208	2,253	66	The numeric criterion is based on an increase as a result of discharge.

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

(2) Most Probable Number (MPN); value shown as "average" represents the geometric mean of the samples.

Table 3-11
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (4951860)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Aluminum-µg/L	35	62	49	4	The numeric criterion for aluminum (1 hour average of 750 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample.
Chromium-µg/L	5	10	7	5	The numeric criterion for chromium (1 hour average of 16 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample.
Iron-µg/L	50	142	85	4	The numeric criterion for chromium (1 hour average of 1,000 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample.
pH-Standard Units	7.0	8.6	8.1	33	All samples were within the 6.5-9.0 range of the criterion.
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	838	4,030	1,726	18	The numeric criterion for TDS (1,000 mg/L) was exceeded in 12 samples (67% of samples). Approximately 62% of the samples have TDS concentrations lower than 1,500 mg/L.
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	6	87,440	6,321	16	Approximately 40% of the samples had a TSS concentration lower than 100 mg/L. The high TSS of 87,440 mg/L represented an isolated event over the sampling period. The average TSS is 916 mg/L if that sampling event is excluded.
Temperature, water-deg C	0	28	11	15	The numeric criterion for temperature (27˚C) was exceeded in 1 samples (7% of samples).
Turbidity-NTU	2	54,380	3,404	18	The numeric criterion is based on an increase as a result of discharge.

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

Table 3-12
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (5994550)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Aluminum-µg/L	ND[(1)]	2,200	429	11	The numeric criterion for aluminum (1 hour average of 750 µg/L) was exceeded in two samples (18% of samples). Aluminum was detected in only three samples (27% of samples).
Cadmium-µg/L	ND	2.2	<1	11	The numeric criterion for cadmium (1 hour average of 2 µg/L) was exceeded in the only two samples in which it was detected (18% of samples).
Chromium-µg/L	ND	24	4	12	The numeric criterion for chromium (1 hour average of 16 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (8% of samples). Chromium was detected in only two samples (17% of samples.
Copper-µg/L	ND	17,100	1425	12	The numeric criterion for copper (1 hour average of 13 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (8% of samples). Copper was detected in only two samples (17% of samples).
Iron-µg/L	ND	5,310	599	14	The numeric criterion for iron (1 hour average of 1,000 µg/L) was exceeded in two samples (14% of samples).
Lead-µg/L	ND	574	53	11	The numeric criterion for lead (1 hour average of 65 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (9% of samples).
pH-Standard Units	7.3	8.9	8.2	186	All samples were within the 6.5-9.0 range of the criterion.
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	504	2,350	957	102	The numeric criterion for TDS (1,000 mg/L) was exceeded in 34 samples (33% of samples). Approximately 70% of the samples collected had TDS concentrations that ranged between 500 mg/L and 1,000 mg/L.
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	4	188,100	6,039	95	Approximately 30% of the samples had TSS concentrations lower than 100 mg/L. Approximately 10% of the samples had TSS concentrations in excess of 10,000 mg/L.
Specific conductance-umho/cm	677	2,920	1,275	185	For approximately 82% of the samples, the specific conductance ranged between 1,000 umho/cm and 1,500 umho/cm.
Temperature, water-deg C	0	31	16	84	The numeric criterion for temperature (27˚C) was exceeded in 13 samples (15% of samples).
Turbidity-NTU	1	19,212	1,606	101	The numeric criterion is based on an increase as a result of discharge.

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

3.2.3 Virgin River

Bound by mountains with elevations reaching over 10,000 feet, the Virgin River lies within the lower Colorado River basin. The lowest elevation is about 2,500 feet where the Virgin River crosses the state line with Arizona. Most Virgin River streamflow originates as snow, the runoff results in high flows from March through May. The greatest water producing area is the headwaters of the North Fork of the Virgin River. The headwaters of the Virgin River are located near Hurricane, Utah, in the high mountains of southern Utah, north and east of Zion National Park. The river flows through Utah and Arizona before entering Nevada near the City of Mesquite. The river is intermittent within Nevada, having no flow in some reaches during certain times of the year. The river flows southwesterly for about 25 miles through the unincorporated towns of Bunkerville and Riverside before emptying into the Overton Arm of Lake Mead.

Segments of the Virgin River are categorized on the Section 303(d) list as impaired for temperature, total phosphorus, selenium, iron, manganese, suspended solids, dissolved oxygen, total dissolved solids, silver, and total ammonia (EPA 2006 and 2008). The characterization of Virgin River water quality is based upon water quality data obtained at nine sampling stations (listed in Table 3-13). Key water quality parameters at each of the stations below the Quail Creek diversion are summarized below.

Table 3-13
Virgin River Water Quality Sample Station Locations

Station ID	Sampling Period	Latitude	Longitude
4950010	1976-1983	37.00000	-113.703
4950020	1984-2008	37.02014	-113.672
4950120	1977, 1989-2006	37.05222	-113.600
4950130	1976-1984, 1999	37.07306	-113.580
4950200	1975-1985, 1996-2007	37.08639	-113.556
4950260	1982-1983	37.11611	-113.500
4950300	2000-2002, 2004-2007	37.16278	-113.395
4950320	1976, 1982-2002, 2006-2007	37.16278	-113.395

Source: Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008)

Numeric water quality criteria for the Virgin River vary based on the different beneficial uses. Table 3-14 presents the most stringent numeric criteria for the Virgin River for the relevant water quality parameters.

Table 3-14
Numeric Criteria for Virgin River (Below Quail Creek Diversion)

Constituent-Units	Numeric Criteria
Aluminum-µg/L	750
Arsenic-µg/L	10
Barium-mg/L	1
Boron-µg/L	0.75
Cadmium-µg/L	2
Chromium (VI)-µg/L	16
Copper-µg/L	13
Dissolved Oxygen-mg/L(1)	6.5 8.0/4.0
Iron-µg/L	1,000
Lead-µg/L	65
Mercury-µg/L	2.4
Nickel-µg/L	468
pH-Standard Units	6.5-9.0
Selenium-µg/L	18.4
Silver-µg/L	1.6
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	1200
Temperature, water-deg C	20
Total Coliform-MPN/100ml	206
Turbidity-NTU (increase of)	10
Zinc-µg/L	120

(1) 30-day day average; minimum when early life stages are present; minimum when all other life stages are present

Historical water quality data for the water bodies at the station locations listed in Table 3-13 are summarized in Tables 3-15 through 3-23.

Table 3-15
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950010)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples
Arsenic-µg/L	2	15	10	4
Boron-mg/L	650	695	677	3
Copper-µg/L	ND[(1)]	30	8	4
Iron-µg/L	1	2	2	4
Lead-µg/L	ND	30	8	4
Manganese-µg/L	50	325	191	4
Nickel-µg/L	ND	25	14	3
pH-Standard Units	7.9	8.4	8.1	5
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	1,334	1,734	1,525	4
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	97	612	380	3
Specific conductance- umho/cm	1,910	2,620	2,240	8
Temperature, water-deg C	3	18	14	5
Total Coliform-MPN/100ml[(2)]	4,600	4,600	4,600	1
Turbidity-NTU	29	300	175	4

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

(2) Most Probable Number (MPN); value shown as "average" represents the geometric mean of the samples.

Table 3-16
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950020)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Aluminum-µg/L	ND[(1)]	5,780	218	33	The numeric criterion for aluminum (1 hour average of 750 µg/L) was exceeded in two samples (6% of samples). Aluminum was detected in 9 samples (27% of samples).
Arsenic-µg/L	ND	23	9	128	The numeric criterion for arsenic (10 µg/L) was exceeded in 49 samples (38% of samples). Arsenic was detected in 117 samples (91% of samples).
Boron-mg/L	231	2,710	909	9	The numeric criterion for boron (0.75 mg/L) was exceeded in five samples (56% of samples).
Cadmium-µg/L	ND	35	1	101	The numeric criterion for cadmium (1 hour average of 2 µg/L) was exceeded in three samples (3% of samples). Cadmium was detected in 9 samples (9% of samples).
Copper-µg/L	ND	90	5	103	The numeric criterion for copper (1 hour average of 13 µg/L) was exceeded in 14 samples (14% of samples). Copper was detected in 17 samples (17% of samples).
Iron-µg/L	ND	1,160	2	53	The numeric criterion for iron (1 hour average of 1,000 µg/L) was exceeded in only one sample (2% of samples). Iron was detected in 26 samples (49% of samples).
pH-Standard Units	6.6	9.0	8.2	352	All samples were within the 6.5-9.0 range of the criterion.
Selenium-µg/L	ND	5	1	125	The numeric criterion for selenium (1 hour average of 18.4 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Selenium was detected in 51 samples (41% of samples).
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	472	3,990	1,856	187	The numeric criterion for TDS (1,200 mg/L) was exceeded in 158 samples (84% of samples). Approximately 88% of the samples collected exceeded the numeric criterion for TDS.
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	4	14,580	736	184	Approximately 43% of the samples had TSS concentrations lower than 100 mg/L. Approximately 20% of the samples had TSS concentrations in excess of 500 mg/L.
Specific conductance-umho/cm	203	8,730	2,560	368	Approximately 75% of the samples had specific conductance in excess of 2,000 umho/cm.

Table 3-16
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950020)

Page 2 of 2

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Temperature, water-deg C	2	34	17	187	The numeric criterion for temperature (20˚C) was exceeded in 72 samples (39% of samples).
Total Coliform-MPN/100ml[(2)]	49	18,500	3,967	6	The numeric criterion of total coliform (206 MPN/100 ml) was exceeded in two samples (33% of samples).
Turbidity-NTU	29	300	175	4	The numeric criterion is based on an increase as a result of discharge.
Zinc-µg/L	ND	180	15	104	The numeric criterion for zinc (1 hour average of 120 µg/L) was exceeded in two samples (2% of samples). Zinc was detected in 42 samples (40% of samples).

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

(2) Most Probable Number (MPN); value shown as "average" represents the geometric mean of the samples.

Table 3-17
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950120)

Page 1 of 3

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Aluminum-µg/L	ND[(1)]	85,900	3,089	28	The numeric criterion for aluminum (1 hour average of 750 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (4% of samples). Aluminum was detected in 10 samples (36% of samples).
Arsenic-µg/L	ND	44	9	72	The numeric criterion for arsenic (10 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (1% of samples). Arsenic was detected in 62 samples (9% of samples).
Barium-µg/L	35	203	84	42	The numeric criterion for barium (1 mg/L) was exceeded in one sample (2% of samples).

Table 3-17
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950120)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Boron-mg/L	219	1,190	768	6	The numeric criterion for boron (0.75 mg/L) was exceeded in four samples (67% of samples).
Cadmium-µg/L	ND	4	<1	49	The numeric criterion for cadmium (1 hour average of 2 µg/L) was exceeded in the one sample where it was detected (2% of samples).
Chromium-µg/L	ND	9	1	50	The numeric criterion for chromium (1 hour average of 16 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Arsenic was detected in 5 samples (10% of samples).
Copper-µg/L	ND	39	4	48	The numeric criterion for copper (1 hour average of 13 µg/L) was exceeded in eight samples (17% of samples). Copper was detected in 9 samples (19% of samples).
Iron-µg/L	ND	195	30	36	The numeric criterion for iron (1 hour average of 1,000 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Iron was detected in 20 samples (56% of samples).
pH-Standard Units	7.2	8.5	8.0	126	All samples were within the 6.5-9.0 range of the criterion.
Selenium-µg/L	ND	4	2	69	The numeric criterion for selenium (1 hour average of 18.4 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Selenium was detected in 41 samples (59% of samples).
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	488	3,216	1,988	40	The numeric criterion for TDS (1,200 mg/L) was exceeded in 34 samples (85% of samples).
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	6	25,450	899	62	Approximately, 90% of the samples had TSS concentrations lower than 500 mg/L.
Specific conductance-umho/cm	362	4,867	2,651	124	None
Temperature, water-deg C	4	33	16	90	The numeric criterion for temperature (20˚C) was exceeded in 30 samples (33% of samples).
Total Coliform-MPN/100 mL[(2)]	200	240,000	36,513	8	The numeric criterion of total coliform (206 MPN/100 ml) was exceeded in six samples (75% of samples).

Table 3-17
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950120)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Turbidity-NTU	4	630	87	36	The numeric criterion is based on an increase as a result of discharge.
Zinc-µg/L	ND	413	18	51	The numeric criterion for zinc (1 hour average of 120 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (2% of samples). Zinc was detected in 14 samples (27% of samples).

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

(2) Most Probable Number (MPN); value shown as "average" represents the geometric mean of the samples.

Table 3-18
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950130)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Arsenic-µg/L	2	16	9	12	The numeric criterion for arsenic (10 µg/L) was exceeded in five samples (42% of samples).
Boron-mg/L	445	1,375	790	3	The numeric criterion for boron (0.75 mg/L) was exceeded in one sample (33% of samples).
Chromium(VI) -µg/L	ND(1)	4	1	3	The numeric criterion for chromium (1 hour average of 16 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Chromium was detected in 1 sample (33% of samples).
Copper-µg/L	ND	20	8	11	The numeric criterion for copper (1 hour average of 13 µg/L) was exceeded in five samples (45% of samples). Copper was detected in 5 samples (45% of samples).

Table 3-18
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950130)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Iron-µg/L	5	5,300	1,231	14	The numeric criterion for iron (1 hour average of 1,000 µg/L) was exceeded in five samples (36% of samples).
Lead-µg/L	ND	50	8	11	The numeric criterion for lead (1 hour average of 65 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Lead was detected in 5 samples (45% of samples).
Nickel-µg/L	ND	26	9	9	The numeric criterion for nickel (1 hour average of 468 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Copper was detected in 5 samples (56% of samples).
pH-Standard Units	7.0	8.7	8.1	24	All samples were within the 6.5-9.0 range of the criterion.
Selenium-µg/L	ND	1	<1	11	The numeric criterion for selenium (1 hour average of 18.4 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Selenium was detected in 2 samples (18% of samples).
Silver-µg/L	ND	15	2	12	The numeric criterion for silver (1 hour average of 1.6 µg/L) was not exceeded in both of the two samples that silver was detected (17% of samples).
Solids, Dissolved-mg/L	272	3,560	1,388	14	The numeric criterion for TDS (1,200 mg/L) was exceeded in seven samples (50% of samples).
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	<1	9,999	1,618	20	Approximately 60% of the samples have TSS concentrations lower than 200 mg/L.
Specific conductance-umho/cm	434	4,180	1,893	23	None
Temperature, water-deg C	1	35	11	20	The numeric criterion for temperature (20˚C) was exceeded in 4 samples (20% of samples).
Total Coliform-MPN/100 ml[(2)]	930	46,000	18,926	10	The numeric criterion of total coliform (206 MPN/100 ml) was exceeded in all samples.
Turbidity-NTU	11	800	226	12	The numeric criterion is based on an increase as a result of discharge.
Zinc-µg/L	ND	50	14	11	The numeric criterion for zinc (1 hour average of 120 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Zinc was detected in 7 samples (64% of samples).

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

(2) Most Probable Number (MPN); value shown as "average" represents the geometric mean of the samples.

Table 3-19
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950200)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Arsenic-µg/L	2	20	9	57	The numeric criterion for arsenic (10 µg/L) was exceeded in 18 samples (32% of samples).
Barium-mg/L	37	600	123	15	The numeric criterion for barium (1 mg/L) was exceeded in nine samples (60% of samples).
Cadmium-µg/L	ND(1)	20	2	36	The numeric criterion for cadmium (1 hour average of 2 µg/L) was exceeded in nine samples (25% of samples). Cadmium was detected in 12 samples (33% of samples)
Copper-µg/L	ND	45	9	44	The numeric criterion for copper (1 hour average of 13 µg/L) was exceeded in 11 samples (25% of samples). Copper was detected in 25 samples (57% of samples).
Iron-µg/L	10	95	33	25	The numeric criterion for iron (1 hour average of 1,000 µg/L) was exceeded in five samples (20% of samples).
Lead-µg/L	ND	90	10	38	The numeric criterion for lead (1 hour average of 65 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (3% of samples). Lead was detected in 18 samples (47% of samples)
pH-Standard Units	6.4	8.8	8.0	208	All but one sample was within the 6.5-9.0 range of the criterion (<1% of samples outside of criterion range).
Selenium-µg/L	ND	5	1	48	The numeric criterion for selenium (1 hour average of 18.4 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Selenium was detected in 26 samples (54% of samples)
Silver-µg/L	ND	30	3	38	The numeric criterion for silver (1 hour average of 1.6 µg/L) was not exceeded in 11 samples (29% of samples). Silver was detected in 12 samples (32% of samples)
Solids, Dissolved-mg/L	424	4,072	1,964	103	The numeric criterion for TDS (1,200 mg/L) was exceeded in 83 samples (81% of samples).
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	1	9,999	476	104	Approximately 87% of the samples collected had TSS concentrations lower than 500 mg/L.
Specific conductance-umho/cm	214	5,550	2,645	189	None

Table 3-19
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950200)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Temperature, water-deg C	1	35	15	115	The numeric criterion for temperature (20˚C) was exceeded in 37 samples (13% of samples).
Total Coliform-MPN/100 mL [(2)]	4	240,000	15,937	63	The numeric criterion of total coliform (206 MPN/100 ml) was exceeded in 58 samples (92% of samples).
Turbidity-NTU	1	1,600	109	91	The numeric criterion is based on an increase as a result of discharge.
Zinc-µg/L	ND	1,900	67	42	The numeric criterion for zinc (1 hour average of 120 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (2% of samples). Zinc was detected in 32 samples (76% of samples).

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

(2) Most Probable Number (MPN); value shown as "average" represents the geometric mean of the samples.

Table 3-20
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950260)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples
Arsenic-µg/L	3	13	9	6
Chromium-µg/L	ND[1]	30	6	6
Copper-µg/L	ND	40	15	6
Iron-mg/L	<1	4	2	6
Lead-µg/L	ND	11	6	6
Magnesium-mg/L	27	61	41	6
Manganese-µg/L	90	660	363	6
Nickel-µg/L	ND	115	24	6
pH-Standard Units	7.6	8.6	8.2	10
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	488	1,610	1,016	6
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	4	1,566	600	6
Specific conductance-umho/cm	280	2,300	1,442	12
Temperature, water-deg C	6	34	16	6
Total Coliform-MPN/100 mL[2]	300	50,000	13,740	5
Turbidity-NTU	4	882	384	6
Zinc-µg/L	ND	70	32	6

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

(2) Most Probable Number (MPN); value shown as "average" represents the geometric mean of the samples.

Table 3-21
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950300)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples
Arsenic-µg/L	15	15	15	1
Boron-µg/L	793	793	793	1
Iron-µg/L	25	25	25	1
pH-Standard Units	7.8	8.4	8.1	6
Selenium-µg/L	3	3	3	1
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	1,898	2,098	1,998	2
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	26	40	33	2
Specific conductance-umho/cm	2,756	3,534	3,142	6
Temperature, water-deg C	7	32	21	4
Total Coliform-MPN/100 mL[(1)]	57	961	409	3
Turbidity-NTU	6	8	7	2

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).
[(1)]Most Probable Number (MPN); value shown as "average" represents the geometric mean of the samples.

Table 3-22
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950320)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Arsenic-µg/L	ND[1]	255	18	113	The numeric criterion for arsenic (10 µg/L) was exceeded in 78 samples (69% of samples). Arsenic was detected in 108 samples (96% of samples)
Barium-mg/L	ND	0.7	0.1	65	The numeric criterion for barium (1 mg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Barium was detected in 48 samples (74% of samples).
Cadmium-µg/L	ND	20	<1	103	The numeric criterion for cadmium (1 hour average of 2 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (1% of samples). Cadmium was detected in 9 samples (9% of samples)
Chromium-µg/L	ND	50	1	103	The numeric criterion for chromium (1 hour average of 16 µg/L) was exceeded in two samples (2% of samples). Chromium was detected in 12 samples (12% of samples).
Copper-µg/L	ND	150	5	105	The numeric criterion for copper (1 hour average of 13 µg/L) was exceeded in 15 samples (14% of samples). Copper was detected in 19 samples (18% of samples).
Iron-µg/L	ND	70	13	41	The numeric criterion for iron (1 hour average of 1,000 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Iron was detected in 14 samples (34% of samples).
Lead-µg/L	ND	50	2	103	The numeric criterion for lead (1 hour average of 65 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Lead was detected in 9 samples (9% of samples).
Nickel-µg/L	ND	22	11	10	The numeric criterion for nickel (1 hour average of 468 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. Nickel was detected in 7 samples (70% of samples).
pH-Standard Units	6.8	9.2	8.0	304	The numeric criterion for pH was exceeded in one sample (<1% of samples).
Selenium-µg/L	ND	6	1	113	The numeric criterion for selenium (1 hour average of 18.4 µg/L) was not exceeded in any sample. (Selenium was detected in 31 samples (27% of samples).

Table 3-22
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Virgin River Station ID (4950320)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples	Remarks
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	362	2,964	1,484	161	The numeric criterion for TDS (1,200 mg/L) was exceeded in 109 samples (68% of samples).
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	<1	32,550	640	165	Approximately 83% of the samples had concentrations lower than 500 mg/L.
Specific conductance-umho/cm	209	4,410	2,212	325	None
Temperature, water-deg C	2	31	15	169	The numeric criterion for temperature (20˚C) was exceeded in 38 samples (23% of samples).
Total Coliform-MPN/100 mL [(2)]	9	46,000	7,401	7	The numeric criterion of total coliform (206 MPN/100 ml) was exceeded in five samples (71% of samples).
Turbidity-NTU	1	9,100	192	161	The numeric criterion is based on an increase as a result of discharge.
Zinc-µg/L	ND	170	12	104	The numeric criterion for zinc (1 hour average of 120 µg/L) was exceeded in one sample (1% of samples). Zinc was detected in 35 samples (34% of samples).

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

(2) Most Probable Number (MPN); value shown as "average" represents the geometric mean of the samples.

Table 3-23
Summary of Virgin River Water Quality – All Stations

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Samples	Criterion	Remarks
Arsenic-µg/L	ND	255	393	10	Most values near criterion
Copper- µg/L	ND	90	321	13	Mostly in compliance with water quality objectives
Iron- µg/L	ND	5,300	180	1,000	Mostly in compliance with water quality objectives
pH-Standard Units	6.6	9.2	1035	6.5-9.0	Almost always in compliance with water quality objectives
Solids, total dissolved-mg/L	272	4,072	517	1200	Often exceeds criterion
Solids, total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	<1	32550	546	-	
Specific conductance-umho/cm	203	8,730	1055	-	
Temperature, water-deg C	0	35	596	20	Often exceeds criterion
Turbidity-NTU	1	882	316	10	Mostly in compliance with water quality objectives

3.3 Beneficial Use Designations - Arizona

In the State of Arizona, water quality protection standards are based on designated state beneficial uses which are defined and classified in the Arizona Administrative Code (AAC) R18-11-105. Use designations are provided in Title 18, Chapter 11 and include the classifications shown in Table 3-24 (AAC 2010).

Table 3-24
Beneficial Use Protection Classifications for Surface Waters of the State of Arizona (R18-11-105)

Designated Uses	Definition
A&Wc	Aquatic and Wildlife cold water
A&Ww	Aquatic and Wildlife warm water
A&We	Aquatic and Wildlife ephemeral
A&Wedw	Aquatic and Wildlife effluent dependent water
FBC	Full-body Contact
PBC	Partial-body Contact
DWS	Domestic Water Source
FC	Fish Consumption
AgI	Agricultural Irrigation
AgL	Agricultural Livestock Watering
U	Unique Water
EDW	Effluent-dependent Water
WWTP	Agricultural Livestock Watering

Beneficial use protection classifications for major rivers in the vicinity of the LPP alignments passing through the State of Arizona are provided in Table 3-25. There are numerous ephemeral washes along the proposed pipeline alignments. Beneficial use designations for these ephemeral washes in the LPP vicinity are not provided in AAC R18-11-105.

Table 3-25
Beneficial Use Protection Classifications Designated for Major Rivers and Reservoirs in the Vicinity of the LPP, AAC R317-2-13

Water Body	Classifications
Kanab Creek (lower)	A&Ww, FBC, DWS, FC, AgL
Paria River	A&Ww, FBC, FC

3.4 Historical Water Quality Conditions - Arizona

Water quality data for the relevant surface water bodies were obtained from the EPA's STORET data system. Water quality data for the water bodies listed in Table 3-25 are summarized in the following sections. Trends in historical water quality are not described because of the limited availability of data for the water bodies in Arizona.

3.4.1 Kanab Creek

Water quality data for the relevant water downstream of Kanab in Kane County, Utah, the Kanab Creek flows into Arizona near Fredonia. It flows through the Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation onto BLM-administered land, and through the Kanab Creek Wilderness (on National Forest System land) before its confluence with the Colorado River in Grand Canyon National Park. It flows through Mojave County, Arizona. The characterization of Kanab Creek water quality is based upon water quality data obtained at one sampling station (listed in Table 3-26).

Table 3-26
Kanab Creek Water Quality Sample Station Locations

Station ID	Station Name	Sampling Period	Latitude	Longitude
100576	Unknown	June 6, 1994	36.96125	-112.529305

Source: Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008)

Numeric water quality criteria for Kanab Creek in the State of Arizona vary based on the different beneficial uses. Table 3-27 presents the most stringent numeric criteria for the Kanab Creek for the relevant water quality parameters.

Table 3-27
Numeric Criteria for Kanab Creek (Arizona)

Constituent-Units	Numeric Criteria
pH	6.5-9.0
Temperature, water-deg C (increase)	3
Total Coliform-MPN/100ml (single sample)	235
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	6

Source: Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008)

Historical water quality data for the water body at the station location listed in Tables 3-26 is summarized in Table 3-28.

Table 3-28 Summary of Historical Water Quality at Kanab Creek Station ID (100576)				
Parameter-Units	**Minimum**	**Maximum**	**Average**	**Number of Samples**
Iron-µg/L	160	160	160	1
pH-Standard Units	8.2	8.8	8.5	2
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	1,070	2,430	1,750	2
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	10	10	10	1
Specific conductance-umho/cm	168	168	168	1
Temperature, water-deg C	23	23	23	1
Turbidity-NTU	6	8	7	2
Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008).				

3.4.2 Paria River

The Paria River flows from its headwaters in Bryce Canyon National Park and Dixie National Forest through private agricultural lands in Garfield County, Utah and south through GSENM (in Kane County, Utah) into Arizona and the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam. In Arizona, the Paria River flows through Coconino County. The characterization of Paria River water quality is based upon water quality data obtained at nine sampling stations (Table 3-29).

Table 3-29 Paria River Water Quality Sample Station Locations			
Station ID	**Sampling Period**	**Latitude**	**Longitude**
100617	2004-2005	36.87264	-111.6
100743	1990-2004	36.86472	-111.588
101073	1999-2001	36.86433	-111.596
101074	1999-2001	36.93189	-111.664
101075	1999-2001	36.95658	-111.743
101076	1999-2001	36.99519	-111.793
101077	1999-2001	37.0008666	-111.864255
101078	1999-2001	37.0019133	-111.8646433
101079	April 14, 2000	37.00143	-111.866
Source: Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008)			

Numeric water quality criteria for Paria River in the State of Arizona vary based on the different beneficial uses. Table 3-30 presents the most stringent numeric criteria for the Paria River for the relevant water quality parameters.

Table 3-30 Numeric Criteria for Paria River (Arizona)	
Constituent-Units	**Numeric Criteria**
pH	6.5-9.0
Temperature, water-deg C (increase)	3
Total Coliform-MPN/100ml (single sample)	235
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	6
Source: Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008)	

Historical water quality data for the water bodies at the station locations listed in Table 3-29 are summarized in Tables 3-31 through 3-38.

Table 3-31
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (100617)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples
Arsenic, Inorganic-µg/L	12	29	18	4
Cadmium-µg/L	1	5	3	3
Copper-µg/L	3	110	39	6
Lead-µg/L	<1	75	32	6
Manganese-µg/L	1,300	5,500	2,900	4
Mercury-µg/L	3	5	4	3
pH-Standard Units	7.4	8.4	8.1	8
Selenium-µg/L	14	14	14	1
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	510	1,400	893	8
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	52	20,000	6,108	12
Specific conductance-umho/cm	796	1,960	1,332	8
Temperature, water-deg C	10	23	14	4
Zinc-µg/L	130	360	195	4

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008).

Table 3-32
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (100743)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples
Aluminum-µg/L	ND[1]	64	4	49
Antimony-µg/L	<1	3	1	4
Arsenic, Inorganic-µg/L	ND	3	1	162
Cadmium-µg/L	<1	16	2	14
Copper-µg/L	1	19	3	69
Iron-µg/L	1	1,800	40	85
Lead-µg/L	1	10	2	13
Manganese-µg/L	1	120	6	47
Mercury-µg/L	<1	1	<1	2
Molybdenum-µg/L	4	20	5	25
Nickel-µg/L	1	8	2	51
pH-Standard Units	7.2	8.4	8.0	197
Selenium-µg/L	1	14	2	152
Silver-µg/L	2	2	2	1
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	386	656	506	182
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	1	13	4	48
Specific conductance-umho/cm	637	1,010	816	164
Strontium-µg/L	594	1,000	745	79
Temperature, water-deg C	7	13	10	112
Turbidity-NTU	<1	2	1	90
Uranium-µg/L	3	4	3	23
Zinc-µg/L	1	20	6	57

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008).

[1] ND – non-detect.

Table 3-33
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101073)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples
Boron-µg/L	ND[1]	120	60	2
Iron-µg/L	3,800	3,800	3,800	1
Magnesium-mg/L	25	47	36	2
Manganese-µg/L	ND	60	30	2
pH-Standard Units	8.3	8.4	8.3	3
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	390	700	545	2
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	32	280	156	2
Specific conductance-umho/cm	530	1,011	778	4
Temperature, water-deg C	22	25	23	2
Turbidity-NTU	32	331	153	3

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

Table 3-34
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101074)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples
Iron-mg/L	1	1	1	1
Magnesium-mg/L	22	22	22	1
pH-Standard Units	8.3	8.5	8.4	2
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	350	350	350	1
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	16	250	133	2
Specific conductance-umho/cm	480	1,035	680	3
Temperature, water-deg C	15	19	17	2
Turbidity-NTU	50	475	263	2

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008).

Table 3-35
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101075)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples
Iron-mg/L	1	1	1	1
Magnesium-mg/L	22	22	22	1
pH-Standard Units	8.4	8.4	8.4	2
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	320	320	320	1
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	28	260	144	2
Specific conductance-umho/cm	460	1,069	672	3
Temperature, water-deg C	22	23	22	2
Turbidity-NTU	400	400	400	1

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008).

Table 3-36
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101076)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples
pH-Standard Units	8.3	8.4	8.3	2
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	240	240	240	1
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	26	250	138	2
Specific conductance-umho/cm	360	1,143	629	3
Temperature, water-deg C	10	15	13	2
Turbidity-NTU	26	492	287	3
Iron-mg/L	1	1	1	1
Magnesium-mg/L	17	17	17	1

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008).

Table 3-37
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101077)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples
Barium-mg/L	<1	<1	<1	2
Beryllium-µg/L	ND[(1)]	1	<1	6
Iron-mg/L	1	1	1	1
Magnesium-mg/L	21	21	21	1
Manganese-mg/L	<1	<1	<1	1
pH-Standard Units	8.4	8.5	8.4	2
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	390	390	390	1
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	22	440	231	2
Specific conductance-umho/cm	460	1,445	790	3
Temperature, water-deg C	11	15	13	2
Turbidity-NTU	817	817	817	1

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

Table 3-38
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101078)

Parameter-Units	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Number of Samples
Beryllium-µg/L	ND[(1)]	1	<1	6
Boron-mg/L	<1	<1	<1	1
Iron-mg/L	<1	<1	<1	1
Magnesium-mg/L	55	55	55	1
Manganese-mg/L	<1	<1	<1	1
pH-Standard Units	8.1	8.5	8.3	2
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	910	910	910	1
Solids, Total Suspended (TSS)-mg/L	34	490	262	2
Specific conductance-umho/cm	1,100	1,448	1,243	3
Temperature, water-deg C	11	14	12	2
Turbidity-NTU	752	752	752	1

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008).

(1) ND – non-detect.

Table 3-39 summarizes the historical water quality for Paria River at Station ID 101079.

Table 3-39
Summary of Historical Water Quality at Paria River Station ID (101079)

Parameter-Units	Measured Value	Number of Samples
Barium-µg/L	120.0	1
Magnesium-mg/L	14.0	1
Manganese-mg/L	0.1	1
Solids, Total Dissolved-mg/L	200.0	1
Specific conductance-umho/cm	310.0	1

Source: Data summarized from EPA's STORET database (EPA 2010). Water quality sampling and analysis were completed by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ 2008).

3.5 Lake Powell

Lake Powell is the reservoir impounded by Glen Canyon Dam. It is the second largest reservoir on the Colorado River and has a total storage capacity of 24.32 million acre-feet. The reservoir is narrow, extending over 180 miles along the Colorado River and 80 miles up the San Juan River, with a shoreline that is over 1,900 miles long. Lake Powell primarily provides water storage for use in meeting the delivery requirements to the Lower Colorado River consistent with the *Law of the River* – the numerous compacts, federal laws, court decisions and decrees, contracts, and regulatory guidelines that apportion and regulate the use of Colorado River water among the seven basin states and Mexico. Releases are also timed for hydropower production. Lake Powell is an important regional resource for water-based recreation. A comprehensive description of Lake Powell's water quality is presented in *Technical Memorandum 5.13 A Review of Water Quality and Treatment Issues* (MWH 2008). A summary of Lake Powell water quality is presented in Table 3-40.

In general, water quality in Lake Powell is better than the surface water quality of the water bodies in the vicinity of the proposed project facilities. In addition, Lake Powell acts as a large sedimentation basin which allows for the settlement of large suspended solids. Therefore, the concentration of suspended solids of the water that would be delivered via the LPP Project is reduced. This also reduces the amount of sediment transport into the receiving waters.

Table 3-40 Summary of Raw Water Quality – Lake Powell	
Parameter	**Untreated Lake Powell Water**
Ammonia (mg/L as N)	< 0.03
Calcium (mg/L as Ca)	60 to 80
Calcium Carbonate Precipitation Potential (CCPP) (mg/L as $CaCO_3$)	3
Chloride (mg/L)	50 to 80
Conductivity (umhos/cm)	800 to 1100
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	saturated
Langelier Saturation Index (LSI)	0.15
Magnesium (mg/L as Mg)	20 to 28
Nitrate (mg/L as N)	< 0.6
pH – std units	7.8 to 8.2
Potassium (mg/L)	2.5 to 4.0
Silica (mg/L as SiO_2)	7 to 9
Sodium (mg/L)	65 to 90
Sulfate (mg/L)	210 to 280
TDS (mg/L)	540 to 680
Temperature (^oC)	7 to 16
Total Alkalinity (mg/L as $CaCO_3$)	135 to 180
Total Hardness (mg/L as $CaCO_3$)	240 to 320
Total Organic Carbon (mg/L)	2.0 to 3.0
Source: MWH 2008	

3.6 Sand Hollow Reservoir

Sand Hollow Reservoir is a 50,000 ac-ft storage facility located about 5 miles southwest of Hurricane. The reservoir was constructed by Washington County Water Conservancy District (WCWCD) in 2002 and is used for culinary raw water supply for WCWCD customers. Water to fill the Sand Hollow Reservoir is conveyed from the Virgin River in the same pipeline serving Quail Creek Reservoir. The reservoir has an active pool of about 30,000 acre-feet and a drought pool of 20,000 acre-feet that would provide water supplies in an extreme drought. Sand Hollow Reservoir also serves as a ground water recharge facility for the Navajo Sandstone Aquifer. There are no beneficial use designations in the UAC for the Sand Hollow Reservoir.

Historical water quality data for the Sand Hollow Reservoir were obtained from a report produced by the USGS titled *Assessment of Managed Aquifer Recharge at Sand Hollow Reservoir, Washington County, Utah, Updated to Conditions through 2012 (USGS 2012).* Measured DO levels are susceptible to variation resulting from turbulence at the air-water interface, slow equilibration after a change in atmospheric conditions, algal photosynthetic activity, as well as possible measurement discrepancies associated with electrochemical type instruments. For reference, saturation DO levels have an inverse relationship with water temperature, and a proportional relationship with hydrostatic pressure experienced with increasing depth. A summary of the historical water quality is presented in Table 3-41.

Table 3-41
Summary of Historical Water Quality – Sand Hollow Reservoir

Date sampled	Water Temp. (°C)	Specific Conductance (µS/cm)	pH (standard units)	Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L and percent saturation)	Chloride (mg/L as Cl)	Bromide (mg/L as Br)	Arsenic (µg/ L as As)
9/10/2002	24.2	1,000	8.8	2.3 (30%)	76	0.02	2
12/18/2002	7.9	860	8.4	10.2 (99%)	-	-	-
3/20/2003	11.1	830	8.2	8.4 (100%)	-	-	0.9
5/6/2003	17.6	820	-	3.1 (38%)	-	-	-
6/10/2003	23.6	850	8.2	8.8 (115%)	-	-	-
8/6/2003	26	930	7.6	3.6 (50%)	-	-	2
10/7/2003	21.9	910	8.4	-	79.5	0.03	2.3
1/8/2004	7.1	870	8.4	11.7 (110%)	-	-	1.2
5/5/2004	17.3	710	8.2	8.5 (101%)	50	0.01	1.1
9/22/2004	18.9	770	8.5	7.2 (86%)	-	-	-
2/10/2005	8.3	860	8.4	11.3 (106%)	56	0.02	1.5
1/18/2006	6.9	820	8.5	11.9 (108%)	44.8	0.04	1.4
2/14/2007	5.1	760	8.1	11.6 (101%)	50.4	0.05	1.8

Source: USGS, 2007

Dissolved oxygen data collected by WCWCD near the dam on the north side of Sand Hollow Reservoir indicate concentrations ranging from 8 to 12.5 mg/L throughout the year from the surface to approximately 50 feet deep. Dissolved oxygen concentrations decrease below 8 mg/L between 50 and 70 feet deep during the summer months when the reservoir stratifies. Figure 3-1 shows the dissolved oxygen concentrations measured at various depths in Sand Hollow Reservoir. The dissolved oxygen data were collected during 2006, 2007 and 2008.



Figure 3-1
Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations in Sand Hollow Reservoir Near the North Dam

Temperature data collected by WCWCD at various depths near the north dam of Sand Hollow Reservoir indicate water temperatures ranging from 61 to 84°F from the surface to 50 feet during the summer months, with water temperatures down to 57°F between 50 and 70 feet deep (Figure 3-2). The temperature profile with depth indicates thermal stratification occurs during the summer months and matches the dissolved oxygen profile shown in Figure 3-1. Water temperatures during the fall and winter periods are nearly uniform with depth, indicating complete turnover and mixing following the summer period. The temperature data were collected during 2006 and 2007.



Figure 3-2
Water Temperature in Sand Hollow Reservoir Near the North Dam

TDS data collected by WCWCD at various depths near the north dam of Sand Hollow Reservoir indicate TDS concentrations ranging from 497 to 519 mg/L from the surface to 70 feet during the summer months (Figure 3-3). The TDS concentrations during fall and winter periods are nearly uniform with depth and indicate complete turnover and mixing following the period of summer stratification. The TDS data were collected during 2006 and 2007.



Figure 3-3
TDS Concentrations in Sand Hollow Reservoir Near the North Dam

Chapter 4
Environmental Consequences (Impacts)

This chapter presents the potential impacts on surface water quality that would be caused by the proposed LPP Project construction and operation. The major surface water features in the vicinity of the proposed project facilities include Kanab Creek, the Paria River, and the Virgin River. Major surface water reservoirs in the vicinity of the proposed pipelines include Quail Creek Reservoir, Sand Hollow Reservoir, and Lake Powell. In addition, there are numerous ephemeral washes that could be impacted by the proposed LPP Project construction and operation.

New facilities proposed under the LPP Project are: intake facilities in Lake Powell, large water conveyance pipelines, booster pump stations, hydro generating stations, and transmission lines. Potential impacts on water quality from the proposed facilities include:

- Sediment transport and introduction of pollutants from equipment used during construction
- Sediment transport and introduction of pollutants from pipeline discharges during operation
- Changes in total dissolved solids from the addition of large volumes of Lake Powell water to Sand Hollow Reservoir
- Changes in water quality from volume changes (Lake Powell and downstream in the Lower Colorado River)

4.1 Significance Criteria

Impacts on water quality are considered significant if construction, operation or maintenance activities would result in any of the following conditions:

- Violation of applicable surface water quality standards
- Substantial degradation of surface water quality
- Substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of a stream or river course in a manner resulting in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site

Criteria for evaluating water quality in the surface water bodies in the vicinity of the proposed pipelines are based on beneficial uses and water quality objectives as determined by the UAC R317-2 (UAC 2010) and the AAC R18-11-105 (AAC 2010). Water quality impacts on the surface water bodies in the vicinity of the proposed project facilities are qualitatively described in this section.

4.2 LPP Project Alternatives (Water Conveyance System, Hydro System, Kane County Pipeline System, Transmission Line Alignment Alternatives and Natural Gas Pipeline and Generators Alternative)

The LPP Project pipeline and transmission line alignment alternatives are briefly described in Chapter 1. Impacts on surface water quality could occur from construction of the proposed project facilities, and from operations and maintenance activities. The pipeline and penstock alignment alternatives share common segments between the intake at Lake Powell and delivery at Sand Hollow Reservoir, and they are spatially different in the area through and around the Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation. The South Alternative extends south around the Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation. The Existing Highway Alternative follows Arizona State Route 389 through the Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation. The Southeast Corner Alternative follows the Navajo-McCullough Transmission Line corridor through the southeast corner of the Kaibab-Paiute Indian Reservation. Impacts on water quality during construction and operation of the project would be common for all alignment alternatives since they all cross the major surface water features described in Chapter 3.

4.2.1 Construction Phase

Construction of the proposed pipelines and other project facilities would require extensive earthwork with the potential to significantly impact natural surface water features in the project area. In addition to the proposed pipelines, the project includes construction of booster pump stations, hydro generating stations, and transmission lines. Staging areas for equipment and personnel and creation of temporary construction roadways, if warranted, would further disturb surface soils and create the potential for water quality impacts.

4.2.1.1 Clearing and Grading

Clearing and grading would reduce vegetation along the cleared sections of the right-of-way thereby increasing the exposure of underlying soils to erosion. Excavated loose soil can be transported into adjacent water bodies via wind and stormwater flows. The use of heavy equipment for construction could also result in increased compaction of the underlying soils which has the potential to increase runoff into surface water bodies. The increased runoff could transport the sediment into the water bodies, resulting in increased turbidity levels and sediment recruitment rates in the receiving water body. An increase in the suspended sediments would increase turbidity, reduce light penetration, and potentially reduce photosynthesis and oxygen production. Dissolved oxygen can be further reduced in affected areas from oxygen consumption by the organic components of the sediment matter.

4.2.1.2 Open-Cut Crossings

There would be several open-cut crossings of surface waters along the LPP. Open-cut pipeline installation offers lower cost, greater continuity of pipeline installation, and less risk of encountering unknowns during construction compared to trenchless construction techniques.

Construction of open-cut crossings disturbs channel banks and sediments and could increase sediment loading downstream, ultimately adversely impacting receiving waters. The extent of the impact would depend on the volume of sediments disturbed, composition of channel materials including sediment particle size, and volume of storm flows during construction activity. These factors would determine the density and downstream extent of sediment migration. Open-cut construction activity can also dislodge

and transport channel bed sediments which could cause changes in downstream bottom contours and stream flow dynamics that could cause additional erosion and downstream sedimentation. Construction of open-cut crossings in areas with shallow groundwater may require trench dewatering and surface discharge operations that may degrade surface water quality of the receiving waters.

Typically, open-cut pipeline installation would be restricted to surface water bodies with intermittent or seasonal flows and construction would occur in dry conditions. However, in cases where continuous flow must be maintained in a waterway and an open-cut installation is proposed, a temporary culvert, pipeline and/or pumping system could be used to divert flows around the pipeline trench and discharge flows downstream. Diversions designed to allow fish passage must maintain suitable temperature and dissolved oxygen conditions for the length of the diversion.

4.2.1.3 Trenchless Construction Techniques

Trenchless crossing for LPP pipeline construction would be marginally feasible at the Paria River. The Paria River pipeline crossing site would be a minimum of 500 feet long and could be more than 800 feet long, which is the feasible limit for most trenchless pipeline construction techniques. The east bank of the Paria River has limited topography for a driving or receiving pit; the west bank of the Paria River is a riparian area that runs parallel to the pipeline alignment for approximately 0.25 mile. Although the Paria River is classified as a perennial stream, it flows intermittently at the Highway 89 crossing during the summer and fall months, and the high cost of installing the pipeline using a trenchless construction technique would be unnecessary when an open-cut installation could be scheduled during a no flow period. Therefore, it is not expected that the Utah Division of Water Rights would require compliance with Utah Administrative Code Section R655 National Resources, Water Rights, which requires trenchless crossings of natural streams with year-round flows.

Trenchless crossings involve costly underground construction methods that avoid surface effects above the pipe crossing. Five trenchless methods have been considered for LPP construction of stream crossings: conventional bore and jack, pipe ramming, microtunneling, horizontal directional drilling, and blasting. All except blasting consist of tunneling an oversized casing below the waterbody to be crossed, using two temporary vertical access shafts on each side of the crossing. The vertical access shafts would be constructed of sheet piles, soldier piles and lagging, caissons or trench boxes – or unsupported if located in firm rock. When groundwater is present, watertight shoring such as sheet piles must be used along with a dewatering system.

Depending upon the type of trenchless construction, substantial volumes of soils may be excavated and large areas may be required for the staging of the tunneling equipment. Therefore, trenchless construction could reduce direct effects on surface waters but would result in increased erosion potential related to earthwork for vertical access points, soil stockpiles, and equipment staging areas and discharges from dewatering.

4.2.1.4 Intake and Discharge Construction

Construction of the intake structure at Lake Powell and the tailrace structure at Sand Hollow Reservoir could have potential impacts on water quality in these two reservoirs. The intake construction would be performed by constructing vertical shafts in the Navajo sandstone rock adjacent to Lake Powell, and then boring horizontal tunnels from inside the shafts toward the vertical cliff face in the reservoir. Each tunnel would be advanced toward the lake, with the excavated rock removed through the tunnel and up out of the vertical shafts for upland disposal. The upland disposal (of what would be the settled sand-sized particles of Navajo sandstone) would occur on the water intake site which is a previously-disturbed construction materials storage area used to construct Glen Canyon Dam. When the tunnel construction would reach the

cliff face, a small quantity of ground-up Navajo sandstone pieces (sand-sized particles) would fall into Lake Powell, which is not expected to change the turbidity in the reservoir and would not violate the water quality standards. Stormwater runoff from surface construction activities would be controlled using silt fences and collection ponds to store and settle particles from turbid water. No water or material discharges to Lake Powell would occur from the surface construction activities.

Construction of Sand Hollow Hydro Station would be performed in upland conditions where all construction site drainage would be collected, pumped into settling ponds and disposed away from the reservoir. The tailrace construction would be performed in solid sandstone bedrock and would be completed during low annual reservoir water surface elevations. Sediment recruitment and turbidity would be controlled within the construction site through implementation of surface water quality BMPs. There would be no measurable construction impacts on water quality in Sand Hollow compared to baseline conditions.

4.2.1.5 Summary of Construction Impacts

Installation of project facilities along any of the proposed alignments could result in extensive areas of construction disturbance and short-term erosion-related water quality impacts. Clearing, grading, excavation, soil stockpiles, and backfilling operations would all disturb stable soils potentially resulting in sediment transport (via wind or stormwater flow) to adjacent water bodies. In addition to sediment, stormwater runoff from construction areas can mobilize potential hazardous substances used in construction such as fuels, oils, antifreeze, coolants, paints, solvents, and other substances. Dewatering potentially required for facilities installation can result in discharges with high sediment loads. These operations could violate applicable surface water quality standards (e.g., result in a discharge with turbidity levels more than 10 NTU greater than the receiving water) and substantially degrade surface water quality (increase sedimentation), and established beneficial uses could be impaired. Furthermore, construction of project facilities would temporarily alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site in a manner that could result in substantial erosion and siltation. Pipeline trenches and tunnels can become diversion points for stormwater flows, altering local flooding patterns. Depending upon the quantity of the sediment carried along with the runoff and toxicity of any hazardous materials carried by the stormwater, the direct impact on receiving water bodies could be potentially significant.

Temporary water quality impacts may occur at any of the pipeline crossings of streams and washes if water is flowing during construction. The use of BMPs and standard construction procedures (SCPs) at pipeline crossings of streams would avoid or minimize temporary water quality impacts, primarily consisting of turbidity and sediment recruitment. The BMPs and SCPs would include the following:

- Construction of pipeline crossings of dry washes would be performed when the washes are dry.
- Construction of pipeline crossings of perennial or intermittent flowing streams (e.g., Paria River) would be performed when the streams are either at low flows or are dry.
- Silt fences and/or straw bales would be temporarily installed upstream or up-gradient of wetlands to filter suspended sediments and bedload sediments to avoid sedimentation impacts during construction. If necessary, silt fences and/or straw bales would be installed in series to control sediments generated by construction activities.
- Temporary coffer dams would be used upstream of the pipeline crossing for diversion of Paria River flows during construction. Stream flows would be diverted around the excavation area to control turbidity and sediment recruitment during construction of the pipeline crossing.

- Equipment usage and operation within temporarily dewatered reaches of stream channels would be minimized to protect stream bed substrates.

- Construction equipment working within the temporarily dewatered reaches of stream channels would be checked and regularly monitored for leaking hydraulic fluid, oil, grease, and fuel. Relevant land management agencies would be notified of any spills or leaks detected.

- All construction equipment refueling would be performed on upland areas to prevent fuel spills from contaminating stream substrates and the dewatered stream reaches.

- Construction trenches within dewatered stream reaches would be pumped as necessary to remove subsurface water. The water would be pumped into settling ponds, and then disposed within the right-of-way away from the stream.

- Silt fences would be installed across the stream channels within the dewatered construction areas downstream of the pipeline crossing excavation to capture sediments that may be mobilized by precipitation events during construction activities. The silt fence toe would be anchored into the stream bed with native material. The silt fence would be removed following completion of the pipeline crossing construction and native material used to anchor the silt fence toe would be returned to pre-construction conditions. The collected silt would be land applied in off-channel areas within the right-of-way, but outside the boundaries of the stream channel or direct stream channel drainage area.

Incorporating these BMPs and SCPs into pipeline construction at crossings of streams and washes would protect water quality and result in minimal or unmeasurable water quality impacts. There would be no significant impacts on water quality at stream crossings from pipeline construction.

Construction activities at the water intake site on Lake Powell and at the Sand Hollow Hydropower Station tailrace would not have measurable effects on reservoir water quality. Construction of the horizontal tunnels intercepting Lake Powell at the water intake site would be through Navajo sandstone, and particles resulting from construction at the bedrock/surface water interface would be sand-sized or larger. Turbidity within Lake Powell would not increase measurably. Construction of the Sand Hollow hydro station tailrace channel would be in Navajo sandstone bedrock extending from the ground surface downward. Sand Hollow Reservoir water surface elevation would be lowered by WCWCD during tailrace construction to below the level of any construction effects on surface water quality. The tailrace construction would involve excavating sandstone bedrock, which would generate sand-sized particles or larger. Construction-generated particles would occur temporarily in dry portions of the excavated tailrace channel, and these particles would be cleaned from the channel prior to contact with water stored in Sand Hollow Reservoir. There would be no measurable and no significant water quality effects from construction activities at either reservoir.

4.2.2 Operations Phase

Operation and maintenance of booster pump stations, hydro generating stations, and the transmission lines would not result in routine water discharges or cause other impacts on water quality. Where applicable, booster pump stations would have surface emergency overflow detention basins. However, operation and maintenance of the proposed pipelines would include occasional annual water discharges with the potential to affect natural surface water features in the project area. LPP Project operation would

alter the inflow water source to Sand Hollow Reservoir. Changes in Lake Powell water quality resulting from the LPP Project operations would not be measurable (see Appendix B, Reclamation Water Quality Modeling Documentation).

4.2.1.1 Maintenance Pipeline Discharges

4.2.2.1.1 Pipeline Flushing. Based on the preliminary design information, it is anticipated that water from Lake Powell would enter the intake structure at depths to approximately 350 feet below the water surface. It is anticipated that the untreated water pumped into the LPP Project would have low concentrations of suspended solids and turbidity because a high percentage of suspended solids in inflows to Lake Powell settle out below this level. However, some pipeline flushing may be required to remove the smaller particles which enter the LPP Project and manage to settle in the pipeline. Flushing would only be required when pipeline flows are low enough for long periods of time to allow particles to settle. Flushing would be accomplished by increasing the pipeline flow to near-maximum rates to re-suspend particles that may have settled in the pipeline at lower flows. The flushed water would be discharged into the LPP Project forebay reservoir above the Hurricane Cliffs.

It is anticipated that standard operating procedures for the Proposed Action would include measures to divert flows generated from flushing operations away from surface water bodies, to settling basins and/or retention/percolation basins.

4.2.2.1.2 Drain Valves. Drain valves for draining the proposed LPP Project pipeline segments for maintenance and repairs would generally be installed at low points in the pipeline profile. Pipeline segment draining would occur in January for up to 15 days. The Conveyance System portion of the pipeline would be drained back to the booster pump stations, and low points in the pipeline would be drained to dry washes. Pipeline water drained to dry washes would be discharged at low rates to avoid transporting sediments and causing local turbidity and sediment recruitment to flowing streams or reservoirs.

The standard operating procedures for the LPP Project include measures to divert flows generated from opening the drain valves away from surface water bodies, to settling ponds and/or retention/percolation basins, if warranted, or to control the release velocity to avoid uncontrolled erosion.

4.2.2.1.3 Pigging. The proposed pipelines would include provisions for “pigging.” Pigging refers to the practice of using pipeline inspection gauges or 'pigs' to perform maintenance operations such as cleaning and inspection on a pipeline without stopping the flow of water through the pipeline. This is accomplished by inserting the pig into a section of the pipeline. Water pressure in the pipeline is used to push the pig along the length of the pipe until it reaches the desired segment from where it is then removed.

Slime buildup in the pipeline would decrease conveyance capacity and the proposed pipelines may have to be cleaned/pigged once or twice a year. Standard operating procedures for the LPP Project would include measures to divert organic wastes such as biofilms detached from the pipeline during pigging operations away from surface water bodies to settling tanks or retention basins.

4.2.1.2 Pipeline Rupture

Although highly unlikely, a pipeline rupture from exceedance of pipeline capacity, seismic activity, or other catastrophic event could result in discharge of large amounts of untreated water which might mix with the local surface water supplies. Potential adverse water quality impacts would be limited to

increased velocity in the receiving water and potentially increased turbidity and sedimentation because the quality of Lake Powell water is generally superior to local surface waters.

4.2.3 Water Quality Impacts on Sand Hollow Reservoir

Lake Powell water quality is similar to or superior to the quality of local surface waters, including the Virgin River, which is the primary inflow source to Sand Hollow Reservoir. Water temperatures are projected to be unaffected by the gradually increasing deliveries of LPP Project water, primarily because Sand Hollow Reservoir is relatively shallow with a proportionately large surface area and experiences thermal stratification during the summer months, regardless of the inflow temperatures. As the LPP Project water deliveries increase, Sand Hollow Reservoir water temperatures during summer months could be slightly colder because of the influence of slightly colder Lake Powell water. Dissolved oxygen concentrations are projected to remain unaffected by the gradually increasing deliveries of LPP Project water because the top 50 feet of the reservoir is near or above dissolved oxygen saturation that occurs from atmospheric pressure at the air/water interface. The upper portions of the reservoir are well mixed throughout the year and maintain dissolved oxygen concentrations near or above saturation.

Groundwater quality would not be measurably affected by recharge associated with LPP Project operation. As LPP Project inflows to Sand Hollow Reservoir increase gradually at an overall lower TDS concentration than water delivered from the Virgin River, TDS concentrations in groundwater may decrease slightly, eventually approaching approximately 570 mg/L. There would be no measurable impacts on groundwater quality from the LPP Project that would affect surface water quality.

The primary impact of LPP Project deliveries on Sand Hollow Reservoir water quality is focused on potential changes in TDS concentrations. A TDS mass balance model was completed for the LPP Project deliveries to Sand Hollow Reservoir. The model is based on an annual time step for a planning period ranging from year 2025 to year 2060. A salt balance is performed for each time step which tracks the inflows, the outflows, and the corresponding change in storage in the reservoir. It is assumed that complete mixing would occur within Sand Hollow Reservoir. Inflows to the reservoir include raw water deliveries from Lake Powell, direct precipitation, and diversions from the Virgin River. Outflows from the reservoir include water lost to evaporation, groundwater seepage, and planned releases from the reservoir to meet raw water demands. It is assumed that the initial (year 2025) storage volume in the reservoir is 50,000 acre-fee and the corresponding TDS concentration in the reservoir is 600 milligrams per liter (mg/L). The inflow and outflow components considered for this evaluation are described below.

4.2.3.1 Inflows

- **Phased delivery of raw water from Lake Powell via the LPP Project** – Table 4-1 lists the planned phased deliveries of raw water from Lake Powell to Sand Hollow Reservoir. Annual deliveries increase from approximately 4,153 ac-ft per year in 2024 to approximately 69,000 ac-ft per year in 2046. Annual deliveries remain constant at 69,000 ac-ft per year from 2046 through 2060. The TDS concentration in the Lake Powell raw water is assumed to be 540 mg/L.

- **Direct precipitation on the Reservoir** – It is assumed that most of the precipitation in the area either evaporates or is consumed by native vegetation because of the minimal precipitation in the area and the arid landscape. Therefore, runoff resulting from precipitation is not included as an inflow component. However, direct precipitation on the reservoir is considered as an inflow component. It is assumed that direct precipitation does not add any TDS load on the reservoir. Historical average annual precipitation for the St. George area is assumed to be 0.7 feet based on information available from the Western Regional Climate Center of the Desert Research Institute

(DRI 2010). An elevation-area-capacity relationship for the reservoir is presented in Table 4-2. This relationship is used to estimate the total surface area at the beginning of each time step. The product of the total reservoir surface area (in acres) and the average annual precipitation (in feet) yields the total volume contributed by direct precipitation.

Table 4-1
Phased Delivery of Raw Water from Lake Powell to Sand Hollow Reservoir

Year	Planned Deliveries 69,000 acre-feet/year (max.)
2024	4,153
2025	6,175
2026	8,911
2027	11,647
2028	14,383
2029	17,120
2030	19,858
2031	22,837
2032	25,816
2033	28,795
2034	31,774
2035	34,753
2036	37,732
2037	40,711
2038	43,690
2039	46,669
2040	49,648
2041	52,941
2042	56,234
2043	59,527
2044	62,820
2045	66,113
2046	69,000
2047	69,000
2048	69,000
2049	69,000
2050	69,000
2051	69,000
2052	69,000
2053	69,000
2054	69,000
2055	69,000
2056	69,000
2057	69,000
2058	69,000
2059	69,000
2060	69,000

Table 4-2 Elevation-Area-Capacity Relationship for Sand Hollow Reservoir		
Elevation (feet)	**Area (acres)**	**Capacity (acre-feet)**
2,972	0	0
2,980	34	64
2,990	138	931
3,000	246	2,835
3,010	385	5,939
3,020	658	11,317
3,030	834	18,858
3,040	1,011	28,128
3,050	1,159	38,970
3,060	1,322	51,360

- **Inflows from the Virgin River** – It is assumed that water from the Virgin River would be delivered into the reservoir when the volume of water lost by the reservoir via evaporation and seepage exceeds the inflows into the reservoir from precipitation and LPP deliveries. If the volume of the inflow water (LPP deliveries and precipitation) is greater than the volume of water lost to evaporation and seepage, it is assumed that there would be no deliveries from the Virgin River to Sand Hollow Reservoir. It is assumed that inflows from the Virgin River have an average TDS concentration of 550 mg/l.

4.2.3.2 Outflows

- **Evaporation** – Based upon a review of historical data at the Sand Hollow Reservoir site (USGS 2009), average annual evaporation of 5 feet (or 60 inches) is assumed. The elevation-area-capacity show on Table 4-2 is used to estimate the total surface area at the beginning of each time step. The product of the total reservoir surface area (in acres) and the average annual evaporation (in feet) yields the total volume lost by evaporation. It is assumed that no TDS load is lost to evaporation.

- **Groundwater seepage –** Based upon a review of historical data at the Sand Hollow Reservoir site (USGS 2009), average groundwater seepage of 11,856 acre-ft/year is assumed. The TDS concentration associated with groundwater seepage at any time-step is assumed to be same as the TDS concentration of the reservoir at the beginning of that time-step.

- **Outflows from the Sand Hollow Reservoir to meet water demands –** It is assumed that all raw water deliveries from Lake Powell would be used to meet demands after offsetting reservoir losses to seepage and evaporation. It is assumed that there would be no releases from the reservoir if the volume of water lost to evaporation and seepage is higher than the inflows into the reservoir.

4.2.3.3 Model Results

The model indicates that the TDS concentration in the reservoir increases initially as the salt load inflows into the reservoir exceed the outflows. As planned deliveries from Lake Powell increase over time, the

TDS concentration in the reservoir gradually decreases and eventually stabilizes at a concentration of 576 mg/l at the end of year 2055 under full deliveries of LPP Project water. The variation in the TDS concentration in the Sand Hollow Reservoir is depicted in Figure 4-1. In summary, a minor reduction in TDS concentration would be anticipated at Sand Hollow Reservoir from the delivery of raw water from Lake Powell.



Figure 4-1
TDS Concentration versus Time (Sand Hollow Reservoir)

4.2.4 Water Quality Impacts on Lake Powell and the Lower Colorado River

Computer modeling was performed by the United States Bureau of Reclamation – Upper Colorado Region (Reclamation) to evaluate potential effects of the proposed LPP Project on temperature, total dissolved solids (TDS), and other water quality parameters for the following water bodies: Lake Powell, below Glen Canyon Dam, and the Lower Colorado River. The Colorado River Simulation System (CRSS) and Lake Powell CE-QUAL-W2 models were used to simulate water quality parameters in and below Lake Powell for the No Action and South Alternative scenarios (Reclamation 2016).

Water quality results from the South Alternative pipeline diversion scenario were compared to the No Action Alternative scenario to determine effects, if any, on water quality. Water quality modeling results included temperature and dissolved oxygen in Lake Powell, temperature, TDS, and dissolved oxygen below Glen Canyon Dam from the CE-QUAL-W2 modeling, and TDS along the Lower Colorado River from the CRSS modeling. Other water quality parameters were simulated by the CE-QUAL-W2 model including nutrients and phytoplankton but quantitative results are not presented for these parameters. Additionally, CE-QUAL-W2 modeling of Glen Canyon Dam release temperatures at varying elevations was performed as part of the "Colorado River Interim Guidelines for Lower Basin Shortages and

Coordinated Operations for Lake Powell and Lake Mead, Final Environmental Impact Statement" or Shortage Criteria EIS (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2007). Results from that modeling are interpreted based on the projected changes in Lake Powell water surface elevations as a result of the proposed LPP Project (Reclamation 2016).

4.2.1.1 Lake Powell

Lake Powell temperature and dissolved oxygen concentrations were evaluated at five day intervals for three reservoir locations and five depths. The three locations were above the dam, below the confluence of the San Juan River, and the upstream reservoir. The five depths were 5, 10, 25, 50, and 100 meters. Simulated reservoir temperatures for the 86,249 acre-foot Proposed Action simulation were compared with the No Action Alternative simulation. Average temperatures at each depth modeled are between 0.04 and 0.19°C colder. Simulated reservoir dissolved oxygen (DO) concentrations for the 86,249 acre-foot Proposed Action simulations were compared with the No Action Alternative simulation and were 0.1 mg/L lower at 25 meters, 0.2 mg/L lower at 50 meters and 0.1 mg/L higher at 100 meters (Reclamation 2016). The DO concentrations for the 0 meter and 10 meter depths modeled for the pipeline simulation were the same as the No Action alternative. Appendix A presents the Reclamation Water Quality Modeling Documentation (Reclamation 2016).

4.2.1.2 Glen Canyon Dam Releases

Modeled release results from Glen Canyon Dam for the No Action Alternative and South Alternative pipeline simulations were evaluated for effects on temperature, TDS, and dissolved oxygen concentrations. Simulated mean dam release temperatures for the period 2045 to 2060 indicate that generally in the South Alternative pipeline scenario, dam release temperatures are slightly colder in winter and spring months (colder by approximately 0.1°C) and slightly warmer (warmer by approximately 0.1°C) in summer and fall months compared with the No Action Alternative scenario (Reclamation 2016). Appendix A presents the Reclamation Water Quality Modeling Documentation (Reclamation 2016).

Glen Canyon Dam release temperatures often peak in October and simulated results show that when the reservoir is at or near full pool elevations, as was the case from 2050 to 2056, water temperatures of releases from the dam for the South Alternative scenario were colder than in the No Action Alternative scenario. The release temperatures from the dam in the pipeline scenarios are colder when the reservoir is near full capacity because of the removal of warm water from the upper, warm layer of the reservoir by the pipeline. Simulated release temperatures for the Proposed Action scenario were warmer than the No Action Alternative scenario during summer and fall months when reservoir pool elevations were below full pool. The largest differences between the Proposed Action scenario and the No Action Alternative scenario coincided with the lowest reservoir pool elevations (Reclamation 2016). On average, the modeled results for the Proposed Action compared with the No Action Alternative were within 0.1°C for the 2045-2060 period. For individual years, differences of up to 0.71°C were predicted (Reclamation 2016). Appendix A presents the Reclamation Water Quality Modeling Documentation (Reclamation 2016).

TDS results from the No Action alternative and Proposed Action models indicate that the average release TDS concentrations from 2045-2060 for the results of the three models would all be within 0.7 mg/L of each other. The Proposed Action average TDS values would be slightly higher than the No Action alternative (Reclamation 2016). Appendix A presents the Reclamation Water Quality Modeling Documentation (Reclamation 2016).

Dissolved oxygen results from the No Action alternative and Proposed Action models indicate that the average release dissolved oxygen concentrations from 2045-2060 for the two models would not vary (Reclamation 2016). Appendix A presents the Reclamation Water Quality Modeling Documentation (Reclamation 2016).

4.2.1.3Lower Colorado River – Salinity

Numeric criteria have been established for salinity at three sites on the Lower Colorado River: below Hoover Dam, below Parker Dam, and above Imperial Dam. The salinity criteria at each of these sites are 723 mg/L, 749 mg/L, and 879 mg/L, respectively. The CRSS model simulated the period 2015 to 2060 using the DNF inflow hydrology scenario. Under the DNF scenario, the historic record 1906-2006 was used to generate 101 simulations of the period 2041 to 2060.

The results of salinity modeling from the CRSS DNF hydrology and operations model comparing the No Action Alternative with the Proposed Action at these three sites indicate that no appreciable differences are found at the 90th, 50th, or 10th percentile levels (Reclamation 2016).

Detailed results of the water quality modeling are documented in *Lake Powell Pipeline Water Quality Modeling Documentation* (Reclamation 2016) and are included in Appendix A of this report.

4.2.1.4 Surface Water Quality and Water Use Balance

Surface water quality would remain mostly unchanged as water is used for hydroelectric power generation and treated for M&I use under normal LPP Project operation. The in-line hydro stations would convert the run-of-pipeline energy in the Hydro System to hydroelectric energy without changing water quality. The afterbay reservoirs at each in-line hydro station would be maintained at atmospheric pressure and dissolved oxygen would not measurably change during operations from the High Point Regulating Tank-2 to the forebay reservoir. The forebay reservoir detention time would be sufficient to allow the LPP Project water to adjust to dissolved oxygen saturation conditions. The afterbay reservoir would provide sufficient detention time for the water to adjust to dissolved oxygen saturation conditions. LPP Project water released to Sand Hollow Reservoir from Sand Hollow Hydro Station would mix with the reservoir water, with no measurable change in dissolved oxygen concentrations, and with slightly colder water temperatures possible during summer months. As the Sand Hollow Reservoir water is delivered to the Quail Creek Water Treatment Plant for treatment prior to M&I use, the water quality would remain measurably unchanged from conditions in the reservoir. M&I use of the water as it is consumed for human indoor purposes would increase TDS concentrations, and the water would have quality typical of municipal wastewater. The M&I water used in Washington, St. George, Santa Clara and Ivins would be treated in the regional wastewater treatment plant, and a portion of the treated effluent would be reclaimed for reuse in the St. George Regional Water Reclamation Facility. The reuse water would be distributed throughout the St. George metropolitan area for outdoor irrigation of parks, cemeteries, recreational sport fields, golf courses, and other irrigation purposes as it is currently used. No LPP Project water would be directly used to meet environmental purposes.

4.2.1.5 Summary of Operations Impacts

A comparison of the raw water quality from Lake Powell and the water quality objectives for the major surface waters in the vicinity of the LPP Project is presented in Table 4-3. Based on the water quality simulation results, Lake Powell water quality would meet or be well within established water quality criteria and standards for the major surface water bodies in the vicinity of the proposed pipelines.

Table 4-3
Summary Comparison of Lake Powell Water Quality and Water Quality Criteria for Surface Waters in the Project Area

Parameter	Untreated Lake Powell Water	Numeric Criteria for Kanab Creek (Utah)	Numeric Criteria for Ash Creek (Utah)	Numeric Criteria for Mill Creek (Utah)	Numeric Criteria for Paria River (Utah)	Numeric Criteria for Virgin River (Below Quail Creek Diversion)	Numeric Criteria for Kanab Creek (Arizona)	Numeric Criteria for Paria River (Arizona)
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	saturated	-	-	-	-	-	6	6
pH-Standard Units	7.8 to 8.2	6.5-9.0	6.5-9.0	6.5-9.0	6.5-9.0	6.5-9.0	6.5-9.0	6.5-9.0
TDS (mg/L)	540 to 680	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	-	-
Temperature (C)	7 to 16	27	27	20	27	20	-	-
Nitrate (mg/L as N)	< 0.6	4	4	4	4	4	-	-

Therefore, potential impacts on water quality considered for project operation include:

- Sediment transport and introduction of pollutants from pipeline discharges during operation
- Changes in total dissolved solids from the addition of large volumes of Lake Powell water to Sand Hollow Reservoir
- Changes in water quality from volume changes (Lake Powell and downstream in the Lower Colorado River)

Uncontrolled discharge of sediment or organics-laden water or disinfected water (if required for quagga mussel control) from the pipeline during maintenance operations could result in exceedance of water quality objectives in receiving waters. However, standard operating procedures for the LPP Project would include measures to divert pipeline discharges away from surface water bodies to settling ponds or retention basins and that any subsequent releases would be controlled to avoid adverse impacts. Discharges to surface waters during project operation, such as from a settling tank to a natural drainage, may be subject to UPDES or APDES permit requirements.

A TDS mass balance model for the LPP Project water delivery to Sand Hollow Reservoir indicates that TDS levels in Sand Hollow Reservoir would increase initially as the salt load of inflows exceeded outflows. Over time, however, TDS concentrations are predicted to stabilize at a level slightly below existing concentrations as increasing delivery of Lake Powell water mixes with Virgin River water in the reservoir.

Modeling performed by Reclamation for water temperature, TDS and dissolved oxygen did not predict measurable or significant changes in Lake Powell, Glen Canyon Dam releases, or in the Lower Colorado River for the Proposed Action compared with the No Action Alternative.

Therefore, with implementation of standard operating procedures to control pipeline discharges, operation of the LPP Project would not be anticipated to result in the violation of applicable surface water quality standards or cause substantial degradation of surface water quality or cause substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area.

All BMPs employed during operation would prevent sediment recruitment and resultant increases in salinity in the Colorado River Basin. The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program emphasizes agricultural flows and reduces soil erosion due to agricultural activity; the program goals would be satisfied by BMPs to control sediment and salinity releases. Because open-cut pipeline crossings would be constructed during dry conditions or with use of active temporary water diversion, sediment recruitment would not be measurable. Any negligible effects on overall Colorado River salinity would not be measureable.

4.2.5 Water Quality Impacts on the Virgin River

Water quality in the Virgin River would not be directly or indirectly affected by the Lake Powell Pipeline construction or operation. LPP Project construction activities would terminate at Sand Hollow Reservoir more than three miles east of the Virgin River. LPP Project operation would supply raw water to Sand Hollow Reservoir for treatment in the Quail Creek Water Treatment Plant before distribution throughout the WCWCD service area. Following use in homes, businesses and institutions, the wastewater would be treated in wastewater treatment facilities and then further treated in the wastewater reclamation facility for reuse as secondary irrigation water. This water would be stored in existing and approved reservoirs in the St. George metropolitan area and used for outdoor watering. The UDWRe has modeled the Virgin River using the Virgin River Daily Simulation Model (VRDSM) for scenarios involving no LPP Project water and with LPP Project water to determine the potential for return flows to the Virgin River that could potentially affect stream flows and water quality. The VRDSM results indicate that LPP return flows to the Virgin River would be within the measurement accuracy of the USGS gages on the Virgin River and changes in river flows would not be measurable (UDWRe 2015). Therefore, potential impacts on stream flows and water quality in the Virgin River are eliminated from further analysis. A detailed analysis of the VRDSM model results is included in the Final Surface Water Resources Study Report (UDWRe 2016).

4.3 No Lake Powell Water Alternative

The No Lake Powell Water Alternative would involve a combination of developing remaining available surface water and groundwater supplies, developing reverse osmosis treatment of existing low quality water supplies, and restricting residential outdoor watering in the WCWCD service area. This alternative could provide a total of 86,249 acre-feet of water annually to WCWCD and KCWCD for M&I use without diverting Utah’s water from Lake Powell.

Construction of the facilities necessary for the No Lake Powell Water Alternative would result in water quality impacts related to soil disturbance and use of heavy equipment during construction. Construction impacts on water quality would be potentially significant and require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce adverse effects.

Sand Hollow Reservoir would continue to receive Virgin River water as at present and water quality of the reservoir would be the same as existing conditions. The minor changes in temperature, TDS, and dissolved oxygen predicted for Lake Powell, Glen Canyon Dam release, and the Lower Colorado River would not occur with no diversion of water from Lake Powell.

Indirect impacts under the No Lake Powell Water Alternative would be significant and include increased water temperatures in the Virgin River and tributary streams under the influence of groundwater recharge from outdoor watering in the St. George metropolitan area. The elimination of residential outdoor watering would significantly reduce recharge and is projected to reduce Virgin River flows during the summer and fall months. This indirect impact may cause the stream water temperatures to increase compared to baseline conditions because the cooler groundwater discharging to the stream under baseline conditions helps control the river water temperature during the summer and fall months.

Therefore, the No Lake Powell Water Alternative may indirectly result in violation of applicable surface water quality standards for temperature and cause substantial degradation of surface water quality. This would be a significant impact on water quality in the Virgin River.

4.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, none of the proposed project facilities would be constructed. Surface water features in the vicinity of the LPP Project would not be impacted by LPP construction activity and water quality would be expected to remain substantially the same as current conditions. Sand Hollow Reservoir would continue to receive Virgin River water as at present and water quality of the reservoir would be the same as existing conditions. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in the violation of applicable surface water quality standards or cause substantial degradation of surface water quality or cause substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area.

Chapter 5
Mitigation and Monitoring

Construction of LPP Project facilities would result in extensive areas of construction disturbance and potentially significant, although short-term, water quality impacts. Erosion generating turbidity and sediment is the primary water quality concern during construction. In addition to sediment, stormwater runoff from construction areas can carry potential hazardous substances used in construction such as fuels, oils, antifreeze, coolants, paints, solvents, and other substances.

This section presents the types of measures to be implemented during project construction to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on surface water quality. These mitigation measures apply to the impacts associated with all proposed pipeline and transmission line alignments.

5.1 Compliance with NPDES Permitting

The proposed pipeline facilities for the conveyance of raw water from Lake Powell would pass through the states of Utah and Arizona. Both states have administrative programs for stormwater permitting in compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting system. In Arizona, this program is called the Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (APDES). Arizona has general permit (Arizona G2008-001) that covers stormwater discharges from construction activities, except for those construction discharges in tribal lands. However, an individual permit is required when the general permit requirements do not accurately represent the activity at a facility and a permit is customized to the site (ADEQ 2016). In Utah, this program is called the Utah Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (UPDES). Utah has a general permit (Utah R300000) that covers stormwater discharges from construction activities. Alternately, an individual permit is issued for some construction projects (UDEQ 2016).

In compliance with the NPDES permits for stormwater discharge associated with construction activity, a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) would be developed prior to the construction phase during final project design. The SWPPP would identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be incorporated during construction to prevent or to minimize the entry of contaminants in the local surface water bodies. Implementation of the SWPPP would typically begin during initial clearing, grubbing, and grading operations, since these activities have the potential to increase erosion at the project sites. The SWPPP would be frequently referred to during the construction phase and amended as changes occur in construction operations, which could further reduce the potential for discharge of pollutants into the local surface water bodies.

The SWPPP would include the types of measures described in the following sections to mitigate the impacts on surface water quality during the construction of the proposed project facilities. The final SWPPP would be developed by UDWRe and would be site-specific for each phase of the construction, and for all project facilities (pipelines, booster stations, transmission lines, hydro generating stations, etc.).

5.1.1 Erosion Control

BMPs for erosion control would be implemented to prevent the detachment of soil particles from construction disturbed ground surfaces from rainfall, wind, or flowing water. In general, steep slopes and large exposed areas in the vicinity of the construction site would require erosion control mechanisms.

Erosion control BMPs would be implemented at slopes and areas where soil has been disturbed during construction. These areas would be protected from concentrated flows by intercepting, diverting, conveying, and discharging concentrated flows such that sediment removal and transport is prevented. Soil disturbed and stockpiled during construction would be moved to areas where there is minimum potential for accelerated erosion and sediment recruitment to streams and reservoirs. Selected BMPs to control erosion are described in the following sections.

5.1.1.1 Preservation of Existing Vegetation

Developed root systems of existing vegetation in the vicinity of the construction site hold the soil in place and prevent rapid drying of the soil thereby providing natural protection against erosion. Prior to clearing and grubbing activities, the contractor would develop a plan to preserve existing vegetation to minimize erosion. All vegetation identified for ultimate removal would be temporarily preserved and utilized for erosion control. Vegetated areas would be clearly marked and a buffer area would be provided to help to preserve these areas and take advantage of natural erosion prevention.

5.1.1.2 Soil Binders

The UDWRe may use soil binders for disturbed areas that require temporary stabilization of the soil surface to prevent erosion caused by rainfall or wind. The binder would be selected based upon the type of the soil at the site. The selected soil binder would not be toxic to existing plant and animal life and would not pollute stormwater. Soil binders would be used only for flat, exposed areas and not for steep slopes. Soil binders would require a curing period of 24-hours upon application. Re-application may be required after storm events because soil binders offer only temporary protection. The soil binders can be plant-material based (guar, psyllium, starch, pitch and rosin emulsion etc.), polymeric emulsion based (acrylic copolymers and polymers, hydro-colloid polymers etc.), or cementitious based (gypsum, etc.).

5.1.1.3 Matting

For surfaces with slopes steeper than 3H:1V, UDWRe could install mats of natural materials to cover the soil surface to minimize erosion caused by the impact of rainfall. Such mats are generally installed in areas where the flow velocities are between 3 feet per second (fps) and 6 fps. The selected material would not be toxic to existing plant and animal life and would not pollute stormwater. The choice of the matting material is usually governed by the size of area, side slopes, surface conditions such as hardness, moisture, weed growth, and availability of materials. Geotextiles, plastic covers, and erosion control blankets are some of the natural and synthetic mattings commonly used. Organic matting materials have been found to be effective where re-vegetation would be provided by re-seeding. Jute, straw blanket, wood fiber blanket, coconut fiber blanket, coconut fiber mesh, etc. are some examples of organic matting materials.

5.1.1.4 Runoff Interception and Diversion

In order to prevent runoff from washing away disturbed soil, UDWRe would plan and design temporary structures to divert runoff to a designated location such as a sediment basin or trap. Design of the structures would be developed in collaboration with, and approved by, federal land management agencies. This would be performed by constructing drainage swales and earth dikes in areas where runoff is expected to impact an erodible area. An earth dike is a ridge constructed from compacted soil while a drainage swale is a sloped depression in the soil. Depending on the intensity of the storm and the expected flow rate, permanent structures may also be constructed to intercept and divert runoff. Diversion structures concentrate surface runoff and increase the flow velocity. All flows from the diversion structure

would be directed to a flow stabilization structure such as a sediment basin which also allows for the settling of suspended solids. UDWRe may install check dams along the drainage swales to reduce the effective slope of the channel, thereby reducing the velocity of flowing water, allowing sediment to settle and reduce erosion and sediment recruitment.

5.1.1.5 Dust Control

UDWRe would implement dust control measures to prevent sediment erosion and transport through wind. The contractor(s) would monitor the direction of the prevailing winds and plan accordingly for dust control. Disturbed soil would either be covered in small stockpiles or water or soil binders would be applied to keep them moist. Dust control by watering would have to be carried out at pre-determined intervals to avoid drying and erosion of the disturbed soil. UDWRe would also ensure that over watering does not occur. All trucks that haul soil would be equipped with covers for adequate dust control. UDWRe would implement track in/track out devices to reduce the transport of sediments by vehicles at specific locations.

5.1.2 Sediment Control

BMPs for sediment control would be implemented to prevent the transport of sediment particles by rain, wind, or flowing water. These BMPs would intercept and detain the runoff to allow sediment to settle and be trapped. Sediment control BMPs would be used in conjunction with erosion control BMPs to increase their effectiveness. Selected BMPs for sediment control are described in the following sections.

5.1.1.6 Silt Fence and Sandbag Barriers

UDWRe would install silt fences in areas where sediment transport occurs because of runoff in the form of sheet flows on level ground. A silt fence is made of a filter fabric attached to supporting poles and supported by wire mesh. The silt fence detains the flow, leading to sediment deposition behind the fence. In most cases, the detained water would be allowed to evaporate. Silt fences are temporary sediment control structures and would not be used in areas where the runoff is concentrated. UDWRe would install sandbags to intercept and detain sheet flows. Unlike silt fences that can only be used on level ground, sand bags can be used on slopes to impound runoff and facilitate sedimentation. Sediment laden flows impounded and/or diverted by these structures may be directed to a sediment basin for settling and evaporation.

5.1.1.7 Sediment Basin

Prior to clearing and grubbing activities, UDWRe would develop a plan for identifying and constructing sediment basins at the construction sites. Design of the basins would be developed in collaboration with, and approved by, federal land management agencies. The sediment basins would be designed based on factors such as rainfall intensity, the expected precipitation volume, and the runoff flow rate. The sediment basins would be located such that they intercept maximum runoff from the disturbed areas. The contractor(s) would install sediment basins to allow settling of the suspended particles prior to discharging the runoff into a receiving water body. A sediment basin is a temporary structure formed by excavation or by the construction of an embankment. UDWRe would maintain the sediment basin until the site area is permanently protected against erosion. During construction, UDWRe would make provisions for the removal of accumulated sediments in the basin. Sediments would be land applied within the right-of-way in uplands away from the receiving water or direct drainage area.

5.1.3 Hazardous Material Control

In order to minimize the potential for spills of potential contaminants into surface water bodies, BMPs would be developed to identify specific fueling areas for construction vehicles and equipment. Procedures for handling hazardous material would be developed. Catch basins and absorbent pads to intercept fuel and other discharges from sedentary equipment would be developed. It is anticipated that the implementation of these BMPs would mitigate the potential impacts of contaminants entering receiving waters.

5.1.4 Final Site Stabilization

Implementation of construction BMPs is completed when final site stabilization can be documented and approved by the federal land management agency authorized officers. All disturbed areas must be either built on, paved, re-vegetated or have equivalent permanent, physical post-construction erosion controls in place. For stream crossings, bank re-contouring to close to pre-project conditions and revegetation would be completed. Where implemented, specific standards for revegetation would apply (e.g., 70 percent of pre-disturbance plant density is considered to be “finally stabilized” per the Utah NPDES stormwater general permit (UDEQ 2008)).

5.2 Compliance Monitoring

UDWRe would monitor compliance with the measures outlined in the SWPPP as part of the overall project monitoring of environmental commitments. Routine inspection of BMPs would be required to confirm effectiveness, identify deficiencies and then document that deficiencies have been adequately addressed.

Chapter 6
Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

6.1 Highway Alternative

The South Alternative would have minor short-term unavoidable adverse impacts on surface water quality, including temporary diversions at actively flowing stream crossings. Potential unavoidable adverse impacts include unmeasurable or minor increases in turbidity and sediment recruitment at perennial stream crossing sites.

The South Alternative would have unmeasurable, minor long-term unavoidable adverse impacts on surface water quality, including TDS and DO concentrations and temperatures in Lake Powell and Glen Canyon Dam releases to the Colorado River, Virgin River water quality through the St. George metropolitan area, and unmeasurable cumulative impacts in combination with Bureau of Reclamation operating decisions on Lake Powell elevations and Glen Canyon Dam releases. Operation and maintenance activities would have a minor unavoidable adverse impact on surface water quality in Sand Hollow Reservoir. TDS concentrations would initially increase over baseline conditions as the salt load in the LPP Project inflow water exceeds the outflow from Sand Hollow Reservoir. Water quality modeling indicates the TDS concentration would decrease after the first several years of LPP Project operation as the LPP Project water with lower TDS concentration becomes the primary inflow source to Sand Hollow Reservoir. The TDS concentration would be lower than baseline conditions after 2028 and would stabilize at a lower concentration through 2060. There would be no other unavoidable adverse impacts on surface water quality under the South Alternative.

6.2 Existing Highway Alternative

The unavoidable adverse impacts of the Existing Highway Alternative on surface water quality would be the same as described for the South Alternative in Section 6.1.

6.3 Southeast Corner Alternative

The unavoidable adverse impacts of the Southeast Corner Alternative on surface water quality would be the same as described for the South Alternative in Section 6.1.

6.4 Transmission Line Alignments

The unavoidable adverse impacts of the Transmission Line Alignments on surface water quality would be the same as described for the South Alternative in Section 6.1.

6.5 Natural Gas Pipeline and Generators Alternative

The unavoidable adverse impacts of the Natural Gas Pipeline and Generators Alternative on surface water quality would be the same as described for the South Alternative in Section 6.1.

6.6 No Lake Powell Water Alternative

The No Lake Powell Water Alternative would have no short-term unavoidable adverse impacts on surface water quality. The No Lake Powell Water Alternative would have major long-term unavoidable adverse impacts on water quality in the Virgin River and its local tributary streams under the influence of groundwater resulting from reduced return flows in response to cessation of outdoor watering with potable water. The decrease in subsurface return flows could adversely affect stream flows, increase water temperatures, and decrease DO concentrations with exceedance of temperature and DO criteria during the summer months. These unavoidable adverse impacts on water quality would be significant.

6.7 No Action Alternative

No unavoidable adverse impacts would occur.

Chapter 7
Cumulative Impacts

This chapter analyzes cumulative impacts that may occur from construction and operation of the proposed LPP Project when combined with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions and projects after all proposed mitigation measures have been implemented. Only those resources with the potential to cause cumulative impacts are analyzed in this chapter.

7.1 South Alternative

The South Alternative would have minimal short-term impacts on surface water quality during construction. Therefore, there would be no measurable cumulative impacts of the LPP Project alternatives on surface water quality when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. The unmeasurable short-term cumulative impacts would not be significant.

The South Alternative could have minimal long-term cumulative impacts on surface water quality in Lake Powell and Glen Canyon Dam releases when combined with the following past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions during operations:

Colorado River Interim Guidelines for Lower Basin Shortages and Coordinated Operations for Lake Powell and Lake Mead EIS and ROD

Operation of Glen Canyon Dam EIS and ROD

Interim Surplus Criteria EIS and ROD

Bureau of Reclamation and National Park Service (LTEMP) EIS

These interrelated actions determine the elevation, storage, release, operational timing, and volume of water in Lake Powell and release rates, release volumes, and operational timing of Glen Canyon Dam releases to the Colorado River. The South Alternative would have minimal impacts on surface water quality in Lake Powell, and when combined with these interrelated actions, there would be long-term minimal cumulative impacts on surface water quality. Similarly, the South Alternative would have minimal impacts on Glen Canyon Dam release water quality and when combined with these interrelated actions, there would be long-term minimal cumulative impacts on surface water quality. These long-term cumulative impacts would not be physically measurable in Lake Powell and Glen Canyon Dam releases; however, they would result from depletions up to 86,249 acre-feet per year from Lake Powell and would have minimal cumulative impacts on Bureau of Reclamation operations and other actions implemented by the U.S. Department of the Interior. These cumulative impacts in surface water quality would be not be significant.

The South Alternative would have a long-term cumulative impact on surface water quality when combined with the St. George Wastewater Reuse Project. The South Alternative would involve utilizing 3,000 acre-feet of off-stream storage of reuse water as part of the return flow management with the LPP project water distribution throughout the St. George metropolitan area. This cumulative impact could result in changing the quality of reuse water for parks, golf courses and cemeteries. The potential cumulative impact would not interfere with the quality of the 2,000 acre-feet per year of reuse water conveyed to Ivins Reservoir for the Shivwits Band of Paiute Indians; however, the future remaining reuse water could be managed in combination with other non-potable water supplies to meet system

requirements. This potential long-term cumulative impact on surface water quality (reuse water) would not be significant.

7.2 Existing Highway Alternative

The cumulative impacts of the Existing Highway Alternative would be the same as described for the South Alternative in Section 7.1.

7.3 Southeast Corner Alternative

The cumulative impacts of the Southeast Corner Alternative would be the same as described for the South Alternative in Section 7.1.

7.4 Transmission Line Alignments

The cumulative impacts of the Transmission Line Alignments would be the same as described for the South Alternative in Section 7.1.

7.5 Natural Gas Pipeline and Generators Alternative

The cumulative impacts of the Natural Gas Pipeline and Generators Alternative would be the same as described for the South Alternative in Section 7.1.

7.6 No Lake Powell Water Alternative

The No Lake Powell Water Alternative would have a long-term cumulative impact on surface water quality when combined with the operation of the St. George Wastewater Reuse Project. Reclaimed wastewater effluent from the St. George Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility would be conveyed to a future Warner Valley Reservoir for mixing with Virgin River water pumped from the Washington Fields Diversion, comprising the raw water supply for reverse osmosis treatment processes. The mixing of higher TDS concentration reuse water with lower TDS concentration Virgin River water in Warner Valley Reservoir would result in increased TDS concentration of the stored water. This cumulative effect would be minor because the stored water would be treated at the RO treatment plant and not released to active streams or other water bodies.

7.7 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would have no cumulative impacts on surface water quality.

References Cited

Arizona Administrative Code (AAC). 2010. Available at: http://www.azsos.gov/public_services/Title_18/18-11.htm, accessed on January 11, 2010.

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. 2008. Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Discharge from Construction Activities to Waters of the United States. Permit No. AZG2008-001. Issued February 28, 2008.

Desert Research Institute (DRI). 2010. Available at: http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/cgi-bin/cliMAIN.pl?utstge, accessed on June 18, 2010.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2006. 2006 Section 303(d) List Fact Sheet for Utah. Available at: http://iaspub.epa.gov/waters10/state_rept.control?p_state=UT&p_cycle=2006.

_____. 2008. 2008 Section 303(d) List Fact Sheet for Arizona. Available at: http://iaspub.epa.gov/tmdl/state_rept.control?p_state=AZ&p_cycle=.

_____. 2010. STORET Database. Available at: www.epa.gov\storet, accessed on January 11, 2010.

MWH. 2008. Technical Memorandum 5.13A: A Review of Water Quality and Treatment Issues.

US Geological Survey (USGS). 2012. Assessment of Managed Aquifer Recharge at Sand Hollow Reservoir, Washington County, Utah, Updated to Conditions through 2012: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2013-5057. Prepared by T.M. Marston and V.M. Heilweil.

U. S. Bureau of Reclamation. 2016. Lake Powell Pipeline Project Water Quality Modeling Documentation. Upper Colorado Region Office. Prepared by Robert Radtke. Salt Lake City, UT. March 2016.

U.S. Congress. 1998. Public Law 105-355. Title II – Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. Section 202, Utility Corridor Designation, U.S. Route 89, Kane County, Utah. November 6, 1998.

U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI). 2007. Record of Decision, Colorado River Interim Guidelines for Lower Basin Shortages and Coordinated Operations for Lake Powell and Lake Mead, Final Environmental Impact Statement. U.S. DOI, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper and Lower Colorado Regions. December 2007.

Utah Administrative Code (UAC). 2010. Available at: http://www.rules.utah.gov/publicat/code/r317/r317.htm, accessed on January 11, 2010.

Utah Board of Water Resources (UBWR). 2011. Lake Powell Pipeline, Draft Study Report 18: Surface Water Resources. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project No. 12966. Prepared by the Utah Division of Water Resources. March 2011.

Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ). 2008. Storm Water General Permit for Construction Activities. Permit No. UTR300000. Issued June 26, 2008.

Utah Division of Water Resources (UDWRe). 2007. *Draft municipal and industrial water supply and uses in the Cedar/Beaver Basin (Data collected for the year 2005)*. November 2007.

_____. 2012. M*unicipal and industrial water supply and uses in the Kanab Creek/Virgin River Basin (Data collected for the year 2010)*. February 2012.

_____. 2015. *Virgin River Daily Simulation Model.* Prepared by UDWRe. September.

_____. 2016. *Final Surface Water Resources Study Report.* Prepared by MWH, Inc. April.

Western Regional Climate Center at Desert Research Institute (WRCC). 2010. Available at: http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/cgi-bin/cliMAIN.pl?utstge, accessed on June 18, 2010.

List of Preparers

MWH Americas, Inc. Consultant Team		
Name	**Degree(s)**	**Role**
Sarah Garber MWH, Inc.	M.S. – Biology B.S. – Natural Resources	Surface Water Quality
Ganesh Krishnamurthy MWH, Inc.	M.S. – Civil and Environmental Engineering B.E. – Civil and Environmental Engineering	Surface Water Quality and Modeling
Dilip Gargeya MWH, Inc.	M.S. – Civil and Environmental Engineering B.S. – Chemical Engineering	Surface Water Quality
Brian Liming MWH, Inc.	M.S. – Civil and Environmental Engineering B.S. – Ecosystems Analysis	Report QA/QC Review
Diana Barnes MWH, Inc.	A.A. – Secretarial Science	Word Processing and Formatting

Appendix A

Lake Powell Pipeline Project Water Quality Modeling Documentation

Appendix A

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Water Quality Modeling Documentation

Lake Powell Pipeline Project Water Quality Modeling Documentation

This section contains the documentation for the modeling and analyses performed to evaluate the potential effects on water quality constituents of concern. Three different models were used to evaluate different water quality parameters and each is described in this appendix. The salinity module of the CRSS RiverWare™ model was used to evaluate changes in salinity concentrations for all alternatives. The CE-QUAL-W2 model was used to evaluate potential changes in temperature and water quality between the no action and action alternatives.

Table of Contents

A. Executive Summary - Lake Powell Pipeline Water Quality Modeling Documentation 5
A.1 Model Descriptions 5
A.1.1 CRSS: Salinity Modeling 5
A.1.2 CE-QUAL-W2: Water Quality Modeling 5
A.2 Results 5
A.2.1 Lake Powell 6
A.2.2 Glen Canyon Dam 6
A.2.3 Lower Colorado River – Salinity 9

B. Salinity Modeling Using the Salinity Module of the CRSS RiverWare™ Model - Model and Approach Description 11
B.1 Model Description (Salinity Module of the CRSS RiverWare™ Model) 11
B.2 Input data 11
B.3 Calibration 12
B.4 Limitations 12
C. Reservoir Modeling Using CE-QUAL-W2 - Model Description 13
C.1 CE-QUAL-W2 Model Description 13
C.1.1 Model Capabilities & Limitations 13
C.1.2 Bathymetry 13
C.1.3 Input Data 14
C.1.4 Model Calibration 14
C.2 Lake Powell Historic Water Quality Model 14
C.2.1 General Description 14
C.2.2 Lake Powell Bathymetry 14
C.2.3 Lake Powell Model Assumptions 16
C.2.4 Lake Powell Model Calibration 17
D. Lake Powell Pipeline Models Water Quality Simulations 22
D.1 Models Descriptions 22
D.1.1 Relation to CRSS Model 22
D.1.2 No Action Water Quality Model 23
D.1.3 86,000 Acre-Feet Pipeline Diversion Water Quality Model 23
D.2 Model Inputs 24

D.3 Model Calibration 26
E. Water Quality Results 27
E.1.1 Lake Powell 27
E.1.2 Glen Canyon Dam Releases 29
E.1.3 TDS downstream of Glen Canyon Dam 33
F. Bibliography 37

Tables

Table A-1: Glen Canyon Dam Release –Monthly Simulated Mean Temperatures, 2041-2060 6
Table A-2: Glen Canyon Dam Release – Simulated October Temperatures, 2041-2060 7
Table C-1: Lake Powell Historic Model Temperature Calibration – Reservoir Profiles 18
Table C-2: Lake Powell Historic Model TDS Calibration – Reservoir Profiles 19
Table C-3: Lake Powell Historic Model Dissolved Oxygen Calibration – Reservoir Profiles 21
Table D-1: Lake Powell Pipeline Model Annual Inflow 24
Table E-1: Glen Canyon Dam Release –Monthly Simulated Mean Temperatures, 2041-2060 30
Table E-2: Glen Canyon Dam Release – Simulated October Temperatures, 2041-2060 31

Figures

Figure A-1: Lake Powell Pipeline Models – Release TDS, 2041-2060 8
Figure A-2: Lake Powell Pipeline Models – Dissolved Oxygen Release, 2041-2060 8
Figure A-3: CRSS DNF results – TDS below Lake Mead, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2020-2060 9
Figure A-4: CRSS DNF results – TDS below Lake Havasu, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2020-2060 10
Figure A-5: CRSS DNF results – TDS above Imperial, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2020-2060 10
Figure C-1: Lake Powell Bathymetry - Top View 15
Figure C-2: Lake Powell Bathymetry - Side View 16
Figure C-3: Lake Powell Historic Model Temperature Calibration – Reservoir Release 18
Figure C-4: Lake Powell Historic Model TDS Calibration – Reservoir Release 20
Figure D-1: Trace 59 Pool Elevation 2041-2060, CRSS NAD Model Results 23
Figure D-2: Lake Powell Pipeline Water Quality Models – Monthly Outflow Volume . **Error! Bookmark not defined.**25
Figure E-1: Lake Powell Evaluation Locations 28
Figure E-2: Lake Powell Pipeline Models – Release TDS, 2041-2060 32
Figure E-3: Lake Powell Pipeline Models – Dissolved Oxygen Release, 2041-2060 33
Figure E-4: CRSS DNF results – TDS below Lake Powell, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2041-2060 34
Figure E-5: CRSS DNF results – TDS below Lake Mead, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2041-2060 35
Figure E-6: CRSS DNF results – TDS below Lake Havasu, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2041-2060 35
Figure E-7: CRSS DNF results – TDS above Imperial, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2041-2060 36

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

A. Executive Summary - Lake Powell Pipeline Water Quality Modeling Documentation

Computer modeling was utilized to evaluate potential effects of the proposed Lake Powell Pipeline on temperature, total dissolved solids (TDS), and other water quality parameters. This section summarizes the water quality models and results. Detailed descriptions of the models, methods, and results are found in the Sections B through F.

A.1 Model Descriptions

The CRSS and Lake Powell CE-QUAL-W2 models were used to simulate water quality parameters in and below Lake Powell for the No Action, and 86,000 acre-feet pipeline diversion, scenarios.

A.1.1 CRSS: Salinity Modeling

The CRSS Model is a rule-based simulation of operations in the Colorado River Basin based in the Riverware™ Modeling framework developed by CADSWES at the University of Colorado at Boulder. The version of the CRSS Model that was used for the hydrological and operational simulations of the Lake Powell Pipeline was also used to simulate salinity, or TDS, in the Colorado River Basin. The salinity model routes salinity through major stream reaches and seven reservoirs (Flaming Gorge, Starvation, Navajo, Powell, Mead, Mohave, and Havasu) in the Colorado River Basin. The model is intended for long-term simulations of salinity (15-20 years).

The model simulated the period 2015 to 2060 using direct natural flow (DNF) inflow. In the DNF scenario the historic record 1906-2010 was used to generate 105 simulations of the period 2015 to 2060.

A.1.2 CE-QUAL-W2: Water Quality Modeling

CE-QUAL-W2 is a water quality model developed by the US Army Corps of Engineers for simulating hydrodynamics and water quality in long, narrow waterbodies such as reservoirs. The Lake Powell CE-QUAL-W2 Model calibrated to the historic time period 1989-2010 was used as the base for simulations of the Lake Powell Pipeline. The model simulates temperature, TDS, dissolved oxygen, nutrients, and algae in the reservoir and releases from Glen Canyon Dam.

The CE-QUAL-W2 simulations used results from the CRSS DNF hydrology simulations as inputs for tributary inflows and dam outflows in the water quality model scenarios. One of the 105 CRSS DNF hydrology simulations was selected to determine these inputs. From the simulation period 2015 to 2060 the years 2039 to 2060 were selected to use directly in the CE-QUAL-W2 model. This period was selected because the simulation years 2039 to 2060 corresponded to the natural flow years 1989-2010. This allowed other CE-QUAL-W2 inputs such as meteorology to use historical data.

A.2 Results

The water quality result from the pipeline diversion scenario was compared to the no action scenario to determine effects, if any, on water quality. Water quality modeling results included temperature and dissolved oxygen in Lake Powell at 3 locations, temperature, TDS, and dissolved oxygen below Glen Canyon Dam from the CE-QUAL-W2 modeling, and TDS along the Lower Colorado River from the CRSS

modeling. Other water quality parameters were simulated by the CE-QUAL-W2 model including nutrients and phytoplankton but quantitative results are not presented for these parameters.

A.2.1 Lake Powell

Lake Powell temperature and dissolved oxygen concentrations were evaluated at five day intervals for three reservoir locations and five depths. The three locations are above the dam, below the confluence of the San Juan River, and the upstream reservoir. The five depths were 5, 10, 25, 50, and 100 (except for the upper most location near Bullfrog) meters.

Simulated reservoir temperatures in the 86K pipeline simulation was compared with the no action simulation and were not different, on average, at depths above 10 meters and were 0.1-.2°C colder at depths greater than 10 meters.

Simulated reservoir dissolved oxygen concentration in the 86K pipeline simulation was compared with the no action simulation and was the same down to 10 meters, 0.1 mg/L lower at 25, 0.2 mg/L at 50 meters and 0.1 mg/L higher at 100 meters near the dam.

A.2.2 Glen Canyon Dam

Modeled release results from Glen Canyon Dam for the no action and 86K pipeline simulations were evaluated for effects on temperature, TDS, and dissolved oxygen concentrations.

Simulated mean dam release temperatures for the period 2041 to 2060 are shown in Table A-1 by month. Generally in the 86K pipeline scenario dam release temperatures are slightly colder in winter and spring months and slightly warmer in summer and fall months compared with the no action scenario.

Table A-1: Glen Canyon Dam Release –Monthly Simulated Mean Temperatures, 2041-2060

Month	NA	86K
January	9.48	9.43
February	8.44	8.40
March	8.40	8.39
April	8.90	8.94
May	9.74	9.88
June	10.50	10.69
July	11.16	11.40
August	11.87	12.41
September	12.16	12.46
October	12.32	12.60
November	12.04	12.22
December	11.18	11.20

Glen Canyon Dam release temperatures often peak in October and simulated results for that month (Table E-2) show that when the reservoir is at or near full pool elevations, temperature releases from the dam in the pipeline scenarios were slightly warmer than in the no action scenario. Simulated release temperatures in the pipeline scenario were also warmer than the no action scenario during

summer and fall. The largest differences between the pipeline scenario and the no action scenario coincided with the lowest reservoir pool elevations.

Table A-2: Glen Canyon Dam Release – Simulated October Temperatures, 2041-2060

Month	NA	86K
Oct-41	11.67	11.89
Oct -42	11.60	11.81
Oct-43	11.59	11.92
Oct-44	11.39	11.61
Oct-45	12.74	13.17
Oct-46	10.41	10.56
Oct-47	10.75	10.91
Oct-48	10.36	10.43
Oct-49	10.89	11.02
Oct-50	10.24	10.37
Oct-51	9.78	9.91
Oct-52	11.19	11.31
Oct-53	13.73	13.87
Oct-54	16.93	17.58
Oct-55	15.45	15.91
Oct-56	14.34	14.45
Oct-57	13.46	13.98
Oct-58	13.40	13.76
Oct-59	13.09	13.45
Oct-60	13.39	14.03
Average	**12.32**	**12.60**

TDS results from the no action, and 86K pipeline models are shown in Figure A-1. Overall, the average release TDS concentrations from 2041-2060 for the results of the two models are less than 1 mg/L of each other. The 86K pipeline average TDS is slightly lower than the no action average.



Figure A-1: Lake Powell Pipeline Models – Release TDS, 2041-2060

Dissolved oxygen results from the no action and 86K pipeline models are shown in Figure A-2. Overall, the average release dissolved oxygen concentrations from 2041-2060 for the results of the models are basically the same. The 86K pipeline average dissolved oxygen concentrations slightly higher than the no action average.



Figure A-2: Lake Powell Pipeline Models – Dissolved Oxygen Release, 2041-2060

A.2.3 Lower Colorado River – Salinity

Numeric criteria for salinity have been established for salinity at three sites on the Lower Colorado River: below Hoover Dam, below Parker Dam, and above Imperial Dam. The criteria at each of these sites are 723 mg/L, 749 mg/L, and 879 mg/L respectively. The results of salinity modeling from the CRSS DNF hydrology and operations model comparing the no action alternative with the 86,000 acre-feet pipeline diversion alternative at these three sites are shown in Figure A-3, Figure A-4, and Figure A-5, respectively. In each case no appreciable differences are found at the 90th, 50th, or 10th percentile levels.



Figure A-3: CRSS DNF results – TDS below Lake Mead, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2041-2060



Figure A-4: CRSS DNF results – TDS below Lake Havasu, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2041-2060



Figure A-5: CRSS DNF results – TDS above Imperial, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2041-2060

B. Salinity Modeling Using the Salinity Module of the CRSS RiverWare™ Model - Model and Approach Description

B.1 Model Description (Salinity Module of the CRSS RiverWare™ Model)

Salinity is the only water quality parameter modeled in CRSS. It is modeled as a conservative substance; therefore, dissolution and precipitation are not modeled. As with the hydrology component, salinity is modeled at a monthly time step and both reservoir and reach objects are assumed fully mixed over the month; thereby, requiring no lagging algorithms to route salt.

Seven of the twelve reservoirs (Flaming Gorge, Starvation, Navajo, Powell, Mead, Mohave, and Havasu) are represented in CRSS model salinity. The reservoirs Flaming Gorge, Navajo, Powell, Mead, and Mohave use a Huen or Predictor-Corrector numerical method to route salinity through the reservoirs. The reservoirs Starvation and Havasu use a weighting method developed by Reclamation that facilities routing salinity in a reservoir that has a small storage to inflow ratio. Under this scenario standard numeric methods, such as the Huen method, can become numerically unstable. Both methods assume the reservoirs are fully mixed at a monthly time step. Flaming Gorge, Powell, and Mead include salinity in their bank storage computation. Water flows into the bank at the current time step concentration and fully mixes with the “bank” water. Water flows out of the “bank” at the current time step “bank” concentration.

Salt can enter the river system from either a natural source, salt loading resulting from irrigated agriculture return flows, or from flows imported into the system. Salt can leave the system from flows exported out of the system. Additionally, water quality improvement projects represent salt prevented from entering the system as the result of salinity control measures.

B.2 Input data

The CRSS salinity component requires several salinity specific data inputs. These include natural salinity at 24 nodes throughout the Colorado River System, future levels of salt loading resulting from agriculture, the concentration of exported and imported flows, future levels of salinity control, and initial reservoir salinity concentrations.

Salinity associated with the available natural flow data (described in Section 3.3) is computed with a single site salinity model (Prairie, Rajagopalan, Fulp, & Zagona, 2005). This model uses a nonparametric regression method based on local polynomial estimation, which describes the variability of salt mass as a function of flow. The model is defined as: natural salt mass = f(natural streamflow) The main feature is that the function f is estimated locally. The implementation steps are as follows.

1) At any value of the streamflow, say x*, K-nearest neighbors (K-NN) are identified from the observations.

2) To the K-NN a polynomial of order p is fit.

3) The fitted polynomial is then used to estimate the salt mass corresponding to the streamflow x*.

The number of nearest neighbors (K) and the order of polynomial p are estimated for the observed data using objective criteria, Generalized Cross Validation (GCV). The local estimation of the function f

provides the capability to capture any arbitrary features (linear or nonlinear) that might be present in the data; besides, this obviates making any assumptions as to the underlying form of the function f (linear in the case of traditional linear regression approach).

Natural salt mass, required in compute the flow-salt regressions, is computed by removing anthropogenic influences (upstream reservoir regulation, salt loading from agriculture return flows, and salt removed with exports) affecting salt from observed historic data. The 9 Lower Basin gauges were modeled based on 1971-2010 natural salt mass data. Once the monthly regression relationships were determined for each gauge the associated natural salt for the natural flows from 1906-2010 are computed.

B.3 Calibration

To ensure the regressions properly capture the flow-salt relationship the regressions used to determine natural salt based on the 1971-1995 natural flows is input in a CRSS based model. The model is run with historic data representing salt loading from agriculture, concentration of exported flows, levels of salinity control, and initial reservoir salinity concentrations for the time period 1971-1995. If the simulated historic salinity concentrations below Powell and above Imperial Dam compare well with the actual historic salinity at these locations the model is properly calibrated (Prairie & Callejo, 2005).

B.4 Limitations

Since the regression relationship between flow and salt is based on post-1971 values future projections are limited to simulating the post-1971 flow and salt relationship. A changing relationship cannot be modeled.

Limited data is available describing the monthly salt loading resulting from agriculture. Annual estimates are disaggregated for modeling purposes and monthly salinity results are typically aggregated to an annual time step before analysis of results. The variability of annual salt loading resulting from agriculture is not well understood; therefore, the annual estimate is held constant over all years. This assumption forces the variability in agricultural salt loading to be back computed into the natural salt mass. Therefore, it is important to recognize that the natural salt mass, as well as the natural flow, is NOT only what would naturally have occurred throughout the basin without anthropogenic effects. It also incorporates the error in any assumptions or in the accuracy of our estimates of the anthropogenic effects that we removed from the historic gauge records.

Lastly, the CRSS salinity component is generally intended for long-term modeling (15-20 years) and reservoir salinity is highly sensitive to initial reservoir conditions for the first 10-12 years. More accurately determining initial reservoir conditions will greatly improve the accuracy of the first 10-12 years of results. After these first 10-12 years the initial conditions have minimal impact on model results.

C. Reservoir Modeling Using CE-QUAL-W2 - Model Description

C.1 CE-QUAL-W2 Model Description

CE-QUAL-W2 is a two dimensional, longitudinal/vertical, hydrodynamic, and water quality model. The model assumes lateral homogeneity and, therefore, is best suited for relatively long and narrow water bodies exhibiting longitudinal and vertical water quality gradients (Cole & Wells, 2003). Development and evolution of CE-QUAL-W2 has spanned three decades. The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE), J.E. Edinger and Associates (Edinger), and Dr. Scott Wells at Portland State have been the major developers in recent years. CE-QUAL-W2 version 3.6 was used for this analysis.

C.1.1 Model Capabilities & Limitations

The CE-QUAL-W2 model is capable of predicting water surface elevations, velocities, temperatures, and a number of water quality constituents. Water is routed through cells in a computational grid in which each grid cell is completely mixed at time step. Geometrically complex water bodies can be represented through multiple branches and cells. Multiple inflows and outflows to the water body are represented through point/nonpoint sources, branches, precipitation, and other methods. Tools for modeling hydraulic structures such as spillways and pipes are available. Output from the model provides options for detailed and convenient analyses.

Several assumptions and approximations are made in the model in order to simulate hydrodynamics, transport, and water quality processes. The model solves for gradients in the longitudinal and vertical directions but assumes lateral gradients are negligible. This assumption may be inappropriate for water bodies with significant lateral variations. Turbulence is modeled through eddy coefficients of which the user must decide which scheme is most appropriate for an application. Vertical momentum is not explicitly modeled and in water bodies with significant vertical acceleration results may be inaccurate. Water quality processes are extremely complex and the model uses simplified approaches to reach solutions.

C.1.2 Bathymetry

A CE-QUAL-W2 model uses the bathymetry, or depth measurements describing the shape and volume of a waterbody to create a computational grid. The computational grid is a two-dimensional numeric representation of a water body. The two dimensions represented are the longitudinal and vertical dimensions, or the length and depth of a water body which are divided into longitudinal segments and vertical layers. The lateral dimension, or width, is not represented in the grid but an average width is computed and used to determine volume. Since the model grid is two-dimensional it assumes that modeled parameters do not vary significantly in the lateral direction. This assumption has been found appropriate in relatively long and narrow water bodies.

The components of the grid are, from smallest to largest, cells, segments, branches, and water bodies. The cell is a single vertical layer within a single segment. Segments consist of one or more cells, branches are one or more longitudinal segments, and a water body is one or more branches. A computational grid represents dimensions from a single water body.

The volume of the grid is computed by multiplying a cell's length, thickness, and width. The sum of all cells within the grid is then the total storage for the water body. The computational grid storage is compared to actual storage-capacity values to verify the model bathymetry accuracy.

C.1.3 Input Data

Applications of the CE-QUAL-W2 model rely on the quality and availability of input data. Typical input data required for model applications include meteorological, inflow and outflow, water temperature, water quality, and calibration data. These data most often determine the accuracy and usefulness of an application.

C.1.4 Model Calibration

Model calibration involves comparing field observed data to modeled, or predicted, results. The observed values are typically vertical profile and reservoir discharge observations for temperature and other water quality parameters. Calibration statistics are generated by computing the absolute mean error (AME). This computation is the sum of the absolute value of the model predicted value minus the field observed value, which is then divided by the total number of observations. This describes, on average, the difference between predicted and observed values.

Model calibration involves several model iterations during which model parameters and assumptions are evaluated and adjusted to achieve a better match with observed data. Model calibration is confirmed by testing the results of adjustments to model parameters and assumptions under various conditions which the water body is subject to such as hydrologic and meteorological variations.

C.2 Lake Powell Historic Water Quality Model

This section describes the Lake Powell application of the CE-QUAL-W2 model including the bathymetry, inputs, assumptions, and calibration. This model simulates historic conditions at Lake Powell for the period 1990 through 2008 and is calibrated and verified with observed field data for the same time period. To differentiate between this Lake Powell model and other models used in the evaluation of the Lake Powell Pipeline this model will be referred to as the Lake Powell historic water quality model, or historic model, from this point forward.

C.2.1 General Description

The Lake Powell historic model simulates hydrodynamics including reservoir discharges, temperature, salinity, dissolved oxygen, phytoplankton and the decay of organic matter. The model uses a geometric, computational grid and various input data to simulate these processes. The grid is discussed in the following section. Input data describe meteorological conditions, inflows, outflows, and water quality parameters. Meteorological data are collected from Page, Arizona and Hanksville, Utah. Gaged streamflow records from the Colorado River (combination of the Colorado, Green, and San Rafael Rivers), San Juan River, and the Dirty Devil River are used to represent reservoir inflows. For inflows where little or no data is available estimates are made. Records of discharges from Glen Canyon Dam represent reservoir outflow. Water quality data from major tributaries, where available, represent inflow water quality. These datasets have been collected from the Bureau of Reclamation, United States Geological Survey, National Park Service - Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, National Climatic Data Center, and Utah and Arizona state and local agency records.

C.2.2 Lake Powell Bathymetry

Bathymetry for Lake Powell is available from topographic maps of the reservoir area which were created prior to its filling. The National Park Service – Glen Canyon National Recreation Area converted these maps to digital format and the digital maps were used to create the computational grid of the Lake Powell historic model. To account for sediment accumulation in the reservoir basin modifications were made to the computational grid based on the most recent reservoir sediment survey conducted by the

Bureau of Reclamation in 1986 (Ferrari, 1988). The grid is composed of 9 branches, 90 segments, and 97 layers. Each layer in the grid is 1.75 meters thick. Branches 1 through 9 represent the following channels and/or bays of the reservoir:

1. Main (Colorado River) channel
2. Bullfrog Bay
3. Escalante River channel
4. San Juan River channel
5. Rock Creek Bay
6. Last Chance Bay
7. Warm Creek Bay
8. Navajo Canyon
9. Wahweap Bay

Figure C-1 is a diagram of the Lake Powell model bathymetry showing a top view of the computational grid. Branches 1 through are visible in this view. The diagram is color coded to indicate the upstream (green) and downstream (blue) segments of each branch and the confluence segment of a tributary branch (red). Figure C-2 is a diagram of branch 1 of the Lake Powell model bathymetry as shown from the side. This view depicts the individual segments and layers in the branch.



Figure C-1: Lake Powell Bathymetry - Top View



Figure C-2: Lake Powell Bathymetry - Side View

C.2.3 Lake Powell Model Assumptions

Several assumptions are inherent in the Lake Powell historic model and other assumptions are made to connect different data sets and to produce more accurate results. The input data used in the model are the best available and are assumed to be accurate representations of meteorology, flow, and water quality parameters. Additional assumptions, described below, may also affect model accuracy and reliability.

C.2.3.1 Meteorological Conditions

Meteorological conditions are represented in the model by temperature, dewpoint, and wind data measured at Page, Arizona and cloud cover measured at Hanksville, Utah. Data from these sources are combined into one dataset to represent meteorological conditions for the entire reservoir. Although meteorological conditions likely vary across the reservoir the model assumes the conditions are the same at all times and locations.

C.2.3.2 Water Balance

The model is calibrated to reproduce observed water surface elevations on the reservoir. This involves comparing modeled water surface elevations with observed water surface elevations. The difference between the two observations is the error in the water balance and represents elements of the water budget which are not directly measured and are difficult to estimate. To minimize this error an additional water input referred to as the distributed tributary is created. This is a derived input that calculates the volume required to balance the water budget, whether positive or negative. The distributed tributary represents estimated elements of Lake Powell's water budget such as precipitation, ungaged tributary inputs, bank storage, ground water, and other source/sinks. The model distributes this inflow (positive or negative) evenly across the top layer in the computational grid. Water quality constituent concentrations of distributed tributary gains to the reservoir are assumed to match Colorado River inflow concentrations.

C.2.3.3 Sediment Delta Interactions

Over the life of Lake Powell sediment deltas have accumulated at the mouths of major and minor tributaries. Deposition and scour of these deltas creates interactions which effect reservoir water quality parameters such as dissolved oxygen, nutrients, plankton, and more. The CE-QUAL-W2 model does not explicitly model these interactions. This is on the edge of modeling and data gathering technology at this time. The interactions are either not represented or an alternate approach is used to model them. The impacts of these interactions on water quality in the reservoir are not insignificant and until the approaches used are studied further the modeled results for dissolved oxygen, nutrients, and plankton are considered qualitative.

C.2.3.4 Code Modifications

The version of CE-QUAL-W2 used for the Lake Powell historic model is version 3.6 with a modification of the model source code. Reclamation contracted Environmental Resources Management, Inc. (ERM) to assist in code modification of the CE-QUAL-W2 model. The modifications were implemented to improve thermal and chemical calibration of the Lake Powell historic model as well as other Reclamation applications of the CE-QUAL-W2 model. The specific modification allows for a time-varying adjustment to the evaporative wind speed coefficients in the CE-QUAL-W2 model (Cole & Wells, 2003). In the Lake Powell historic model the coefficients are varied by month and the monthly coefficients are repeated for each year in the simulation. The resulting thermal and chemical calibration of the Lake Powell historic model improved following the code modification and monthly adjustment of evaporative wind speed coefficients (Williams, 2007). Evaporation totals were compared with Reclamation estimated monthly evaporation values as a calibration check.

C.2.4 Lake Powell Model Calibration

The Lake Powell historic model is continuously being updated and calibrated as additional years are added to the simulation period and as model methods improve. The Lake Powell historic model used in this application is calibrated for temperature and total dissolved solids for the period 1990-2008. Calibrations results for dissolved oxygen are also presented, but as mentioned previously, these are considered qualitative. Calibration results and statistics were determined by comparing predicted results with observed data from 20 reservoir locations and for discharges from the dam. Observed data have been collected by several agencies over the life of the reservoir (Vernieu W. , 2009). The AME statistic is used specifically to evaluate model calibration. Calibration efforts for other water quality parameters such as nutrients and algae still continue and modeled results for these parameters are qualitative only.

C.2.4.1 Temperature Calibration

Temperature calibration of the historic model compares modeled temperature results to observed reservoir profile and release data. Calibrations statistics for reservoir profiles are shown for 20 reservoir locations in Table C-1. The number of profiles collected at each location from 1990 through 2008 is also given in the table. The AME of the temperature profiles is 0.78°C. The model calibration for reservoir temperatures has, on average, a 4% error when compared with the typical variation in surface temperatures at Wahweap of 7 to 26°C. Modeled and observed reservoir release temperatures are displayed in Figure C-3. The AME of the reservoir release temperatures is 0.45°C. Compared with the historical variation of 7 to 16°C during the modeled time period the model calibration for reservoir releases has, on average, a 5% error.

Table C-1: Lake Powell Historic Model Temperature Calibration – Reservoir Profiles

Station	AME	Profiles
Forebay (CR0.5)	0.76	18
Wahweap (CR2.4)	0.59	210
Romano Narrows (CR23.7)	0.42	9
Crossing of the Fathers (CR45.3)	0.52	73
Oak (CR90.5)	0.59	71
San Juan Confluence (CR100.1)	0.60	50
Escalante (CR116.9)	0.65	65
Iceberg (CR139.5)	0.66	53
Lake (CR158.7)	0.75	51
Bullfrog (CR169.2)	0.83	64
Moki (CR177.2)	0.75	49
Knowles (CR193.3)	0.85	51
Lower Good Hope Bay (CR208.5)	1.05	63
Scorup (CR225.5)	1.20	65
Hite Basin (CR238.7)	1.32	63
Cha Canyon (SJR19.3)	0.60	62
Lower Piute Bay (SJR32.9)	0.73	55
Upper Piute Bay (SJR43.1)	0.89	60
Alcove Canyon (SJR53.0)	1.58	15
Lower Zahn Bay (SJR62.5)	1.15	40
Average	**0.78**	



Figure C-3: Lake Powell Historic Model Temperature Calibration – Reservoir Release

C.2.4.2 Total Dissolved Solids Calibration

Total dissolved solids (TDS) calibration of the historic model compares modeled TDS results to observed reservoir profile and release data. Calibrations statistics for reservoir profiles are shown for 20 reservoir locations in Table C-2. The AME of the TDS profiles is 32 mg/L. The model calibration for reservoir TDS concentration has, on average, an 8% error when compared with the typical variation in TDS concentrations at Wahweap of 300 to 700 mg/L. Modeled and observed reservoir release TDS concentrations are displayed in Figure C-4. The AME of the reservoir release TDS concentrations is 18 mg/L. Compared with the historical variation of 400 to 600 mg/L during the modeled time period the model calibration for reservoir releases has, on average, a 9% error.

Table C-2: Lake Powell Historic Model TDS Calibration – Reservoir Profiles

Station	AME	Profiles
Forebay (CR0.5)	32	19
Wahweap (CR2.4)	25	211
Romano Narrows (CR23.7)	22	9
Crossing of the Fathers (CR45.3)	20	72
Oak (CR90.5)	25	71
San Juan Confluence (CR100.1)	27	50
Escalante (CR116.9)	27	65
Iceberg (CR139.5)	31	53
Lake (CR158.7)	33	51
Bullfrog (CR169.2)	32	64
Moki (CR177.2)	38	49
Knowles (CR193.3)	42	51
Lower Good Hope Bay (CR208.5)	44	53
Scorup (CR225.5)	52	65
Hite Basin (CR238.7)	56	63
Cha Canyon (SJR19.3)	26	62
Lower Piute Bay (SJR32.9)	25	55
Upper Piute Bay (SJR43.1)	28	60
Alcove Canyon (SJR53.0)	31	15
Lower Zahn Bay (SJR62.5)	37	40
Average	**32**	



Figure C-4: Lake Powell Historic Model TDS Calibration – Reservoir Release

C.2.4.3 Dissolved Oxygen Calibration

The dissolved oxygen calibration is still in its initial stages of development and is of limited value for use in the Lake Powell Pipeline water quality studies. An empirical method was used to represent the processes affecting dissolved oxygen concentrations in the reservoir (Williams, 2007). The AME of the dissolved oxygen profiles is 1.2 mg/L. The model error for dissolved oxygen is, on average, 15% when compared with the typical variation in dissolved oxygen at Wahweap of 2 to 10 mg/L. Model prediction of dissolved oxygen is expected to be improved with further refinement of the empirical method. Dissolved oxygen is not shown for dam releases because the available observed dissolved oxygen data are collected from below the hydropower turbines in the dam. Hydropower generation at Glen Canyon Dam results in increased dissolved oxygen and a comparison of modeled and historic release dissolved oxygen values for calibration is not possible.

Table C-3: Lake Powell Historic Model Dissolved Oxygen Calibration – Reservoir Profiles

Station	AME	Profiles
Forebay (CR0.5)	1.18	19
Wahweap (CR2.4)	1.23	213
Romano Narrows (CR23.7)	0.95	9
Crossing of the Fathers (CR45.3)	1.19	73
Oak (CR90.5)	1.18	71
San Juan Confluence (CR100.1)	1.29	50
Escalante (CR116.9)	1.22	65
Iceberg (CR139.5)	1.23	53
Lake (CR158.7)	1.15	51
Bullfrog (CR169.2)	1.11	65
Moki (CR177.2)	1.19	49
Knowles (CR193.3)	1.25	51
Lower Good Hope Bay (CR208.5)	1.11	63
Scorup (CR225.5)	1.04	65
Hite Basin (CR238.7)	0.99	63
Cha Canyon (SJR19.3)	1.31	62
Lower Piute Bay (SJR32.9)	1.31	55
Upper Piute Bay (SJR43.1)	1.27	60
Alcove Canyon (SJR53.0)	1.84	15
Lower Zahn Bay (SJR62.5)	1.44	40
Average	**1.21**	

D. Lake Powell Pipeline Models Water Quality Simulations

Water quality effects from the proposed Lake Powell Pipeline on Lake Powell and the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam were evaluated using the CE-QUAL-W2 hydrodynamic and water quality model which was described in Section C.1 above. The two scenarios which were evaluated for effects on water quality were the No Action and an 86,000 Acre-Feet Diversion scenario.

D.1 Models Descriptions

The Lake Powell Pipeline water quality models were based from the Lake Powell historic model for calibrated model parameters. The historic model was described in Section C.2 above. For each scenario a single water quality model was developed. Each model simulates the same time period and includes the same set of inputs and assumptions except for reservoir outflows, pipeline diversion volumes, and resulting effects on reservoir elevations, releases, and system storage operation. In this way the effects of the proposed pipeline can be isolated and compared with the No Action, or zero pipeline depletion, scenario.

D.1.1 Relation to CRSS Model

Simulating the hydrology and operations of Lake Powell required using results from the Colorado River Simulation System (CRSS) modeling, specifically the No Additional Depletions (NAD) simulations. These results provided monthly reservoir inflow, outflow, pool elevation, and pipeline diversions for the water quality models. The CRSS NAD modeling consisted of a future inflow hydrology scenario, direct natural flow by the Index Sequential Method. This scenario and the results from the CRSS modeling are described in detail in "Lake Powell Pipeline Hydrologic Modeling: No Additional Depletions Sensitivity Analysis" (Grantz, 2015).

CRSS results from the direct natural flow simulations were used because the water quality models are based from the Lake Powell historic water quality model. The reason for this is the direct natural flows in the CRSS simulations are taken from the historic record and correspond to the historic meteorological data used by the historic water quality model. By selecting the corresponding time period in a CRSS model trace the meteorological data from the Lake Powell historic model can be matched with the corresponding hydrology from the CRSS models. Trace 59 was selected from the 86,000 acre-feet and no action (zero diversion) CRSS NAD models to provide reservoir inflows, outflow, elevations, and pipeline diversions values for the water quality models. The time period 2041-2060 from the CRSS models was selected for the water quality simulations. This future period corresponds to the historic natural flows for the years 1991 to 2010. The year 2048 is the first year of full diversions for the pipeline at 86,000 acre-feet. The 2041-2060 Lake Powell pool elevations from the CRSS NAD model, Trace 59 are shown in Figure D-1. For reference, full pool elevation is 3,700 feet. As shown by the graph this time period covers a broad range of wet and dry conditions as reflected by Lake Powell pool elevations.



Figure D-1: Trace 59 Pool Elevation 2041-2060, CRSS NAD Model Results

D.1.2 No Action Water Quality Model

The Lake Powell no action water quality model, or no action model, simulates temperature and water quality in and below Lake Powell for the zero pipeline diversion, or no action, scenario from 2041-2060. The no action model uses the reservoir inflow, outflow, and pool elevation results from Trace 59 of the CRSS NAD direct natural flow no action simulation. This is the baseline model from which comparisons to the pipeline diversion, or action alternative, scenario was made.

D.1.3 86,000 Acre-Feet Pipeline Diversion Water Quality Model

The Lake Powell 86,000 acre-feet pipeline diversion water quality model, or 86K pipeline model, simulates temperature and water quality in and below Lake Powell and in the pipeline for the 86,000 acre-feet pipeline diversion scenario from 2041-2060. The 86K pipeline model uses the reservoir inflow, outflow, and pool elevation results from Trace 59 of the CRSS NAD direct natural flow 86,000 acre-feet depletion simulation. The 86K pipeline model simulates the diversion of 86,249 acre-feet from a location just upstream of Glen Canyon Dam for each year of the simulation. The model computational grid was modified by splitting the segment just above the dam into two segments. This modification allowed the outflow results for reservoir releases and pipeline diversions to be analyzed separately.

D.2 Model Inputs

The inputs for the no action and 86k pipeline models consist of meteorological data, tributary temperature and water quality, reservoir inflows, outflows, and reservoir initial conditions. The 86K pipeline model also includes input for the pipeline diversions.

Inputs for meteorological data and tributary temperature and water quality for all models were identical to historic model inputs for those parameters from 1991-2010.

Modeled reservoir inflows and outflows for the no action and 86K pipeline models were built from monthly results from corresponding CRSS model scenarios. Reservoir inflows for the two scenarios were identical in each month of the simulation. The inflows represent a drought period (2041-2042) followed by a wet period (2043-2050) followed by another drought period (2051-2054) and a wet period returning (2054-2060). The annual inflows are shown in Table D-1. Inflows were distributed between the Colorado River and San Juan River tributaries of Lake Powell. Daily inflows for the two major rivers were generated by using the ratio of CRSS monthly inflow volume and historic monthly inflow volume to adjust the historic daily inflow rate.

Table D-1: Lake Powell Pipeline Model Annual Inflow

Year	Inflow, AC-FT
2041	7,440,651
2042	6,523,804
2043	12,935,575
2044	6,340,859
2045	14,264,424
2046	10,224,118
2047	15,885,646
2048	12,060,282
2049	10,722,330
2050	7,079,898
2051	6,276,681
2052	3,590,217
2053	6,604,103
2054	5,681,958
2055	11,310,336
2056	9,113,519
2057	7,254,431
2058	10,577,429
2059	9,661,871
2060	8,588,572

Monthly outflow volumes were converted to monthly average outflow rates for dam discharges. Monthly outflow volumes between the two scenarios only differed during equalization operations. In these cases the pipeline scenario released slightly less water as illustrated in Figure D-2.



Figure D-2: Lake Powell Pipeline Water Quality Models – Monthly Outflow Volume

Reservoir initial conditions in the model included pool elevation, temperature, TDS, and dissolved oxygen. The initial pool elevation of each model was set as the December 31, 2038 pool elevation from each corresponding CRSS model. In all models the initial temperature was set at 8°C, the initial TDS concentration was set at 400 mg/L, and the initial dissolved oxygen concentration was set at 8 mg/L. These values were determined from the modeler's best estimate of January conditions if the entire reservoir were completely mixed. The reservoir does not often completely mix, however, and initial conditions can influence model results. To account for this the first two years of each model are intended to reset the reservoir to more representative thermal and water quality conditions. For these reasons model results from the first two years are not considered in the analyses (2039-2040).

The pipeline intakes are represented in the model by withdrawals at three elevations: 3,575 feet, 3,475 feet, and 3,375 feet. The operation of the intakes assumes water is withdrawn from the upper 100 feet of the lake and only a single intake is used for the withdrawals. The operation of the intakes is, therefore, determined by reservoir pool elevation. The upper intake is operated for reservoir pool elevations between 3,711 and 3,600 feet, the middle intake is operated between 3,600 and 3,500 feet, and the lower intake is operated between 3,400 and 3,500 feet.

The schedule for the 86,000 acre feet pipeline diversion scenario breaks the diversion down into a monthly volume and shows that the 86,000 acre-feet diversion reaches capacity in 2048 (see Attachment A). Pipeline maintenance is scheduled for the first 15 days in January of each year. The pipeline diversion input for the 86K pipeline model was converted from the monthly volume used in the CRSS models to average daily flow rates which result in the same daily flow rate each day of the year. Leap years are accounted for by leaving the daily flow rate unchanged and assuming an additional day that the pipeline is offline in January. This results in slightly different monthly diversion volumes for January and February in leap years but does not affect model results.

D.3 Model Calibration

Prior to evaluating results from the water quality model simulations several iterations of the model are done to calibrate the reservoir pool elevations. The process calibrates the water quality model generated reservoir pool elevations with the CRSS monthly pool elevations. Following several iterations the absolute mean error in reservoir pool elevations of the no action and 86K pipeline was approximately 0.1 meters.

E. Water Quality Results

Water quality results are provided from the CRSS modeling for TDS and from the CE-QUAL-W2 modeling for temperature, TDS, and dissolved oxygen. Since dissolved oxygen is influenced by a number of water quality parameters including nutrients, organic matter, phytoplankton, and biological interactions it is assumed to be representative of effects on reservoir water quality in general. The two action alternatives for pipeline diversions are evaluated against the no action alternative for effects of the action alternatives on Lake Powell and on releases from Glen Canyon Dam. Results from the water quality models do not include the first two simulated years (2039 & 2040) since these years are simulated to establish representative thermal and water quality conditions in the reservoir. TDS results from CRSS modeling also include evaluation at locations downstream of Glen Canyon Dam where numeric criteria for TDS have been established.

E.1.1 Lake Powell

Lake Powell temperature and water quality concentrations were evaluated at five day intervals for three reservoir locations and five depths. The three locations are all in the Colorado River channel of the reservoir and are specifically above the dam, below the confluence of the San Juan River, and above Bullfrog Bay (see Figure E-1). These locations represent the downstream reservoir (above the dam), interactions from the confluence of the major tributaries (below the confluence of the San Juan River), and the upstream reservoir (above Bullfrog Bay). The five depths provide information about the top, warm layer of water known as the epilimnion; the middle layer which transitions from the top, warm layer to the bottom, cold layer and is known as the metalimnion or thermocline; and the bottom, cold layer known as the hypolimnion. The five depths are 0, 10, 25, 50, and 100 meters (0, 33, 82, 164, and 328 feet) as measured from the water surface at each location. Above Bullfrog Bay only includes four depths since it is not 100 meters deep.



Figure E-1: Lake Powell Evaluation Locations

E.1.1.1 Temperature

Simulated reservoir temperatures were compared for the no action and the 86K pipeline models at the several reservoir locations and depths. Compared with the no action the reservoir temperatures are, on average, 0.1°C colder at depths greater than 25 meters in the 86K pipeline alternative. The pipeline diverts water from the upper 30 meters (100 feet) in the reservoir which reduces the volume of warmer water in the reservoir. The modeled results for each scenario are found in Attachment B.

The differences in reservoir temperatures are very small and are actually less than the instrument accuracy of typical temperature sensors used to measure in situ water temperature. For example the YSI 6560 temperature sensor manufactured by YSI Incorporated has an accuracy of +/- 0.15°C (YSI Inc.). The Hydrolab temperature sensor manufactured by Hach® has an accuracy of +/- 0.10 °C (Hach Environmental).

E.1.1.2 Dissolved Oxygen

Results for dissolved oxygen are included for the purpose of assessing effects to reservoir water quality other than TDS. As discussed in previous sections dissolved oxygen is influenced by many factors including sediment delta interactions which were not explicitly modeled but instead represented by an empirical method. There are significant uncertainties about the impact of these interactions on reservoir water quality as the reservoir ages and model simulations of water quality parameters such as dissolved oxygen provide limited information. However, the no action and 86K pipeline model have the same assumptions regarding water quality and comparison of the values provides information about the effects of the pipeline on reservoir water quality. The empirical method used to represent oxygen

demand assumes increased oxygen demand at lower reservoir pool elevations (Williams, 2007). This assumption is based on the conclusions of others (Vernieu, Hueftle, & Gloss, 2005).

Simulated reservoir dissolved oxygen concentrations at reservoir locations and depths were compared for the no action and, 86K pipeline models. Compared with the no action the reservoir dissolved oxygen concentrations near the dam are 0.1 mg/L lower at 25 meters, 0.2 mg/L lower at 50 meters and 0.1 mg/L higher at 100 meters, while at the other reservoir locations the dissolved oxygen differences are the same except around Bullfrog where at 50 meters it is 0.1 mg/L lower in the 86K pipeline alternative. Modeled results for each scenario are found in Attachment B.

The differences in dissolved oxygen concentrations are very small and, except for the reservoir bottom, are actually less than the instrument accuracy of typical dissolved oxygen sensors used to measure in situ dissolved oxygen. For example The ROX™ optical dissolved oxygen sensor has an accuracy of +/- 0.1 mg/L and the YSI 6562 Rapid Pulse dissolved oxygen sensor has an accuracy of +/- 0.2 mg/L (YSI Inc.). The Hach LDO™ dissolved oxygen sensor has an accuracy of +/- 0.1 mg/L (Hach Environmental).

E.1.2 Glen Canyon Dam Releases

Modeled release results from Glen Canyon Dam for the no action and 86K pipeline model were evaluated for effects on temperature, TDS, and dissolved oxygen concentrations. Nutrients such as phosphorus and nitrogen were part of the model simulation and results are discussed briefly. The evaluations used monthly flow-weighted means for data. A summary of modeled results for all parameters can be found in Attachment C. Results including detailed output from the no action and 86K pipeline model are included in Attachments G, and H respectively.

E.1.2.1 Temperature

Simulated dam release temperatures were compared for the no action and 86K pipeline models. Mean dam release temperatures for the period 2041 to 2060 are shown in Table E-1 by month. Generally in the 86K pipeline scenario dam release temperatures are slightly colder in winter and spring months and slightly warmer in summer and fall months compared with the no action scenario. The most extreme differences in modeled results compared with the no action occurred in August, 2057 where the 86K pipeline was 1.36°C warmer and in January, 2058 the 86K pipeline was 0.47°C colder.

Table E-1: Glen Canyon Dam Release –Monthly Simulated Mean Temperatures, 2041-2060

Month	NA	86K
January	9.48	9.43
February	8.44	8.40
March	8.40	8.39
April	8.90	8.94
May	9.74	9.88
June	10.50	10.69
July	11.16	11.40
August	11.87	12.14
September	12.16	12.46
October	12.32	12.60
November	12.04	12.22
December	11.18	11.20

The average temperature differences of the scenario is less than the measurement accuracy of current instrument technology (see Section E.1.1.1 above) but averaging the data also masks some variations. These variations show up in the summer and fall months and are best explained using modeled results. Glen Canyon Dam release temperatures often peak in October and simulated results for that month (Table E-2) show that the pipeline scenario to be warmer than results from the no action scenario. When the reservoir is fuller, (see Figure D-1), temperature releases in the pipeline scenario were closer to the temperature of the no action scenario. During these years releases in the pipeline scenario was closer than in the no action scenario for nearly every month, but the differences were generally very small.

Table E-2: Glen Canyon Dam Release – Simulated October Temperatures, 2041-2060

Month	NA	86K
Oct-41	11.67	11.89
Oct-42	11.60	11.81
Oct-43	11.59	11.92
Oct-44	11.39	11.61
Oct-45	12.74	13.17
Oct-46	10.41	10.56
Oct-47	10.75	10.91
Oct-48	10.36	10.43
Oct-49	10.89	11.02
Oct-50	10.24	10.37
Oct-51	9.78	9.91
Oct-52	11.19	11.31
Oct-53	13.73	13.87
Oct-54	16.93	17.58
Oct-55	15.45	15.91
Oct-56	14.34	14.45
Oct-57	13.46	13.98
Oct-58	13.40	13.76
Oct-59	13.09	13.45
Oct-60	13.39	14.03
Average	**12.32**	**12.60**

Simulated release temperatures in the pipeline scenario were warmer than in the no action scenario during summer and fall months and when reservoir pool elevations were not near full capacity. The largest differences between the pipeline scenario and the no action scenario coincided with the lowest reservoir pool elevations.

E.1.2.2 Total Dissolved Solids

The TDS results from the CE-QUAL-W2 water quality modeling provide detailed information about the effects of the two pipeline alternatives on TDS but these results are not as robust as the TDS results from the CRSS modeling. The CRSS model covers a much broader range of hydrology, system demands, and reservoir operations and also includes current and planned salinity control projects. TDS results from the CE-QUAL-W2 model are provided because they support and confirm the CRSS model results.

Overall, the average release TDS concentrations from 2041-2060 for the results of the models are all within 1 mg/L of each other with the 86K pipeline averages being higher than the no action average. The largest difference in any one month for the 86K pipeline was 47 mg/L lower than the no action results. Results from the 86K pipeline were never more than 13 mg/L higher than the no action for any one month. The standard laboratory analysis for determining TDS has a precision of 21 mg/L (Eaton, Clesceri, Rice, & Greendberg, 2005).



Figure E-2: Lake Powell Pipeline Models – Release TDS, 2041-2060

E.1.2.3 Dissolved Oxygen

Dissolved oxygen results from the no action and 86K pipeline models are shown in Figure E-3. Overall, the average release dissolved oxygen concentrations from 2041-2060 for the results of the two models are within 0.03 mg/L of each other with the 86K pipeline average being slightly lower than the no action average.



Figure E-3: Lake Powell Pipeline Models – Dissolved Oxygen Release, 2041-2060

Absolute values of the results were presented but the assumptions used in the modeling should be considered before interpreting these results. The difference between dissolved oxygen concentrations of dam releases for the modeled scenarios is often too small to be measured by field instrumentation. The greatest differences occur when the reservoir pool elevations are lowest. In general, unusually low dissolved oxygen concentrations in dam releases have a higher probability of occurrence at low reservoir pool elevations (<3600 feet).

E.1.2.4 Nutrients

Nutrients such as phosphorus, nitrate-nitrogen, and ammonia-nitrogen are modeled parameters in the water quality models. These, and other parameters, are essential for certain modeled processes which influence the dissolved oxygen concentrations in the reservoir. Modeled results for these parameters from the no action and 86K pipeline are included in Attachment C. These parameters were not, however, part of rigorous model calibration. Results are not presented in any detail other than to state that no significant differences were noted. Further analysis of these results is not recommended considering the assumptions used.

E.1.3 TDS downstream of Glen Canyon Dam

TDS downstream of Glen Canyon Dam was simulated using the CRSS hydrology and operations model. The salinity, or TDS, component of CRSS was developed to simulate long-term salinity conditions in the Colorado River Basin (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2013). Modeled results are presented for four locations: below Lake Powell, below Lake Mead (Hoover Dam), below Lake Havasu (Parker Dam), and above Imperial Reservoir and Dam. The latter three locations are the sites of numeric criteria established for TDS in 1975 (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2013). Results are presented in graphs in which the 90th, 50th, and 10th statistical percentiles are compared for the pipeline and no action

alternatives. Results include the DNF scenario simulated by CRSS. Results are presented for the years 2015-2060 and only TDS results for the 86K pipeline alternative are included in this document. All results from the CRSS TDS modeling are available in Attachment I.

The four following graphs present the results of the 86K pipeline alternative for the DNF hydrology scenario. Figure E-4 is TDS below Lake Powell, Figure E-5 is TDS below Lake Mead, Figure E-6 is TDS below Lake Havasu, and Figure E-7 is TDS above Imperial Reservoir & Dam. As can be seen in each graph, there is no visual difference between the 86K pipeline and no action alternatives for the 90th, 50th, and 10th statistical percentiles.



Figure E-4: CRSS DNF results – TDS below Lake Powell, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2041-2060



Figure E-5: CRSS DNF results – TDS below Lake Mead, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2041-2060



Figure E-6: CRSS DNF results – TDS below Lake Havasu, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2041-2060



Figure E-7: CRSS DNF results – TDS above Imperial, 86K Pipeline Alternative, 2041-2060

F. Bibliography

Cole, T., & Wells, S. (2003). *CE-QUAL-W2: A Two-Dimensional, Laterally Averaged, Hydrodynamic and Water Quality Model, Version 3.2, Instruction Report EL-03-1.* Vicksburg, Mississippi: US Army Engineering and Research Development Center.

Eaton, A. D., Clesceri, L. S., Rice, E. W., & Greendberg, A. E. (Eds.). (2005). *Standard Methods of the Examination of Water & Wastewater, 21st Ed.* Washington DC: American Public Health Association.

Ferrari, R. L. (1988). *1986 Lake Powell Survey, REC-ERC-88-6.* Denver, Colorado: Bureau of Reclamation.

Grantz, K. (2015). *Lake Powell Pipeline Hydrologic Modeling.* Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Region.

Hach Environmental. (n.d.). *Hach Hydromet*. Retrieved 2 18, 2010, from Products - Water Quality Sensors - Hach LDO: http://www.hydrolab.com/products/ldo_sensor.asp

Hach Environmental. (n.d.). *Products - Water Quality Sensors - Temperature*. Retrieved 2 18, 2010, from Hach Hydromet: http://www.hydrolab.com/products/temp.asp

Prairie, J., & Callejo, R. (2005). *Natural Flow and Salt Computation Methods, Calendar Years 1971-2005.*

Prairie, J., Rajagopalan, B., Fulp, T., & Zagona, E. (2005). Statistical Nonparametric Model for Natural Salt Estimation. *Jounral of Environmental Engineering, 131*(1), 130-138.

U.S. Department of the Interior. (2013). *Quality of Water Colorado River Basin Progress Report No. 24.* Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Region.

U.S. Department of the Interior. (2007). *Colorado River Interim Guidelines for Lower Basin Shortages and Coordinated Operations for Lake Powell and Lake Mead, Final Environmental Impact Statement.* Bureau of Reclamation, Upper and Lower Colorado Regions.

Vernieu, W. (2009). *Physical and chemical data for water in Lake Powell and from Glen Canyon Dam releases, Utah-Arizona, 1964-2008.* U.S. Geological Survey.

Vernieu, W. S., Hueftle, S. J., & Gloss, S. P. (2005). Water Quality in Lake Powell and the Colorado River. In S. P. Gloss, J. E. Lovich, T. S. Melis, & eds., *The State of the Colorado River Ecosystem in Grand Canyon: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1282* (p. 220).

Williams, N. (2007). *Modeling Dissolved Oxygen in Lake Powell using CE-QUAL-W2.* Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University.

YSI Inc. (n.d.). *Products - YSI 6600V2 - Specifications*. Retrieved 2 18, 2010, from YSI: Monitor, Analyze, and Protect the World's Natural Resources: http://www.ysi.com/productsdetail.php?6600V2-1

Zagona, E., Fulp, T., Shane, R., Magee, T., & Goranflo, H. (2001). Riverware: A Generalized Tool for Complex Reservoir System Modeling. *Journal of American Water Resources Association, 37*(4), 913-929.