# Utah 2008
# Integrated Report
# Part 1 - Water Quality Assessment Guidance

**Utah Division of Water Quality**
**Utah Department of Environmental Quality**

# Utah 2008 Integrated Report
## Part 1. Water Quality Assessment Guidelines

**May 7, 2008**

**Department of Environmental Quality**
**Division of Water Quality**
**Salt Lake City, Utah**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Department of Environmental Quality** | *Rick Sprott, Executive Director* |
| **Division of Water Quality** | *Walter Baker, P.E., Director* |
| **Engineering & Water Quality Management Branch** | *Leah Ann Lamb, Manager* |
| **Water Quality Management Section** | *Jeffrey Ostermiller, Manager* |
| **Integrated Report Coordinator:** | *Tom Toole, Environmental Scientist* |

# Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Ying-Ying Macauley who made suggestions, edited and supported the development of the 2008 Integrated Report especially the guidelines for assessment until she moved on to Drinking Water. Harry Judd also contributed much to the report before he retired. Thanks to Mark Stanger who was Acting Manager until Jeffrey Ostermiller was named Section Manager.

Authors: Part 1. Water Quality Assessment Guideline, Tom Toole
Lake Assessment, Theron Miller
Great Salt Lake Appendix, Theron Miller
Stream Assessment, Tom Toole
Biological Assessment: Dorrie Pnayotou, Jeffrey Ostermiller

Graphics and Editing: Mark Stanger (Geographical Information Systems)

Programming: Scott Daly

Information and Data:

Monitoring Section:

Jeffrey Ostermiller, Arne Hultquist, Alex Anderson, Robert Bird, Ben Brown, Dan English, Chris Martin, Brent Shaw

TMDL Section:

Carl Adams, Mike Allred, Amy Dickey, Jodi Gardberg, Jim Harris, Kari Lundeen, Dave Wham, Scott Daly

Others:

Lonnie Shull, Jeffrey Studenka, Rand Fisher, Don Hall, Rhonda Thiel, William Damery, Candace Cady, Matt Garn, Dan Griffin, Jennifer Robinson, Rob Herbert, John Whitehead

Disclaimer

This assessment guidance portion of the 2008 Integrated report provides the public with information and methods used by the Division of Water Quality to assess waters of the State. Every attempt will be made to update this document in a timely manner, but the Division of Water Quality (DWQ) does not guarantee that it is free of errors. If anyone uses the methods in this guidance to assess water quality of the State, they cannot directly state or imply that a river, stream, lake or reservoir is supporting or not supporting its designated beneficial uses. Only the Division of Water Quality, Department of Environmental Quality has the authority to make such determinations.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Overview of Water Quality Assessment Guidance ..... 1

1.1 Introduction ..... 1

1.2 Designated Beneficial Uses ..... 1

1.3 Assessment Units ..... 2

1.4 Assessment Methodologies ..... 2

Chapter 2. Data Used in Making Assessments ..... 5

2.1 Introduction ..... 5

2.2 Data Requirements ..... 5

2.2.3 Field Collection Methods ..... 5

2.2.4 Water Quality Field Data ..... 5

2.2.5 Water Quality Laboratory Analysis ..... 6

2.2.6 Number of Samples ..... 6

2.2.7 Age of Data ..... 6

2.2.5 Electronic Format ..... 6

2.3 Reports, Professional Publications and Other Types of Information ..... 7

2.4 Decision Flow Chart for Data Evaluation ..... 7

Chapter 3. Assessment Unit Delineation and Identification ..... 12

3.1 Introduction ..... 12

3.2 Guidelines for Delineating Stream and River Assessment Units (AUs) ..... 12

Chapter 4. Beneficial Use Assessment Categories ..... 16

4.1 Introduction ..... 16

4.2 Beneficial Use Assessment Categories ..... 16

Category 1: All designated uses are attained ..... 16

Category 2: Some designated uses are attained, but there are insufficient data to determine beneficial use support for the remaining designated uses.....16

Category 3: Insufficient data to make a decision or a lake is impaired during one monitoring period.....16

- Category 3A: Assessment Units are listed in Category 3A if there are no data or insufficient data to make an assessment of fully supporting or not supporting .....17
- Category 3B: Lakes and reservoirs that have been assessed as not supporting a beneficial use for one monitoring cycle are included in Category 3C. If a lake or reservoir is assessed as impaired for two consecutive monitoring cycles it is listed on the 303(d) list.....17
- Category 3C: This category includes waters identified where data and information are insufficient to determine an assessment status. The DWQ will devise an assessment plan for waters identified in this category. The plan will address data and information needed to make an assessment decision, a time-line goal for obtaining essential data and information and a projected date when the assessment will be completed.....17

Category 4: Impaired for one or more designated uses, but does not require development of a TMDL.15

Category 4A: TMDL has been completed for any pollutant .....17

Category 4B: Other pollution control requirements are reasonably expected to result in attainment of the water quality standard in the near future .....17

Category 4C: The impairment is not caused by a pollutant.....17

Category 5: The water quality standard is not attained and is caused by a pollutant .....17

Category 5: A TMDL is underway or scheduled and the AU is on the 303d(d) list of impaired waters.....17

Chapter 5. Domestic Source Use Support Determination (Class 1C) .....21

5.1 Introduction.....21

5.2 Domestic Source Water Assessment Procedure and Criteria .....21

5.2.1 Field and Water Chemistry Data.....21

5.2.2 Restriction Data .....22

5.2.3 Bacteriological Data.....22

Chapter 6. Contact Recreation Use Support Determination (Class 2A and 2B) .....27

6.1 Introduction.....27

6.2 Contact Recreation Classifications .....27

6.3 Recreation Use Assessment Procedure.....27

6.3.1 Bacteriological Data.....27

6.3.2 Bathing Area Closure Data .....28

6.3.3 Conventional Parameters (pH) ..... .....28

Chapter 7. Aquatic Life Uses Support Determination (Class 3).....33

7.1 Aquatic Life Use Classifications .....33

7.2 Aquatic Life Beneficial Use Support Assessment Procedure.....33

7.2.1 Field and Water Chemistry Data.....33

7.2.2 Beneficial Use Assessment Based on Mercury Health Advisories .....35

Chapter 8. Agricultural Beneficial Use Support Determination (Class 4).....39

8.1 Introduction.....39

8.2 Agricultural Beneficial Use Assessment Procedure .....39

8.2.1. Conventional Data .....39

8.2.2 Toxicant Data.....40

8.2.3 Radiological Data.....40

Chapter 9. Lake and Reservoir Assessment Methodology for Determining Beneficial Use Support .....43

9.1 Introduction.....43

9.2 Great Salt Lake .....43

9.3 Reservoir and Lake Assessments.....44

9.4 Tier I Assessment Method Based On Total Dissolved Solids .....45

9.5. Tier I Assessment Methods Based On pH, Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen .....45

9.5.1 Using pH Data.....47

9.5.2 Using Temperature Data .....47

9.5.3 Using Dissolved Oxygen Data.....47

9.5.4 Tier I Assessment Based on Dissolved Oxygen Concentration and Temperature Above The Thermocline.....50

9.6 Tier I Assessment Based on Dissolved Metals, Ammonia, and Gross Alpha Data.....51

9.7 Tier I Assessment Based on Mercury Health Advisories .....51

9.8 Tier II Beneficial Use Assessment Based on Weighted Evidence Criteria. ..... 51

9.8.1 Assessment Using Carlsons Trophic State Index .....52

9.8.2 Assessment Using Fish Kill Data or Dissolved Oxygen Data.....52

9.8.3 Assessment Using Blue-Green Algae Abundance.....53

9.9 Tier III Beneficial Use Assessment Based on Cyclic Nature of Data ..... 53

Chapter 10. Review of Beneficial Use Assessments .....61

10.1 Overview.....61

10.2 When Fewer than the Recommended Number of Samples Are Collected .....61

10.3 Lake Data Collection .....62

10.4 Natural Hydrological Conditions.....62

10.5 Field and Water Chemistry Data Versus Biological Data .....62

Chapter 11. Criteria For Removing Assessment Units From 303(d) List .....63

11.1 Introduction.....63

11.2 List Criteria for Which an Assessment Unit Can Be Removed from the 303(d) List .....63

Chapter 12. Total Phosphorus Evaluations To Determine Need For Further Studies .....65

12.1 Overview ..... 65

12.2. Total Phosphorus Assessment ..... 65

References ..... 67

## TABLES

**Table** **Page**

Table 1.1. Designated Beneficial Uses For Rivers, Streams, Lakes, and Reservoirs ..... 1

Table 5.1. Examples of Beneficial Use Support Using Above Procedure for Conventional Pollutants ..... 21

Table 5.2. E. coli Assessment Criteria Used To Determine Beneficial Use Support For Source Water ..... 22

Table 6.1. E. coli assessment Criteria For Determining Beneficial Use Support for Contact Recreation ..... 28

## FIGURES

**Figure** **Page**

Figure 1.1a. Flow chart illustrating the overall assessment process used by the DWQ to determine if the waters of the state are being supported ..... 3

Figure 1.1b. Flow chart illustrating the overall assessment process used by the DWQ to determine if the waters of the state are being supported ..... 4

Figure 2.1. Decision flow chart used to evaluate field data ..... 9

Figure 2.2. Decision flow chart used to evaluate laboratory water chemistry data measurements ..... 10

Figure 3.1. Example of delineation of assessment units following established guidelines ..... 14

Figure 4.1. Decision flow chart for assessing Assessment Units by categories ..... 19

Figure 4.2. Decision flow chart for assessment diagram for Category 5 sub-categories ..... 20

## FIGURES (continued)

**Figure** **Page**

Figure 5.1. Decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for source water based on bacteriological and restriction data – Class 1C .....24

Figure 5.2. Decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for source water using water chemistry data – Class 1C .....25

Figure 6.1. Decision flow diagram to determine recreation beneficial use support using bacteriological and closure data.....30

Figure 6.2. Decision flow chart to determine recreation beneficial use support using conventional data (pH data) .....31

Figure 7.1. Decision flowchart for determining aquatic life use support using conventional and acute toxic data.....36

Figure 7.2. Decision flowchart for determining aquatic life use support using chronic toxicant data .....37

Figure 7.3. Assessment Methodology using Health Advisories for Mercury.....38

Figure 8.1. Decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for agricultural waters using water chemistry and field data.....41

Figure 9.1. Tier 1 example of beneficial use supported based on pH data (100% of the pH Measurements are within the pH standard range).....46

Figure 9.2. Tier 1 example of beneficial use not supported based on pH data (>10 % of the measurements are outside the pH standard range).....46

Figure 9.3. Tier 1 example of beneficial use supported based on temperature data (≤ 10% of the measurements exceed the Class 3A standard for temperature) .....48

Figure 9.4. Tier 1 example of beneficial use not supported based on temperature data (> 10% of the measurements exceed the Class 3A standard for temperature) .....48

Figure 9.5. Tier 1 example of beneficial use supported based on dissolved oxygen data – Class 3A (The dissolved oxygen concentrations are greater than 4.0 mg/L in the upper 50% of the water column) .....49

Figure 9.6. Tier 1 example of beneficial use not supported based on dissolved oxygen data – Class 3A (The dissolved oxygen concentrations are not greater than 4.0 mg/L in the upper 50% of the water column) .....49

## FIGURES (continued)

**Figure** **Page**

Figure 9.7. Tier I decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for lakes and reservoirs using total dissolved solids....50

Figure 9.8. Tier I decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for lakes and reservoirs using pH, temperature, and dissolved oxygen data....51

Figure 9.9. Tier I decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for lakes and reservoirs using total dissolved solids data....54

Figure 9.10. Tier I decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for lakes and reservoirs using pH, temperature, and dissolved oxygen data....55

Figure 9.11. Tier I decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for lakes and reservoirs using chronic and acute toxicant data....56

Figure 9.12. Tier II decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for lakes and reservoirs....57

Figure 9.13. Tier III evaluation of lakes exhibiting cyclic beneficial uses support....58

Figure 12.1. Decision flow chart to determine if further studies are needed to assess the beneficial use support for Class 3A and 3B waters....64

# Chapter 1. Overview of Water Quality Assessment Guidance

## 1.1 Introduction

This guidance manual contains the methodologies that the Division of Water Quality (DWQ) uses to assess whether the designated beneficial uses assigned to the waters of the state are being supported. Field and water chemistry data are compared against water quality standards and the determination of whether a water is supporting or not supported is made following the methods contained in this document.

## 1.2 Designated Beneficial Uses

The DWQ has assigned designated beneficial uses to the rivers, streams, lakes and reservoirs of the state. These designated uses, listed below, are set forth in *Section R317-2-6* of Utah Administrative Code "Standards of Quality for Waters of the State. Pursuant to the requirements of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the DWQ has developed water quality standards, including narrative standards, which are used to determine if the beneficial uses are supported.

The beneficial uses that the State can assign to its waters are domestic use sources, primary and secondary recreation, aquatic life uses, and agricultural uses. The definition of each of the classes is listed in Table 1.1.

**Table 1. 1 Designated Beneficial Uses For Rivers, Streams, Lakes, And Reservoirs**

| Class | Definition |
|---|---|
| 1C | Protected for domestic purposes with prior treatment by treatment processes as required by the Utah Division of Drinking Water. |
| 2A | Protected for primary contact recreation such as swimming. |
| 2B | Protected for secondary contact recreation such as boating, wading, or similar uses. |
| 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 he 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. |

| Table 1. 1 Designated Beneficial Uses For Rivers, Streams, Lakes, And Reservoirs | |
|---|---|
| **Class** | **Definition** |
| 5 | The Great Salt Lake. Protected for primary and secondary contact recreation, aquatic wildlife, and mineral extraction. |

### 1.3 Assessment Units

To accomplish the assessment, the rivers and streams of the state have been separated into waterbodies called Assessment Units (see Chapter 3). Lakes and reservoirs are delineated as individual Assessment Units (AU). Data collected from these Assessment Units (AUs) are compared against the standards. An AU can be assigned multiple designated beneficial use classes such as 2B, 3A, and 4.

Data are compared against the standards for each of these classes to determine if there have been any violations of the standards and to what extent the violations have occurred to determine whether each beneficial use is supported.

### 1.4 Assessment Methodologies

The assessment methodologies using field and water chemistry data are contained in Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. Methods include those used to assess rivers, streams, lakes and reservoirs to determine if their designated beneficial uses are being met.

Figure 1.1 is a flow chart illustrating the overall assessment process used by the DWQ to determine if the waters of the state are being supported.




Figure 1.1a Flow chart illustrating the overall assessment process used by the DWQ to determine if the waters of the state are being supported.




Figure 1.1b. Flow chart illustrating the overall assessment process used by the DWQ to determine if the waters of the state are being supported

# Chapter 2. Data Used in Making Assessments

## 2.1 Introduction

States are mandated in the Clean Water Act (CWA) to use all "existing and readily available" data. The Division of Water Quality (DWQ) defines data as field data and laboratory analysis data. The DWQ reviews and evaluates the data collected by the Division, data collected by other entities, and data that is submitted to the agency to be used in the assessment to determine if the data are sufficient and adequate enough to use in making an assessment.

The DWQ uses data collected by the DWQ, cooperators, and the United States Geological Survey (USGS) that meet the requirements for use in assessments. The DWQ also solicits data from other agencies, private organizations, and the public that may be involved in water quality monitoring. To accomplish this, the DWQ publishes public notices requesting data to be used in Integrated Report assessment. The request is also placed on the Division's website www.waterquality.utah.gov and mails requests to groups or individuals interested in water quality, and contacts others by phone.

The DWQ has cooperative monitoring programs with the United States Forest Service, United States Bureau of Land Management, Salt Lake City, United States National Park Service, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Salt Lake County and the Provo River Watershed Council. Water quality data from the U.S.G.S are requested and used in making beneficial use assessments for the Integrated Report. This includes data collected for the Great Salt Lake Basins National Water-Quality Assessment Program (NAWQA) study and any monitoring projects that the USGS is doing for other federal agencies or other entities.

## 2.2 Data Requirements

Data should be applicable to state water quality standards and beneficial use designations. To ensure that data meet the requirements to be used in making assessments the following minimum data requirements should be met.

### 2.2.3 Field Collection Methods

The data should be collected following DWQ's field procedures listed in the DWQ Monitoring Manual (DWQ, 2006). Data collected using procedures accepted by EPA and U.S.G.S approved methods will be considered for assessment purposes. If the procedures used are not State, EPA, or USGS approved, a Quality Assurance Plan (QAPP) including standard operating procedures (SOPs) and data sheets must be submitted with the data. The DWQ assesses the quality of the data collected to determine if it can be used in making beneficial use assessments.

### 2.2.4 Water Quality Field Data

All field data must be accompanied with a Quality Assessment and Quality Control (QA/QC) report for the DWQ to determine the reliability of the data. Such data should include copies of calibration data for any instrument or method used in measuring the field parameters.

### 2.2.5 Water Quality Laboratory Analysis

All water quality samples should be analyzed in a State or EPA certified laboratory or in a USGS approved laboratory. If the samples are analyzed in a non-certified laboratory, a QAPP must be submitted with the data which includes the QA/QC data used in quality control checks within the laboratory. These data should include quality assurance data such as results from field blanks, duplicate samples, spiked samples and samples with a known concentration for each of the parameters submitted to the DWQ. A citation of the method used to analyze the samples should be included to assist the DWQ in evaluating the data. If the method was developed by the laboratory, the method should be submitted along with the data for evaluation.

### 2.2.6 Number of Samples

The DWQ recommends a minimum of ten data points at individual sites except for metals analysis and in cases where access is limited or protocol of analysis is supported by fewer samples (e.g. phytoplankton). If less than 10 samples are collected, the data will be reviewed to determine if a sound decision can be made using it.

The DWQ prefers that the data be collected within one year and that seasonality is incorporated into collection of the data. For rivers and streams, data from four samples, one collected each quarter, are considered sufficient to determine beneficial use support for the acute standard for dissolved metals and ammonia. If accessibility to the monitoring site is limited due to access, or costs and resources, the DWQ will assess the data and determine if sufficient data are available to determine beneficial use support. If the water is not already listed, the data may indicate that further study is needed to consider it for listing.

### 2.2.7 Age of Data

Analysis of data by DWQ will focus on data not older than 5-years. Data as old as ten years may be used if information is available to validate that there has not been a significant disturbance in the watershed during the ten years that would significantly change the results of the assessment.

### 2.2.5 Electronic Format

All data must be submitted in electronic format. Data can be submitted in EXCEL or in a comma delimited format. The data should contain the following information.

- The latitude and longitude of the monitoring site that the sample was collected.
- The date the sample was collected.
- The time the sample was collected.
- The type of Assessment Unit sampled: river (r), stream (s), lake or reservoir (l).

- The type of sample collected, i.e. grab (g), composite (c), or profile (p).
- The parameter ID.
- The code for identifying measurements that are less than the minimum detectable limit.
- The measurement for the parameter, e.g. mg/L, ppm, degrees, etc.
- The unit of measurement used, mg/L, ppm, degrees, etc
- The analytical method used to obtain the data.

## 2.3 Reports, Professional Publications and Other Types of Information

Reports, articles from refereed journals, and other types of information are reviewed to determine if they can be used in making water quality assessments. They should include the methods of field collection, observation, and laboratory methods used to analyze the samples.

The publications are evaluated for applicability to water quality standards, both numeric and narrative. Although a conclusion about impairment of water quality may be drawn in the publications, the DWQ will make the final judgment as to whether there is impairment or not.

## 2.4 Decision Flow Chart for Data Evaluation

Figures 2.1 and 2.2 are flow charts that illustrate the data quality evaluation decisions used to determine whether or not the field and laboratory data being used meet the requirements for making beneficial use assessments. The assessments are done following the methods in Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

If the submitted dataset is determined to be usable, the preliminary assessment is conducted to determine if the data meet other data limits. Other items taken into consideration before a final decision is made to accept the assessment are listed below.

- Age of Data – If the data are older than 5 years, a review of activities in the watershed will be made to determine if there has been a significant change in environment that could possibly result in a different beneficial use assessment.
- Naturally occurring or severe environmental conditions not reflective of a normal hydrological regime occurred during the monitoring period, e.g., severe to extreme drought or flooding.
- Robustness of the data set including spatial and temporal characteristics.

- Sufficient data - If there are less than ten samples for conventional data, are they considered acceptable for assessment?

- Adherence to Quality Assurance Plan (QAPP) and Quality Assessment and Quality Control (QA/QC) report.




**Figure 2.1. Decision flow chart used to evaluate field data.**




**Figure 2.2. Decision flow chart used to evaluate laboratory water chemistry data measurements.**

# Chapter 3. Assessment Unit Delineation and Identification

## 3.1 Introduction

Streams, Rivers, lakes and reservoirs have been delineated into discrete units called Assessment Units (AUs). Assessment Units are used in identifying waters of the State that have been assessed to determine if they are supporting their designated beneficial uses. Lakes and reservoirs have been delineated as individual AUs and the size is reported in acres. Rivers and streams have been delineated by specific river, river or stream reach, or several stream reaches in sub-watersheds. When using sub-watersheds to delineate stream AUs, the new USGS 5$^{th}$ (10-digit) and 6$^{th}$ (12-digit) level watershed units for Utah are used to delineate the AUs. These watershed units allow for the aggregation of stream reaches into individual AUs that are hydrologically based. The 5$^{th}$ and 6$^{th}$ hydrological units were developed by individuals representing state and federal agencies, and have been certified by the Natural Resource Conservation Service.

## 3.2 Guidelines for Delineating Stream and River Assessment Units (AUs)

When delineating river and stream AUs, DWQ followed the guidelines listed below with the first two guideline statements being fixed rules.

- The AU is within an eight-digit USGS hydrologic unit (HUC).

- Each river and stream AU is comprised of stream reaches having the same designated beneficial use classifications, i.e. a stream that has beneficial uses of Class 1C, 2B and 3A and at another part of the stream has Class 2B and 3B. This stream would have at least two AUs because of the difference in beneficial use designations.

- Large rivers, such as the Green River, Colorado River and portions of other large rivers (Bear River, Weber River, etc), were delineated into "linear" or "ribbon" AUs. Where a major tributary enters these rivers or hydrological features such as dams exist, the river is further delineated into two or more AUs.

- Tributary rivers and streams were delineated primarily using the 5$^{th}$ and 6$^{th}$ level hydrologic units to define the AUs.

- Additional AUs were defined by combining or splitting 5$^{th}$ or 6$^{th}$ level watersheds using tributary streams, stream size, and ecological changes such as geology, vegetation, or land use.

- Small tributary streams to larger streams that could not be incorporated into a watershed unit were combined into separate unique AUs.

New assessment units can be created based upon additional ecological, geological, and beneficial use assessment information that provides greater resolution in identifying and delineating rivers and streams into more assessment units that provide for a more precise assessment of the State's rivers and streams.

These AUs units have been geo-referenced (indexed) to the National Hydrologic Database using a reach-indexing tool that provides the capability of using GIS techniques to display information and data for each AU. Beneficial use classifications and assessments for individual AUs can be mapped or displayed to provide visual representation of assessment results. Individual stream AUs were assigned a unique identification code for indexing which includes the 8-digit hydrological unit (HUC) number with the prefix UT and followed by a 3-digit code to identify each unique AU in a HUC. Lake and reservoir AUs were identified by adding the prefix UT-L- to the 8-digit HUC follow by a 3-igit code.

Figure 3.1 illustrates one example of the results of using the above guidelines to delineate and identify AUs. The Weber River was delineated as a linear AU from its confluence with Chalk Creek upstream to the Wanship Dam (UT16020101-017). One AU, UT16020101-011, in the Chalk Creek watershed was delineated by combining two 5th level watershed units located in the South Fork Chalk Creek sub-basin. The first AU (UT16020101-010) in the Chalk Creek watershed was delineated using the confluence of the South Fork as the upstream point. This necessitated splitting the 5$^{th}$ level watershed unit into two segments. An example of small tributary streams that could not be combined into a hydrological based AU is illustrated by the AU, (UT16020101-019). These are very small tributaries and the Weber River is not reflective of their stream order or the habitat that they flow through. Rockport Reservoir (UT-L-16020101-002) and Echo Reservoir (UT16020101-001) are examples of lake and reservoir AUs.






**Figure 3.1. Example of delineation of assessment units following established guidelines.**

# Chapter 4. Beneficial Use Assessment Categories

## 4.1 Introduction

Beginning in 2002, the U.S. EPA, recommended that states adopt their assessment procedure that consists of five categories denoting the type of assessment made for each assessment unit within a state. The five categories of reporting were developed by EPA to provide a clearer summary of a state's water quality status and to assist in developing management actions to protect and restore waters of a state to meet the state's water quality standards and support its designated beneficial uses. Utah uses the five categories developed by EPA. In addition, Category 5 is divided into 4 sub-categories to provide a more definitive separation of how waters are defined in Category 5.

The assessment category or categories that an AU will be placed in is determined using the methods used to determine beneficial use support. These methods are found in Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. The unique assessment categories are described as follows:

## 4.2 Beneficial Use Assessment Categories

**Category 1: All designated uses are attained.**

Assessment Units are listed in this category if there are data and information that meet all requirements of the assessment and listing methodology and support a determination of fully support for all of an AU's designated beneficial uses.

**Category 2: Some of the designated uses are attained, but there is insufficient data to determine beneficial use support for the remaining designated uses.**

AUs are listed in this category if there are data and information that meet requirements of the assessment and listing methodology to support a determination that some, but not all, uses are attained. Attainment status of the remaining uses is unknown because there is insufficient or no data to assess beneficial use support.

**Category 3: Insufficient data to make a determination, or lakes and reservoirs that show indication of impairment for one monitoring cycle only.**

Three sub-categories for Category 3 are defined below.

- **Category 3A:** Assessment Units are listed in Category 3A if there are no data to do an assessment,

- **Category 3B:** Lakes and reservoirs that have been assessed as not supporting a beneficial use for one monitoring cycle are included in Category 3B. If a lake or reservoir is assessed as impaired for two consecutive monitoring cycles it is listed on the 303(d) list.

- **Category 3C:** This category includes waters identified where data and information are insufficient to determine an assessment status. The DWQ will devise an assessment plan for waters identified in this category. The plan will address data and information needed to make an assessment decision, a time-line goal for obtaining essential data and information and a projected date when the assessment will be completed.

**Category 4: Impaired for one or more designated uses, but does not require development of a TMDL.**

- **Category 4A: TMDL has been completed for any pollutant.**

  Assessment Units are listed in this sub-category when any TMDL(s) has been developed and approved by EPA, that when implemented, are expected to result in full support of the water quality standards or support the designated beneficial uses. Where more than one pollutant is associated with the impairment of an AU, the AU and the parameters which have an approved TMDL are listed in this category. If it has other pollutants that need a TMDL, it is also listed in Category 5. Therefore, an AU can be listed in Category 4A and 5.

- **Category 4B: Other pollution control requirements are reasonably expected to result in attainment of the water quality standard in the near future.**

  Consistent with the regulation under 40 CFR, 130.7(b)(I) (ii), and (iii), AUs are listed in this subcategory where other pollution control requirements (e.g., best management practices required by local, state, or federal authority are stringent enough to meet any water quality standard or support any beneficial use applicable to such waters.

- **Category 4C: The impairment is not caused by a pollutant.**

  Assessment units are listed in this subcategory if the impairment is not caused by a pollutant (e.g., habitat alteration).

**Category 5: The water quality standard is not attained and is caused by a pollutant**.

The AU is found not supporting one or more of its designated beneficial uses as determined by current water quality standards and assessment methodologies. This category constitutes EPA's definition of Section 303(d) list of waters.

- **Category 5: A TMDL is underway or scheduled and the AU is on the 303d(d) list of impaired waters.**

  Assessment Units are listed in this category if the AU is impaired for one or more designated uses by a pollutant. This constitutes the 303(d) list because a

Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) analysis is required to evaluate the sources of the pollutant(s).

The decision flowcharts used for determining which category or categories an AU will be placed are illustrated in Figures 4.1 and 4.2. An AU can be listed in more than one category depending on how many pollutants it is impaired by or if it is impaired by pollution.




Figure 4.1. Decision flow chart for assessing Assessment Units by categories.




Figure 4.2. Decision flow chart for assessment diagram for Categories 3A, 3B, and 3C.

# Chapter 5. Domestic Source Use Support Determination (Class 1C)

## 5.1 Introduction

Utah water quality standards allow water bodies to be designated as Class 1C, protected for domestic purposes with prior treatment by treatment processes as required by the Utah Division of Drinking Water (*UAC R317-2-6)*. The assessment is made using field, water chemistry, and bacteriological data. The use of restriction data for assessment is being evaluated.

## 5.2 Domestic Source Water Assessment Procedure and Criteria

Beneficial use assessment is based upon the analysis of field, water chemistry, bacteriological, and restriction data. The AU can be listed on the 303(d) list if any of the listing criteria for each of the data types is met.

### 5.2.1 Field and Water Chemistry Data

- **Conventional Data (pH)**

**Beneficial Use Supported** – For any one conventional pollutant, the beneficial use is supported if any of the following conditions are met:

1. The criterion was violated no more than (≤) one time.
2. The criterion was violated in no more than ten percent (≤ 10%) of the measurements if the criterion was exceeded more than (>) one time.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported** – For any one conventional pollutant, the beneficial use is not supported if both of the following conditions are met:

1. The criterion was exceeded more than (>) one time.
2. The criterion was exceeded in more than 10 percent (> 10%) of the measurements.

Table 5.1 A list of various examples of assessment results for using conventional data.

**Table 5.1. Examples of Beneficial Use Support Using Above Procedure for Conventional Pollutants.**

| Number of Times Exceeded | Number of Samples Collected | Percent of Measurements That Exceeded Criterion | Beneficial Use Support |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 11 | 9.1 | Supported |
| 1 | 9 | 11.1 | Supported |
| 2 | 9 | 22.2 | Not Supported |
| 2 | 20 | 10.0 | Supported |
| 4 | 15 | 27.7 | Not Supported |

- **Toxicant Data (Dissolved Metals, Organics, and Radiological)**

  **Beneficial Use Supported** – For any one toxic pollutant, the beneficial use is supported if the standard is not violated more than one time.

  **Beneficial Use Not Supported** – For any one toxic pollutant, the beneficial use is not supported if the standard is exceeded two or more (≥ 2) times both of the following conditions are met:

### 5.2.2 Restriction Data

The DWQ is in the process of investigating whether the Division of Drinking Water has a method for issuing advisories and closures for drinking water sources.

### 5.2.3 Bacteriological Data

The bacteriological standard is based on *E. coli* counts and the data used to make assessments must be less than 5 years old. The criteria for assessing beneficial use support using *E. coli* are listed below.

- The geometric mean should not exceed the criterion for Class 1C.
- At least five samples should be collected as equally spaced as possible over a 30-day period.
- The moving 30-day geometric mean will be calculated if data are collected over a period greater than 30-days. The equally spaced requirement must be adhered to when the geometric mean is calculated when data are collected for more than 30 days.
- If maximum standard is exceeded one time, a follow-up sample will be collected to determine beneficial use support.

The numeric standards for *E. coli* are listed in Section R317-2-14 of the water quality standards.

| **Table 5.2. *E. coli* Assessment Criteria Used To Determine Beneficial Use Support For Source Water.** |
|---|
| **Criterion 1 -** For Class 1C, the geometric mean should not exceed 206 per 100 mL for any 30-day period. |
| **Criterion 2 -** For Class 1C, if the maximum value is exceeded one time and is confirmed in the follow-up sample the AU will be listed. |

**Beneficial Use Supported** – The beneficial use is supported if both Criterion 1 and 2 are both met.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported** – The beneficial use is not supported if one or both Criterion 1 or 2 are not met.

The decision criteria for assessing beneficial use support are illustrated in Figures 5.1 and 5.2.




Figure 5.1. Decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for source water based on bacteriological and restriction data – Class 1C.




Figure 5.2. Decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for source water using water chemistry data – Class 1C.

# Chapter 6. Contact Recreation Use Support Determination (Class 2A and 2B)

## 6.1 Introduction

Section R317-2-6 of the Utah water quality standards allow water bodies to be designated as Class 2A or 2B waters for primary contact and secondary contact recreation. Class 2A is primary contact recreation and includes activities that entail swimming. Class 2B is secondary contact recreation and includes activities such as boating, wading or similar activities.

## 6.2 Contact Recreation Classifications

All rivers and streams within the state are designated as Class 2B waters, protected for secondary contact recreation such as boating, wading, or similar uses. Some lakes and reservoirs have been designated as Class 2A, waters protected for primary contact recreation such as swimming. The beneficial use for lakes and reservoirs greater than 20 acres are listed *in* R317-2-13.12. All lakes and reservoirs not designated in the standards as 2A are designated as Class 2B waters by default. Lakes or reservoirs not listed in the standards are assigned uses by default to the classification(s) of their tributary streams.

## 6.3 Recreation Use Assessment Procedure

DWQ considers assessing the recreational beneficial use of an Assessment Unit (AU) if *E. coli* data or pH data are collected. An AU can be assessed as not supporting the primary or secondary recreation beneficial use if the pH standard is violated and *E. coli* data are not available.

The following factors are considered to determine whether the primary contact (Class 2A) or the secondary contact beneficial use (Class 2B) is being supported.

- Bacteriological Data
- Bathing Closure Data (being investigated)
- Other parameters (DWQ will investigate the possibility of using of algal communities as a criterion for evaluation of recreational uses.)

### 6.3.1 Bacteriological Data

The bacteriological standard is based on *E. coli* counts and the data used to make assessments must be less than 5 years old. The factors for assessing beneficial use support using *E. coli* are listed below.

- Samples should be collected during the recreational season. In general, the recreational season is defined as June 1 to September 30. Exceptions to this time period will be taken into consideration during the assessment if they are justified. The recreational season varies by latitude and elevation. For example, waters in southern Utah may have a longer recreational season than in northern Utah. Waters

at higher elevations such as Mirror Lake are open for recreation from the time the snow is removed from the roads until it is closed for winter. State or federal agencies such as the USFS and BLM may set recreational seasons by limiting access to campgrounds or other areas as they deem necessary.

- The geometric mean should not exceed the criterion for streams that are classified 2A or 2B.

- At least five samples should be collected as equally spaced as possible over a 30 day period.

- The moving 30-day geometric mean will be calculated if data are collected over a period greater than 30-days. The data should be equally spaced over any period where samples are collected for more than 30 days.

The 30-day geometric mean and the single sample maximum for *E. coli data* will be compared to the standards listed in Table 6.1 to determine beneficial use support. The standards are found in Section R317-2-14 of the state water quality standards.

| **Table 6.1**. ***E. coli* Assessment Criteria For Determining Beneficial Use Support For Contact Recreation.** |
|---|
| **Criterion 1 -** For Class 2A, the geometric mean should not exceed 126 per 100 mL for any 30-day period. For Class 2B, the geometric mean should not exceed 206 per 100 mL for any 30-day period. |
| **Criterion 2 -** For Class 2A, single sample maximum should not exceed 576 per 100 m/L. For Class 2B, the single sample maximum should not exceed 940 per 100/mL |

**Beneficial Use Supported -** The beneficial use is supported if both Criteria 1 and 2 are met.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported** – The beneficial use is not supported if one or both criteria (Criteria 1 or 2) are not met are not met.

### 6.3.2 Bathing Area Closure Data

The development of decision criteria for listing using bathing closures is being investigated.

### 6.3.3 Conventional Parameters (pH)

**Beneficial Use Supported** – For any one conventional pollutant, the beneficial use is supported if any of the following conditions are met:

1. The criterion was exceeded no more than ( ≤ ) one time.

2. The criterion was exceeded in no more than ten percent (≤ 10% ) of the measurements if the criterion was exceeded more than (>) one time.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported** – For any one conventional pollutant, the beneficial use is not supported if both of the following conditions are met:

1. The criterion was exceeded more than ( > ) one time.

2. The criterion was exceeded in more than 10 percent ( > 10%) of the measurements.

The decision criteria for making beneficial use assessments for primary and secondary contact recreation are diagramed in Figures 6.1 and 6.2.




Figure 6.1. Decision flow diagram to determine recreation beneficial use support using bacteriological and closure data.




**Figure 6.2. Decision flow chart to determine recreation beneficial use support using conventional data (pH data).**

# Chapter 7. Aquatic Life Use Support Determination (Class 3)

## 7.1 Aquatic Life Use Classifications

Utah water quality standards R317-2-6 allow waters to be protected for use by aquatic life. There are five beneficial use classifications for aquatic life that can be assigned to stream and rivers in Utah. They include the following:

- Class 3A, protected cold water species of game fish and other cold water aquatic life including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain;
- Class 3B, protected for warm water species of game fish and other warm water aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain;
- Class 3C, protected for nongame fish and other aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain;
- Class 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, and
- Class 3E, severely habitat-limited waters. Narrative standards will be applied to protect these waters for aquatic wildlife chain.

## 7.2 Aquatic Life Beneficial Use Support Assessment Procedure

The data used to assess the beneficial use support of the aquatic life uses includes field and water chemistry data. The assessment is made by comparing sample results against the standards for Classes 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D and Class 3E

### 7.2.1 Field and Water Chemistry Data

Field data include pH, dissolved oxygen, and temperature. These are also referred to as conventional parameters. Among the water chemistry data, toxicant data include dissolved metals and ammonia. The sample results for toxicants are compared to the acute and the chronic criteria to determine beneficial use support.

**<u>Conventional Pollutants (pH, Dissolved Oxygen, and Temperature)</u>**

Because grab samples are generally not collected during worst case conditions for dissolved oxygen (early morning hours before sunrise, the conservative 30-day standard for dissolved oxygen (DO) is used for assessment of data that are collected during day light hours. Dissolved oxygen follows a diurnal cycle with the highest values occurring during the day. The AU is listed on the 303(d) list if two or more samples are less than the 30-day standard and if the standard is violated in more than 10% of the samples. As a follow-up, DWQ may conduct a diurnal

dissolved oxygen assessment to determine if the AU is supporting the aquatic life beneficial use or delist it based upon diurnal data.

**Beneficial Use Supported** – For any one conventional pollutant, the beneficial use is supported if any of the following conditions are met:

1. The criterion was exceeded no more than ( ≤ ) one time.

2. The criterion was exceeded in no more than 10 percent ( ≤ 10% ) of the measurements if the criterion was exceeded more than (>) one time.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported** – For any one conventional pollutant, the beneficial use is not supported if both of the following conditions are met:

1. The criterion was exceeded more than (> ) one time.

2. The criterion was exceeded in more than 10 percent ( > 10%) of the measurements.

**<u>Toxic Parameters (Dissolved Metals and Ammonia)</u>**

- **Acute Standard For Toxic Parameters**

  **Beneficial Use Supported –** The beneficial use is supported if for any one toxic pollutant, there is no more than ( > ) one violation of the acute standard in a 3-year period.

  **Beneficial Use Not Supported –** The beneficial use is not supported if there are two or more violations ( ≥ 2 ) of the acute standard in a 3-year period.

- **Chronic Standard For Toxic Parameters**

  If ten or more samples are collected, the following procedure is used to determine beneficial use support.

  **Beneficial Use Supported** – The beneficial use is supported if there is no more than one (≤ 1) violation of the chronic standard in a 3-year period.

  **Beneficial Use Not Supported** – The beneficial use is not supported if for anyone toxic pollutant, there are 2 or more ( ≥ 2) violations of the chronic standard in a 3-year period.

If less than ten samples are collected, the following assessment is used to determine beneficial use support. The chronic standard is multiplied by 1.75 to determine the listing value and it cannot exceed the acute standard. The listing method for chronic levels of toxicants when less

than ten samples are used was developed following EPA's Region 8 compelling evidence guidance.

**Beneficial Use Supported** – The beneficial use is supported if there is no more than (>) 1 violation of the chronic listing value within a 3-year period.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported** – The beneficial use is not supported if there are 2 or more (≥ 2) violations of the chronic listing value in a 3-year period.

The decision flow chart for assessing aquatic life uses for Classes 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D, are diagramed in Figures 7.1 and 7.2.

### 7.2.2 Beneficial Use Assessment Based on Mercury Health Advisories

Health Advisories for mercury are issued by the Utah State Department of Health (USDH), in conjunction with the DWQ, the Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) and local health departments. The DWQ and the USDH developed a sampling protocol based upon statistical analyses to determine how many fish are required to be collected to use in an advisory (need citation).

- **Fish**

Currently health advisories are issued if the mercury concentration in fish tissue 0.3 ppm (3 mg/kg, or 0.3 ug/g). This concentration is recommended by EPA but is less than the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) value of 1.0 mg/kg. The FDA set the consumption concentration at 1.0 mg/kg, which correlates to the water column mercury concentration of 0.012 ug/l in previous studies by EPA. (EPA, 1985). Utah's water quality standard for mercury is 0.012 ug/l as a 4-day average. Therefore, the corresponding fish tissue concentration of 1.0 mg/kgis used for assessment.

**Beneficial Use Supported** – No fish consumption advisories for mercury or fish tissue mercury concentration is less than or equal to (≤) 1.0 mg/kg.

**Beneficial Not Supported -** Fish consumption advisory for mercury is in place and fish tissue mercury concentration is greater than (>) 1.0 mg/kg.

- **Waterfowl**

The DWQ will work on a listing methodology for the 2010 Integrated Report based on waterfowl consumption advisories..




**Figure 7.1. Decision flowchart for determining aquatic life use support using conventional and acute toxic data.**




**Figure 7.2. Decision flowchart for determining aquatic life use support using chronic toxicant data.**




**Figure 7.3. Assessment methodology using health advisories for mercury.**

# Chapter 8. Agricultural Beneficial Use Support Determination (Class 4)

## 8.1 Introduction

Waters of the State that are protected for agricultural use are classified as Class 4 and include irrigation of crops and stock watering. Numerical standard for this beneficial use are found in the *Standards of Quality for Waters of the State* (*UAC R317-2)*. Criteria have been established for toxicants, radiological and conventional data including total dissolved solids (TDS).

## 8.2 Agricultural Beneficial Use Assessment Procedure

Agricultural beneficial use support assessment is made using conventional, toxicant, and radiological data. The standards for these three types of data are found in found in *Section R317-2-14* of the standards.

### 8.2.1. Conventional Data

Total dissolved solids (TDS) and pH are the two conventional parameters that are evaluated to determine beneficial use support. With the exception of those streams segments that have a site specific TDS standard, there are two standards for TDS. One is for irrigation and the other is for stock watering. The TDS standard for irrigation waters is 1,200 mg/l and 2,000 mg/l for waters designated for stock watering only. However, the DWQ has not identified any waters that are used for stock watering only. Therefore, all assessments are done using the more stringent standard of 1,200 mg/L standard. The standard for pH is 6.5-9.0. These standards and listed in
R317-2-14.

To do an assessment, 10 or more ( ≥ 10) measurements are needed for conventional data unless there are mitigating reasons why ten measurements could not be obtained.

**Beneficial Use Supported** – For any one conventional pollutant, the beneficial use is supported if any of the following conditions are met:

1. The criterion was exceeded no more than ( ≤ ) one time.

2. The criterion was exceeded in no more than ten percent ( ≤10%) of the measurements if the criterion was exceeded more than (>) one time.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported** – For any one conventional pollutant, the beneficial use is not supported if both of the following conditions are met:

1. The criterion was exceeded more than one time.

2. The criterion was exceeded in more than ten percent (>10%) of the measurements.

### 8.2.2 Toxicant Data

Toxicant data include dissolved metals and nitrates. To do an assessment, 4 or more measurements are needed for toxicant data.

**Beneficial Use Supported** – For any one pollutant, no more than one ( ≤ 1) violation of the standard during a 3-year period. (see Section R317-1-14)

**Beneficial Use Not Supported -** For any one pollutant, two or more ( ≥ 2 ) violations of the standard during a 3-year period. (see Section R317-1-14)

### 8.2.3 Radiological Data

Gross alpha measurements are compared to the standard to determine beneficial use support. Gross alpha is treated as a toxicant and the beneficial use support assessment is the same as for toxicant data.

**Beneficial Use Supported** – For any one pollutant, no more than one (≤ 1) violation of the standard during a 3-year period. (see Section R317-1-14)

**Beneficial Use Not Supported -** For any one pollutant, two or more ( ≥ 2 ) violations of the standard during a 3-year period. (see Section R317-1-14)

The decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for agricultural waters using water chemistry and field data are illustrated in Figure 8.1.




Figure 8.1. Decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for agricultural waters using water chemistry and field data.

# Chapter 9. Lake and Reservoir Assessment Methodology for Determining Beneficial Use Support

## 9.1 Introduction

Lakes and reservoirs are defined as waters of the State which are protected by beneficial use designations. Each lake and reservoir has been designated as an Assessment Unit (AU) for purposes of assessment. The terms lake, reservoir and assessment unit are used interchangeably in this chapter.

Section R317-2-14 contains the standards established for both toxicants and conventional parameters including total dissolved solids. Lakes and reservoirs greater than 20 acres are listed along with their beneficial use classifications. Lakes or reservoirs not specifically listed in Section R317-2-13.12 are assigned beneficial uses by default to the classification(s) of their tributary stream(s).

## 9.2 Great Salt Lake

The issues related to the Great Salt Lake are many and complex. The hydrologic restrictions caused by the Union Pacific causeway that was constructed in 1959 resulted in large differences in salinity between the different bays and interrupted natural circulation patterns. Gunnison Bay has the highest salinity (25-30%), and regularly precipitates NaCl. Gilbert Bay has intermediate salinity (12-18%). The Farmington Bay (Syracuse) causeway (built in 1967), restricts circulation between Farmington Bay and Gilbert Bay. Consequently, tributary flow into Farmington Bay dilutes the salinity to a range of 2 to 10%. Similarly, the fresh water from Bear River keeps Bear River Bay between 0.5 and 2%. These discrete ranges of salinity clearly result in biological communities dominated by different species and hence, different occupants of food chain levels and ecological guilds. This information supports the Division's position to divide the lake into four sub-classes (assessment units) for open water and a fifth subclass for transitional wetlands. The four open water assessment units would be Gilbert Bay (South Arm), Gunnison Bay (North Arm), Farmington Bay and Bear River Bay. These areas of the lake would be sub-classes of beneficial use Class 5, i.e. 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D and 5E (see Table 1.1). This will likely result in appropriate modification of our current defined beneficial uses for the open-water regions and include different standards or criteria for each region. Details of this classification scheme are reported in detail in Appendix 3 of Part II of this document.

Until such time numeric standards are developed, the Great Salt Lake and Farmington Bay will be assessed using the narrative standard in the water quality standards.

## 9.3 Reservoir and Lake Assessments

When the DWQ started to monitor lakes and reservoirs, 132 lakes based on size and public interest were selected to make lake and reservoir assessments for the Integrated Report, i.e., 305(b) Report and 303(d) List of Impaired Waters. These lakes and reservoirs account for 93% of the water surface acres in the State. The lakes were divided into two groups, one group being sampled during even years e.g., 2002; and the other group during the odd years, e.g., 2003. Monitoring for each lake and reservoir is done twice each year. The first set of samples is typically collected starting about June 1st and the second set is collected starting about

August 1st.

Currently, one hundred thirty-two (132) lakes are monitored. The odd/even year monitoring has been maintained, but some lakes and reservoirs are monitored every year because a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) analysis is required or because a special project is being conducted. The TMDL and special studies lakes and reservoirs are monitored four times during the monitoring season.

The profile data are collected at the surface and at every meter of the water column depth, and is completed when the probe is 1 meter above the bottom. All water chemistry samples, except dissolved metals and algal samples, are collected at the surface, one meter above the thermocline, one meter below the thermocline, and near the bottom. The dissolved metals sample is collected 1 meter above the bottom at the deepest site on the lake or reservoir. The algal sample is collected as a composite sample from 3 times the depth of the secchi disc reading to the surface. The algal sample is collected once at the deepest monitoring site on the lake or reservoir.

The assessment of reservoirs and lakes consists of three tiers:

- **Tier I assessment** is the preliminary determination of support status based on conventional parameters, such as DO, temperature, pH, toxicants, etc.

- **Tier II assessment** looks further into the weighted evidence criteria (trophic state index TSI, fish kills, and blue-green algal dominance) using best professional judgment. The Tier I preliminary support status may be modified through an evaluation of the TSI, winter DO conditions with reported fish kills, and the presence of significant blue-green algal populations in the phytoplankton community. The Tier II evaluation could adjust the preliminary support status ranking if at least two of the three criteria indicate a different support status.

  For lakes or reservoirs that are stratified, the dissolved oxygen concentrations and temperature above the thermocline are reviewed to determine if the lens of habitat is sufficient enough to protect the fishery. If it is not sufficient, the lake or reservoir is listed in Category 3B or 5, the 303(d) list. The determination is based on best professional judgment.

  If the data collected during the first cycle of monitoring indicate overwhelming evidence of impairment to the fishery, the lake or reservoir can be listed.

- **Tier III assessment** is the final evaluation based on cyclic nature of the data. Any change of support status requires two consecutive assessment cycles of equivalent support status.

### 9.4 Tier I Assessment Based On Total Dissolved Solids

Data collected on individual Assessment Units (AU)from all monitoring sites are used to determine the beneficial use support based on total dissolved solids (TDS).

**Beneficial Use Supported –** The beneficial use is supported if the standard is exceeded not more than one time (≤ 1) in two consecutive monitoring cycles, e.g., 2002 and 2004 for even-numbered years, or 2001 and 2003 for odd-numbered years.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported –** The beneficial use is not supported if the TDS standard is exceeded two or more times (≥ 2) in two consecutive monitoring cycles.

## 9.5 Tier I Assessment Based On pH, Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen

The water column measurements are compared against the State water quality standards to assess beneficial use support. Dissolved oxygen (DO) profile measurements collected at the deepest site are used to do the assessment, unless there is sufficient reason to use the profile data from other locations on the lake or reservoir. In addition, only DO readings collected in the fall monitoring period (August 1st or later) are used to do the assessment because they are more indicative of the worst scenarios.

Temperature and pH measurements from all sites and all monitoring dates are used to make the beneficial use assessment for aquatic life and other beneficial uses.

### 9.5.1 Using pH Data

The criteria for assessing the beneficial use support for all beneficial uses assigned to lakes and reservoirs using pH data are based on the pH profile data collected at the surface and then at one meter intervals. Data collected from the deepest location during the spring (June 1st - July 31st) sampling period and the fall sampling period (August 1st or later.) are used to calculate the percentage of violations (see Section R317-2-14 for the range of the pH standard).

**Beneficial Use Supported –** The beneficial use is supported if the number of violations are less than or equal to 10 percent (≤10%) of the measurements.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported –** The beneficial use is not supported if more than 10 percent (>10%) of the measurements violate the pH standard.

Figures 9.1 and 9.2 are of examples illustrating the procedure used to determine beneficial use support using pH data. Figure 9.1 is a diagram of the pH profile that would be assessed as fully supporting all beneficial uses that have the pH standard of 6.5 to 9.0. Figure 9.2 illustrates a profile that would result in a beneficial use not being supported because more than 10 percent (>10%) of the measurements are violations.




Figure 9.1. Tier I example of beneficial use supported based on pH data (100% of the pH measurements are within the pH standard range).




Figure 9.2 Tier 1 example of beneficial use not supported based on pH data (>10% of the measurements are outside of the pH standard range).

### 9.5.2 Using Temperature Data

The criteria for assessing the beneficial use support for lakes and reservoirs using temperature data is based upon profile data collected at the surface and then at one meter intervals. Data collected from the deepest site during the spring (June 1st through July 31st ) and fall monitoring periods are used to calculate the percentage of violations. For a lake or reservoir to be placed on the 303(d) list, the temperature standard must be exceeded in two consecutive monitoring cycles, e.g., in the 2002 and 2004 monitoring cycles the temperature was exceeded in more than 10 percent (> 10 %) of the measurements.

**Beneficial Use Fully Supported –** The beneficial use is supported if the number of violations are less than or equal to 10 percent (≤10%) of the measurements (see Figure 9.3).

**Beneficial Use Not supported –** The beneficial use is not supported if more than 10 percent ( >10% ) of the measurements violate the temperature standard (see Figure 9.4).

### 9.5.3 Using Dissolved Oxygen Data

The dissolved oxygen (DO) assessment uses the DO standard of 4.0 mg/L for Class 3A waters and 3.0 mg/L for Class 3B waters (see R317-2-14). State standards account for the fact that anoxic or low dissolved oxygen (DO) conditions may exist in the bottom of deep reservoirs. Therefore, a fully supporting status is assigned for DO when all the measurements are above the applicable DO standard for the upper 50% of the entire water column depth at the deepest site for each lake.

The DWQ recognizes that the standard does not address depth per se. Some lakes are shallow and an anoxic zone may not be formed. The DWQ will not use the 50% depth criteria for lakes that do not thermally stratify. In these cases, DWQ uses the entire water column to assess DO. See Figures 9.5 and 9.6 for examples of beneficial use supported and not supported.

**Beneficial Use Supported –** For stratified lakes, the beneficial use is supported if the oxygen concentrations are greater than the dissolved oxygen standard for the upper 50% of the water column depth (see Figure 9.5). For non-stratified lakes, the beneficial use is supported if at least 90% (≥ 90%) of the oxygen measurements are greater than the dissolved oxygen standard for the entire water column depth.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported –** For stratified lakes, the beneficial use is not supported if the dissolved oxygen concentrations are not greater than the dissolved oxygen standard for the upper 50% of the water column (see Figure 9.6). For non-stratified lakes, the beneficial use is not supported if more than 10% (> 10%) of the oxygen measurements are below the dissolved oxygen standard for the entire water column depth.




Figure 9.3. Tier I example of the beneficial use being supported based on temperature data (≤10% of the measurements exceed the Class 3A standard for temperature).




Figure 9.4. Tier I example of beneficial use not supported based on temperature data. (>10% of measurements exceed the Class 3A standard for temperature).




Figure 9.5. Tier I example of beneficial use supported based on dissolved oxygen data. (All of the DO concentrations are greater than 4.0 mg/L in the upper 50% of the water column – Class 3A).




Figure 9.6. Tier I example of beneficial use not supported based on dissolved oxygen data. (Some of the DO concentrations are less than 4.0 mg/L in the upper 50% of the water column – Class 3A).

### 9.5.4 Tier I Assessment Based on Dissolved Oxygen Concentration and Temperature Above The Thermocline

If the temperature profile indicates that the habitat is reduced by high temperatures at or near the surface, an assessment of the thickness of the lens is made to determine if there is sufficient habitat for the fishery. If the data indicates insufficient habitat for fishery, the lake or reservoir shall be listed. This assessment is largely based upon best professional judgment because of the variability in the size and depth of the lake or reservoir. In the case of reservoirs that are subject to human controlled operations, drawdown is taken into consideration. Drawdown can change from year to year based upon the spring runoff and how full they were at the end of the previous irrigation season or how much water was needed for culinary purposes. Figures 9.7 and 9.8 are examples of supporting and not supporting the beneficial use based on the DO and temperature data above the thermocline.

**Beneficial Use Supported –** Sufficient habitat for fish based on DO and temperature above the thermocline.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported –** Insufficient habitat for fish based on DO and temperature above the thermocline.




**Figure 9.7. Lens formed between dissolved oxygen and temperature above thermocline – supported.**




**Figure 9.8. Lens formed between dissolved oxygen and temperature above thermocline – not supported**

## 9.6 Tier I Assessment Based on Dissolved Metals, Ammonia and Gross Alpha Data

One sample is collected near the bottom at the deepest site in the lake or reservoir for dissolved metals, ammonia and gross alpha. If the concentration exceeds the standard, DWQ will return to the site to conduct follow-up sampling. In some cases this may occur the following year.

**Beneficial Use Supported –** The beneficial use is supported if there are less than two (< 2) exceedances of the chronic or acute standard.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported –** The beneficial use is not supported if concentration exceeds the chronic or acute standard two or more (≥ 2) times.

## 9.7 Tier I Assessment Based on Mercury Health advisories

Benefical use support for health advisories on lakes or reservoirs are the same as for rivers and stream. (See Section 7.2.2 and Figure 7.3)

## 9.8 Tier II Assessment Based on Weighted Evidence Criteria

The weighted evidence criteria consist of the following three data types. These evaluations are based to a large extent on best professional judgment.

1. There is an increasing TSI trend over a long-term period or a TSI greater than 50.

2. There are winter fish kills or low winter dissolved oxygen when it is measured.

3. There is a dominance of blue blue-green algae.

**Beneficial Use Supported -** To be assessed as supporting, these lakes must be assessed as supporting for two consecutive assessment cycles.

**Beneficial Use Not Supported -** To be assessed as not supporting, these lakes must be assessed as not supporting for two consecutive assessment cycles.

### 9.8.1 Tier II Assessment Using Carlsons Trophic State Index

The Carlson's Trophic State Index (TSI) is calculated using secchi disk transparency total phosphorus and chlorophyll-a. Typically, the average of the three is calculated to obtain the TSI. The TSI calculation method may be re-evaluated using best professional judgment, if specific data indicate overwhelming evidence that differ from the results of averaging TSI. Typically, the TSI value ranges from 0 to 100 with increasing values indicating a more eutrophic condition. Carlson's TSI estimates are calculated using the following equations:

Trophic status based on secchi disk (TSIS):

**TSIS = 60 - 14.41 ln (SD)**,
where SD = Secchi disk transparency in meters.

Trophic status based on total phosphorus (TSIP):

**TSIP = 14.20 ln (TP) + 4.15**,
where TP = Total phosphorus concentration in µg/L.

Trophic status based on chlorophyll-a (TSIC):

**TSIC = 9.81 ln (TC) + 30.60**,
where TC = Chlorophyll-a concentrations in µg/L.

The abbreviation "ln" indicates the natural logarithm

**Trophic State Index (TSI) = (TSIS + TSIP + TSIC) / 3**

### 9.8.2 Tier II Assessment Using Fish Kill Data Or Dissolved Oxygen Data

Regional biologists within the Division of Wildlife are contacted and fish kill information is obtained. If dissolved oxygen (DO) data are available, it is evaluated also. In general, winter is defined as from November through March depending on the latitude and elevation of a lake or reservoir. To assess DO data

in the winter months, a DO profile is taken and 3.0 mg/L DO is used as the listing value.

### 9.8.3 Tier II Assessment Using Blue-Green Algae Abundance

Phytoplankton (algal) data are used in the Tier II assessment process, because they reflect nutrient abundance and nutrient ratios. Although there is seasonal variability, diatoms dominate lakes that have relatively low nutrient concentrations and the nitrogen:phosphorus ratios are normal (16:1 respectively). These lakes are classified as oligotrophic (meaning low food or nutrients).

On the other end of the scale, nutrient loading often leads to an imbalance of nutrients. In freshwater lakes, excess phosphorus is the most common problem. Such lakes are classified as eutrophic or even hypereutrophic (meaning true or high food or nutrients, respectively). This high and imbalanced nutrient ratio favors another group of algae known as cyanobacteria or blue-green algae. This group is unusual in that it can "fix" or convert atmospheric nitrogen to biologically available organic forms. This can allow explosive growth of the algal biomass, which may coat the surface of lakes or wetlands with algal films unless the nutrient ratio in the algal cells once again approaches 16:1.

Although daytime dissolved oxygen may be very high, evening oxygen depletion often results from respiration and biodegradation of cyanobacteria may cause dissolved oxygen to fall below values needed to support aquatic life.

## 9.9 Tier III Assessment Based on Cyclic Nature of the Data

Lakes or reservoirs are identified as being cyclic if they are assessed as not supporting in the during the odd (2003) or even year (2004) they are monitored and then assessed as fully supporting during the next odd (2005) or even (2006) year monitoring. If the assessment is the reverse of the above, the lake or reservoir is cyclic also. In general, if an AU is assessed as not supporting the aquatic beneficial use designation on a consistent basis, it is listed on the 303(d) list. Lakes that fluctuate between fully supporting and not supporting the beneficial use over several cycles are not automatically listed on the 303(d) list. They are first placed in Utah's Category 3B. In order to be listed on the 303(d) list, lakes or reservoirs that exhibit this cyclic characteristic must be assessed as impaired for two consecutive assessment cycles.

The decision flow diagram for Tier I beneficial use support determination for lakes and reservoirs for total dissolved solids data is illustrated in Figure 9.9. The flow chart for Tier I evaluation of pH, temperature and dissolved oxygen is illustrated in Figure 9.10. The decision flow chart for Tier 1 determination of toxicants is illustrated in Figure 9.11. The flow chart for Tier II and Tier III lake assessment and lake beneficial use support determination are illustrated in Figures 9.12 and 9.13.




Figure 9.9. Tier I decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for lakes and reservoirs using total dissolved solids data.




Figure 9.10. Tier I decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for lakes and reservoirs using pH, temperature, and dissolved oxygen data.




Figure 9.11. Tier I decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for lakes and reservoirs using acute and chronic toxicant data.




**Figure 9.12.Tier II decision flow diagram to determine beneficial use support for lakes and reservoirs.**




Figure 9.13. Tier III evaluation of lakes exhibiting cyclic beneficial use support.

# Chapter 10 Special Considerations of Beneficial Use Assessments

## 10.1 Overview

There are times when the beneficial use support decisions need to be evaluated further because of mitigating circumstances that may result in the assessment being changed. One of the most common occurrences that results in a review of an assessment is when it is based upon less than the number of samples recommended by the DWQ. For conventional parameters, the recommended number of samples is ten, and for toxicants, the number of samples is four. For conventional parameters, the samples should be as evenly distributed as possible across the collection period. For toxicants, the recommendation is that the samples be collected quarterly. Quarterly being defined as the first, second, third and fourth quarters of the calendar year. This chapter addresses how and when assessments will be made using less than the recommended number of samples or data are not collected following the DWQ prescribe procedures for assessment.

## 10.2 When Fewer than the Recommended Number of Samples Are Collected

After the preliminary determination of beneficial use support, those assessments based on less than the recommended number are reviewed to determine if the assessment is valid or if it should be changed. The list below includes some of the situations for which there may be valid reasons for using less than the suggested number of samples to make a final determination.

- Inaccessibility to sites due to weather conditions. For example, the monitoring site is located in the mountains where snow prevents access to it during the winter months.

- The monitoring site is remote and its access is limited. Floating the Green River to assess some tributary streams is an example of when less than the recommended number of samples can be collected. Available resources and the cost are limiting factors in the collection of samples.

- Manpower limitations at peak periods of sampling. This may result in some sites not being collected as scheduled.

- Other reasons where the number of samples is less than the number recommended, e.g., laboratory analysis not done, sample lost, etc.

- Samples collected during a synoptic survey of limited duration. Most synoptic surveys are based upon collecting only one sample and have limited value in making beneficial use assessments.

Decisions to accept the beneficial use support decision under the conditions outlined above are to an extent based upon best professional judgment. Historical data, if available, are reviewed to determine if a similar pattern of collection has occurred at the monitoring site in the past.

## 10.3 Lake Data Collection

Chapter 9 of this guidance outlines the specific methodology for evaluating lakes and reservoirs. Data should be collected following the methodology stated in Chapter 9 of this document as closely as possible in order to be considered adequate enough to be used in an assessment. However, if data are submitted that would provide significant evidence that a beneficial use is impaired, the lake or reservoir could be listed.

## 10.4 Natural Hydrological Conditions

Severe or extreme natural conditions, such as a drought, can be considered during the beneficial use assessment. During severe to extreme drought conditions, streams can have temperatures greater than the standard but are rare in occurrence if the normal hydrological regime occurs. In this case, the DWQ reserves the right to identify these waters, but not list the AU on the 303(d) list. A rationale for not listing will be provided whenever this occurs. The AU will be assessed again when normal flow conditions return. For example, during the extreme drought in southern Utah, the Paria River was listed as not being assessed because the stream dried up during several months of the year and samples could not be collected.

## 10.5 Field and Water Chemistry Data Versus Biological Data

There are instances when a biological assessment for an AU has been done using a Multimetric Index approach (MMIs) or River Invertebrate Prediction and Classification Scheme (RIVPACS) models. The DWQ is in the process of developing the assessment methods for benthic macroinvertebrate data. Where the assessments are different and the compelling evidence indicate that the bioassessment is more reliable, the biological assessment results will take priority in determining beneficial use support.

Data from the current biological assessment program will be used on a limited basis to assess some waters that have been categorized as “in need of further study.”

# Chapter 11 Criteria For Removing Assessment Units From 303(d) List.

## 11.1 Introduction

There are various reasons for removing an Assessment Unit (AU) from the 303(d) list. Any AU can be removed from the 303(d) list based upon the criteria listed below. Once a decision is made the pollutant is removed from the 303(d) list. The AU is listed in the assessment category that results because of the delisting, e.g., an assessment unit is moved to Category 4A if a TMDL has been completed and approved by EPA. As a result of a delisting, an AU could be placed in multiple assessment categories.

## 11.2 List Criteria for Which an Assessment Unit Can Be Removed from the 303(d) List

**1.** The AU was placed on list due to error in assessment or because an AU was listed incorrectly in place of another AU or any other error not based on water quality assessment.

**2.** The most recent data assessment indicates that the AU is now meeting the State water quality standard or is supporting the designated beneficial use support for all of its designated beneficial uses that were assessed.

**3.** A total maximum daily load analysis (TMDL) for any pollutant(s) has been completed and approved by EPA. The approved TMDL and the pollutant(s), is automatically moved to Category 4A. Any pollutant(s) remaining on the 303(d) list for which a TMDL has not been completed and approved for that AU will remain on the 303(d) list (Category 5A). Therefore, an AU may be listed in both Categories 4A and 5A.

**4.** An existing AU delineation has changed**.**

(1) An AU has been changed by dividing it into several assessment units.

(2) The AU boundaries have been changed and it is now a part of a different AU or portions of the AU are included in newly defined assessment units.

**5.** A change in the method(s) of determining beneficial use support. The methodology change may cause the assessment to result in all of the beneficial uses being assessed as fully supported.

**6.** A change in State water quality standards or pollution indicator values may change assessment to fully supporting all beneficial uses that have sufficient data to be assessed.

**7.** A determination that insufficient amounts of data were collected to place the AU on the list originally, e.g., too few samples collected to make a reliable determination of beneficial use support.

**8.** Utah exercises discretion in using data or information that goes beyond the criteria listed above in determining whether to de-list an AU and can include other types of information and best professional judgment.

# Chapter 12. Total Phosphorus Evaluations

The concentrations of total phosphorus are evaluated to determine what stream and river AUs may need further studies to determine if total phosphorus is causing an impairment of the aquatic life use in Class 3A and 3B.

## 12.1 Overview

Total phosphorus does not directly affect aquatic life, but as a nutrient it can stimulate growth of aquatic algae and emergent plants. Nuisance blooms of algae and other aquatic plants can have an effect on the amount of dissolved oxygen (DO) and habitat that fish and macroinvertebrates occupy. During the day, algae produce dissolved oxygen and the concentrations of DO may reach supersaturated concentrations. At night, the cycle is reversed and DO is used in respiration. This can cause a reduction in the DO concentrations and it can cause stress on fish or even death if the concentration is too low.

The DWQ has developed a screening technique to determine if an AU needs to have further study to determine whether there is an impact caused by total phosphorus. Those AUs that exceed the screening criteria are identified and placed on a list of waters that need further evaluation. If an AU is currently part of an ongoing or completed Total Maximum Daily Load analysis (TMDL) for total phosphorus, it will not be listed in the further study list. The AU may be evaluated by doing a DO diurnal study to determine if the DO concentrations are low enough to cause impairment to the fishery. Another method that can be used is to evaluate the benthic macroinvertebrate community and compare the results with a reference site to determine if there has been an impact to the community.

DWQ is currently developing indices and thresholds for waters of the State that will enhance assessment methodology in determining impairment. Limited use of this data will be used to support assessments during the 2008 cycle. This process is well underway and the preliminary thresholds will be established during the 2008 cycle.

The longterm project is to develop defensible biological criteria in support of water qater quality assessments and support a Tier Aquatic Life Use (TALU) support for inclusion in Utah's water quality standards.

## 12.2 Total Phosphorus Assessment

The assessment methodology to determine the need for further studies based on the potential impact of total phosphorus is listed below.

- **Assessment Unit Needs Further Evaluation –**The mean concentration of the total phosphorus exceeds 0.06 mg/L AND more than ten percent (>10% ) of the samples exceed the total phosphorus indicator value of 0.05 mg/L.

- **Assessment Unit Does Not Need Further Evaluation** – The mean concentration of total phosphorus does not exceed 0.06 mg/L OR less than 10% of the samples exceed the total phosphorus indicator value of 0.05 mg/L.




Figure 12.1. Decision flow chart to determine if further studies are needed to assess the beneficial use support for Class 3A and 3B waters based on total phosphorus data.

## REFERENCES


DWQ. 2005. Standards of quality for waters of the State, R317-2, Utah Administrative Code, Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Utah Division of Water Quality. 62 pp.

Horne, Alexander, and Charles Goldman. 1994. Limnology. 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill. New York

USEPA. 2006. Guidance for 2006 assessment, listing and reporting requirements pursuant to Sections 303(d) and 305(b) of the Clean Water Act. United States Environmental Protection Agency.

USEPA. 2004. Guidance for 2004 assessment, listing and reporting requirements pursuant to Sections 303(d) and 305(b) of the Clean Water Act. United States Environmental Protection Agency.

USEPA. 1997. Guidelines for preparation of the comprehensive state water quality assessments 305(b) reports and electronic updates: supplement. EPA-841-B-97-002B.

USEPA. 2006. Guidance for 2006 assessment, listing and reporting requirements pursuant to Sections 303(d) and 305(b) of the Clean Water Act. Watershed Branch, Assessment and Watershed Protection Division, Office of Wetland, Oceans and Watershed, United States Environmental Protection Agency.

DWQ. 2006. Monitoring Manual, Utah Division of Water Quality, Utah Department of Environmental Quality.