



CENTRAL VALLEY REGIONAL
WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

San Joaquin River Basin
Rotational Sub-basin Monitoring:
Eastside Basin: January 2003 –
April 2004

(Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River
Watersheds and Farmington and Valley Floor
Drainage Areas)

Final May 2010



CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY



State of California
Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor

California Environmental Protection Agency
Linda S. Adams, Secretary for Environmental Protection

**REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

*Katherine Hart, Chair
Cheryl Maki, Vice-Chair
Nicole M. Bell, Member
Sandra O. Meraz, Member
Robert Walters, Member
Dan Odenweller, Member
Julian Isham, Member*

Pamela C. Creedon, Executive Officer

11020 Sun Center Drive #200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Phone: (916) 464-3291
email: info5@waterboards.ca.gov
Web site: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/>

DISCLAIMER

*This publication is a technical report by staff of the
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley
Region.*

No policy or regulation is either expressed or intended.

San Joaquin River Basin Rotational Sub-basin Monitoring:
Eastside Basin, January 2003 – April 2004
(Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River Watersheds and Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage
Areas)

San Joaquin River Basin Rotational Sub-basin Monitoring: Eastside Basin: January 2003 – April 2004

(Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River
Watersheds and Farmington and Valley Floor
Drainage Areas)

Final May 2010

REPORT PREPARED BY:

CATHERINE GILL
Environmental Scientist
San Joaquin River Watershed Unit

UNDER DIRECTION OF:

JEANNE CHILCOTT
Chief, San Joaquin River Watershed Unit

REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

San Joaquin River Basin Rotational Sub-basin Monitoring:
Eastside Basin, January 2003 – April 2004
(Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River Watersheds and Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage
Areas)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

This report was made possible through countless hours of field and lab work, quality assurance, data compilation and data analysis, primarily performed by staff and students of the San Joaquin Watershed Unit. We would like in particular to thank Amy Clark, Susan Massey, Kim Parker, Ann Pignitore, and Dana Kulesza for their work in all aspects of this monitoring program.

A portion of the funding for this monitoring effort was made possible through the California State Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP). Additional resources were provided through the Agricultural Subsurface Drainage, Total Maximum Daily Load, and Watershed Management Initiative Programs.

San Joaquin River Basin Rotational Sub-basin Monitoring:
 Eastside Basin, January 2003 – April 2004
 (Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River Watersheds and Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage Areas)

TABLE OF CONTENTS		PAGE
1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.0	INTRODUCTION	5
3.0	STUDY AREA	7
3.1	<i>San Joaquin River Hydrology</i>	7
3.2	<i>San Joaquin River Sub-Basins</i>	7
3.3	<i>Eastside Basin</i>	9
4.0	SAMPLING PROGRAM	15
4.1	<i>Program Objectives</i>	15
4.2	<i>Program Design</i>	15
4.3	<i>Sampling Sites</i>	16
4.4	<i>Sampling Procedures</i>	21
4.5	<i>Quality Assurance and Quality Control</i>	21
5.0	PRECIPITATION AND FLOW: JANUARY 2003 - April 2004	24
6.0	BENEFICIAL USES AND APPLICABLE WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES AND GOALS	28
6.1	<i>Applicable Beneficial Uses</i>	28
6.2	<i>Applicable Water Quality Objectives and Goals</i>	31
7.0	RESULTS	33
7.1	<i>Farmington Drainage Area</i>	42
7.2	<i>Valley Floor Drainage Area</i>	43
7.3	<i>Stanislaus River Watershed</i>	44
7.4	<i>Tuolumne River Watershed</i>	44
7.5	<i>Merced River Watershed</i>	46
8.0	DISCUSSION	48
8.1	<i>Spatial and Temporal Trends within Individual Sub-Basins</i>	48
8.1.1	<i>River Basin Sites</i>	48
8.1.2	<i>Lower Sub-basins (Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage Areas)</i>	67
8.2	<i>Interbasin Comparisons</i>	83
8.2.1	<i>Comparing General Water Quality Above and Below Reservoirs</i>	84
8.2.2	<i>Evaluating Constructed Agricultural Facilities Discharge to the San Joaquin River</i>	94
8.2.3	<i>Sub-basin Discharge to the San Joaquin River</i>	104
8.3	<i>Special Studies</i>	111
8.3.1	<i>Potential Impact of Residential Construction in a Rural Community (Woods Creek Study)</i>	111
8.3.2	<i>Potential Impact of an Agriculturally Dominated Subwatershed (Dry Creek) on the Tuolumne River</i>	114
8.4	<i>Evaluation of Beneficial Uses</i>	119
9.0	SUMMARY/CONCLUSION	138
10.0	FUTURE ACTIVITIES	141
11.0	REFERENCES	143

San Joaquin River Basin Rotational Sub-basin Monitoring:
 Eastside Basin, January 2003 – April 2004
 (Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River Watersheds and Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage Areas)

LIST OF TABLES		PAGE
Table 1	Location and Duration of Eastside Basin Study Sites, January 2003 - April 2004	17
Table 2	Parameters, Detection Levels, Holding Times, and Acceptable Analytical Recoveries	23
Table 3	Applicable Beneficial Uses for Water Bodies in the Eastside Basin	29
Table 4	Indicator and Beneficial Uses	32
Table 5	Summary Results: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	34
Table 6	Summary Results: Valley Floor Drainage Area Drains, January 2003 - April 2004	35
Table 7	Summary Results: Valley Floor Drainage Area Laterals, January 2003 - April 2004	36
Table 8	Summary Results: Stanislaus River Watershed, January 2003 - April 2004	37
Table 9	Summary Results: Tuolumne River Watershed Tributaries (sites with full data sets), January 2003 - April 2004	38
Table 10	Summary Results: Tuolumne River Mainstem (sites with full data sets), January 2003 - April 2004	39
Table 11	Summary Results: Tuolumne River Watershed (sites with partial data sets), January 2003 - April 2004	40
Table 12	Summary Results: Merced River Watershed, January 2003 - April 2004	41
Table 13	Site Categories for Discussion of Comparison of Upper Watershed, Discharge from Impoundment, and Lower Watershed Integrator Sites	84
Table 14	Site Categories for Discussion of Comparison of Valley Floor Drainage Areas	94
Table 15	Summary Results: Sub-basin Discharge to the San Joaquin River	105
Table 16	Drinking Water Beneficial Use Evaluation: Trace Elements	123
Table 17	Aquatic Life Beneficial Use Evaluation: pH	124
Table 18	Aquatic Life Beneficial Use Evaluation: Dissolved Oxygen	127
Table 19	Aquatic Life Beneficial Use Evaluation: Turbidity	128
Table 20	Aquatic Life Beneficial Use Evaluation: Trace Elements	129
Table 21	Comparison of Bacteria Results to Environmental Protection Agency E. coli (MPN) Guidelines for Contact Recreation	134
Table 22	Summary of Potential Beneficial Use Concerns: Eastside Basin (2003-2004)	137

San Joaquin River Basin Rotational Sub-basin Monitoring:
 Eastside Basin, January 2003 – April 2004
 (Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River Watersheds and Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage
 Areas)

LIST OF FIGURES		PAGE
Figure 1	San Joaquin River Watershed Sub-basins	9
Figure 2	Farmington Drainage Area	11
Figure 3	Intensive Basin Monitoring Program - Phase II: Eastside Basin, January 2003 - April 2004	19
Figure 4	Intensive Basin Monitoring Program - Phase II: Sampling Site Close-ups, Valley Floor, Dry Creek, and Upper Tuolumne Watershed	20
Figure 5	Monthly Average Flows vs. Precipitation: Eastside Basin, January 2003 - April 2004	24
Figure 6	Stanislaus Flow vs. Precipitation: Eastside Basin, January 2003 - April 2004	26
Figure 7	Tuolumne Flow vs. Precipitation: Eastside Basin, January 2003 - April 2004	26
Figure 8	Merced Flows vs. Precipitation: Eastside Basin, January 2003 - April 2004	27
Figure 9	Summary Temperature: Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	53
Figure 10	Summary Temperature: Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	53
Figure 11	Biweekly Temperature: Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	54
Figure 12	Biweekly Temperature: Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	54
Figure 13	Summary Dissolved Oxygen: Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	55
Figure 14	Summary Dissolved Oxygen: Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	55
Figure 15	Biweekly Dissolved Oxygen: Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	56
Figure 16	Biweekly Dissolved Oxygen: Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	56
Figure 17	Summary Specific Conductance: Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	57
Figure 18	Summary Specific Conductance: Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	57
Figure 19	Biweekly Specific Conductance: Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	58
Figure 20	Biweekly Specific Conductance: Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	58
Figure 21	Summary Specific Conductance: Merced Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	59
Figure 22	Biweekly Specific Conductance: Merced Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	59
Figure 23	Summary pH: Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	60
Figure 24	Summary pH: Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	60
Figure 25	Biweekly pH: Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	61
Figure 26	Biweekly pH: Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	61
Figure 27	Summary Turbidity: Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	62
Figure 28	Summary Turbidity: Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	62
Figure 29	Biweekly Turbidity: Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	63

San Joaquin River Basin Rotational Sub-basin Monitoring:
 Eastside Basin, January 2003 – April 2004
 (Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River Watersheds and Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage Areas)

	LIST OF FIGURES	PAGE
Figure 30	Biweekly Turbidity: Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	63
Figure 31	Summary Total Coliform: Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	64
Figure 32	Summary Total Coliform: Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	64
Figure 33	Summary <i>E. coli</i> : Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	65
Figure 34	Summary <i>E. coli</i> : Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	65
Figure 35	Biweekly <i>E. coli</i> : Tuolumne Main Stem, January 2003 - April 2004	66
Figure 36	Biweekly <i>E. coli</i> : Tuolumne Tributaries, January 2003 - April 2004	66
Figure 37	Summary Temperature: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	70
Figure 38	Summary Temperature: Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	70
Figure 39	Biweekly Temperature: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	71
Figure 40	Biweekly Temperature: Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	71
Figure 41	Summary Dissolved Oxygen: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	72
Figure 42	Summary Dissolved Oxygen: Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	72
Figure 43	Biweekly Dissolved Oxygen: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	73
Figure 44	Biweekly Dissolved Oxygen: Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	73
Figure 45	Summary Specific Conductance: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	74
Figure 46	Summary Specific Conductance: Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	74
Figure 47	Biweekly Specific Conductance: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	75
Figure 48	Biweekly Specific Conductance: Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	75
Figure 49	Summary pH: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	76
Figure 50	Summary pH: Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	76
Figure 51	Biweekly pH: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	77
Figure 52	Biweekly pH: Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	77
Figure 53	Summary Turbidity: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	78
Figure 54	Summary Turbidity: Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	78
Figure 55	Biweekly Turbidity: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	79
Figure 56	Biweekly Turbidity: Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	79
Figure 57	Summary Total Coliform: Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	80
Figure 58	Summary Total Coliform: Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	80

San Joaquin River Basin Rotational Sub-basin Monitoring:
 Eastside Basin, January 2003 – April 2004
 (Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River Watersheds and Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage Areas)

LIST OF FIGURES		PAGE
Figure 59	Summary <i>E. coli</i> : Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	81
Figure 60	Summary <i>E. coli</i> : Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	81
Figure 61	Biweekly <i>E. coli</i> : Farmington Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	82
Figure 62	Biweekly <i>E. coli</i> : Valley Floor Drainage Area, January 2003 - April 2004	82
Figure 63	Eastside Basin Watershed Integrator Sites: Temperature	85
Figure 64	Eastside Basin Watershed Integrator Sites: Dissolved Oxygen	86
Figure 65	Eastside Basin Watershed Integrator Sites: pH	87
Figure 66	Eastside Basin Watershed Integrator Sites: Specific Conductance	88
Figure 67	Eastside Basin Watershed Integrator Sites: Turbidity	89
Figure 68	Eastside Basin Watershed Integrator Sites: Total Suspended Solids	90
Figure 69	Eastside Basin Watershed Integrator Sites: Total Organic Carbon	91
Figure 70	Eastside Basin Watershed Integrator Sites: Total Coliform	92
Figure 71	Eastside Basin Watershed Integrator Sites: <i>E. coli</i>	93
Figure 72	Eastside Basin Valley Floor Integrator Sites: Temperature	95
Figure 73	Eastside Basin Valley Floor Sites: Dissolved Oxygen	96
Figure 74	Eastside Basin Valley Floor Sites: pH	97
Figure 75	Eastside Basin Valley Floor Sites: Specific Conductance	98
Figure 76	Eastside Basin Valley Floor Sites: Turbidity	99
Figure 77	Eastside Basin Valley Floor Sites: Total Suspended Solids	100
Figure 78	Eastside Basin Valley Floor Sites: Total Organic Carbon	101
Figure 79	Eastside Basin Valley Floor Sites: Total Coliform	102
Figure 80	Eastside Basin Valley Floor Sites: <i>E. coli</i>	103
Figure 81	Eastside Sub-basin Discharge to the San Joaquin River: Temperature	106
Figure 82	Eastside Sub-basin Discharge to the San Joaquin River: Specific Conductance	107
Figure 83	Eastside Sub-basin Discharge to the San Joaquin River: Turbidity	108
Figure 84	Eastside Sub-basin Discharge to the San Joaquin River: Total Organic Carbon	109
Figure 85	Eastside Sub-basin Discharge to the San Joaquin River: <i>E. coli</i>	110
Figure 86	Facilities located near Sonora and Jamestown, as identified in EPA Envirofacts	112
Figure 87	Facilities located near Modesto, as identified in EPA Envirofacts	115
Figure 88	Drinking Water Beneficial Use Evaluation: Total Organic Carbon (TOC), compared to the Bay-Delta Criterial of <3.0 mg/l	121
Figure 89	Drinking Water Beneficial Use Evaluation: Sites with Medians Above the Bay Delta Authority's Guideline for Total Organic Carbon	122
Figure 90	Aquatic Life Beneficial Use Evaluation: Overall Temperature as Compared to the Bay-Delta Authority Guideline of 20 degrees Celsius from April 1 to June 30 and/or September 1 to December 31	125
Figure 91	Aquatic Life Beneficial Use Evaluation: Temperature by Watershed as Compared to the Bay-Delta Authority Guideline of 20 degrees Celsius from April 1 to June 30 and/or September 1 to December 31	126

San Joaquin River Basin Rotational Sub-basin Monitoring:
 Eastside Basin, January 2003 – April 2004
 (Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River Watersheds and Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage
 Areas)

	LIST OF FIGURES	PAGE
Figure 92	Contact Recreation Beneficial Use Evaluation: <i>E. coli</i> , As Subset of the Basin Plan Fecal Coliform Single Sample Objective (<400 MPN/100mL), Year Round Data	131
Figure 93	<i>E. coli</i> Results as Compared to the USEPA Recreational Guidelines, January 2003 - April 2004 - Eastside Basin	132
Figure 94	Comparison of <i>E. coli</i> Results to USEPA Guidelines for Recreational Waters, by Watershed	133
Figure 95	Recreation Beneficial Use Evaluation: Comparison of Bacteria Results Medians to Environmental Protection Agency <i>E. coli</i> (MPN) Guidelines for Contact Recreation	136

	LIST OF APPENDICES	PAGE
Appendix A	Site Descriptions and Monthly Photographic Documentation	A-1
Appendix B	Water Quality Data By Watershed	B-1
Appendix C	Water Quality Objectives/Goals and Related Beneficial Use Tables	C-1
Appendix C1	Water Quality Objectives and Targets Used to Analyze Data	C-2
Appendix C2	Water Quality Goals Used to Analyze San Joaquin River SWAMP Data	C-4
Appendix C3	Site Specific Beneficial Uses	C-6
Appendix C4	Exceedance/Elevated Levels Summary	C-9
Appendix C5	Monthly Comparison of Results to Water Quality Objectives, Targets, and Goals by Watershed	C-18
Appendix D	Multi-Agency Monitoring Table	D-1
Appendix E	Outreach Effort	E-1
Appendix F	Spatial and Temporal Graphs not Included in Section 8.1, Individual Watershed Discussion	F-1
Appendix G	Special Study Data Comparisons, Section 8.3	G-1
Appendix H	Precipitation and Flow Data	H-1
Appendix I	Pre-Draft Report Comments and Response	I-1

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From January 2003 through March 2004, staff from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) initiated the second rotation of the Intensive Basin Program (IBP) as part of the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) for the San Joaquin River. The IBP was the final layer in the 3-tiered monitoring framework developed as part of the San Joaquin River Basin SWAMP. In the first two tiers, the main stem of the San Joaquin River (SJR) and the major inflows to the River were monitored monthly. During the IBP, sub-basins of the SJR were intensively monitored for one year on a rotational basis. The SJR watershed was divided into five sub-basins, based on similar management practices and hydrologies.

The purpose of each rotation was to identify current monitoring efforts within the sub-basin (agency and local) as well as any local water quality concerns, evaluate spatial and temporal trends of key constituents, and determine whether there was any evidence that beneficial uses were not being protected. Resulting information was utilized in the development of the Integrated Report which both assesses water quality in all surface waters and identifies beneficial use impairments (CVRWQCB 2009).

This second phase of the IBP focused on the watersheds draining the east side of the San Joaquin River Watershed, south of the Calaveras Watershed, and north of the Bear Creek Watershed. Specifically, this 6,091 square mile area, named the Eastside Basin covers approximately one third of the entire San Joaquin River Basin and includes the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River Basins as well as the Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage Areas. The main source of water for the three major rivers is snowmelt from the Sierra Nevada, which travels through diverse geography with elevations ranging from 20 to 13,000 feet, as well as a variety of land uses (undisturbed, timber, grazing, urban and irrigated agriculture), and intense hydrologic management including regulating dams on the three major rivers.

Prior to initial water quality sampling, over 200 state, federal, and local agencies as well as known watershed groups were surveyed to identify current monitoring efforts and local concerns. Monitoring during the time of the study was limited to selected gauges maintained by the California Department of Water Resources and US Geological Survey, and targeted studies conducted by others. Data for the targeted studies was not readily accessible. Local concerns were focused on watershed characterization, flood control, agricultural and rural/urban development impacts. The final sampling design incorporated the initial survey findings including special studies upstream and downstream of subdivision construction in a rural foothill community (Sonora) and impacts of an agriculturally dominated watershed (Dry Creek) on the Tuolumne River.

Sampling within each basin was conducted twice a month for a 12-month period. Core constituents sampled consisted of: temperature, turbidity, dissolved oxygen, pH, specific conductance, total Coliform, and *E. coli*. As funding permitted, additional constituents were added: total suspended solids, total organic carbon, partial minerals, total trace elements, and water column toxicity. All information and water quality data for this project and other monitoring activities conducted under SWAMP in the San Joaquin River Basin are available within a year of sampling at the following web site:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/water_quality_studies/surface_water_ambient_monitoring/index.shtml

The San Joaquin River Index is used to classify water year type from 1 October through 30 September of the following year, based on unimpaired runoff (SWRCB, 1995). Sampling in the Eastside Basin coincided with WYs 2003 and 2004, which were classified as below normal and dry, respectively.

During the study, constituents monitored displayed both spatial and temporal variations and some areas were identified for further review of potential impacts to beneficial uses.

Spatial Trend Findings:

Within the river basins, temperature, SC, turbidity, and *E. coli* concentrations were highly variable in the upper watersheds, while concentrations of all constituents except pH were the most stable at the reservoir releases. In the lower watersheds, concentrations of SC, turbidity, TOC, TSS and *E. coli* generally increased moving downstream. Tributary sites in both the upper watershed and lower watershed generally had higher temperature, median turbidity, TOC, and TSS than the main stem river sites.

Within the lower drainage areas, the Valley Floor area showed greater diversity in DO, SC, and pH concentrations than in the Farmington Area. The Valley Floor drains were overall higher in all parameters measured except temperature, pH, and DO, while the laterals generally had the highest concentrations of those parameters, matched by Farmington for DO. Additionally, TOC was higher in agriculturally dominated areas than in combined urban/agriculturally influenced areas.

Overall, discharges from all basins to the San Joaquin River had comparable temperature values and ranges. Concentrations and ranges for SC, turbidity, TOC, and *E. coli* were lowest at the three river inflows. For turbidity and *E. coli*, the Valley Floor laterals were similar to the river inflows, and for specific conductance, the Farmington site was similar to the river inflows. The Valley Floor Drains consistently had higher results and were more variable for SC, turbidity, TOC, and *E. coli*.

Temporal Trend Findings:

Seasonal trends in the river basins included increased temperature in the summer months, with an inverse trend in DO concentrations, except for the reservoir releases which were relatively constant year-round. Dips in SC corresponded to reservoir releases. Spikes in turbidity, TSS, TOC, and *E. coli* often occurred after rains and with irrigation flows. Similar to the River Basins, turbidity, TOC, TSS, and *E. coli* in the lower drainage areas increased after rainfall events, and in the case of turbidity and *E. coli*, after increased agricultural flows.

Stakeholder Concerns:

In evaluating the stakeholder concerns, significant increases of SC, turbidity, boron, calcium, chloride, sulfate, copper, cadmium, and zinc were found downstream of a residential construction site in a rural community. Also, significant increases of turbidity and *E. coli* were found downstream of the inflow to the Tuolumne River from an agriculturally dominated subwatershed.

Preliminary Assessment of Potential Beneficial Use Concerns:

Potential impacts to key beneficial uses were evaluated by using selected indicators and comparing results against published water quality goals, targets and/or guidelines as follows:

- Drinking Water (SC, minerals (chloride and sulfate), TOC, trace elements (arsenic cadmium, copper, mercury, nickel, lead and zinc) and *E. coli*);
- Aquatic Life (pH, temperature, DO, turbidity, water column toxicity, trace elements (arsenic, cadmium, copper, mercury, nickel, lead, and zinc), and hardness)
- Irrigation water supply (SC)
- Recreation (*E. coli*)

In summary:

Drinking Water – Elevated concentrations of arsenic were found at Littlejohn’s Creek at Sonora Road and cadmium at Woods Creek at Mill Villa Drive. The high percent of elevated TOC concentrations above the Bay-Delta Program guideline for source water (43% of samples collected) makes TOC the highest potential drinking water concern, especially in the drainage areas and lower watershed tributaries. *E. coli* presence in most samples analyzed indicates possible presence of pathogens and a requirement of treatment prior to use for municipal supply.

Aquatic Life – Most areas of concern occurred in the Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage areas, especially for pH, DO, temperature, and trace elements. The majority of pH exceedances occurred during the late storm season (January – May) and was skewed to higher (more alkaline) concentrations. The DO at the MID Main Drain was below the objective (7.0 mg/l) throughout the study period. In addition, 34% of the samples analyzed did not meet the Bay-Delta Authority target for temperature (20-degrees C from 1 April to 30 June and/or 1 September to 30 December). Unlike drinking water where cadmium and arsenic were the only trace elements with elevated concentrations, zinc and copper were the only trace elements that had elevated concentrations when evaluated for aquatic life.

Irrigation – Concentrations above the 700 umhos/cm recommended by the Water Quality Goal for Agriculture were only found in the Valley Floor Drainage area from both drains and TID Laterals 6/7 and Lateral 7, representing 49% of the total elevated SC samples analyzed in the Valley Floor Drainage Area, but only 6% of the total elevated SC samples analyzed basin wide.

Recreation – The Basin Plan identifies a fecal coliform objective of 400 MPN/100-ml, which may have been exceeded at selected sites based on analysis of *E. coli*, a subset of fecal coliform. The elevated levels primarily occurred in tributaries passing through grazed land and in the drainage areas, with spikes in the tributaries corresponding to rainfall events and variable year-round spikes in the drainage areas. The *E. coli* results were also compared to USEPA contact recreation guidelines. All sub basins had concentrations above USEPA’s Designated Beach guideline (235 MPN/100ml), except within the Stanislaus Watershed. When evaluated against USEPA’s guidelines, approximately 70% of samples were acceptable for designated beaches, while 14% had limited use, and 16% were above all acceptable contact guidelines.

Future Activities

By the end of 2005, other Central Valley Water Board surface water monitoring efforts had expanded—notably the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP) and monitoring conducted under various grant efforts. The Central Valley Water Board SWAMP efforts became more focused on internal and external monitoring coordination rather than continuing to maintain a

separate monitoring strategy with shrinking resources. Some of these efforts related to the Eastside Basin include:

- Leveraging funds with a separate USEPA project to continue development of a web-based monitoring directory designed to display active monitoring within the entire Central Valley (<http://centralvalleymonitoring.org>)
- Providing resources to insure ILRP water quality information is captured in the state-wide SWAMP master data base
- Developing a region-wide, long-term trend monitoring framework based on 30-sites within the Central Valley that are part of the state-wide SWAMP contaminant trend monitoring efforts (three Eastside Basin sites are included)

Efforts related specifically to the elevated *E. coli* concentrations found within the Eastside Basin as well as in other areas of the Central Valley as part of the ILRP monitoring follow:

- A Safe to Swim survey of *E. coli* concentrations in local swimming holes before, during, and after a holiday weekend (coordinated with Central Valley watershed groups during both 2007 and 2008, with a follow study in 2009).
- A pilot bacteria source identification project with the University of California, Davis, in selected streams that had demonstrated elevated *E. coli* concentrations.
- Continued, seasonal *E. coli* monitoring at 30 major integrator sites throughout the Central Valley.

Based on information collected during this project, future monitoring efforts in the Eastside Basin should consider:

- Increased coordination
 - Coordinated monitoring with the Irrigated Lands Program and stakeholder groups.
 - Tie monitoring in with priorities of other efforts to include the California Watershed Council and the San Joaquin River Restoration Program
 - Mapping all NPDES, irrigated lands, and other monitoring efforts.
- Expanded studies
 - Temperature surveys in the lower watershed areas during spawning and migration periods.
 - Expanded surveys for TOC, DO, SC, arsenic, and cadmium, especially in the Farmington and Valley Floor Drainage Areas, to include examining the impact of high concentration of these constituents in these waterways plays on the San Joaquin River and Delta.
 - Focused seasonal and source bacteria studies, particularly at areas known to be utilized for full contact recreation (e.g. local swimming holes).

Recommendations for future monitoring for each sub-basin include those parameters identified in Table 22 within the discussion and conclusion section of this report.