PEER REVIEW DRAFT

STAFF REPORT FOR THE KLAMATH RIVER BASIN TEMPERATURE, DISSOLVED OXYGEN, ORGANIC MATTER, AND NUTRIENT TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS

December 2008

State of California
North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
5550 Skylane Boulevard, Suite A
Santa Rosa, California 95403
707-576-2220
www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast

TMDL Development Team

Steve Butkus
Katharine Carter
Clayton Creager
Elmer Dudik
Holly Lundborg
Bryan McFadin
Samantha Olsen
Matt St. John
Ben Zabinski

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS i
LIST OF FIGURES vi
LIST OF TABLES x

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION
1.1 Overview 1
1.2 Report Organization 4
1.3 TMDL Development and Adoption Process 5
1.4 Regulatory Framework and Purpose of the TMDL 6
1.5 Other Ongoing Regulatory Processes in the Klamath River Basin 7
1.5.1 Tribal Trust Responsibilities 8
1.5.2 ESA Consultation 8
1.5.3 Water Quality Certification 8
1.6 Physical Setting 9
1.6.1 Population and Land Ownership 9
1.6.2 Topography, Geology and Soils 11
1.6.3 Vegetation 16
1.6.4 Climate 16
1.6.5 Hydrology 19
1.6.6 Water Use 21
1.6.6.1 Water Rights of the Klamath River Basin, California 23

CHAPTER 2. PROBLEM STATEMENT
2.1 Introduction 1
2.1.1 Non-TMDL Factors and Other Regulatory Processes 2
2.2 Water Quality Standards 3
2.2.1 Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region 4
2.2.1.1 Beneficial Uses 4
2.2.1.2 Water Quality Objectives 4
Temperature 5
Dissolved Oxygen 6
Nutrients 7
Nutrient-Related Water Quality Objectives 7
2.2.1.3 Antidegradation Policies 8
2.2.1.4 Program of Implementation 8
2.2.2 Tribal Water Quality Standards 9
2.2.2.1 Hoopa Valley Tribe Beneficial Uses 9
2.2.2.2 Hoopa Valley Tribe Water Quality Criteria 9
Dissolved Oxygen 9
Nutrients 10
Nutrient-Related Water Quality Criteria 11
2.2.2.3 Karuk Tribe, Resighini Rancheria, and Yurok Tribe Beneficial Uses 11
2.2.2.4 Karuk Tribe, Resighini Rancheria, and Yurok Tribe, Water Quality Objectives and Criteria 12

2.3 Numeric Targets 15
2.3.1 Temperature 15
2.3.2 Dissolved Oxygen and Nutrient-Related 15
2.3.2.1 Benthic Algae Biomass 15
2.3.2.2 Suspended Algae Chlorophyll-a, Microcystis aeruginosa, and Microcystin Toxin 16
2.4 Water Quality Conceptual Models Overview 24
2.4.1 Klamath River Nutrient and Temperature Conceptual Models 25
2.4.2 Nutrient Conceptual Model Environmental Conditions and Cofactors 29
2.4.2.1 Nutrient Related Effects on Productivity 29
2.4.2.2 Nutrient Related Effects on Ammonia Toxicity 33
2.4.2.3 Nutrient Risk Cofactors 33
2.4.3 Temperature Conceptual Model Environmental Conditions and Cofactors 35
2.4.3.1 Thermal Processes Related to Solar Loading 35
2.4.3.2 Thermal Processes Related to Sediment Load 36
2.4.3.3 Thermal Processes Related to Flow 37
2.4.3.4 Thermal Processes Related to Direct Thermal Discharges 38
2.4.3.5 Thermal Processes Related to Impoundments 38
2.4.3.6 Temperature Risk Cofactors 39
2.4.4 Responses/Outcomes 40
2.4.4.1 Migration/Avoidance Barrier (Da1) 40
2.4.4.2 Decreased Spawning and Reproductive Success (Da2) 40
2.4.4.3 Increased Physiological Stress (Da3) 41
2.4.4.4 Increased Incidence of Fish Disease (Ceratomyxa shasta and Columnaris) (Da4) 41
2.4.4.5 Decreased Juvenile Growth (Da5) 43
2.4.4.6 Increased Fish Mortality and Lower Overall Populations (Da6, Da7, Da8) 43
2.4.4.7 Impacts to Cultural and Harvest-Related Activities (Da9, Da10, Da11) 44
2.4.4.8 Impacts to Municipal Supply, Recreation, and Traditional/Cultural Use (Db1, Db2, Db3, Db4) 44
2.5 Evidence of Water Quality Objective and Numeric Target Exceedances 45
2.5.1 Temperature and Nutrient Data Sources 45
2.5.2 Temperature 45
2.5.2.1 Mainstem Klamath River 46
2.5.2.2 Tributaries to the Klamath River 48
2.5.2.3 Reservoirs 49
2.5.3 Nutrients and Indicators of Nutrient-Related Impairment 50
2.5.3.1 Nutrient Concentrations 51
2.5.3.2 Benthic Algal Biomass 53
2.5.3.3 Diurnal DO and pH 53
2.5.3.4 Chlorophyll-a – Reservoirs 55
2.5.4 Blue-Green Algae and Microcystin Toxin 58
2.5.5 Dissolved Oxygen 60
2.5.6 pH 62

2.5.7 Ammonia Toxicity 63
2.5.8 Sediment 63
2.6 Evidence of Beneficial Use Impairment 65
2.6.1 Evidence of Impairment to Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD), Rare, Threatened, or Endangered Species (RARE), Migration of Aquatic Organisms (MIGR), and Spawning, Reproduction, and/or Early Development (SPWN) 65
2.6.1.1 Salmonid Population Decline 65
Fall Chinook Salmon 65
Spring Chinook Salmon 66
Steelhead Trout 66
Spring/Summer Steelhead Trout 66
Fall Steelhead Trout 66
Winter Steelhead Trout 66
Coho Salmon 66
2.6.1.2 Juvenile and Adult Fish Kills 67
2.6.1.3 Adult and Juvenile Salmonid Migration Barriers and Spawning and Rearing Habitat Degradation 69
2.6.2 Impairment of Native American Culture (CUL) and Subsistence Fishing (FISH) Beneficial Uses 71
2.6.2.1 Decline in Salmonid and Other Fish Populations 72
2.6.2.2 Degraded Water Quality 74
2.6.3 Impairment of Water Contact Recreation (REC-1), Non-Contact Water Recreation (REC-2), and Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) 76
2.6.3.1 Recreational Impacts 76
2.6.3.2. Health Impacts 78
2.6.3.3. Aesthetic Impacts 79
2.6.4 Impairment of Commercial and Sport Fishing (COMM) 79
2.6.4.1 In-River Sport Fishing Impairment 80
2.6.4.2 Ocean Sport Fishing Impairment 80
2.6.4.3 In-River Commercial Fishery Impairment 81
2.6.4.4 Ocean Commercial Fishery Impairment 81
2.7 Problem Statement Synthesis 83

CHAPTER 3. ANALYTIC APPROACH
3.1 Introduction 1
3.2 Modeling Approach 1
3.2.1 Primary Models Applied 1
3.2.1.1 Model Configuration and Testing 4
3.2.1.2 Assumptions, Limitations, and Uncertainty 7
3.2.2 Nutrient Numeric Endpoint Analysis 7
3.3 Model Application to TMDL Determination 8
3.3.1 Current Conditions (S1) 8
3.3.2 Natural Baseline Conditions (T1BS) 8
3.3.3 TMDL Compliance 9
3.3.3.1 Temperature Compliance in Oregon (TOT1 and TOT2) 10
3.3.3.2 Temperature Compliance in California (TCT1 and TCT2) 10

Shasta River 11
Scott River 11
Salmon River 14
Trinity River 15
3.3.3.3 Dissolved Oxygen Compliance in Oregon (TOD1 and TOD2) 15
3.3.3.4 Dissolved Oxygen Compliance in California (TCD2) 15
3.3.4 Dam Impacts (T4BS1) 16

CHAPTER 4. POLLUTANT SOURCE ANALYSIS
4.1 Introduction 1
4.1.1 Pollutant Source Categories 2
4.1.2 Natural Conditions Baseline - Background Loads 3
4.1.3 Pollutant Source Loads – Overview 4
4.2 Pollutant Source Area Loads 11
4.2.1 Stateline – Upper Klamath Basin 11
4.2.1.1 Temperature 11
4.2.1.2 Nutrients and Organic Matter 12
4.2.2 Copco 1 and 2 and Iron Gate Reservoirs 13
4.2.2.1 Temperature 13
4.2.2.2 Nutrients, Organic Matter, and Dissolved Oxygen 15
Internal Nutrient Loading Within Reservoirs 15
Nutrient Retention Within Free-Flowing Rivers 16
TMDL Model Results 17
4.2.3 Iron Gate Hatchery 23
4.2.3.1 Temperature 23
4.2.3.2 Nutrients and Organic Matter 24
4.2.4 Tributaries 25
4.2.4.1 Temperature 25
Shasta River 26
Scott River 27
Trinity River 30
Effects of Shade on Klamath River Tributaries 32
Effects of Sediment Loads on Klamath River Tributaries 32
4.2.4.2 Nutrients and Organic Matter 33

CHAPTER 5. KLAMATH RIVER TMDLs – ALLOCATIONS and NUMERIC TARGETS
5.1 Introduction 1
5.1.1 Numeric Targets 1
5.1.1.1 Temperature Numeric Targets 1
5.1.1.2 Dissolved Oxygen and Nutrient-Related Numeric Targets 3
5.1.2 Loading Capacity, Allocations, and Margin of Safety 3
5.1.2.1 Temperature Loading Capacity, Allocations, and Margin of Safety 4
5.1.2.2 Dissolved Oxygen, Nutrient and Organic Matter Loading Capacity, Allocations, and Margin of Safety 5
5.2 Temperature-Related Numeric Targets and Allocations 11

5.2.1. Watershed-Wide Temperature-Related Targets and Load Allocations in California 12
5.2.1.1 Riparian Shade 12
5.2.1.2 Excess Sediment 14
5.2.2 Temperature Numeric Targets and Load Allocations at Stateline 15
5.2.3 Temperature Numeric Targets and Load Allocations to Copco 2 and Iron Gate 15
5.2.4 Temperature Numeric Targets and Waste Load Allocations to Iron Gate Hatchery 18
5.3 Dissolved Oxygen and Nutrient-Related Numeric Targets and Allocations 18
5.3.1 Dissolved Oxygen and Nutrient-Related Numeric Targets and Load Allocations at Stateline 18
5.3.2 Dissolved Oxygen and Nutrient-Related Numeric Targets and Load Allocations to Copco 1 and 2 and Iron Gate Reservoirs 20
5.3.2.1 Copco 2 and Iron Gate Reservoir Targets 20
5.3.2.2 Copco 1 and 2 and Iron Gate Reservoir Load Allocations 22
5.3.3 Dissolved Oxygen and Nutrient-Related Numeric Targets and Waste Load Allocations to Iron Gate Hatchery 23
5.3.4 Dissolved Oxygen and Nutrient-Related Numeric Targets and Load Allocations to California Tributaries 24

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

Figure 1.1: Klamath River Basin Showing Rivers, Lakes and Reservoirs, Population Centers, and Major Roads 2
Figure 1.2: Land Ownership in the Klamath River Basin 10
Figure 1.3: Land Elevation in the Klamath River Basin 12
Figure 1.4: Geomorphic Provinces in the Klamath River Basin 13
Figure 1.5: Geologic Map of the Klamath River Basin 15
Figure 1.6: Vegetation and Land Cover of the Klamath River Basin 17
Figure 1.7: Average Annual Rainfall in the Klamath River Basin 18
Figure 1.8: Average Monthly Precipitation, 1905-2003, in Klamath Falls, Oregon and Orleans, California 19
Figure 1.9: Map of Klamath River Basin Emphasizing Subbasins and Surface Drainage 20
Figure 1.10: Monthly Average Flows at Five Klamath River Locations, Water Years 1963-2005 21
Figure 1.11: Estimated unimpaired Klamath River flows at Seiad Valley, California, and historic monthly average Klamath River flow at Seiad Valley, California; Water Years 1952-2004 23

CHAPTER 2

Figure 2.1: Relationship of chlorophyll-a and Microcystis aeruginosa (MSAE) cell density at monitoring stations along the Klamath River (2005-2007) from above Copco Reservoir to the lower Klamath River estuary 19
Figure 2.2: Relationship of chlorophyll-a and microcystin at monitoring stations along the Klamath River (2005-2007) from above Copco Reservoir to the lower estuary 20
Figure 2.3: Microcystis aeruginosa (MSAE) cell density exceedance probability plotted as a function of chlorophyll-a concentration (10 µg/L) for Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs using data collected by the Karuk Tribe of California Natural Resources Department for the years 2005, 2006, and 2007 during peak growing season (June – August) 21
Figure 2.4: Microcystin concentration exceedance probability plotted as a function of chlorophyll-a concentration (10 µg/L) for Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs using data collected by the Karuk Tribe of California Natural Resources Department for the years 2005, 2006, and 2007 during peak growing season (June – August) 22
Figure 2.5: Relationship of Microcystis aeruginosa (MSAE) cell density and microcystin concentrations for stations along the Klamath river from above Copco to the lower estuary for the years 2006 and 2007 (Kann 2009). 23
Figure 2.6: Microcystin exceedance probability plotted as a function of Microcystis aeruginosa cell density for Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs using data collected by the Karuk Tribe of California Natural Resources Department and PacifiCorp for the years 2005, 2006, and 2007 during peak growing season (June – August). 24
Figure 2.7: Nutrient Conceptual Model for the Klamath River in California 27
Figure 2.8: Temperature Conceptual Model for the Klamath River in California 28

Figure 2.9: Life cycle of C. shasta showing release of the myxospore stage from the infected fish, the polychaete alternate host, and release of the alternate actinospore stage from the polychaete....31
Figure 2.10: Severity of Ceratomyxosis in Klamath River suggests a shift in the host/parasite balance towards C. shasta....32
Figure 2.11 : Measured Klamath River MWMTs, 2000-2005....47
Figure 2.12: Current and Estimated Natural Temperatures Downstream of Iron Gate Dam, 2000....47
Figure 2.13: Klamath River Tributary Mouth MWMTs Stream Temperatures 2000-2005....49
Figure 2.14: Dissolved oxygen and temperature depth profiles in Iron Gate Reservoir – average for July and August 2000 – 2005....50
Figure 2.15: Comparison of total phosphorous concentrations for existing conditions (consolidated monitoring data 1996-2007) with estimated (TMDL model) natural conditions baseline at Klamath River monitoring stations in California....52
Figure 2.16: Comparison of total nitrogen concentrations for existing conditions (consolidated monitoring data 1996-2007) with estimated (TMDL model) natural conditions baseline at Klamath River monitoring stations in California....52
Figure 2.17: Benthic algal biomass consolidated monitoring results (summer mean and maximum) for 2003, 2004, 2006, and 2007 with CA NNE target (150 mg chlorophyll-a/m2) and simulated background conditions....53
Figure 2.18: Example diurnal DO and pH cycle below Iron Gate Dam, summer 2006....54
Figure 2.19: Example diurnal DO and pH cycle above the Shasta River, summer 2004....54
Figure 2.20: Example diurnal DO and pH cycle at Seiad Valley, summer 2002....55
Figure 2.21: Comparison of central tendencies of summer (May – September) chlorophyll-a measurements for 2005, 2006, and 2007 at twenty monitoring stations along the Klamath River....56
Figure 2.22: Longitudinal analysis of chlorophyll-a concentrations for the period May through September (2005 – 2007) along the Klamath River from the mouth of Link River (OR) to the lower estuary (CA) using monitoring data collected by Yurok Tribe Environmental Program, Karuk Tribe Natural Resources, and PacifiCorp....57
Figure 2.23: Summer mean concentrations of chlorophyll-a (2000 – 2007) at four stations within the Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs. 58
Figure 2.24: Percent of DO measurements below Basin Plan Water Quality Objective of 8.0 mg/L for 2005 at nine stations along the Klamath River....61
Figure 2.25: Calculated percent DO saturation at nine stations on the Klamath River for 2005....62
Figure 2.26: Percent of 2005 pH measurements in the Klamath River that exceed 8.5....62
Figure 2.27: Mapped extent of stream channels substantially altered by sediment loads associated with the 1997 flood. Source: Klamath National Forest....64
Figure 2.28: Fish Kill Years and Locations in the Klamath River in California....68

CHAPTER 3

Figure 3.1: Model segments in Oregon and Northern California....3
Figure 3.2: Model segments in California....3

CHAPTER 4

Figure 4.1: Current total phosphorous annual loading diagram 6
Figure 4.2: Current total nitrogen annual loading diagram 7
Figure 4.3: Current organic matter (as CBOD) annual loading diagram 8
Figure 4.4: Estimated temperature changes at Stateline due to reservoirs and irrigation return flows upstream. Positive values represent an increase above the natural conditions baseline 11
Figure 4.5: Estimated change in daily maximum temperature at Stateline resulting from altered flows, 2000 simulation year. Positive values represent an increase in temperatures due to reduced flow 12
Figure 4.6: Comparison of Current Annual TP, TN, and CBOD Loads at Stateline to Natural Conditions Baseline Loads 13
Figure 4.7: Calculated change in daily maximum Klamath River temperatures resulting from the presence of Copco Reservoir for the 2000 calendar year. Positive values represent an increase in temperatures due to the presence of Copco 1 and 2 14
Figure 4.8: Calculated change in daily maximum Klamath River temperatures resulting from the presence of Iron Gate Reservoir for the 2000 calendar year. Positive values represent an increase in temperatures due to the presence of Iron Gate Reservoir 14
Figure 4.9: Comparison of Current Annual Loads of TP, TN, and CBOD with Natural Baseline Loads at Copco Reservoirs 17
Figure 4.10: Comparison of Current Annual Loads of TP, TN, and CBOD with Natural Baseline Loads at Iron Gate Reservoir 18
Figure 4.11: Comparison of PO4 concentrations immediately downstream of Iron Gate Reservoir illustrating contribution of nutrient flux from reservoir sediments under anoxic conditions (summer stratification) 20
Figure 4.12: Box Plot presenting Seasonal Distribution (1990 to 2007) of Total Phosphorus (TP) Concentrations (mg/L) below Iron Gate Dam 21
Figure 4.13: Box Plot presenting Seasonal Distribution of Ortho-Phosphate (PO4) Concentrations (mg/L) below Iron Gate Dam 21
Figure 4.14: Box Plot presenting Seasonal Distribution of Total Nitrogen (TN) Concentrations (mg/L) below Iron Gate Dam 22
Figure 4.15: Box Plot presenting Seasonal Distribution of Total Inorganic Nitrogen (TIN) Concentrations (mg/L) below Iron Gate Dam 22
Figure 4.16: Change in Klamath River daily maximum temperatures resulting from current and Shasta TMDL compliant Shasta River conditions. Negative values indicate that the Shasta River is cooling the Klamath River 26
Figure 4.17: Change in Klamath River daily maximum temperatures resulting from current and estimated natural Shasta River conditions. Negative values indicate that the Shasta River is cooling the Klamath River 26
Figure 4.18: Estimated daily average Shasta River temperatures at the mouth of the Shasta River for the three management scenarios evaluated 27
Figure 4.19: Change in Klamath River daily maximum temperatures resulting from current and Scott TMDL compliant Scott River conditions. Negative values indicate that the Scott River is cooling the Klamath River 28

Figure 4.20: Change in Klamath River daily maximum temperatures resulting from current and originally estimated natural Scott River conditions. Negative values indicate that the Scott River is cooling the Klamath River 28
Figure 4.21: Change in Klamath River daily maximum temperatures resulting from current and revised natural Scott River conditions estimates. Negative values indicate that the Scott River is cooling the Klamath River 29
Figure 4.22: Estimated daily average Scott River temperatures at the mouth of the Scott River for three scenarios.....30
Figure 4.23: Comparison of estimated Scott River Temperature conditions to estimated Klamath River conditions 30
Figure 4.24: Change in Klamath River daily maximum temperatures resulting from current and estimated natural Trinity River conditions. Negative values indicate that the Trinity is cooling the Klamath River 31
Figure 4.25: Change in Klamath River daily maximum temperatures resulting from current and Trinity ROD compliant Trinity River conditions. Negative values indicate that the Trinity River is cooling the Klamath River 31
Figure 4.26: Current Total Annual Loading (Pounds/Year) of Total Phosphorus, Total Nitrogen, and CBOD to the Klamath River from California Tributaries 34
Figure 4.27: Shasta River Comparison of Current Loads (pounds/year) of TP, TN, and CBOD with Natural Conditions Baseline Loads 35

CHAPTER 5

Figure 5.1: Total Phosphorous Loading Capacity and Allocations for the Klamath River Consistent with Assimilative Capacity and Beneficial Use Support.....6
Figure 5.2: Total Nitrogen Loading Capacity and Allocations for the Klamath River Consistent with Assimilative Capacity and Beneficial Use Support.....7
Figure 5.3: Organic Matter Loading Capacity and Allocations for the Klamath River Consistent with Assimilative Capacity and Beneficial Use Support. 8
Figure 5.4: Effective shade vs. channel width for various channel orientations, Douglas Fir and mixed hardwood-conifer forests. Assumed vegetation height = 40 meters (131.2 feet). 12
Figure 5.5: Effective shade vs. channel width for various channel orientations, Klamath mixed conifer and Ponderosa Pine forests. Assumed vegetation height = 35 meters (114.8 feet). 13
Figure 5.6: Effective shade vs. channel width for various channel orientations, oak woodland forest. Assumed vegetation height = 20 meters (65.6 feet).....13
Figure 5.7: Natural temperature change through the Copco Reservoir reaches. Calculated as difference of downstream and upstream daily maximum and daily average temperatures; a positive value indicates warming through the reach. 17
Figure 5.8: Natural temperature change through the Iron Gate Reservoir reach. Calculated as difference of downstream and upstream daily maximum and daily average temperatures; a positive value indicates warming through the reach 17
Figure 5.9: Illustrated Conceptual Model of Reservoir Compliance Lens for Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen.....23

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1
Table 1.1: Klamath River Water Quality Impairments in California.....3
Table 1.2: Status of TMDLs in the Klamath River Basin.....4
Table 1.3: Fully Appropriated Klamath River Reaches and Tributaries to the Klamath River in California 24
Table 1.4: Summary of Water Rights in the Klamath River Basin in California 25

CHAPTER 2
Table 2.1: Hoopa Valley Tribe Numeric Nutrient Criteria 11
Table 2.2: Hoopa Valley Tribe Numeric Nutrient and Toxicity Related Criteria 11
Table 2.3: Karuk Tribe, Resighini Rancheria, and Yurok Tribe Narrative Objectives and Criteria for the Klamath River in California.....12,13
Table 2.4 Karuk Tribe Numeric Water Quality Objectives 14
Table 2.5 Resighini Rancheria Numeric Water Quality Criteria 14
Table 2.6: Yurok Tribe Numeric Water Quality Objectives.....14
Table 2.7: MWMT Chronic Effects Temperature Thresholds.....46
Table 2.8: Lethal Temperature Thresholds 46
Table 2.9: Summary of blue-green algae monitoring data for 2006, 2007, and 2008 59
Table 2.10: Percent of DO measurements below Basin Plan Water Quality Objective of 8.0 mg/L for 2004 – 2006 at nine stations along the Klamath River.....60
Table 2.11: Percent of calculated percent DO saturation estimates below the proposed Basin Plan Water Quality Objective of 85% saturation for 2004 – 2006 at nine stations along the Klamath River 61
Table 2.12: Percent of pH measurements above 8.5 for 2004 – 2006 at nine stations along the Klamath River. 63
Table 2.13: Juvenile Fish Kill Locations and Causes in the Klamath River in California 68
Table 2.14: Adult Fish Kill Locations and Causes in the Klamath River in California 69
Table 2.15: Karuk, Yurok, and Quartz Valley Tribes Cultural Beneficial Uses (CUL and FISH) of the Klamath River and Tributaries 77
Table 2.16: Detection of Microcystin in Fish Tissue and Liver Samples from the Klamath River and Reservoirs.....80
Table 2.17: Estimates of Maximum Dollars for the ex-Vessel price of the Commercial Ocean Salmon Fishery for the Four Major Ports within the KMZ from 1976-1990 and 1991-2001. 82

CHAPTER 3
Table 3.1: Models applied to each Klamath River and estuary segment 2
Table 3.2: Estimated and measured flows at USGS' "Scott River near Fort Jones" gauge 14

CHAPTER 4
Table 4.1: Klamath River Anthropogenic Pollutant Source Categories Impacting Water Quality Parameters of Concern 3

Table 4.2: Current and Natural Conditions Baseline Nutrient and Organic Matter Loadings to the Klamath River in California....9,10
Table 4.3: Current Total Phosphorus, Total Nitrogen, and CBOD Loads at Stateline, Copco Outlet, and Iron Gate Outlet, and Associated Loading Changes....19

CHAPTER 5

Table 5.1: Summary of Klamath River TMDLs Numeric Targets and Allocations....2
Table 5.2: Total Phosphorus TMDL (lbs.)....10
Table 5.3: Total Nitrogen TMDL (lbs.)....11
Table 5.4: Total Organic Matter TMDL (lbs.)....11
Table 5.5: Temperature Numeric Targets (°C) at Stateline, Expressed as Monthly Averages....15
Table 5.6: Temperature Numeric Targets for Iron Gate and Copco Reservoir Tailrace Waters, Expressed as Monthly Averages....16
Table 5.7: Temperature Load Allocations for Reservoir Tailrace Waters, Expressed as Increase Relative to Inflow....18
Table 5.8: Temperature Numeric Targets for Iron Gate Hatchery, Expressed as Monthly Averages....18
Table 5.9: Dissolved Oxygen Numeric Targets (mg/L) at Stateline....19
Table 5.10: Nutrient and Organic Matter Monthly Mean Concentrations (mg/L) Allocations at Stateline....19
Table 5.11: Dissolved Oxygen Numeric Targets (mg/L) for Copco 2 and Iron Gate Tailraces....20
Table 5.12: Nutrient and Organic Matter Monthly Mean Concentration Targets (mg/L) for Copco 2 and Iron Gate Tailraces....21
Table 5.13: Nutrient and Organic Matter Monthly Mean Concentration Targets (mg/L) for Mid-Point of Copco 1 and Iron Gate Reservoirs....21
Table 5.14: Dissolved Oxygen Numeric Targets (mg/L) for Iron Gate Hatchery Discharge....23
Table 5.15: Nutrient and Organic Matter Monthly Mean Concentration Targets (mg/L) for Iron Gate Hatchery....24
Table 5.16: Dissolved Oxygen Numeric Targets (mg/L) for the Klamath River Mainstem Below the Salmon River....24
Table 5.17: Nutrient and Organic Matter Monthly Mean Targets (mg/L) for Klamath River Below the Salmon River....24
Table 5.18: Nutrient and Organic Matter Seasonal Monthly Mean Concentration Allocations (mg/L) for Tributaries to the Klamath River....25
Table 5.19: Nutrient and Organic Matter Annual Monthly Mean Concentration Allocations (mg/L) for Tributaries to the Klamath River....26