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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report describes water quality studies conducted by the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) in accordance with the AQ 11 - Water Quality Technical Study Plan (AQ 11 - TSP) for the Middle Fork American River Project (MFP or Project). The stakeholder-approved TSP was included in Supporting Document (SD) H of the PreApplication Document (PAD) filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) on December 13, 2007 (PCWA 2007). A draft report was distributed to the Aquatics Technical Working Group (TWG) on February 1, 2008 for a 60 day comment period. The comment period ended on April 4, 2008. Oral comments were received at the March 10, 2008 Aquatics TWG meeting and have been addressed in this report. No written comments were received.

Water quality studies were conducted in the vicinity of the MFP during the spring and fall 2007 to characterize the physical, chemical, and bacterial water quality conditions upstream and downstream of Project facilities. The study consisted of summarizing current water quality objectives from the literature, implementing a water quality field sampling field program, and comparing water quality data from field with pertinent regulatory objectives and criteria. In addition, a screening level study of methyl mercury concentrations in sport fish tissue muscle was completed.

The water quality field sampling program included: (1) in-situ measurements; (2) collection of water quality samples for laboratory chemical analysis, hereafter referred to as the general water quality sampling; (3) voluntary water quality sampling that enhanced the approach described in the AQ 11 - TSP; (4) coliform sampling; and (5) measurement of water temperature and dissolved oxygen (profiles) in Project reservoirs. Fish for the methyl mercury muscle tissue analysis were also collected from the Project reservoirs and one location in the Middle Fork American River peaking reach (downstream of Oxbow Powerhouse, the lowermost Project facility) near Otter Creek.

The following sections provide a detailed description of the study objectives, study implementation, extent of the study area, study approach, study results, and literature cited.

### 2.0 STUDY OBJECTIVES

The objective of the water quality studies described in the AQ 11 - TSP is to characterize physical, chemical, and bacterial water quality conditions in the bypass reaches and the peaking reach, comparison reaches, and Project reservoirs and diversion pools and compare to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB 1998) Basin Plan objectives and water quality objectives.

### 3.0 STUDY IMPLEMENTATION

Figure 11-1 shows the AQ 11 - TSP objective and the study elements and activities that relate to completion of the study. It also shows how information developed through the water quality studies will be documented and provided to the stakeholders. The
following sections summarize the study elements completed, any deviations from the TSP and the rationale, outstanding study elements, and proposed modifications to the TSP.

### 3.1 Study Elements Completed

The following study elements have been completed:

- Collected in-situ and general water quality measurements on the bypass reaches, peaking reaches, reservoirs, and diversion pools in spring (39 locations) and fall (36 locations).
- Collected fecal coliform samples at 17 sites.
- Collected fish samples at Project reservoirs (Hell Hole, French Meadows, Ralston Afterbay, Middle Fork Interbay) and at one river site (Middle Fork American River downstream of Ralston Afterbay) for mercury fish tissue analyses.
- Provided water quality samples to State-certified laboratories approved by the State Water Resources Control Board for chemical analyses.
- Compared water quality results to the CVRWQCB Basin Plan objectives and water quality objectives (CVRWQCB, Fourth Edition revised February 2007).
- Compared fish tissue results to the California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) guidelines.


### 3.2 Deviations from Technical Study Plan

The water quality studies proceeded as described in the AQ 11-TSP except for the following deviations:

## General Water Quality Sampling

- Water quality samples were not collected during high and low flow events at all of the sampling locations along the peaking reach of the Middle Fork American River during the spring and fall sampling events, as indicated in the TSP. Instead, water quality samples were collected in the peaking reach once during the spring sampling event and again during the fall sampling event. During each event, water quality samples were collected at each of the locations identified in the TSP, under a range of flow conditions.
- One metal (manganese) was not analyzed during the spring sampling event due to a transcription error. Manganese was sampled during the fall sampling event.


## Coliform Sampling

- According to the fecal coliform sampling protocols, fecal coliform samples were to be collected five times within a 30 day period between July 4 and Labor Day. Two of the fecal coliform sampling locations were sampled the week after Labor

Day (the fifth sample in 30 days) because of a sampling location change late in the summer. Two of the sampling locations were changed to better meet the water quality sampling objectives. The location changes were agreed to by the Aquatics TWG.

## Voluntary Enhancements

- In-situ measurements were taken at three additional locations (leakage channels and main channel) downstream of Hell Hole Reservoir and five additional locations (leakage channels and main channel) downstream of French Meadows Reservoir.
- Additional water samples were collected and analyzed for dissolved metals and total mercury due to the presence of a rust-color staining on the substrate and precipitate at these selected locations described above.
- The TSP states that the water quality analytical results would be compared to the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region, Fourth Edition, published in September 1998. The analytical results were compared to the most recent version of the Basin Plan, which was updated with amendments in February 2007.


## Fish Tissue Sampling

- Five of the 10 recommended fish caught at French Meadows Reservoir (two brown trout and three rainbow trout) were analyzed for individual methyl mercury concentrations in the fish muscle tissue. The remaining five fish (brown trout) that were caught should have been analyzed individually. However, these five fish were analyzed as a composite.


## Voluntary Enhancements

- In addition to the ten fish caught at Hell Hole Reservoir (brown trout, rainbow trout, and lake trout that were analyzed for individual methyl mercury concentration), five additional fish (brown trout) were caught and analyzed as a composite sample.


### 3.3 Outstanding Study Elements

The following describes the only outstanding element of the water quality study:

- Consult with Aquatic TWG to discuss contingency water quality related studies.


### 3.4 Proposed Modification to Technical Study Plan

These are no proposed modifications to the AQ 11 - TSP.

### 4.0 EXTENT OF STUDY AREA

The study area included bypass and comparison reaches, the peaking reach, Project reservoirs, and diversion pools. The sampled locations are listed in Table AQ 11-1 and are shown on Maps AQ 11-1 and 11-2.

### 5.0 STUDY APPROACH

This section describes the study approach used to conduct the water quality studies in the study area. This section first describes the sources that were reviewed to identify the existing water quality objectives relevant to the physical, chemical, and bacterial constituents that were analyzed during this study. The section next describes the field sampling methods and associated laboratory analyses methods and reporting employed during the collection of in-situ measurements, general water quality sampling, coliform sampling, and fish tissue sampling. This section concludes with a discussion of quality assurance / quality control procedures.

### 5.1 Existing Water Quality Objectives

Existing water quality objectives for the physical, chemical, and bacterial constituents analyzed in this study were identified by reviewing The Sacramento River Basin and San Joaquin River Basin Water Quality Control Plan (CVRWQCB, Fourth Edition revised February 2007), California Toxics Rule (CTR) "Water Quality Standards: Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California" (Federal Register, 65 FR 31682, EPA 2000) and the National Toxics Rule (NTR) "Water Quality Standards: Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants" (Federal Register, 57 FR 60848, EPA 1992). The Basin Plan includes water quality objectives established by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for waters in the Upper American River Watershed. The CTR and NTR, which consider background levels based on criteria that protect both human health and aquatic life, were also reviewed. The SWRCB selects the most controlling (most stringent) of these values to determine compliance with the Clean Water Act.

The California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) guidelines (Cal EPA 2005 and Klasing and Brodberg 2006) were also reviewed for fish tissue analysis.

### 5.2 Water Quality Field Sampling Program

The water quality field sampling program was conducted during spring and fall 2007 and included collection of: (1) in-situ measurements; (2) general water quality samples; (3) voluntary enhanced water quality samples; (4) coliform samples; and (5) fish tissue samples. The locations of sampling stations for each of these sampling activities are summarized in Tables AQ 11-1 and 11-3 and are shown on Maps AQ 11-1 through 114.

Three spring sampling locations within the Project area were not sampled in the fall. These locations included Duncan Creek above Middle Fork American River confluence
(DC-3 RM0.2) and the Middle Fork American River above and below Duncan Creek confluence (MFAR-3 RM39.9 and MFAR-4 RM39.5). After the spring sampling event and following consultation with the Aquatic TWG, access to these locations was determined to be unsafe for continued sampling.

### 5.2.1 In-situ Measurements

In-situ measurements in the stream and river study reaches were made at each of the sampling locations listed in Table AQ 11-1 during the spring runoff period (May 14 through 31, 2007) and during the low flow (base flow) period in the fall (September 24 through October 3, 2007). The in-situ measurements included dissolved oxygen (DO), pH , specific conductance, and water temperature. These four parameters were measured at each sampling location on the stream and river reaches and Middle Fork Interbay using portable multi-probe water quality meters (YSI® or Hydrolab Quanta). Hach Environmental (Loveland, CO) and Equipco (Concord, CA) calibrated the water quality meters prior to the spring and fall sampling events, respectively. In addition, the DO sensor was calibrated in the field to adjust for changes in elevations and barometric pressure at each sampling location prior to data collection. The in-situ measurements were taken just below the water surface at representative locations within the stream.

In-situ water quality measurements were also collected during the general water quality sampling program at Project reservoirs (French Meadows Reservoir, Hell Hole Reservoir, and Ralston Afterbay) as outlined in the AQ 11 - TSP (Table AQ 11-1) using portable, multi-probe water quality meters ( $\mathrm{YSI®}$ or Hydrolab Quanta). A secchi depth was also measured at these locations to determine the clarity of the water column. Middle Fork Interbay was only sampled at the surface as outlined in the AQ 11- TSP.

### 5.2.2 General Water Quality Sampling

General water quality samples were collected once during the spring runoff period (May 14 through 31, 2007) and once during the low flow (base flow) period in the fall (September 24 through October 4, 2007) at sampling locations listed in Table AQ 11-1. The location of all the sampling sites were identified using a Global Positioning System (GPS) unit and the coordinates recorded in a field log book. Water quality samples in bypass reaches, peaking reach, and comparison reaches were collected in representative portions of the stream channel, using methods consistent with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 1669 sampling protocol Sampling Ambient Water for Trace Metals at EPA Water Quality Criteria. Water quality samples collected from the streams and rivers were analyzed for the parameters listed in Table AQ 11-2, which include a suite of general parameters, dissolved metals, total mercury, and total and fecal coliform.

General water quality samples were also collected once during the spring and fall at Project reservoirs (Table AQ 11-1). In Hell Hole Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, and Ralston Afterbay, the samples were collected at the surface and immediately below the thermocline, if the reservoir was thermally stratified. If the Project reservoir was not thermally stratified, then water quality samples were collected at mid-depth of the
reservoir. A boat with gasoline engine was used to access the various reservoir sampling locations. Prior to sample collection, the engine was turned off for five to ten minutes to minimize the potential for sample contamination.
Surface water quality samples from Project reservoirs were collected using similar methods as those used for the stream water quality collection. Sub-surface water quality samples for laboratory analysis were collected using a Teflon® Kemmerer style sampler to ensure integrity of the sample collected from depth. Water quality samples collected from the reservoirs were analyzed for the parameters listed in Table AQ 11-2. Laboratory analysis for hydrocarbons were conducted on water quality samples collected from French Meadows and Hell Hole reservoirs and Ralston Afterbay, where motorized boating may occur.

All water quality samples were decanted into laboratory-supplied sample containers. Sample bottles requiring chemical preservation $\left(\mathrm{HCl}, \mathrm{HNO}_{3}\right.$, or $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ were preserved by Test America Laboratory (Morgan Hill, California). Samples collected for dissolved metals were filtered in the field with pre-cleaned $0.45 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ filtration units supplied by Brooks Rand Laboratory (Seattle, Washington). The sample containers were labeled with the sampling site ID and the date and time that the sample was collected. The sample container was stored on ice and delivered to a State-certified water quality laboratory for analyses in accordance with maximum holding periods. A chain-ofcustody record was also maintained with the samples at all times.

### 5.2.3 Voluntary Enhanced Water Quality Sampling

Voluntary enhanced water quality samples not specified in the AQ 11 - TSP were collected during the spring and fall general water quality sampling program. The additional sampling was initiated by PCWA when field personnel observed and reported the presence of rust color staining of the substrate and a precipitate at select locations below Hell Hole Dam and French Meadows Dam. Based on experience in other relicensing water quality studies, the staining was thought to be result of iron oxidation and warranted further investigation. The locations of the voluntary enhanced water quality samples are described in Table AQ 11-3 and identified on Maps AQ 11-3 and AQ 11-4. The additional samples were collected immediately downstream of Hell Hole Dam (May 22, 2007) and French Meadows Dam (August 6, 2007) in the leakage channels and river locations upstream and downstream of the confluence of the leakage channel. Water quality samples collected from the leakage and river channel were analyzed for hardness, dissolved metals (arsenic, cadmium, copper, iron, lead, manganese, nickel and total chromium), and total mercury.

### 5.2.4 Coliform Sampling

Total and fecal coliform sampling was conducted to determine if the study waters met Basin Plan objectives for contact recreational activities. Samples were collected at all locations listed in Table AQ 11-1 in the spring (May 14 through 31, 2007) and fall (September 24 through October 3, 2007) concurrent with the general water quality sampling program. These samples were analyzed for total and fecal coliform in accordance with the AQ 11-TSP.

Sampling for fecal coliform also occurred at near-shore locations adjacent to recreation facilities at Project reservoirs and along bypass reaches where substantial contact recreation (swimming, fishing, rafting, etc.) occurs. These sampling locations were identified in the AQ 11 - TSP and are provided in Table AQ 11-1 and depicted on Map AQ 11-2.

The samples for fecal coliform analysis at 15 of the 17 locations with substantial contact recreation were collected five times within a thirty-day period between August 6, 2007 and Labor Day. The sampling was conducted over Labor Day weekend, rather than July $4^{\text {th }}$ to attempt to capture the highest holiday recreation use. July 4 occurred in the middle of the week in 2007 and therefore recreation use was assumed to be higher during the Labor Day weekend. Two of the coliform sampling locations (FC-9 and FC11) were not sampled during the first week (August 6, 2007) due to a location change after the first sampling event. Sampling at these two locations extended one additional week after Labor Day until September 10, 2007 in order to complete the 5 samples in a 30-day period.

The sample containers were provided by Diamond Water Laboratory (Auburn, California). The containers were labeled with the sampling site ID and the date and time that the sample was collected. The sample container was stored on ice and delivered to the local State-certified water quality laboratory for analyses in accordance with maximum holding periods. A chain-of-custody record was also maintained with the samples at all times.

### 5.2.5 Water Quality Laboratory Analysis and Reporting

Water quality samples collected during the general water quality sampling program and coliform sampling were submitted for laboratory analysis at a State-certified laboratory approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for chemical analysis (total of 31 analytes). The analytes tested are listed in Table AQ 11-2 and are described in Appendix A. Twenty analytes (general parameters and hydrocarbons) were submitted to Test America Laboratory, nine analytes (a suite of dissolved metals and total mercury) were submitted to Brooks Rand Laboratory, and two analytes (total and fecal coliform) were submitted to Diamond Water Laboratory. The laboratories provided reports of each chemical parameter analyzed and the associated laboratory method detection limit, reporting limit, and practical quantification limit.

The reporting units from Test America and Brooks Rand laboratories were reported in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}(\mathrm{ppm}), \mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}(\mathrm{ppb})$, or $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{L}$ (ppt). To keep the data results consistent with the reporting parameters listed for the Basin Plan, CTR, and NTR, all lab results were converted to the appropriate unit, if necessary. If these sources do not have a criterion for an analyte, then the units provided in the laboratory reports were used. Conversions between the units are shown in Appendix $B$.

### 5.3 Water Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen Reservoir Profiles

Reservoir profiles were completed at selected sampling locations in Hell Hole Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, and Ralston Afterbay during the spring and fall sampling period as described in the AQ 11-TSP. The reservoir profile measurements included water temperature and DO at 1-meter ( m ) depth intervals to determine if thermal stratification was present. If a thermocline was present, the water quality parameters were measured below the thermocline at 2-m intervals or less to the bottom of the reservoir. If a thermocline was not present, measurements were made at 2-m intervals or less below the mid-depth point to the bottom of the reservoir. Results of the sampling were compiled and presented in tabular and graphical format in Appendix C.
The sampling locations within the Project reservoirs are described below.

## Hell Hole Reservoir

Water quality depth profiles and sampling were conducted at three locations on May 30, 2007 and October 1-2, 2007 (Map AQ 11-1). HH-1 was located at the front of the reservoir near the dam, $\mathrm{HH}-2$ was in the middle of the reservoir near the French Meadows Powerhouse, and $\mathrm{HH}-3$ was the upstream most location within the reservoir. Between the spring and fall sampling events, the reservoir water surface elevation steadily declined, resulting in a decrease in the maximum depth sampled. Reservoir storage during the spring and fall sampling events was obtained from the California Department of Water Resources website (DWR 2007), and surface elevations were estimated from PCWA storage capacity curves (PCWA 2007). Water surface elevations were estimated at:

May 30, 2007: 4,583 ft msl
October 1, 2007: 4,514 ft msl.

## French Meadows Reservoir

Water quality depth profiles and sampling were conducted at three locations on May 30, 2007 and October 3, 2007 (Map AQ 11-1). FM-1 was located at the front of the reservoir near the dam, FM-2 was in the middle of the reservoir, and FM-3 was just downstream from the French Meadows boat ramp in the middle of the reservoir. Between the spring and fall sampling events, the reservoir water surface elevation steadily declined, resulting in a decrease in the maximum depth sampled. Reservoir storage during the spring and fall sampling events was obtained from the California Department of Water Resources website (DWR 2007), and surface elevations were estimated from PCWA storage capacity curves (PCWA 2007). Water surface elevations during the spring and fall sampling events were estimated at:

May 30, 2007: 5,243 ft msl
October 3, 2007: 5,206 ft msl.

## Ralston Afterbay

Water quality depth profiles and sampling were conducted at one location just behind the float barriers on May 29, 2007 and September 26, 2007 (Map AQ 11-1). Water surface elevations during the spring and fall sampling events were estimated by PCWA at:

May 29, 2007: 1,177 ft msl
September 26, 2007: 1,175 ft msl.
Monthly reservoir profiles (consisting of temperature, DO, and specific conductance) at the same reservoir locations described above were also completed by PCWA in 20052007 as part of early relicensing studies. The results of the 2005 and 2006 reservoir profiles are presented in the PAD, SD (G) (PCWA 2007). The 2007 reservoir profile results will be summarized in early 2008 and provided to the Aquatics TWG under separate cover.

### 5.4 Fish Tissue Collection and Analysis for Methyl Mercury

A screening level study of methyl mercury concentrations in sport fish muscle tissue was conducted at selected locations in the study area. As identified in the AQ 11 - TSP, at least 10 non-hatchery sport fish of edible size were collected from each of the following locations: Hell Hole Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Middle Fork Interbay, Ralston Afterbay, and the Middle Fork American River near the Otter Creek confluence. Larger fish and species with greater potential for bioaccumulation were targeted for collection and analysis. The initial goal of the study was to collect five fish each of two different species from each location based on the following priority ranking. The two species present with the highest priority ranking would be targeted for collection (1 = highest priority) as follows:

1) bass
2) pikeminnow
3) lake trout
4) brown trout
5) rainbow trout

If five fish of two different species were not caught, then fish from a third species was included in the analysis.

At the four reservoirs, fish were captured in clean nylon gill nets. In the Middle Fork American River near Otter Creek fish were captured by electrofishing and hook-and-line sampling. For each fish collected, the species, fork length, total length, and weight were recorded.

The field handling procedures were consistent with those outlined in California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA 2005) and those used at the Department of Fish and Game Marine Pollution Studies Laboratory at Moss Landing (Method \# MPSL-

102a). The fish were placed into zipper-closure bags and immediately placed on ice in a cooler. The fish were then stored in a freezer prior to shipment to the analytical laboratory. All fish were shipped in an ice chest packed with ice and delivered by an overnight courier to Brooks Rand Laboratory (Seattle, Washington). Each cooler was shipped with a chain of custody form showing the sample identification number and collection date and time of each sample.

Muscle tissue from individual fish was analyzed for concentrations of methyl mercury in accordance with the General Protocol for Sport Fish Sampling and Analysis developed by the Cal EPA (2005) and with methods comparable to those used at the Department of Fish and Game Marine Pollution Studies Laboratory at Moss Landing. The results of the fish fillet analyses were reported in $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{g}$. These were converted to $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ fish ( ppm ) to be consistent with the OEHHA guidelines. The conversion is provided in Appendix B.

In one instance at French Meadows Reservoir, five brown trout were sent to the laboratory for analysis as one composite sample. For Hell Hole Reservoir, in addition to the 10 individual fish analyzed, a composite sample of five brown trout was analyzed.

### 5.5 Quality Assurance/ Quality Control Procedures

Standard precautions were established for the collection of water quality samples. At each station, all samples were collected by the same person, wearing ultra-trace sampling gloves. Water quality samples were collected using the designated collection bottle supplied by the appropriate laboratory. Upon collection, each sample was immediately labeled with the date and time and logged on a chain-of-custody form and placed into a cooler filled with ice.

Water quality samples were delivered to the analytical laboratory within the appropriate holding times. Coliform samples were delivered to the laboratory on the same day of collection, while all other samples were delivered between 24 to 48 hours of the sample collection time by courier. A chain-of-custody form accompanied all samples from the time of collection to delivery and submittal to the analytical laboratory.

In-stream water samples were collected just below the water surface in areas of steady flow. Water samples from the reservoirs and impoundments were collected below the water surface following the same quality control (QC) procedures. Additional precautions were followed when sampling from a motorized boat. Samples were collected from the bow of the boat after the motor was turned off for at least five to ten minutes to avoid possible hydrocarbon contamination from the motor boat. Sampling equipment was cleaned with a cleaning solution and distilled water prior to sample collection.

Standard quality assurance (QA) procedures were performed by the laboratories during analyses of water samples. These included matrix and laboratory spikes and spike duplicates, matrix duplicates, and method blanks as appropriate. A summary of the QA measures were included with each certified laboratory report.

A QA/QC screening level review was also conducted on all of these laboratory analytical reports. Results of the QA/QC review are presented in Appendix D.

### 6.0 STUDY RESULTS

### 6.1 Review of Existing Water Quality Objectives

The Basin Plan identifies specific water quality objectives of allowable limits or levels of water quality constituents. These objectives are established for the protection of beneficial uses of the waters associated with the MFP (CVRWQCB 2007). If water quality is maintained at levels that meet these objectives, the beneficial uses of the waters are considered to be protected. The beneficial uses identified in the Basin Plan that pertain to water associated with the MFP include: (1) municipal and domestic supply; (2) agricultural irrigation and stock watering; (3) power generation; (4) contact recreation; (5) non-contact recreation; (6) coldwater habitat and spawning habitat for fisheries; and (7) wildlife habitat. The definition of each of these beneficial uses is provided in Table AQ 11-4.

Water quality objectives include both numeric and narrative objectives (Table AQ 11-2). The Basin Plan provides specific numeric objectives for bacteria, in-situ measurements, and for chemical or metal constituents. The objectives for chemical and metal constituents are derived from various sources such as maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) that are provided in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations or from the CTR or NTR. The most stringent objectives were used for this study.

Often more stringent objectives are provided by the CTR and the NTR to protect aquatic life and human health. The CTR and NTR numeric objective for cadmium (Cd), copper $(\mathrm{Cu})$, lead $(\mathrm{Pb})$ and nickel $(\mathrm{Ni})$ is more stringent than the Basin Plan objective. The CTR and NTR have established more stringent criteria for these metals to protect freshwater aquatic life. The CTR and NTR set acute and chronic criteria that are hardnessdependent and must be calculated on a location-by-location basis. For each of these metals, the water quality criterion decreases with decreasing water hardness. These calculated criteria and laboratory results are shown in Tables AQ 11-9, AQ 11-12, and AQ 11-15. The formulas for calculating hardness-dependent criteria are provided in the CTR and NTR guidance documents (US EPA 2007 and 2007a).

The Basin Plan also specifies a water temperature thermal heating objective that states, "Natural water temperatures shall not be altered unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Regional Board that such alteration does not adversely affect beneficial uses. At no time or place shall the temperature be increased more than $5^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ $\left(2.8^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ above the natural receiving water."

Several of the parameters analyzed do not have established objectives. Various literature sources were reviewed for each parameter to identify guidelines or ranges of the different parameters that might be expected for the MFP area. The ranges are described in Appendix A.

The results of the water quality sampling field program were compared to the most stringent water quality objectives identified Table $A Q$ 11-2. The locations where the objectives have not been met were identified and are discussed in the following results section.

### 6.2 Water Quality Sampling and Analytical Results

The following sections provide a discussion of the results of the water quality field sampling program (including the in-situ measurements, general water quality sampling, voluntary enhanced water quality sampling, and coliform sampling) associated with the spring and fall sampling events. Within this section the results from the stream and river reaches are discussed first, followed by the results of the sampling on Project reservoirs. The results of the in-situ measurements and coliform sampling for the spring and fall sampling events are summarized below. For the other general water quality parameters in the streams and rivers, only those that do not meet the most stringent Basin Plan, CTR, or NTR water quality objective are summarized.

### 6.2.1 Water Quality Results from Streams and Rivers

All the parameters measured in Project area streams and rivers during the spring and fall sampling event met with the Basin Plan, CTR, and NTR objectives with the exception of dissolved oxygen at three locations near the confluence of Duncan Creek and Middle Fork American River in the spring, and manganese in the fall at one location on the Middle Fork American River below French Meadows Dam at the gaging station.

## In-situ Field Measurements

The results of in-situ measurements collected in streams and rivers in the vicinity of the MFP during the sampling periods are shown in Tables AQ 11-5 and 11-6. The results of the measurements indicate that three sampling locations did not meet the Basin Plan objectives for dissolved oxygen in the spring. All measurements met the Basin Plan objectives for pH . There are no Basin Plan objectives for temperature, and specific conductance, but measurements were all within expected ranges.

## Dissolved Oxygen

According to the Basin Plan objectives, DO concentrations shall not be reduced below a minimum level of $7.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ for waters designated as COLD. DO concentration will vary with other parameters such as temperature, elevation, photosynthetic activity, biotic activity, stream discharge, and the concentration of other solutes (Hem 1989, Michaud 1994). Increasing temperature or elevation will result in lower DO (MELP 1998).

Dissolved oxygen measurements typically ranged between 7.1 and 11.7 during the spring and fall sampling events. These measurements are consistent with Basin Plan objective. However, at three locations during the spring sampling event, DO was below the Basin Plan objective of $7.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. These locations included Duncan Creek above Middle Fork American River confluence (DC-3 RM0.2) and the Middle Fork American River above and below the Duncan Creek confluence (MFAR-3 RM39.9 and MFAR-4

RM39.5). DO concentrations at these locations were measured at 6.2 and 6.3. Based on DO concentrations measured at locations upstream and downstream from these sampling locations, these data are believed to be incorrect due to instrument malfunction or sampling error. These locations were not sampled in the fall due to the unsafe field conditions accessing the sampling locations.

## Water Temperature

Measured surface water temperatures generally warm in the downstream direction during both the spring and fall sampling events (Tables AQ 11-5 and AQ 11-6).

Additional water temperature monitoring in rivers and streams in the vicinity of the MFP have been conducted by PCWA as part of ongoing studies. Water temperature data has been collected annually from 2005 through 2007. This monitoring program will continue through summer 2008. The data collected will be summarized and used to evaluate compliance with temperature objectives defined in the Basin Plan. Preliminary water temperature data are presented in the PAD, SD (G), 2005 Water Temperature Report and the 2006 Water Temperature Report (PCWA 2007).
pH
According to the Basin Plan, pH should not be below 6.5 or above 8.5. Furthermore, changes in normal ambient pH levels shall not exceed 0.5 in fresh waters designated as COLD or WARM beneficial uses. Values above 9.5 or below 4.5 are considered lethal to aquatic organisms (EPA 1996; MELP 1998).

Measured pH values were within the range required in the Basin Plan (between 6.5 and 8.5) at all sampling locations.

## Specific Conductance

There are no specific Basin Plan objectives for specific conductance. The conductivity of freshwater at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ varies between 50 and $1,500 \mu \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{cm}$ (Hem 1989; MELP 1998).

Specific conductance measurements during the spring sampling event ranged from 51 to $82 \mu \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{cm}$ and ranged from 16 to $107 \mu \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{cm}$ during the fall sampling event (Tables AQ 11-5 and AQ 11-6).

## General Water Quality Parameters

The laboratory analytical results for the spring and fall sampling programs are summarized in Tables AQ 11-7 through AQ 11-12. Electronic copies of laboratory reports are available on CD. The analytes collected and submitted for laboratory analysis including 17 general parameters, eight dissolved metals, and total mercury. Refer to Table AQ 11-2 for the list of analytes.

During the spring and fall sampling events, all general parameters measured and total mercury samples met the Basin Plan, CTR, or NTR objectives, or were within the expected ranges for the ones that do not have established objectives. All dissolved metal analyses with the exception of dissolved manganese at one location (Middle Fork American River below French Meadows Dam at gaging station) met Basin Plan, CTR, or NTR objectives. The results of the general water quality parameters are summarized in Tables AQ 11-7 through AQ 11-12.

## Manganese

The Basin Plan objectives for manganese is $50 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$. One sampling location below French Meadows Reservoir, MFAR-2 RM46.6 (Middle Fork American River below French Meadows Dam at gaging station) did not meet the Basin Plan objective (Figure AQ 11-2). The laboratory measured a concentration of $57.7 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$. Manganese was not analyzed during the spring sampling event, so it is unknown if MFAR-2 RM46.6 met the Basin Plan objective in the spring (runoff flow). Manganese concentrations in the fall (base flow) met the Basin Plan objective at the sampling locations farther downstream on the Middle Fork American River (Table AQ 11-10).

## Voluntary Enhanced Water Quality Sampling

Voluntary enhanced water quality samples, not specified in the AQ 11 - TSP, were collected immediately downstream of Hell Hole Dam (May 22, 2007) and French Meadows Dam (August 6, 2007) in the leakage channels and river locations upstream and downstream of the confluence of the leakage channel. Three locations were sampled below Hell Hole Dam and five locations were sampled below French Meadows Dam. Analyses included in-situ measurements, calculated hardness, eight dissolved metals, and total mercury. Flows within the leakage weirs below French Meadows and Hell Hole dams are provided in Appendix E.
Similar to the discussion above, the in-situ measurements collected are summarized at each location and only the water quality objectives that did not meet the Basin Plan, CTR or NTR objectives are discussed. The in-situ measurements and sampling results are presented in Tables AQ 11-13 through 11-15.

## Hell Hole Dam

## In Situ Field Measurements

All in-situ field measurements collected below Hell Hole Dam met Basin Plan objectives or were within the expected ranges for the ones that do not have established objectives.

## General Water Quality Parameters

The three voluntary enhanced water quality samples collected below Hell Hole Dam met all listed Basin Plan, CTR and NTR objectives.

## French Meadows Dam

In Situ Field Measurements
In-situ measurements results indicated that pH and DO did not meet water quality objectives.

- pH

The five sampling locations below French Meadows Dam were all below the Basin Plan objective of 6.5 and ranged between 5.3 and 5.3. The results are listed in Table AQ 11-13.

## - Dissolved Oxygen

Two sampling locations (FM-D and FM-E, both located within the main channel) below French Meadows Dam met the Basin Plan objective of $7.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. Three sampling locations in the leakage channel (FM-A, FM-B, and FM-C) did not meet the Basin Plan objective and were below $7.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. The results are listed in Table AQ 11-13 and are shown in Figure AQ 11-2.

## General Water Quality Parameters

Iron and manganese concentrations in the five samples collected below French Meadows Dam exceeded Basin Plan or NTR objectives. These locations are shown with the sampled locations further downstream in Figure AQ 11-2. All other analytes met the listed Basin Plan or NTR objectives (Tables AQ 11-14 and AQ 11-15).

- Iron

The Basin Plan objective for iron is $0.3 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ and the NTR objective is $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. The Basin Plan specifies a criterion for iron of $0.3 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, based on secondary maximum contaminant levels for drinking water. This criterion is based on a taste, odor, and visual threshold (CTR 2000). When iron is precipitated out of solution due to oxidation, it causes a reddish brown color in the water. The EPA has recommended a value of $1.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ for a 4-day average continuous concentration for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.

Three of the five samples collected below French Meadows Dam did not meet the Basin Plan and NTR objectives for iron and ranged from $16.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ to $20.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. All of these locations are in the small leakage channels draining from the base of French Meadows Dam. These locations are shown on Map AQ 11-4. The laboratory results for iron are summarized in Table AQ 11-14 and Figure AQ 11-2.

Iron staining was observed along the ground and drainage channels at these three locations, as well as in the Middle Fork American River channel downstream. However, iron results in the plunge pool at the outlet pipe for French Meadow Reservoir (FM-E) and several hundred feet downstream (FM-D) met the Basin Plan and NTR objectives.

- Manganese

The Basin Plan objective for manganese is $50 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ and is based on secondary maximum contaminant levels for drinking water. Four of the five locations sampled below French Meadows Dam did not meet the Basin Plan objective. Three of these locations are in the small leakage channels draining from the base of French Meadows Dam (results range from 3,610 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ and $4,040 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ ) and the fourth is in the channel downstream of the dam $(62.6 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L})$. These locations are shown on Map AQ 11-4. The laboratory results are summarized in Table AQ 11-14 and Figure AQ 11-2.

## Coliform Sampling

Total and fecal coliform samples were collected from streams and rivers in the vicinity of the MFP to determine if study waters met Basin Plan objectives for recreational activities. Coliform concentrations are reported at the number of bacteria colonies per 100 mL of sample water (MPN/100 mL). An objective of 200 colonies $/ 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ was used to determine if fecal coliform concentrations met Basin Plan objectives for contact recreational activities. There are no Basin Plan objectives for total coliform.

Total and fecal coliform samples were collected during the spring and fall sampling events (Map AQ 11-2). The laboratory results of the total and fecal coliform concentrations are provided in Tables AQ 11-7 and AQ 11-10 and are summarized below.

The fecal coliform results met Basin Plan objectives during the spring sampling event and ranged from less than 2 to $4 / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$. Total coliform results during the spring sampling event ranged from less than $2 / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ to $30 / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$.

During the fall sampling event, one location (NFLC-2 RM2.9) exceeded the objective for fecal coliform ( $300 / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The remainder of the fecal coliform results met Basin Plan objectives. Total coliform results ranged from less than $2 / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ to $900 / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$.

## 30-Day, Five Sample Fecal Coliform Sampling

The Basin Plan states that "...the fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100 mL, nor shall more than ten percent of the total samples during any 30-day period exceed $400 / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$." Seventeen locations throughout the study area were sampled five times over a 30-day period (Table AQ 11-16 and Map AQ 11-2). Sampling began on August 6, 2007 and continued for five subsequent weeks and concluded on Labor Day. At two locations (FC-9 and FC-11), sampling continued until September 10, 2007 due to a sampling location change after the first sampling event on August 6, 2007.

The geometric mean at each of the 17 sampling locations was below the objective of 200/100 mL. However, at one location (FC-15, Ralston Afterbay near the Ralston picnic area) on August 27, 2007, the sample result was $1,600 / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$. Although, the
geometric mean at this location was $30 / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$, which is below the Basin Plan objective.

### 6.2.2 Water Quality Results: Reservoir Profiling and Laboratory Analysis

Water quality depth profiles and the water quality sampling program (including in-situ measurements, secchi depth, general water quality sampling, and coliform sampling) associated with the spring and fall sampling events were conducted at various locations in Hell Hole Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, and Ralston Afterbay. The following provides a summary of the water quality profiling and sampling results for Ralston Afterbay, Hell Hole Reservoir, and French Meadows Reservoir. The temperature and DO profiling measurements are presented in Appendix C. The results of the profiles and in-situ measurements are summarized for each reservoir. For the other general water quality parameters, only those that do not meet the most stringent Basin Plan, CTR, or NTR water quality objectives are summarized.

All parameters measured in Hell Hole Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, and Ralston Afterbay during the spring and fall sampling program met with the Basin Plan, CTR, and NTR objectives with the exception of dissolved oxygen in Hell Hole and French Meadows reservoirs.

## Hell Hole Reservoir

## Water Quality Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen Profile Results

The spring water temperature profiles at the three sampling locations were similar. Spring surface temperatures ranged from $12.7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at $\mathrm{HH}-3$ to $14.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at $\mathrm{HH}-1$. Temperatures steadily declined with depth until 30 to 35 m below the water surface, where temperatures remained relatively steady at 6 to $7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ down to the bottom of the reservoir. The fall temperature profiles at the three locations were also similar. Fall surface temperatures were slightly warmer than spring surface water temperatures. Fall water temperatures varied only slightly with depth from the surface to approximately 35 to 40 m . At greater depths, temperatures steadily declined to 11 to $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Reservoir bottom temperatures were approximately 5 to $7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ warmer in the fall than those recorded during the spring sampling event. There was no distinct thermal stratification or thermocline measured in either the spring or fall temperature profiles.

The DO profiles during the spring sampling were similar between the three locations. DO concentrations ranged from $8.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ to $8.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ at the surface and ranged from $8.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ to $8.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ near the bottom. DO concentrations varied little with depth. The spring DO profiles were also similar between each sampling location. Fall concentrations were slightly lower than those measured during the spring sampling event. Surface concentrations ranged from $6.3 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ to $7.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ and decreased to 5.4 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ to $5.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ near the bottom of the reservoir. DO concentrations had a slight decreasing trend with depth. The DO concentrations for most of the three sampling locations during the fall sampling events were below the Basin Plan objective of 7.0 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ for COLD water bodies except at the surface for $\mathrm{HH}-1$. The lowest DO
measurement of $5.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ was recorded at the bottom of the reservoir at the $\mathrm{HH}-2$ sampling location. Based on other DO concentrations collected in the fall in 2005 and 2006 from Hell Hole Reservoir (PCWA 2007), these fall 2007 data from Hell Hole Reservoir are believed to be incorrect due to instrument malfunction or sampling error.

## In-Situ Field Measurements

In-situ measurements were collected at the surface and at approximately mid-depth in the profile. The sampling depths at the three locations for the spring and fall sampling events are shown below.

| Site <br> ID | Spring Sampling <br> Depths $(\boldsymbol{m})$ | Fall Sampling <br> Depths $(\boldsymbol{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH-1 | 0 and 30 | 0 and 23 |
| HH-2 | 0 and 30 | 0 and 27 |
| HH-3 | 0 and 30 | 0 and 20 |

The results of the measurements are shown in Tables AQ 11-5 and AQ 11-6.
In-situ temperature and DO measurements followed the same trends as discussed above in the profiles for the spring and fall sampling events. Surface water temperatures were warmer than the mid-depth measurements. DO concentration measurements were slightly higher at mid-depth than at the surface for the spring sampling, but were slightly lower at two of the three sampling locations in the fall.

All pH measurements are within the objective listed in the Basin Plan. Surface pH measurements were higher than mid-depth measurements for all three sampling locations during the spring and fall sampling events. Surface pH measurements ranged from 6.9 to 7.1 in the spring and 6.7 to 7.9 in the fall. Mid-depth pH measurements ranged from 6.7 to 6.8 in the spring and 6.8 to 7.1 in the fall. Surface pH measurements were greater in the fall than in the spring at $\mathrm{HH}-1$ and $\mathrm{HH}-3$, but were less at $\mathrm{HH}-2$. All mid-depth pH measurements were greater during the fall sampling event than in the spring sampling event.

Specific conductance measurements were similar between the surface and mid-depth and between the spring and fall sampling events. Spring measurements were approximately $20 \mu \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{cm}$ and fall measurements were ranged between 30 and 40 $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$.

Secchi depth measurements were conducted at the three sampling locations. The secchi depths for each sampling location during the spring and fall sampling events are shown below.

| Site <br> ID | Spring Sampling <br> Secchi <br> Depth $(\mathrm{m})$ | Fall Sampling <br> Secchi Depth $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH-1 | 9 | 10 |
| HH-2 | 11 | 10 |
| HH-3 | 8 | 9.4 |

## General Water Quality Parameters

All the spring and fall parameters analyzed met the Basin Plan, CTR, or NTR objectives. All sampling locations were within or below the suggested ranges discussed in Appendix A for parameters analyzed without established objectives.

## Coliform Sampling

All fecal coliform concentrations met the 200/100 mL objective during the spring and fall sampling events.

## French Meadows Reservoir

## Water Quality Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen Profile Results

The spring water temperature profiles at the three locations were similar (surface temperatures at approximately $16^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). Temperatures steadily declined until approximately 20 m in depth, where temperatures remained relatively steady at 7 to $8^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ down to the bottom. The fall temperature profiles at the three locations were similar with surface temperatures (approximately $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and were slightly cooler than spring surface water temperatures. Fall water temperature profiles were different from the spring water temperature profiles. In the fall, water temperatures varied only slightly in depth from the surface to approximately 20 m . Below this depth, temperatures rapidly declined to $8^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at $\mathrm{FM}-1$ and $\mathrm{FM}-2$. Bottom temperatures were warmer at $\mathrm{FM}-3$ (the shallowest location) than at the other two sampling locations. A thermocline was measured in the spring temperature profiles between 10 and 15 m and during the fall between 20 and 25 m .

The DO profiles during the spring sampling were similar at the three locations. Spring DO concentrations ranged from $7.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ to $7.9 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ at the surface and generally increased to the thermocline, then slowly decreased to the bottom of the reservoir. DO concentrations near the bottom of the reservoir ranged from $6.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ to $8.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. The fall DO profiles were also similar at each sampling location. Fall DO surface concentrations were slightly higher than during the spring sampling event. Surface concentrations ranged from $8.2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ to $8.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ and stayed relatively constant down to the thermocline. DO concentrations then increased at the thermocline (only at FM-1 and FM-2), followed by decreasing concentrations to the bottom of the reservoir (4.3 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ to $7.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ). The DO concentrations for most of the three sampling locations during the spring and fall sampling events met the Basin Plan objective of $7.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ for COLD water bodies. DO measurements below $7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ were measured at $\mathrm{FM}-1$ during the spring, and at FM-2 during the spring and fall near the bottom of the reservoir sampling areas.

## In-Situ Field Measurements

In-situ measurements were collected at the surface and at approximately mid-depth or at the thermocline. The sampling depths at the three locations for the spring and fall
sampling events are shown below. The results of the measurements are shown in Tables 11-5 and 11-6.

| Site <br> ID | Spring Sampling <br> Depths $(\mathbf{m})$ | Fall Sampling <br> Depths $(\mathbf{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FM-1 | 0 and 30 | 0 and 22.5 |
| FM-2 | 0 and 20 | 0 and 22.5 |
| FM-3 | 0 and 15 | 0 and 22.5 |

In-situ temperature and DO measurements followed the same trends as discussed above in the profiles for the spring and fall sampling events. Surface water temperatures were warmer than the mid-depth measurements. DO concentration measurements were slightly higher at mid-depth than at the surface for the spring sampling. In comparison, in the fall, DO concentrations were greater at the surface that at mid-depth.

All pH measurements were within the acceptable ranges of 6.5 to 8.5 , as listed in the Basin Plan. Surface pH measurements were higher than mid-depth measurements for all three sampling locations during the spring and fall sampling events. Spring surface and mid-depth pH measurements were overall slightly higher during the fall sampling event. Surface pH measurements ranged from 6.6 to 6.9 in the spring and from 7.2 to 7.9 in the fall. Mid-depth pH measurements ranged from 6.5 to 6.6 in the spring and from 6.5 to 6.7 in the fall.

Specific conductance measurements were similar between the surface and mid-depth and between the spring and fall sampling events. Spring measurements were approximately $30 \mu \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{cm}$ and fall measurements were approximately $20 \mu \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{cm}$.

Secchi depth measurements were conducted at the three sampling locations during the spring event. Measurements were taken at only one location during the fall event due to high winds on the reservoir later in the day. The winds and water currents would have prevented accurate secchi depth measurements, as the disk would not drop vertically, skewing the results. At the one sampling location, water clarity was better during the fall than during the spring. The secchi depths for each sampling locations during the spring and fall sampling events are shown below.

| Site <br> ID | Spring Sampling <br> Secchi Depth $(\mathrm{m})$ | Fall Sampling <br> Secchi Depth $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FM-1 | 6.5 | 9.5 |
| FM-2 | 7.5 | Too Windy* |
| FM-3 | 7 | Too Windy* |

*Conditions on the reservoir were too windy for collecting accurate measurements.

## General Water Quality Parameters

All the spring and fall parameters analyzed met the Basin Plan, CTR, or NTR objectives. All sampling locations were within or below the expected ranges discussed in Appendix A for parameters analyzed without established objectives.

## Coliform Sampling

All fecal coliform concentrations met the 200/100 mL objective during the spring and fall sampling events.

## Ralston Afterbay

## Water Quality Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen Profile Results

Spring surface temperature in Ralston Afterbay was measured at $19{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and decreased to $10.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ near the bottom of the afterbay. In comparison, temperatures in the fall were fairly constant with depth, ranging from $13.5{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at the surface to $12{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ near the bottom. Some thermal stratification was present during the spring profiling event, but not during the fall profiling event.

The DO at the surface was $10.3 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ and $11.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ for the spring and fall sampling events, respectively. The concentration of DO generally increased with increasing depth (and with decreasing water temperature) to 10 m below the water surface. During the spring when the depth exceeded 10 m , DO concentrations decreased. DO concentrations ranged between $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ and $11.6 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ during both sampling events throughout the entire profile.

## In-Situ Field Measurements

In-situ measurements were collected at the surface and at approximately mid-depth in the profile. The sub-surface measurements were collected at 6 m and at 5 m during the spring and fall sampling events, respectively. The results of the measurements are shown in Tables AQ 11-5 and AQ 11-6.

In-situ temperature and DO measurements followed the same trend as discussed above in the profiles for the spring and fall sampling events. Surface water temperatures were warmer than the mid-depth measurements and conversely, DO measurements were higher at mid-depth than at the surface.

In-situ pH measurements were between 6.0 and 7.0 , acceptable limits within the Basin Plan. Spring pH measurements were 6.6 at the surface and 6.5 at mid-depth. Fall pH measurements were 7.0 at the surface and 6.8 at mid-depth.

Specific conductance measurements were similar between the surface and mid-depth and between the spring and fall sampling events. Spring measurements ranged between 30 and $50 \mu \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{cm}$. Fall measurements ranged between 30 and $40 \mu \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{cm}$.

Secchi depth measurements were also collected at the sampling location. Water clarity remained the same between the two sampling periods, with secchi depth readings of 7 m for both the spring and fall sampling events.

## General Water Quality Parameters

All the spring and fall parameters analyzed met the Basin Plan, CTR, or NTR objectives. In addition, the results of the analyses for the parameters without established objectives were within the expected ranges discussed in Appendix A.

## Coliform Sampling

All fecal coliform concentrations met the $200 / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ objective during the spring and fall sampling events.

### 6.3 Fish Tissue Analysis

The following section provides a discussion of the fish tissue analysis from the Project reservoirs, Ralston Afterbay, Middle Fork Interbay, and the Middle Fork American River near Otter Creek. Laboratory analyses of methyl mercury were conducted on muscle tissue samples from individual and composite fish samples. The screening value for methyl mercury in fish established by the OEHHA to determine if additional studies are warranted is 0.08 ppm (which is equal to $0.08 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ fish).

Methyl mercury concentrations in at least one fish from each location exceeded the OEHHA screening value of $0.08 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ fish. Twenty-three of the 45 individual fish analyzed exceeded the screening value. The highest concentrations (up to 1.140 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ ) were measured in fish from Hell Hole Reservoir, where the largest fish were caught. A summary of the fish that were caught, including the species, fork and total lengths, and weight, is provided in Table AQ 11-17. The direct relationship between methyl mercury concentrations and the weight of the fish for each of the sampling locations is shown in Figure AQ 11-3. The results of the fish tissue sampling at each location are summarized below.

In Hell Hole Reservoir, eight of the ten individual fish analyzed (brown trout, lake trout, and rainbow trout), as well as the composite sample of brown trout, exceeded the OEHHA guidelines. Methyl mercury concentrations in the fish tissue from Hell Hole Reservoir ranged from $0.004 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ fish to $1.14 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ fish. All the brown trout analyzed exceeded the screening level.

In French Meadows Reservoir, three of the five individual fish, including both brown trout exceeded 0.08 ppm . The composite sample of five brown trout also exceeded the screening value. The highest methyl mercury concentration measured in the fish from French Meadows Reservoir was $0.357 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ fish.

Only one of the ten brown and rainbow trout caught in Middle Fork Interbay exceeded the screening value. The concentration of the rainbow trout measured was $0.135 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ fish.

Eight of the ten fish caught, including all the Sacramento pikeminnows and the four largest brown trout, in Ralston Afterbay exceeded the screening value. The highest concentration measured in the fish caught in Ralston Afterbay was $0.348 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ fish.

Methyl mercury concentrations in three of the ten fish caught in the Middle Fork American River near Otter Creek exceeded $0.08 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ fish. Only rainbow trout were caught at this location. The exceedances occurred in the three of the four largest fish caught at this location. The greatest concentration measured in fish from the Middle Fork American River was $0.130 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ fish.

### 6.4 Quality Assurance/ Quality Control Procedures

A detailed summary of the QA/QC review of these reports can be found in Appendix D, Tables D-1 through D-4. A summary of potential issues identified in the QA/QC reports from each laboratory and sampling event is also provided in Appendix D.

The QA/QC review from the Test America (TA) and Brooks Rand (BR) laboratories indicated that most sample results (spring and fall sampling event, voluntary enhanced sampling below Project reservoirs, and fish tissue sampling) were acceptable, with only four sample results considered estimates. The results that were considered estimates include the spring sample at FM-3 (S) for TOC, and for three of the additional samples below French Meadows Dam (FM-A, FM-B, and FM-C) for manganese.

### 7.0 LITERATURE CITED

California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2007. California Data Exchange Center, Reservoir Information. http://cdec.water.ca.gov/misc/resinfo.html. Site accessed on November 15, 2007.

California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA). 2005. General Protocol for Sport Fish Sampling and Analysis. Pesticide and Environmental Toxicology Branch, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, California Environmental Protection Agency. December 2005.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB). 1998. Basin Plan. Fourth Edition, The Sacramento River Basin and the San Joaquin River Basin. September 1998.

Hem, J.D. 1989. Study and Interpretation of the Chemical Characteristics of Natural Water. Third Edition. U. S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 2254.

Klasing, S. and R. Brodberg. 2006. Draft Development of Guidance Tissue Levels and Screening Values for Common Contaminants in California Sport Fish: Chloradane, DDTs, Dieldrin, Methylmercury, PCBs, Selenium, and Toxaphene.

Pesticide and Environmental Toxicology Branch Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, California Environmental Protection Agency. http://www.oehha.ca.gov/fish/gtlsv/pdf/draftGTLSCchddt.pdf.

Michaud, J. 1994. A Citizen's Guide to Understanding and Monitoring Lakes and Streams. January 1994. Washington State, Department of Ecology. 73 pp.

Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks, British Columbia (MELP). 1998. Guidelines for Interpreting Water Quality Data. Resources Inventory Committee Publications.

Available: http://ilmbwww.gov.bc.ca/risc/pubs/aquatic/interp/index.htm.

Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). 2007. Placer County Water Agency Middle Fork American River Project, FERC Project No. 2079, Pre-Application Document.

Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). 2008. Annual Dam Surveillance and Monitoring Report. February 27, 2008.

Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB). 2007. The Sacramento River Basin and San Joaquin River Basin Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Central Valley Region (CVRWQCB, Fourth Edition revised February 2007).

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 1991. California Inland Surface Waters Plan: Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters in California. Water Resources Control Board of California. April 1991.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1992. Water Quality Standards: Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants. Federal Register, 57 FR 60848.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1996. The Metals Translator: Guidance for calculating a total recoverable permit limit for a dissolved criterion. June 1996. EPA 823-B-96-007.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2000. Water Quality Standards: Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California. Federal Register, 65 FR 31682.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2007. Water Quality Standards; Established of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California; Rule. August 2007, 40 CFR Part 131.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2007a. Water Quality Standards; Established of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants. Federal Register, 57 FR 60848.

TABLES
Table AQ 11-1. Water Quality Monitoring and Sampling Station Locations for 2007 Sampling Program.

| Sample ID | Location Name | GPS Coordinates |  | Spring Sampling Program <br> May 14-31 | Weekly Sampling |  |  |  |  |  | Fall Sampling Program <br> Sept. 24-Oct. 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | UTM10 NAD $83 \overline{\mathbf{X}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM10- } \\ & \text { NAD } 83 \text { Y } \end{aligned}$ |  | Aug 6 | Aug. 13 |  | Aug. 27 | Sept. 3 | Sept. 10 |  |
| Duncan Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DC-1 RM8.9 | Duncan Creek above diversion | 718058 | 4334904 | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| DC-2 RM8.8 | Duncan Creek below diversion | 717492 | 4334534 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| DC-3 RM0. 2 | Duncan Creek above Middle Fork American River confluence | 712310 | 4324261 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Fork American River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MFAR-1 RM52.8 | Middle Fork American River above French Meadows Reservoir | 724030 | 4334663 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| FM-1 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (lower) | 718930 | 4332295 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| FM-1 | French Meadows Reservoir subsurface (lower) | 718930 | 4332295 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| FM-2 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (middle) | 720708 | 4332155 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| FM-2 | French Meadows Reservoir subsurface (middle) | 720708 | 4332155 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| FM-3 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (upper) | 722241 | 4332680 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| FM-3 | French Meadows Reservoir subsurface (upper) | 722241 | 4332680 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| MFAR-2 RM 46.6 | Middle Fork American River below French Meadows Dam at gaging station | 717789 | 4331977 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| MFAR-3 RM39.9 | Middle Fork American River above Duncan Creek confluence | 712707 | 4324155 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MFAR-4 RM39.5 | Middle Fork American River below Duncan Creek confluence | 712202 | 4323824 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MFAR-5 RM36.3 | Middle Fork American River above Interbay Reservoir | 708507 | 4322669 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| IR-1 RM35.7 | In Middle Fork Interbay | 717789 | 4331977 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| MFAR-6 RM35.5 | Middle Fork American River below Middle Fork Interbay | 707362 | 4322470 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| MFAR-7 RM26.1 | Middle Fork American River above Ralston Afterbay | 696379 | 4320205 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Ralston Afterbay Downstream |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RA-1(S) | Ralston Afterbay surface | 695348 | 4319604 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| RA-1 | Ralston Afterbay sub-surface | 695348 | 4319604 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| MFAR-8 RM24.7 | Middle Fork American River below dam | 694987 | 4319551 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| MFAR-9 RM24.3 | Middle Fork American River below Oxbow Powerhouse tailrace | 695104 | 4319974 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |

Table AQ 11-1. Water Quality Monitoring and Sampling Station Locations for 2007 Sampling Program (continued).

| Sample ID | Location Name | GPS Coordinates |  | Spring Sampling Program May 14-31 | Weekly Sampling |  |  |  |  |  | Fall Sampling Program Sept. 24-Oct. 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | UTM10 NAD 83 X | UTM10 NAD $83 \bar{Y}$ |  | Aug 6 | Aug. 13 | Aug. 20 | Aug. 27 | Sept. 3 | Sept. 10 |  |
| MFAR-10 RM9.1 | Middle Fork American River below the Drivers Flat Road Rafting TakeOut | 679156 | 4314631 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| MFAR-11 RM0. 1 | Middle Fork American River above North Fork American River | 670249 | 4309058 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| NFAR-1 RM20.6 | North Fork American River below Middle Fork American River | 669795 | 4308943 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Rubicon River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RR-1 RM35.9 | Rubicon River above Reservoir | 729518 | 4328802 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| HH-1 (S) | Hell Hole Reservoir surface (lower) | 724117 | 4326670 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| HH-1 | Hell Hole Reservoir sub-surface (lower) | 724117 | 4326670 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| HH-2 (S) | Hell Hole Reservoir surface (middle) | 724599 | 4328282 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| HH-2 | Hell Hole Reservoir sub-surface (middle) | 724599 | 4328282 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| HH-3 (S) | Hell Hole Reservoir surface (upper) | 726090 | 4329264 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| HH-3 | Hell Hole Reservoir sub-surface (upper) | 726090 | 4329264 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| RR-2 RM30.2 | Rubicon River below dam at gaging station | 724209 | 4326071 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| RR-3 RM 22.8 | Rubicon River above South Fork Rubicon River confluence | 719372 | 4316701 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| SFRR-1 RM0. 2 | South Fork Rubicon River above Rubicon River confluence | 719482 | 4316246 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| RR-4 RM22.5 | Rubicon River below South Fork Rubicon River confluence | 719153 | 4316364 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| RR-5 RM3.8 | Rubicon River above Long Canyon Creek confluence | 700507 | 4318147 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| RR-6 RM3.5 | Rubicon River below Long Canyon Creek confluence | 700162 | 4318171 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| RR-7 RM0.7 | Rubicon River above Ralston Afterbay | 697119 | 4319216 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Long Canyon Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NFLC-1 RM3.2 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek above diversion | 717980 | 4325629 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| NFLC-2 RM2.9 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek below diversion | 717848 | 4325174 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| NFLC-3 RM0.3 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek above Long Canyon Creek confluence | 715004 | 4322534 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| SFLC-1 RM3.4 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above diversion | 719042 | 4325646 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| SFLC-2 RM3.1 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek below diversion | 718669 | 4325275 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| SFLC-3 RM0. 2 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above Long Canyon Creek confluence | 715314 | 4322198 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |

Copyright 2008 by Placer County Water Agency
Table AQ 11-1. Water Quality Monitoring and Sampling Station Locations for 2007 Sampling Program (continued).

| Sample ID | Location Name | GPS Coordinates |  | Spring Sampling Program <br> May 14-31 | Weekly Sampling |  |  |  |  |  | Fall Sampling Program <br> Sept. 24-Oct. 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM10- } \\ & \text { NAD } 83 \mathbf{X} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM10- } \\ & \text { NAD } 83{ }^{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | Aug 6 | Aug. 13 | Aug. 20 | Aug. 27 | Sept. 3 | Sept. 10 |  |
| LCC-1 RM11.3 | Long Canyon Creek below North Fork and South Fork Long Canyon creeks confluence | 714962 | 4321986 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| LCC-2 RM0.3 | Long Canyon Creek above Rubicon River confluence | 700544 | 4318487 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Fecal Coliform |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FC-1 | Middle Fork American River below Ahart Campground | 724066 | 4336067 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-2 | Middle Fork American River below Gates Group Campground | 723679 | 4335535 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-3 | Middle Fork American River below Coyote and Lewis Campground | 723578 | 4334312 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-4 | French Meadows Reservoir near McGuire Picnic Area | 722892 | 4333328 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-5 | French Meadows Reservoir near McGuire Boat Ramp | 722565 | 4333376 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-6 | French Meadows Reservoir near French Meadows Campground | 722654 | 4332703 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-7 | French Meadows Reservoir near French Meadows Boat Ramp | 722249 | 4332433 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-8 | French Meadows Reservoir near Poppy Campground | 721628 | 4333151 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-9 | Hell Hole Reservoir near Upper Hell Hole Reservoir Campground | 728501 | 4329059 |  |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| FC-10 | Hell Hole Reservoir near Hell Hole Boat Ramp | 723737 | 4326842 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-11 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above Big Meadows Campground | 722744 | 4328540 |  |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| FC-12 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek below Big Meadows Campground | 722119 | 4328056 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-13 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above Middle Meadows Campground | 719274 | 4325849 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-14 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek below Middle Meadows Campground | 718907 | 4325560 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-15 | Ralston Afterbay near Ralston Picnic Area | 696326 | 4319720 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-16 | Middle Fork American River below Oxbow Powerhouse (Horseshoe Bar Area) | 695159 | 4320291 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| FC-17 | Middle Fork American River below the Drivers Flat Road Camping and Rafting Take-out | 679156 | 4314631 |  | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |

Table AQ 11-2. Summary of Water Quality Analytical Tests, Including Laboratory Methods and Detection Limits, and Chemical Water Quality Objectives.

Table AQ 11-2. Summary of Water Quality Analytical Tests, Including Laboratory Methods and Detection Limits, and Chemical Water Quality Objectives (continued).

|  |  |  |  |  |  | State and Fed | eral Criteria |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Units ${ }^{1}$ | Analysis Method ${ }^{2}$ | Method Detection Limit (MDL) ${ }^{3}$ | Practical Quantitation Limit (PQL) ${ }^{4}$ | Basin Plan ${ }^{5}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CA Toxics Rule } \\ \text { (CTR) }^{6} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | National Toxics Rule (NTR) ${ }^{7}$ | Sample Container | Hold Time | Preservative/Comment |
| Hydrocarbons |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Methyl-tertiary-buty <br> Ether (MtBE) | ug/L | EPA-8260 | Not Applicable | 0.50 | $5^{12}$ | NS | NS | 40 mL VOA | 14 days | HCL, refrigerate |
| Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (as gasoline and as diesel) | ug/L | EPA-8020 | Not Applicable | 50 | NS | NS | (23) | 40 mL VOA | 14 days | HCL, refrigerate |
| Oil and Grease | mg/L | EPA-1664 | Not Applicable | 4.8 | (24) | NS | (25) | 1L amber glass | 48 hours | HCL, refrigerate |
| Bacteria |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total <br> ( $3 \times 5,6 \mathrm{hr}$ hold ) | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{MPN} / 100 \\ \mathrm{~mL}^{26} \end{gathered}$ | EPA-SM9222B | Not Applicable | 2 | NS | NS | NS | NS | 24 hours | Refrigerate |
| Fecal <br> $(3 \times 5)$ Coliform | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{MPN} / 100 \\ \mathrm{~mL}^{26} \end{gathered}$ | EPA-SM922B | Not Applicable | 2-1600 | 200 | NS | NS | 100 mL plastic | 24 hours | Refrigerate |

'Units follow listed criterion standards. If standards were not available, laboratory supplied units were used. (Note: $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}-\mathrm{ppb}$ and $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}=\mathrm{ppm}$ )
${ }^{2}$ Analysis methods are periodically updated by the EPA. The most recent methods available were used for the water quality analysis.
²Analysis methods are periodically updated by the EPA. The most recent methods available were used for the water quality analysis.
${ }^{3}$ MDL: "the minimum concentration of a substance that can be reported with a $99 \%$ confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero." (40 CFR Part 136)
²MDL: "the minimum concentration of a substance that can be reported with a $99 \%$ confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero." ( 40 CFR Part 136 )
${ }^{4}$ PQL: "the lowest concentration of an analyte that can be reliably measured within specified limits of precision and accuracy during routine laboratory operating conditions." (50 FR 46906)
${ }^{5}$ The Basin Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins rely on California primary and secondary Maximum Concentration Level objectives as criteria for water quality to be used as
CCalifornia Toxics Rule (CTR) criteria are based primarily on USEPA
Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) as of October $1,1996$.
7The National Toxics Rule (NTR) criteria are based on USEPA standards developed under the Clean Water Act for human consump
as of October 1,1996. These criteria are to be applied to all states not complying with the Clean Water Act section 303(c)(2)(B).
${ }^{8}$ as of October 1, 1996 . These designated as COLD.
${ }^{9}$ The water column concentration of $9.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ for a 7 -day mean is recommended to achieve the required intergravel dissolved oxygen concentrations.
${ }^{10} \mathrm{pH}$ shall not be depressed below 6.5 or raised greater than 8.5 . Changes in normal ambient pH should not exceed 0.5 .
${ }^{11}$ Instantenous maximum value. This limit has a range of values between the first and second numbers shown.
odor, or appearance of drinking water.
${ }^{13}$ Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, continuous concentration (4-day average)/maximum concentration (1-hour average).
${ }^{14}$ Taste and odor threshold.
${ }^{{ }^{15} \mathrm{pH}}{ }^{16}$, tempereature and life cycle dependent.
${ }^{16}$ Increases in turbidity attributable to controllable water quality factors shall not exceed the following limits: where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 NTU 's, increases shall not exceed 1 NTU . Where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTU 's, increases
shall not exceed $20 \%$. Where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTU 's, increases shall not exceed $10 \mathrm{NTU's}$. Finally, where natural turbidity is greater than $100 \mathrm{NTU's}$, increases shall not exceed $10 \%$.
${ }^{17} 20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ or more of $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ for freshwater aquatic life except where natural concentrations are less (USEPA's 1976 'Red Book'). The 'Red Book' also recommends that natural alkalinity not be reduced by more than $25 \%$.
${ }^{18} \mathrm{Cr}$ riterion is hardness dependent which is expressed as a function of hardness and decreases as hardness decreases. The actual criteria are calculated based on the hardness (as CaCO ${ }_{3}$ ) of the sample water.
${ }^{19}$ NTR Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, continuous concentration (4-day average).
${ }^{20}$ CTR and NTR human heath ( 30 -day average); Drinking Water Sources (consumption of water an aquatic organisms).
${ }^{21}$ CTR human health (30-day average); Other Waters (aquatic organism consumption only).
${ }^{22}$ This value is an Ambient Water Quality Criteria (AWQC) for methyl mercury and was publis
This AWQC for total mercury published in 1980 and partially updated in 1997.
This AWQC for total mercury published in 1980 and partially updated in 1997
${ }^{23}$ From Compilation of Water Quality Goals - TPH-diesel: taste and odor threst
${ }^{24}$ Waters shall not contain oils, greases, waxes, or other materials in concentra ${ }^{25}$ For domestic water supply: Virtually free from oil and grease, particularly
${ }^{26}$ MPN: Most probable number of bacterial colonies per 100 mL of water.

[^0]MPN: Most probable number of bacterial colonies per 100 mL of water.

Table AQ 11-3. List of Voluntary Enhanced Water Quality Sampling Locations.
Hell Hole Reservoir

|  |  | GPS Coordinates |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | UTM10_ | UTM10 |
| Sample ID | Sample Location Description | NAD 83X | NAD 83Y |
| RR-2A | Rubicon River below Hell Hole Reservoir outlet pipe | 724275 | 4326213 |
| RR-EC | Leakage channel below Hell Hole Reservoir | 724237 | 4326112 |
| RR-BEC | Rubicon River below Hell Hole Reservoir and leakage channel | 724232 | 4326108 |

## French Meadows Reservoir

|  |  | GPS Coordinates |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  |  | UTM10_ UTM10 |  |
| Sample ID | Sample Location Description | NAD 83X | NAD 83Y |
| FM-A | Leakage channel A below French Meadows Reservoir | 718622 | 4332105 |
| FM-B | Leakage channel B below French Meadows Reservoir | 718569 | 4332212 |
| FM-C | Leakage channel C below French Meadows Reservoir <br> Middle Fork American River below French Meadows Reservoir | 718569 | 4332226 |
| FM-E* | outlet pipe | 718551 | 4332220 |
| FM-D* | Middle Fork American River below French Meadows Reservoir <br> and spillway channel | 718304 | 4332195 |

*Sampling IDs are listed in upstream to downstream order

Table AQ 11-4. The Sacramento River Basin and San Joaquin River Basin Water Quality Control - Definition of Beneficial Uses.

| Beneficial Use | Definition |
| :--- | :--- |
| Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) | Uses of water for community, military, or individual water supply <br> systems including, but not limited to, drinking water supply. |
| Agricultural Supply (AGR) | Uses of water for farming, horticulture, or ranching including, but <br> not limited to, irrigation (including leaching of salts), stock watering, <br> or support of vegetation for range grazing. |
| Hydropower Generation (POW) | Uses of water for hydropower generation. |
| Water Contact Recreation (REC-1) | Uses of water for recreational activities involving body contact with <br> water, where ingestion of water is reasonably possible. These uses <br> include, but are not limited to, swimming, wading, water-skiing, skin <br> and scuba diving, surfing, whitewater activities, fishing, or use of <br> natural hot springs. |
| Non-contact Water Recreation (REC-2) | Uses of water for recreational activities involving proximity to water, <br> but where there is generally no body contact with water, nor any <br> likelihood of ingestion of water. These uses include, but are not <br> limited to, picnicking, sunbathing, hiking, beachcombing, camping, <br> boating, tidepool and marine life study, hunting, sightseeing, or <br> aesthetic enjoyment in conjunction with the above activities. |
| Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD) | Uses of water that support cold water ecosystems including, but not <br> limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, <br> vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates. |
| Spawning, Reproduction and/or Early <br> Development (SPWN) | Uses of water that support high quality aquatic habitats suitable for <br> reproduction and early development of fish. |
| Wildlife Habitat (WILD) | Uses of water that support terrestrial or wetland ecosystems <br> including, but not limited to, preservation and enhancement of <br> terrestrial habitats or wetlands, vegetation, wildlife (e.g., mammals, <br> birds, reptiles, amphibians, invertebrates), or wildlife water and food <br> sources. |

Source: Table II of The Sacramento River Basin and San Joaquin River Basin Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the California Regional Water Quality Control Board -Control Valley Region Fourth Edition revised February 2007.
Table AQ 11-5. Summary of In-Situ Stream Measurements Collected During the Spring 2007 Sampling Event.

| Sample ID | Location Name | Date | Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | Specific Conductance ( $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | pH | Sample <br> Water <br> Depth ${ }^{1}$ <br> (m) | Secchi <br> Depth ${ }^{2}$ <br> (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Duncan Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DC-1 RM8.9 | Duncan Creek above diversion | 5/22/2007 | 7.24 | 8.9 | 57 | 7.6 | 0 |  |
| DC-2 RM8.8 | Duncan Creek below diversion | 5/22/2007 | 7.97 | 8.8 | 57 | 7.9 | 0 |  |
| DC-3 RM0. 2 | Duncan Creek above Middle Fork American River confluence | 5/17/2007 | 11.16 | 6.3 | 67 | 8.2 | 0 |  |
| Middle Fork American River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MFAR-1 RM51.6 | Middle Fork American River above French Meadows Reservoir | 5/22/2007 | 8.23 | 9.0 | 53 | 7.7 | 0 |  |
| FM-1 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (lower) | 5/30/2007 | 16.32 | 7.9 | 25 | 6.9 | 0 |  |
| FM-1 | French Meadows Reservoir sub-surface (lower) | 5/30/2007 | 7.17 | 8.2 | 23 | 6.5 | 30 |  |
| FM-2 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (middle) | 5/31/2007 | 16.12 | 7.7 | 25 | 6.6 | 0 | 7.5 |
| FM-2 | French Meadows Reservoir sub-surface (middle) | 5/31/2007 | 8.25 | 8.4 | 24 | 6.5 | 20 | 7.5 |
| FM-3 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (upper) | 5/31/2007 | 16.45 | 7.9 | 25 | 6.6 | 0 | 7 |
| FM-3 | French Meadows Reservoir sub-surface (upper) | 5/31/2007 | 9.89 | 8.8 | 23 | 6.6 | 15 | 7 |
| MFAR-2 RM 46.6 | Middle Fork American River below French Meadows Dam at gaging station | 5/22/2007 | 10.60 | 9.0 | 54 | 7.4 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-3 RM39.9 | Middle Fork American River above Duncan Creek confluence | 5/17/2007 | 13.17 | 6.3 | 66 | 7.7 | 0 |  |

Table AQ 11-5. Summary of In-Situ Stream Measurements Collected During the Spring 2007 Sampling Event (continued).

| Sample ID | Location Name | Date | Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | Specific Conductance ( $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | pH | Sample Water Depth ${ }^{1}$ (m) | Secchi <br> Depth ${ }^{2}$ <br> (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MFAR-4 RM39.5 | Middle Fork American River below Duncan Creek confluence | 5/17/2007 | 12.44 | 6.2 | 67 | 7.8 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-5 RM36.3 | Middle Fork American River above Middle Fork Interbay | 5/16/2007 | 13.25 | 8.9 | 68 | 8.4 | 0 |  |
| IR-1 RM35.7 | In Middle Fork Interbay | 5/16/2007 | 13.77 | 8.8 | 66 | 7.2 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-6 RM35.5 | Middle Fork American River below Middle Fork Interbay | 5/16/2007 | 10.02 | 9.3 | 60 | 7.7 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-7 RM26.1 | Middle Fork American River above Ralston Afterbay | 5/22/2007 | 15.44 | 8.5 | 82 | 7.4 | 0 |  |
| Ralston Afterbay Downstream |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RA-1(S) | Ralston Afterbay surface | 5/29/2007 | 19.15 | 10.3 | 53 | 6.6 | 0 |  |
| RA-1 | Ralston Afterbay sub-surface | 5/29/2007 | 12.03 | 11.4 | 36 | 6.5 | 6 |  |
| MFAR-8 RM24.7 | Middle Fork American River below dam | 5/21/2007 | 18.76 | 8.0 | 63 | 7.0 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-9 RM24.3 | Middle Fork American River below Oxbow Powerhouse tailrace | 5/21/2007 | 15.32 | 8.9 | 66 | 7.3 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-10 RM9.1 | Middle Fork American River below the Drivers Flat Road Rafting Take-Out | 5/14/2007 | 16.53 | 9.7 | 64 | 6.8 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-11 RM0.1 | Middle Fork American River above North Fork American River | 5/16/2007 | 19.73 | 8.7 | 67 | 7.3 | 0 |  |
| NFAR-1 RM20.6 | North Fork American River below Middle Fork American River | 5/16/2007 | 18.51 | 8.7 | 72 | 7.4 | 0 |  |

Table AQ 11-5. Summary of In-Situ Stream Measurements Collected During the Spring 2007 Sampling Event (continued).

Table AQ 11-5. Summary of In-Situ Stream Measurements Collected During the Spring 2007 Sampling Event (continued).

| Sample ID | Location Name | Date | Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | Specific Conductance ( $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | pH | Sample Water Depth ${ }^{1}$ (m) | Secchi <br> Depth ${ }^{2}$ <br> (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RR-6 RM3.5 | Rubicon River below Long Canyon Creek confluence | 5/21/2007 | 16.26 | 8.4 | 72 | 7.3 | 0 |  |
| RR-7 RM0.7 | Rubicon River above Ralston Afterbay | 5/21/2007 | 19.61 | 8.6 | 71 | 7.3 | 0 |  |
| Long Canyon Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NFLC-1 RM3.2 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek above diversion | 5/15/2007 | 12.86 | 8.8 | 55 | 7.5 | 0 |  |
| NFLC-2 RM2.9 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek below diversion | 5/15/2007 | 13.80 | 8.7 | 54 | 7.7 | 0 |  |
| NFLC-3 RM0.3 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek above Long Canyon Creek confluence | 5/15/2007 | 10.81 | 9.2 | 63 | 7.3 | 0 |  |
| SFLC-1 RM3.4 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above diversion | 5/15/2007 | 11.31 | 8.8 | 59 | 6.5 | 0 |  |
| SFLC-2 RM3.1 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek below diversion | 5/15/2007 | 11.68 | 9.1 | 58 | 6.6 | 0 |  |
| SFLC-3 RM0.2 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above Long Canyon Creek confluence | 5/15/2007 | 9.51 | 9.3 | 60 | 7.2 | 0 |  |
| LCC-1 RM11.3 | Long Canyon Creek below North Fork and South Fork Long Canyon creeks confluence | 5/15/2007 | 9.61 | 9.3 | 60 | 7.3 | 0 |  |
| LCC-2 RM0.3 | Long Canyon Creek above Rubicon River confluence | 5/21/2007 | 15.14 | 8.8 | 69 | 7.5 | 0 |  |
| 1. Water sample was collected just below the water surface unless otherwise noted. <br> 2: Secchi depth measurements were only collected in the reservoirs. <br> 3: Instrument malfunction, no in-situ measurements available. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table AQ 11-6. Summary of In-Situ Stream Measurements Collected During the Fall 2007 Sampling Event.

| Sample ID | Location Name | Date | Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | Specific Conductance ( $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | pH | Sample Water Depth ${ }^{1}$ (m) | Secchi <br> Depth ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Duncan Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DC-1 RM8.9 | Duncan Creek above diversion | 9/25/2007 | 12.25 | 7.2 | 67 | 7.8 | 0 |  |
| DC-2 RM8.8 | Duncan Creek below diversion | 9/25/2007 | 11.61 | 7.0 | 65 | 7.1 | 0 |  |
| DC-3 RM0. 2 | Duncan Creek above Middle Fork American River confluence | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |  |
| Middle Fork American River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MFAR-1 RM51.6 | Middle Fork American River above French Meadows Reservoir | 10/3/2007 | 8.79 | 13.6 | 33 | 7.5 | 0 |  |
| FM-1 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (lower) | 10/3/2007 | 15.07 | 8.3 | 34 | 7.8 | 0 | 95 |
| FM-1 | French Meadows Reservoir sub-surface (lower) | 10/3/2007 | 10.07 | 7.3 | 33 | 6.7 | 22.5 | 9.5 |
| FM-2 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (middle) | 10/3/2007 | 15.23 | 8.3 | 33 | 7.9 | 0 | Too |
| FM-2 | French Meadows Reservoir sub-surface (middle) | 10/3/2007 | 10.23 | 7.7 | 30 | 6.6 | 22.5 | windy |
| FM-3 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (upper) | 10/3/2007 | 15.36 | 8.6 | 33 | 7.2 | 0 | Too |
| FM-3 | French Meadows Reservoir sub-surface (upper) | 10/3/2007 | 11.36 | 7.7 | 33 | 6.5 | 22.5 | windy |
| MFAR-2 RM 46.6 | Middle Fork American River below French Meadows Dam at gaging station | 10/3/2007 | 8.93 | 11.7 | 16 | 7.5 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-3 RM39.9 | Middle Fork American River above Duncan Creek confluence | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |  |

Table AQ 11-6. Summary of In-Situ Stream Measurements Collected During the Fall 2007 Sampling Event (continued).

| Sample ID | Location Name | Date | Temperature <br> ( $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Dissolved Oxygen $(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ | Specific Conductance <br> ( $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | pH | Sample Water Depth ${ }^{1}$ (m) | Secchi Depth ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MFAR-4 RM39.5 | Middle Fork American River below Duncan Creek confluence | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NA |  |
| MFAR-5 RM36.3 | Middle Fork American River above Middle Fork Interbay | 9/24/2007 | 11.75 | 7.8 | 62 | 8.0 | 0 |  |
| IR-1 RM35.7 | In Middle Fork Interbay | 9/24/2007 | 12.14 | 7.8 | 66 | 8.0 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-6 RM35.5 | Middle Fork American River below Middle Fork Interbay | 9/24/2007 | 12.41 | 7.7 | 39 | 7.8 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-7 RM26.1 | Middle Fork American River above Ralston Afterbay | 9/26/2007 | 13.52 | 10.5 | 54 | 7.4 | 0 |  |
| Ralston Afterbay Downstream |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RA-1(S) | Ralston Afterbay surface | 9/26/2007 | 13.24 | 10.9 | 41 | 7.0 | 0 | 7 |
| RA-1 | Ralston Afterbay sub-surface | 9/26/2007 | 12.38 | 11.3 | 36 | 6.8 | 5 |  |
| MFAR-8 RM24.7 | Middle Fork American River below dam | 9/26/2007 | 17.58 | 9.9 | 42 | 6.9 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-9 RM24.3 | Middle Fork American River below Oxbow Powerhouse tailrace | 9/26/2007 | 13.08 | 11.3 | 39 | 7.1 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-10 RM9.1 | Middle Fork American River below the Drivers Flat Road Rafting Take-Out | 9/24/2007 | 13.90 | 10.2 | 46 | 7.7 | 0 |  |
| MFAR-11 RM0.1 | Middle Fork American River above North Fork American River | 9/25/2007 | 13.62 | 10.5 | 49 | 7.7 | 0 |  |
| NFAR-1 RM20.6 | North Fork American River below Middle Fork American River | 9/25/2007 | 14.45 | 10.0 | 63 | 7.7 | 0 |  |

Table AQ 11-6. Summary of In-Situ Stream Measurements Collected During the Fall 2007 Sampling Event (continued).

| Sample ID | Location Name | Date | Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | Specific Conductance ( $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | pH | Sample Water Depth ${ }^{1}$ (m) | Secchi <br> Depth ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubicon River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RR-1 RM35.9 | Rubicon River above Reservoir | 10/2/2007 | 11.74 | 7.8 | 107 | 7.1 | 0 |  |
| HH-1 (S) | Hell Hole Reservoir surface (lower) | 10/1/2007 | 16.66 | 7.2 | 36 | 7.9 | 0 | 10 |
| $\mathrm{HH}-1$ | Hell Hole Reservoir sub-surface (lower) | 10/1/2007 | 15.81 | 6.3 | 31 | 6.8 | 23 |  |
| HH-2 (S) | Hell Hole Reservoir surface (middle) | 10/1/2007 | 16.10 | 6.4 | 33 | 6.7 | 0 | 10 |
| HH-2 | Hell Hole Reservoir sub-surface (middle) | 10/1/2007 | 15.82 | 6.3 | 32 | 7.0 | 27 |  |
| HH-3 (S) | Hell Hole Reservoir surface (upper) | 10/2/2007 | 15.80 | 6.3 | 44 | 7.8 | 0 | 9.4 |
| HH-3 | Hell Hole Reservoir sub-surface (upper) | 10/2/2007 | 15.76 | 6.3 | 40 | 7.2 | 20 |  |
| RR-2 RM30.2 | Rubicon River below dam at gaging station | 10/3/2007 | 8.97 | 9.9 | 18 | 6.9 | 0 |  |
| RR-3 RM 22.8 | Rubicon River above South Fork Rubicon River confluence | 9/25/2007 | 11.34 | 7.6 | 54 | 7.1 | 0 |  |
| SFRR-1 RM0.2 | South Fork Rubicon River above Rubicon River confluence | 9/25/2007 | 11.56 | 7.7 | 25 | 8.4 | 0 |  |
| RR-4 RM22.5 | Rubicon River below South Fork Rubicon River confluence | 9/25/2007 | 11.64 | 7.3 | 30 | 7.0 | 0 |  |
| RR-5 RM3.8 | Rubicon River above Long Canyon Creek confluence | 9/27/2007 | 15.40 | 8.4 | 56 | 7.7 | 0 |  |
| RR-6 RM3.5 | Rubicon River below Long Canyon Creek confluence | 9/27/2007 | 15.27 | 8.3 | 59 | 7.3 | 0 |  |
| RR-7 RM0. 7 | Rubicon River above Ralston Afterbay | 9/26/2007 | 17.86 | 9.7 | 62 | 7.2 | 0 |  |

Table AQ 11-6. Summary of In-Situ Stream Measurements Collected During the Fall 2007 Sampling Event (continued).

| Sample ID | Location Name | Date | Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | Specific Conductance ( $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | pH | Sample Water Depth ${ }^{1}$ (m) | Secchi Depth ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long Canyon Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NFLC-1 RM3.2 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek above diversion | 10/2/2007 | 8.46 | 9.7 | 41 | 7.4 | 0 |  |
| NFLC-2 RM2.9 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek below diversion | 10/2/2007 | 10.52 | 9.0 | 42 | 7.4 | 0 |  |
| NFLC-3 RM0.3 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek above Long Canyon Creek confluence | 10/2/2007 | 8.46 | 9.8 | 29 | 7.3 | 0 |  |
| SFLC-1 RM3.4 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above diversion | 10/2/2007 | 8.81 | 8.8 | 34 | 7.1 | 0 |  |
| SFLC-2 RM3. 1 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek below diversion | 10/2/2007 | 8.85 | 9.6 | 34 | 7.4 | 0 |  |
| SFLC-3 RM0. 2 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above Long Canyon Creek confluence | 10/2/2007 | 7.52 | 9.7 | 29 | 7.0 | 0 |  |
| LCC-1 RM11.3 | Long Canyon Creek below North Fork and South Fork Long Canyon creeks confluence | 10/2/2007 | 8.17 | 7.6 | 29 | 7.5 | 0 |  |
| LCC-2 RM0.3 | Long Canyon Creek above Rubicon River confluence | 9/27/2007 | 14.30 | 8.6 | 92 | 7.4 | 0 |  |

1: Water sample was collected just below the water surface unless otherwise noted.
NS: No sample was collected at this location during the fall sampling event due to dangerous access conditions.
Table AQ 11-7. Summary of Analytical Results for Water Quality Samples Collected during the Spring 2007 Sampling Event.

|  |  |  |  | Station | DC. 1 RMB. 9 | DC.2 RM 8.8 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { DC-3 } \\ \text { RM0.2 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MFAR-1 } \\ & \text { RM51.6 } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{\text {FMM }}$ (1) S ) | FM-1 | FM-2(S) | FM-2 | FM-3(S) | FM-3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { MFAR-2 RM } \\ 46.6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MFAR-3 } \\ & \text { RM39.9 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MFAR-4 } \\ & \text { RM39.5 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MFAR-5 } \\ & \text { RM } 36.3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | IR-1 RM35.7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MFAR-6 } \\ & \text { RM35.5 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | MFAR-7 RM26. | RA-1(S) | RA-1 | MFAR-8 RM24.7 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { MFAR-9 } \\ \text { RM24.3 } \end{gathered}$ | MFAR-10 RM9.1 | MFAR-11 RM0.1 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { NFAR-1 } \\ \text { RM20.6 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Dato | 512272007 | 5/22/2007 | 51707 | 5/2212007 | 5/3112007 | 5/31/2007 | 51312007 | 5/312007 | 5/312007 | $53^{1 / 2007}$ | $5 / 2212007$ | 51712007 | 51712007 | 516/2007 | 514612007 | 5116/2007 | 5/2227207 | 5/29212007 | 5/2922007 | 51212007 | 5/2112007 | $51 / 4212007$ | 5/1612007 | 5/16/2007 |
|  |  |  |  | Time | 9.45 | 10:40 | 11:00 | 11:40 | 9:30 | 8:40 | 10:00 | 10:40 | 13:15 | 12:15 | 12:30 | 12:30 | 12:00 | $9: 25$ | 10:10 | 8.50 | 8:00 | 12:30 | 10:40 | 14:00 | 13:30 | 15:50 | 15:10 | 14:30 |
| General Parameters | Units | pal | wa Criteria |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Calcium | mal | 0.5 | ns |  | 2.7 | 2.8 | 4.8 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 3.5 | 7.4 | 5.7 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 6 |
| Choride | mal | 1.0 | $250^{\prime}$ |  | ND | ND | 1.1 | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| Hardness (as $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | mal | 1.0 | Ns |  | 9.5 | 9.8 | 16 | 8.2 | 7.5 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 7.9 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 9 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 16 | 12 | 23 | 18 | 14 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 21 |
| Magnesium | $\mu g$ ¢ | 100 | ns |  | 680 | 690 | 910 | 600 | 540 | 570 | 560 | 580 | 570 | 570 | 620 | 800 | 890 | 970 | 920 | 730 | 1200 | 1000 | 810 | 980 | 910 | 1200 | 1300 | 1500 |
| NitraieNivitie ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}$ ) | mal | 0.20 | $1^{\prime}$ |  | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Ammonia as N | mal | 0.100 | 1.5 |  | ND | ND | ND | No | ND | No | No | ND | No | ND | ND | ND | No | No | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Total Kieldahi Nitrogen (TKN) | mg | 0.100 | ns |  | 4.2 | 8.4 | 0.56 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 2 | 1.1 | 2.5 | 78 | 5 | 7 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 3.9 | 1.1 | 0.56 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.84 | 0.56 | 0.56 |
| Total Phosphorus | mg ${ }^{\text {ch }}$ | 0.100 | ns |  | ND | 0.49 | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | No | ND | ND | ND | No | No | ND | ND | ND | ND | 0.13 | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Otho-phosphate | mal | 0.010 | ns |  | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | No | ND | No | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Potassium | mar | 0.20 | Ns |  | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | No | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Sodium | mal. | 0.50 | ns |  | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| Sultate ( $\mathrm{SO}_{4}$ ) | mal | 0.50 | $250{ }^{\circ}$ |  | 0.56 | 0.58 | 0.98 | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | 0.73 | 0.88 | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.72 | 2.9 | 1.4 | 0.76 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 2 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mal | 10 | $500^{\prime}$ |  | 32 | 24 | 30 | 30 | 40 | 44 | 40 | 44 | 38 | 40 | 28 | 50 | 38 | 46 | 34 | 24 | 44 | 48 | 26 | 36 | 50 | 38 | 60 | 38 |
| Toal Suspended Solids | man | 10 | ns |  | nD | no | ND | no | ND | ND | No | ND | No | ND | ND | ND | no | no | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Tubididy | NTU | 0.10 | (5) |  | ND | 0.16 | 3.8 | ND | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.78 | 0.6 | 0.44 | 1.2 | 0.13 | 0.86 | 2.2 | 0.44 | 0.12 | 0.41 | 1.2 | 0.38 | 0.15 | 0.27 | 0.44 | 0.53 |
| Organic Carbon, Tolal (TOC) | mal | 1.00 | ns |  | ND | ND | ND | 1.3 | 1 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.1 | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.9 | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Total Akalinty | mat | 5.0 | $20^{\circ}$ |  | 16 | 14 | 16 | 14 | 22 | 22 | 24 | 20 | 20 | 22 | 14 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 18 | 16 | 20 | 22 | 16 | 20 | 20 | 16 | 22 | 26 |
| Metals-Dissolved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assenic | нgя | 0.20 | $10^{\prime}$ |  | $0.060^{0}$ | $0.060^{0}$ | $0.060^{0}$ | $0.090^{8}$ | $0.130^{8}$ | $0.120^{8}$ | $0.130^{8}$ | $0.110^{8}$ | $0.110^{8}$ | $0.120^{8}$ | $0.130^{8}$ | $0.120^{8}$ | $0.090^{8}$ | $0.100^{8}$ | $0.090^{8}$ | $0.170^{8}$ | 0.230 | 0.220 | $0.200^{8}$ | $0.170^{\text {g }}$ | $0.170^{\text {e }}$ | 0.220 | 0.240 | 0.450 |
| Cadmum | $\mu g{ }^{\text {m }}$ | 0.010 | (6) |  | $0.005^{\text { }}$ | $0.005^{\text { }}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.006^{\text {b }}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.004^{0}$ | $0.004^{\prime \prime}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.004^{0}$ | $0.004^{0}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.004^{\prime \prime}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.004^{\text {" }}$ | $0.004^{\prime \prime}$ | $0.004^{\text { }}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.004^{4}$ | $0.004^{4}$ |
| Copper | mal | 0.00020 | (6) |  | $0.00015^{6}$ | $0.00016^{\text {b }}$ | $0.000130^{\circ}$ | $0.000160^{8}$ | $0.000190^{8}$ | 0.000220 | $0.000190^{8}$ | $0.000180^{\circ}$ | $0.000180^{8}$ | $0.000180^{8}$ | $0.000190^{8}$ | $0.000140^{8}$ | $0.000160^{8}$ | $0.000180^{88}$ | 0.000590 | 0.000240 | 0.000330 | 0.000340 | 0.000390 | 0.000310 | 0.000340 | 0.000410 | 0.00030 | 0.000430 |
| ron | mal | 0.005 | ${ }_{0}^{0.3}$ |  | $0.00140^{0}$ | 0.0019390 | ${ }^{0.00228^{\circ}}$ | $0.005^{\text {® }}$ | ${ }^{0.00140^{\circ}}$ | ${ }^{0.00222^{3}} 0$ | ${ }^{0.00140^{\circ}} 0$ | $0.00014^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{0.00410^{8}}$ | $0.00014^{0}$ | ${ }^{0.1355000}$ | 0.0013100 | 0.0008400 | ${ }^{0.008600}$ | $0^{0.005350}$ | ${ }^{0.007700}$ | $0.00280^{\circ}$ | 0.005400 | $0^{0.008300} 0$ | 0.0071600 | ${ }^{0.0222100}$ | ${ }^{0.008200}$ | ${ }^{0.007400}$ | ${ }^{0.0014600}$ |
| Lead Manganese | $\stackrel{\mu 92}{\mu 92}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.050} 0$ | ${ }_{50}^{(6)}$ |  | $0.010^{\circ}$ | 0.010 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{8}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | $0^{0.010^{\circ}}$ | ${ }^{0.010^{\circ}}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{0.010} 0^{\circ}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{0.010^{\circ}}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | $0^{0.0010}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{0.010} 0^{\circ}$ | $0^{0.010^{\circ}}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | $0.010^{\circ}$ | $0.0 .10^{\circ}$ |
| Nichel | $\mu \mathrm{mg}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.20}$ | ${ }^{\text {(6) }}$ |  | 0.180 | $\frac{0.170}{0.00^{\circ}}$ | ${ }^{0.166^{80}}$ | ${ }^{0.0880^{8}}$ | ${ }^{0.0400^{\circ}}$ | $0^{0.0440^{\circ}}$ | ${ }^{0.040^{0}}$ | ${ }^{0.040^{\circ}}$ | ${ }^{0.044^{0}}$ | $0^{0.040^{0}}$ | ${ }^{0.0600^{8}}$ | $0.0 .70^{80}$ | $0^{0.110^{80}}$ | $0.100^{80}$ | $0^{0.120^{80}}$ | $0.090^{\text {8 }}$ | $0^{0.210}$ | $0.090^{\text {b }}$ | ${ }^{0.0900^{80}}$ | ${ }^{0.155^{\text {a }}}$ | ${ }^{0.130^{\text {d }}}$ | ${ }^{0.230}$ | ${ }^{0.250}$ | ${ }^{0.380}$ |
| Chromium-Total <br> Metals-Total | н92 | 0.15 | $5{ }^{\circ}$ |  | $0^{0.030^{\circ}}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | 0.030 | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0^{0.030^{\circ}}$ | $0^{0.030^{\circ}}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | $0.000360^{8}$ | $0.00027^{8}$ | $0.0004^{8}$ | 0.000430 | $0.000290^{8}$ | 0.000860 | $0.000350^{8}$ | 0.000420 | $0.000340^{6}$ | 0.000610 | $0.000330^{8}$ | $0.000350^{8}$ | $0.000400^{8}$ | 0.000530 | $0.000380^{8}$ | 0.000560 | $0.000330^{8}$ | $0.000340^{8}$ | 0.000880 | $0.000370^{8}$ | $0.00030^{\circ}$ | 0.00085 | 0.000610 | ${ }^{0.00148}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | н9\% | 0.50 | $5^{\prime}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ND | ND |  |  |  |  |  |
| gasoline and as diesel) | нgヶ | 50 | ns |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | no | No |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fecal Coliform (3x5) | MPN100 mL | 2.1600 | 200/100' |  | $<2$ | $<2$ | <2 | 4 | <2 | 70 | $<2$ | $<2$ | $<2$ | 23 | $<2$ | 4 | $<2$ | $<2$ | 4 | <2 | 23 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 13 | 30 | 2 | 7 |

Table AQ 11-7. Summary of Analytical Results for Water Quailty Samples Collected during the Spring 2007 Sampling Event (continued)


[^1]Table AQ 11-8. Calculated Ammonia Concentration Criteria for the Spring 2007 Sampling Event.








Table AQ 11-10. Summary of Analytical Results of Water Quality Sampling for Fall 2007 (continued).

Table AQ 11-10. Summary of Analytical Results of Water Quality Sampling for Fall 2007 (continued).

Note: Bold results do not meet the listed criteria
PaL: Practical Quanatitation Limit: the lowest concentration of an analyte that can be eeliably measured within specified limits of precision and accuracy during routine laboratory operating conditions.


四


Table AQ 11-11. Calculated Ammonia Concentration Criteria for the Fall 2007 Sampling Event.

| Sample ID | Location Name | Date | pH | Temperature | Ammonia Criteria Continuous Concentration with fish early life stages present (NTR) ${ }^{1}$ | Ammonia Concentration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | mg/L | mg/L |
| DC-1 RM8.9 | Duncan Creek above diversion | 9/25/2007 | 7.8 | 12.25 | 3.22 | \#N/A |
| DC-2 RM8.8 | Duncan Creek below diversion | 9/25/2007 | 7.1 | 11.61 | 5.79 | \#N/A |
| DC-3 RM0. 2 | Duncan Creek above Middle Fork American River confluence | * | * | * | * | * |
| MFAR-1 RM52.8 | Middle Fork American River above French Meadows Reservoir | 10/3/2007 | 7.5 | 8.79 | 4.51 | \#N/A |
| FM-1 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (lower) | 10/3/2007 | 7.8 | 15.07 | 3.00 | \#N/A |
| FM-1 | French Meadows Reservoir sub-surface (lower) | 10/3/2007 | 6.7 | 10.07 | 6.43 | 0.133 |
| FM-2 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (middle) | 10/3/2007 | 7.9 | 15.23 | 2.74 | \#N/A |
| FM-2 | French Meadows Reservoir sub-surface (middle) | 10/3/2007 | 6.6 | 10.23 | 6.52 | 0.207 |
| FM-3 (S) | French Meadows Reservoir surface (upper) | 10/3/2007 | 7.2 | 15.36 | 4.99 | \#N/A |
| FM-3 | French Meadows Reservoir sub-surface (upper) | 10/3/2007 | 6.5 | 11.36 | 6.64 | 0.122 |
| MFAR-2 RM 46.6 | Middle Fork American River below French Meadows Dam at gaging station | 10/3/2007 | 7.5 | 8.93 | 4.33 | \#N/A |
| MFAR-3 RM39.9 | Middle Fork American River above Duncan Creek confluence | * | * | * | * | * |
| MFAR-4 RM39.5 | Middle Fork American River below Duncan Creek confluence | * | * | * | * | * |
| MFAR-5 RM36.3 | Middle Fork American River above Middle Fork Interbay | 9/24/2007 | 8.0 | 11.75 | 2.58 | ND |
| IR-1 RM35.7 | In Middle Fork Interbay | 9/24/2007 | 8.0 | 12.14 | 2.33 | \#N/A |
| MFAR-6 RM35.5 | Middle Fork American River below Middle Fork Interbay | 9/24/2007 | 7.8 | 12.41 | 3.18 | ND |
| MFAR-7 RM26.1 | Middle Fork American River above Ralston Afterbay | 9/26/2007 | 7.4 | 13.52 | 4.70 | \#N/A |
| RA-1(S) | Ralston Afterbay surface | 9/26/2007 | 7.0 | 13.24 | 6.02 | ND |
| RA-1 | Ralston Afterbay sub-surface | 9/26/2007 | 6.8 | 12.38 | 6.23 | ND |
| MFAR-8 RM24.7 | Middle Fork American River below dam | 9/26/2007 | 6.9 | 17.58 | 5.01 | \#N/A |
| MFAR-9 RM24.3 | Middle Fork American River below Oxbow Powerhouse tailrace | 9/26/2007 | 7.1 | 13.08 | 5.64 | \#N/A |
| MFAR-10 RM9.1 | Middle Fork American River below the Drivers Flat Road Rafting Take-Out | 9/24/2007 | 7.7 | 13.9 | 3.70 | \#N/A |
| MFAR-11 RM0.1 | Middle Fork American River above North Fork American River | 9/25/2007 | 7.7 | 13.62 | 3.50 | ND |
| NFAR-1 RM20.6 | North Fork American River below Middle Fork American River | 9/25/2007 | 7.7 | 14.45 | 3.78 | \#N/A |
| RR-1 RM35.9 | Rubicon River above Reservoir | 10/2/2007 | 7.1 | 11.74 | 5.59 | \#N/A |
| HH-1 (S) | Hell Hole Reservoir surface (lower) | 10/1/2007 | 7.9 | 16.66 | 2.44 | \#N/A |
| HH-1 | Hell Hole Reservoir sub-surface (lower) | 10/1/2007 | 6.8 | 15.81 | 5.84 | ND |
| HH-2 (S) | Hell Hole Reservoir surface (middle) | 10/1/2007 | 6.7 | 16.10 | 5.79 | \#N/A |
| HH-2 | Hell Hole Reservoir sub-surface (middle) | 10/1/2007 | 7.0 | 15.82 | 5.35 | ND |
| HH-3 (S) | Hell Hole Reservoir surface (upper) | 10/2/2007 | 7.8 | 15.80 | 2.79 | \#N/A |
| HH-3 | Hell Hole Reservoir sub-surface (upper) | 10/2/2007 | 7.2 | 15.76 | 5.08 | ND |
| RR-2 RM30.2 | Rubicon River below dam at gaging station | 10/3/2007 | 6.9 | 8.97 | 6.21 | \#N/A |
| RR-3 RM 22.8 | Rubicon River above South Fork Rubicon River confluence | 9/25/2007 | 7.1 | 11.34 | 5.56 | \#N/A |
| SFRR-1 RM0.2 | South Fork Rubicon River above Rubicon River confluence | 9/25/2007 | 8.4 | 11.56 | 1.38 | \#N/A |
| RR-4 RM22.5 | Rubicon River below South Fork Rubicon River confluence | 9/25/2007 | 7.0 | 11.64 | 5.89 | ND |
| RR-5 RM3.8 | Rubicon River above Long Canyon Creek confluence | 9/27/2007 | 7.7 | 15.40 | 3.23 | \#N/A |
| RR-6 RM3.5 | Rubicon River below Long Canyon Creek confluence | 9/27/2007 | 7.3 | 15.27 | 4.84 | \#N/A |
| RR-7 RM0.7 | Rubicon River above Ralston Afterbay | 9/26/2007 | 7.2 | 17.86 | 4.27 | ND |
| NFLC-1 RM3.2 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek above diversion | 10/2/2007 | 7.4 | 8.46 | 4.77 | ND |
| NFLC-2 RM2.9 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek below diversion | 10/2/2007 | 7.4 | 10.52 | 4.66 | \#N/A |
| NFLC-3 RM0.3 | North Fork Long Canyon Creek above Long Canyon Creek confluence | 10/2/2007 | 7.3 | 8.46 | 5.14 | \#N/A |
| SFLC-1 RM3.4 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above diversion | 10/2/2007 | 7.1 | 8.81 | 5.61 | ND |
| SFLC-2 RM3.1 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek below diversion | 10/2/2007 | 7.4 | 8.85 | 4.66 | ND |
| SFLC-3 RM0. 2 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above Long Canyon Creek confluence | 10/2/2007 | 7.0 | 7.52 | 5.84 | \#N/A |
| LCC-1 RM11.3 | Long Canyon Creek below North Fork and South Fork Long Canyon creeks confluence | 10/2/2007 | 7.5 | 8.17 | 4.51 | \#N/A |
| LCC-2 RM0.3 | Long Canyon Creek above Rubicon River confluence | 9/27/2007 | 7.4 | 14.3 | 4.73 | \#N/A |

1:Ammonia criteria calculated using guidelines from the National Toxic Rule (NTR), which is based on ambient pH and temperature conditions
ND: Not detected
*: No sample was collected at this location during the fall sampling event due to dangerous access condition.
Table AQ 11-12. Hardness-based Water Quality Criteria tor Cadmium, Copper, Lead, and Nickel for the Fall 2007 Sampling Event.


Table AQ 11-13. Summary of In-Situ Measurements for Voluntary Enhanced Water Quality Sampling Locations.

| Sample ID | Location Name | Date | Temperature <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | Specific Conductance <br> ( $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | pH | Sample Water Depth ${ }^{1}$ (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Additional Sampling below Project Reservoirs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RR-2A | Rubicon River below Hell Hole Reservoir outlet pipe | 5/22/2007 | 6.88 | 9.0 | 59 | 6.9 | 0 |
| RR-EC | Leakage weir channel below Hell Hole Reservoir <br> Rubicon River below Hell | 5/22/2007 | (3) | (3) | (3) | (3) | 0 |
| RR-BEC | Hole Reservoir and leakage weir channel | 5/22/2007 | 7.13 | 9.8 | 54 | 7.2 | 0 |
| FM-A | Leakage weir A below French Meadows Reservoir | 8/6/2007 | 13.3 | 1.1 | 165 | 5.3 | 0 |
| FM-B | Leakage weir B below French Meadows Reservoir | 8/6/2007 | 11.57 | 5.2 | 180 | 5.6 | 0 |
| FM-C | Leakage weir C below French Meadows Reservoir | 8/6/2007 | 9.65 | 2.9 | 181 | 5.5 | 0 |
| FM-D | Middle Fork American River below French Meadows Reservoir and spillway channel | 8/6/2007 | 4.21 | 9.3 | 26 | 5.3 | 0 |
| FM-E | Middle Fork American River below French Meadows Reservoir outlet pipe | 8/6/2007 | 8.22 | 9.1 | 25 | 5.4 | 0 |

Table AQ 11-14. Summary of Analytical Results for Voluntary Enhanced Water Quality Samples.

|  |  |  |  | RR-2A | RR-2EC | RR-2DEC | FM-A | FM-B | FM-C | FM-D | FM-E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 5/22/2007 | 5/22/2007 | 5/22/2007 | 8/7/2007 | 8/7/2007 | 8/7/2007 | 8/7/2007 | 8/7/2007 |
| Water Quality Parameters | Units | PQL | WQ Criteria | 15:10 | 14:40 | 14:45 | 10:15 | 10:50 | 11:10 | 12:00 | 12:30 |
| Metals-Dissolved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arsenic | ug/L | 0.20 | $10^{1}$ | 0.210 | $0.060^{\text {U }}$ | 0.230 | 2.760 | 5.540 | 4.800 | $0.160^{\text {B }}$ | $0.120^{B}$ |
| Cadmium | ug/L | 0.01 | (3) | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | 0.004 | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ |
| Copper | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 0.0002 | (3) | 0.000320 | 0.000300 | 0.000300 | $0.000110^{\text {B }}$ | $0.000060^{\text {B }}$ | $0.000060^{B}$ | $0.000190^{\text {B }}$ | $0.000180^{\text {B }}$ |
| Iron | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 0.0014 | $0.3{ }^{1}$ | $0.001400^{\text {U }}$ | $0.001400{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.001400^{\text {U }}$ | 20.400 | 16.000 | 19.400 | 0.137 | 0.0348 |
| Lead | ug/L | 0.05 | (3) | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ |
| Manganese | ug/L | 0.05 | $50^{1}$ | NS | NS | NS | 4040 | 3610 | 3860 | 62.600 | 22.000 |
| Nickel | ug/L | 0.20 | (3) | $0.080^{\text {B }}$ | 0.300 | $0.090^{\text {B }}$ | 0.390 | 0.310 | 0.240 | $0.070^{\text {B }}$ | $0.060^{\text {B }}$ |
| Chromium-Total | ug/L | 0.15 | $50^{1}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.030^{\circ}$ | $0.140^{\text {B }}$ | $0.100^{\text {B }}$ | $0.090^{\text {B }}$ | $0.030^{\text {U }}$ | $0.030^{\text {U }}$ |
| Metals-Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mercury | ug/L | 0.0004 | $0.05^{2}$ | 0.000540 | 0.000750 | 0.000630 | $0.000100^{\text {U }}$ | $0.000100^{\circ}$ | $0.000100^{\circ}$ | 0.000410 | $0.000220^{8}$ |

Note: Bold results do not meet the listed criteria
det'
B: Results are above the MDL and less than or equal to the practical quantitation limit (PQL) and should be considered estimates.
1: Basin Plan criteria for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers Basins.
2: California Toxics Rule Criteria
3: Criteria is hardness dependent which is expressed as a function of hardness and decreases as hardness decreases. The actual criteria are
Table AQ 11-15. Hardness-based Water Quality Criteria for Cadmium, Copper, Lead, and Nickel for Voluntary Enhanced Water Quality Sampling Locations.

| Station ID | RR-2A | RR-2EC | FM-A | FM-B | FM-C | FM-D | FM-E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date Sampled | 5/22/2007 | 5/22/2007 | 8/7/2007 | 8/7/2007 | 8/7/2007 | 8/7/2007 | 8/7/2007 |
| Time Sampled | 15:10 | 14:40 | 10:15 | 10:50 | 11:10 | 12:00 | 12:30 |
| Hardness (CaCO3) (ppm) | 9 | 9.3 | 41.9 | 54.9 | 49.3 | 9.16 | 9.02 |
| Cadmium (Cd) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laboratory Result (ug/L) | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ | $0.004{ }^{\text {U }}$ |
| Maximum Criterion (NTR) (ug/L) | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.86 | 1.12 | 1.01 | 0.20 | 0.19 |
| Continuous Criterion (NTR) (ug/L) | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Copper (Cu) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laboratory Result (mg/L) | 0.000320 | 0.000300 | $0.000110^{\text {B }}$ | $0.000060^{\text {B }}$ | $0.000060^{\text {B }}$ | $0.000190^{\text {B }}$ | $0.000180^{\text {B }}$ |
| Maximum Criterion (mg/L) | 0.0014 | 0.0014 | 0.0059 | 0.0076 | 0.0069 | 0.0014 | 0.0014 |
| Continuous Criterion (mg/L) | 0.0011 | 0.0012 | 0.0043 | 0.0054 | 0.0049 | 0.0012 | 0.0011 |
| Lead (Pb) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laboratory Result (ug/L) | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ | $0.010^{\text {U }}$ |
| Maximum Criterion (ug/L) | 4.35 | 4.51 | 24.76 | 33.43 | 29.67 | 4.44 | 4.36 |
| Continuous Criterion (ug/L) | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.96 | 1.30 | 1.16 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| Nickel (Ni) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laboratory Result (ug/L) | $0.080^{\text {B }}$ | 0.300 | 0.390 | 0.310 | 0.240 | $0.070^{\text {B }}$ | $0.060{ }^{\text {B }}$ |
| Maximum Criterion (ug/L) | 61.06 | 62.78 | 224.31 | 281.93 | 257.40 | 61.98 | 61.17 |
| Continuous Criterion (ug/L) | 6.78 | 6.97 | 24.91 | 31.31 | 28.59 | 6.88 | 6.79 |

[^2]Table AQ 11-16. Summary of 30-Day, 5-Sample Fecal Coliform Results (MPN).

| Sample ID | Location | GPS Coordinates |  | Sampling Period |  |  |  |  | Geometric Mean ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | UTM10 NAD $83 \bar{X}$ | UTM10 NAD $83 \bar{Y}$ | Week 1 | Week 2 | Week 4 | Week 4 | Week 5 |  |
| FC-1 | Middle Fork American River below Ahart Campground | 724066 | 4336067 | 4 | 13 | 2 | 11 | <2 | $5^{2}$ |
| FC-2 | Middle Fork American River below Gates Group Campground | 723679 | 4335535 | 8 | 2 | <2 | 8 | <2 | $3^{2}$ |
| FC-3 | Middle Fork American River below Coyote and Lewis Campground | 723578 | 4334312 | 2 | <2 | 13 | 2 | <2 | $3^{2}$ |
| FC-4 | French Meadows Reservoir near McGuire Picnic Area | 722892 | 4333328 | <2 | 4 | 2 | <2 | <2 | $2^{2}$ |
| FC-5 | French Meadows Reservoir near McGuire Boat Ramp | 722565 | 4333376 | <2 | <2 | <2 | <2 | <2 | <2 |
| FC-6 | French Meadows Reservoir near French Meadows Campground | 722654 | 4332703 | <2 | <2 | <2 | 2 | <2 | $<2^{2}$ |
| FC-7 | French Meadows Reservoir near French Meadows Boat Ramp | 722249 | 4332433 | <2 | <2 | <2 | <2 | <2 | <2 |
| FC-8 | French Meadows Reservoir near Poppy Campground | 721628 | 4333151 | <2 | <2 | <2 | <2 | 2 | $<2^{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{FC}-9^{3}$ | Hell Hole Reservoir near Upper Hell Hole Reservoir Campground | 728501 | 4329059 | 23 | 30 | 17 | 4 | 8 | 13 |
| FC-10 | Hell Hole Reservoir near Hell Hole Boat Ramp | 723737 | 4326842 | <2 | <2 | <2 | 2 | <2 | $<2^{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{FC}-11^{3}$ | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above Big Meadows Campground | 722744 | 4328540 | 4 | 7 | 30 | 130 | 23 | 19 |
| FC-12 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek below Big Meadows Campground | 722119 | 4328056 | <2 | <2 | <2 | 2 | <2 | $<2^{2}$ |
| FC-13 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek above Middle Meadows Campground | 719274 | 4325849 | 2 | 80 | 50 | 80 | 17 | 26 |

Table AQ 11-16. Summary of 30-Day, 5-Sample Fecal Coliform Results (MPN) (continued).

| Sample ID | Location | GPS Coordinates |  | Sampling Period |  |  |  |  | Geometric Mean ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM10 } \\ & \text { NAD } 83 \text { X } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM10 } \\ & \text { NAD } 83 \mathrm{Y} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Week 1 | Week 2 | Week 3 | Week 4 | Week 5 |  |
| FC-14 | South Fork Long Canyon Creek below Middle Meadows Campground | 718907 | 4325560 | 8 | 13 | 8 | 23 | 22 | 13 |
| FC-15 | Ralston Afterbay near Ralston Picnic Area | 696326 | 4319720 | 110 | <2 | 4 | 1600 | 17 | $30^{2}$ |
| FC-16 | Middle Fork American River below Oxbow Powerhouse (Horseshoe Bar Area) | 695159 | 4320291 | 2 | <2 | <2 | <2 | <2 | $<2^{2}$ |
| FC-17 | Middle Fork American River below the Drivers Flat Road Camping and Rafting Take-out | 679156 | 4314631 | 13 | 30 | 13 | 4 | 11 | 12 |

[^3]Table AQ 11-17. Summary of Fish Specimens Collected for Fish Tissue Analysis.

| Location | Fish Sample ID | Date Collected | Time Collected | Species ${ }^{1}$ | Total Length (mm) | Fork Length (mm) | Weight <br> (g) | Weight (lbs) | Methyl mercury Concentration ${ }^{4}$ (mg/Kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individual Fish Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hell Hole Reservoir |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | HH-1-DS-1-BNT-2 | 10/11/2007 | 13:30 | BNT | 398 | 393 | 650 | 1.43 | 0.66 |
|  | HH-1-MID1-BNT-1 | 10/11/2007 | 11:50 | BNT | 485 | 480 | 1200 | 2.64 | 1.08 |
|  | HH-1-MID3-BNT-3 | 10/11/2007 | 10:30 | BNT | 495 | 490 | 1175 | 2.59 | 0.92 |
|  | HH-1-US2-RBT-1 | 10/11/2007 | 9:30 | RBT | 230 | 220 | 125 | 0.28 | 0.05 |
|  | HH-1-US2-BNT-2 | 10/11/2007 | 9:30 | BNT | 422 | 415 | 925 | 2.04 | 0.60 |
|  | HH-1-US2-BNT-3 | 10/11/2007 | 9:30 | BNT | 477 | 470 | 1075 | 2.37 | 1.03 |
|  | HH-3B-BT-1 | 9/11/2007 | 14:20 | BNT | $571{ }^{3}$ | 561 | 2150 | 4.73 | 1.14 |
|  | HH-1-MIDL-LT-1 | 10/11/2007 | 11:50 | LKT | 360 | 330 | 450 | 0.99 | 0.00 |
|  | HH-1-MID3-LT-1 | 10/11/2007 | 10:30 | LKT | 265 | 235 | 160 | 0.35 | 0.24 |
|  | HH-1-US1-LT-1 | 10/11/2007 | 8:30 | LKT | 270 | 245 | 125 | 0.28 | 0.21 |
| French Meadows Reservoir |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | FM-2B-BT-3 | 9/12/2007 | 15:50 | BNT | $615^{3}$ | 605 | 2000 | 4.40 | 0.21 |
|  | FM-2C-BT-1 | 9/13/2007 | 10:20 | BNT | 740 | 730 | 3900 | 8.58 | 0.36 |
|  | FM-1E-RT-1 | 9/13/2007 | 17:00 | RBT | 240 | 230 | 100 | 0.22 | 0.05 |
|  | FM-2F-RT-1 | 9/13/2007 | 15:30 | RBT | 290 | 280 | 180 | 0.40 | 0.07 |
|  | FM-3D-RT-2 | 9/13/2007 | 11:24 | RBT | 335 | 325 | 270 | 0.59 | 0.18 |
| Middle Fork Interbay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I-US-1-BNT-1 | 9/20/2007 | 14:46 | BNT | 345 | 338 | 450 | 0.99 | 0.02 |
|  | I-US1-BNT-2 | 9/21/2007 | 10:30 | BNT | 370 | 360 | 625 | 1.38 | 0.03 |
|  | I-US-1-BNT-3 | 9/21/2007 | 10:30 | BNT | 320 | 310 | 420 | 0.92 | 0.03 |
|  | I-U2-BNT-1 | 9/20/2007 | 14:56 | BNT | 323 | 315 | 390 | 0.86 | 0.05 |
|  | I-US-2-BNT-2 | 9/21/2007 | 11:15 | BNT | 355 | 350 | 570 | 1.25 | 0.03 |
|  | I-US-2-BNT-3 | 9/21/2007 | 11:15 | BNT | 330 | 320 | 430 | 0.95 | 0.01 |
|  | 1-L1-RBT-1 | 9/21/2007 | 11:15 | RBT | 255 | 245 | 225 | 0.50 | 0.03 |
|  | I-US1-RBT-1 | 9/21/2007 | 10:30 | RBT | 285 | 270 | 200 | 0.44 | 0.02 |
|  | I-US2-RBT-1 | 9/21/2007 | 11:15 | RBT | 315 | 307 | 410 | 0.90 | 0.14 |
|  | I-US2-RBT-5 | 9/21/2007 | 11:15 | RBT | 263 | 253 | 210 | 0.46 | 0.03 |
| Ralston Afterbay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RA-2A-BT-14 | 9/14/2007 | 13:05 | BNT | 476 | 465 | 925 | 2.04 | 0.08 |
|  | RA-2A-BT-7 | 9/14/2007 | 12:40 | BNT | 470 | 464 | 1050 | 2.31 | 0.10 |
|  | RA-2B-BT-6 | 9/14/2007 | 13:30 | BNT | 477 | 474 | 1250 | 2.75 | 0.11 |
|  | RA-3B-BT-7 | 9/14/2007 | 14:50 | BNT | 462 | 460 | 1100 | 2.42 | 0.06 |
|  | RA-3B-RT-19 | 9/14/2007 | 15:10 | RBT | 375 | 365 | 550 | 1.21 | 0.04 |
|  | RA-1D-SPM-4 | 9/14/2007 | 16:19 | SPM | $405^{3}$ | 385 | 510 | 1.12 | 0.31 |
|  | RA-2B-SPM-7 | 9/14/2007 | 13:31 | SPM | 470 | 445 | 840 | 1.85 | 0.35 |
|  | RA-2B-SPM-8 | 9/14/2007 | 13:35 | SPM | 405 | 384 | 640 | 1.41 | 0.21 |
|  | RA-3A-SPM-20 | 9/14/2007 | 14:25 | SPM | 239 | 225 | 100 | 0.22 | 0.11 |
|  | RA-3A-SPM-21 | 9/14/2007 | 14:30 | SPM | 260 | 245 | 50 | 0.11 | 0.12 |
| Middle Fork American River near Otter Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | OC-1-BNT-1 | 10/9/2007 | 9:40 | BNT | $390^{3}$ | 385 | 634 | 1.39 | 0.08 |
|  | OC-RBT-1 | 10/16/2007 | 14:00 | RBT | 365 | 344 | 380 | 0.84 | 0.08 |
|  | OC-1-RBT-1 | 10/2/2007 | 11:30 | RBT | 308 | 300 | 282 | 0.62 | 0.03 |
|  | OC-1-RBT-2 | 10/2/2007 | 11:30 | RBT | 202 | 193 | 65 | 0.14 | 0.01 |
|  | OC-1-RBT-3 | 10/2/2007 | 11:30 | RBT | 202 | 200 | 66 | 0.15 | 0.02 |
|  | OC-1-RBT-4 | 10/2/2007 | 11:30 | RBT | 249 | 238 | 139 | 0.31 | 0.02 |
|  | OC-1-RBT-5 | 10/2/2007 | 11:30 | RBT | 303 | 311 | 236 | 0.52 | 0.04 |
|  | OC-1-RBT-6 | 10/2/2007 | 11:30 | RBT | 374 | 363 | 463 | 1.02 | 0.08 |
|  | OC-1-RBT-7 | 10/9/2007 | 10:30 | RBT | $310^{3}$ | 300 | 282 | 0.62 | 0.03 |
|  | OC-1-RBT-8 | 10/9/2007 | 13:30 | RBT | $415^{3}$ | 395 | 468 | 1.03 | 0.13 |
| Composite Fish Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hell Hole Reservoir |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Composite-HH-BT-1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.07 |
|  | HH-1A-BT-34 ${ }^{2}$ | 9/11/2007 | 10:00 | BNT | $449{ }^{3}$ | 432 | 940 | 2.07 |  |
|  | HH-1B-BT-15 ${ }^{2}$ | 9/11/2007 | 11:00 | BNT | $483^{3}$ | 473 | 1040 | 2.29 |  |
|  | HH-2A-BT-6 ${ }^{2}$ | 9/11/2007 | 12:15 | BNT | $419^{3}$ | 411 | 760 | 1.67 |  |
|  | HH-3A-BT-3 ${ }^{2}$ | 9/11/2007 | 13:45 | BNT | $485{ }^{3}$ | 475 | 1260 | 2.77 |  |
|  | HH-2C-BT-1 ${ }^{2}$ | 9/11/2007 | 9:45 | BNT | 360 | 350 | 310 | 0.68 |  |
| French Meadows Reservoir |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Composite-FM-BT-1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.18 |
|  | FM-2B-BT-4 ${ }^{2}$ | 9/12/2007 | 15:50 | BNT | $360^{3}$ | 353 | 420 | 0.92 |  |
|  | FM-2A-BT-2 ${ }^{2}$ | 9/12/2007 | 16:20 | BNT | 355 | 348 | 430 | 0.95 |  |
|  | FM-1A-BT-1 ${ }^{2}$ | 9/12/2007 | 18:30 | BNT | 410 | 400 | 470 | 1.03 |  |
|  | FM-1D-BT-1 ${ }^{2}$ | 9/13/2007 | 9:50 | BNT | 408 | 392 | 590 | 1.30 |  |
|  | FM-3D-BT-3 ${ }^{2}$ | 9/13/2007 | 11:30 | BNT | 400 | 393 | 600 | 1.32 |  |

${ }^{1}$ BNT: Brown Trout; RBT: Rainbow Trout; SPM: Sacramento Pikeminnow; LKT: Lake Trout
${ }^{2}$ These fish were analyzed as a composite.
${ }^{3}$ Total length was not measured in the field. Total length is estimated based on fish size, species, and fork length.
${ }^{4}$ Bold numbers indicate screening value of $0.08 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ were exceeded (Cal EPA 2005; Klasing and Brodberg 2006).
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### 1.0 WATER QUALITY MONITORING PARAMETER

### 1.1 In-Situ Measurements

## Dissolved Oxygen (DO)

Dissolved oxygen (DO) is a measure of the amount of oxygen dissolved in water. Values for DO in water analyses are commonly provided in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, although a percentage of saturation may also be used. The concentration of DO in surface water is usually less than $10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (MELP 1998; EPA 2006). The actual concentration will vary with other parameters such as temperature, elevation, photosynthetic activity, biotic activity, stream discharge, and the concentration of other solutes (Hem 1989, Michaud 1994). The maximum solubility of oxygen (fully saturated) at sea level is $12.75 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ at $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DO concentrations decrease within increasing temperatures or elevation (MELP 1998).

Dissolved oxygen is derived from the atmosphere and photosynthetic production by aquatic plants. Atmospheric oxygen is changed to dissolved oxygen when it enters the water, with more mixing occurring in turbulent waters. Dissolved oxygen is essential for the respiration of fish and other aquatic organisms (Michaud 1994). As water moves past their breathing apparatus (such as gills in fish), oxygen gas bubbles in the water (DO) are transferred from the water to their blood. The transfusion is efficient only above certain concentrations. Oxygen is also used for the decomposition of organic matter and other biological and chemical processes. Anoxic waters have obvious detrimental effects on aerobic organisms. These conditions can also lead to the accumulation of chemically reduced compounds, such as ammonium and hydrogen sulfide, in the bottom sediments that can be toxic to benthic organisms (Michaud 1994).

Nutrient solubility and availability rely partly on DO levels, and thus it also affects the productivity of aquatic ecosystems. In low-nutrient lakes, the deeper waters tend to have higher DO concentrations than the surface waters. In comparison, in lakes with high nutrient concentrations, the surface waters tend to have higher concentrations of DO compared to the deeper waters (MELP 1998). In streams, DO concentrations tend to be higher in faster moving waters. During the summer, in particular, when discharges and velocities decrease in streams, DO concentrations can be quite low.

Pollution can cause decreases in average DO concentrations by contributing organic matter that uses oxygen or nutrients and stimulates the growth of algae.

## Secchi Depth

Secchi depth or secchi disk depth is a measure of water clarity. It is primarily used as an indicator of algal abundance and general lake productivity. The measurement is often made in a lake over time to monitor water clarity trends. A secchi disk is a circular plate that is divided into alternating black and white painted quarters. The disk is attached to a rope and lowered into the water until it is no longer visible. This depth is then noted. Secchi depth is usually reported in feet to the nearest tenth of a foot or
meters to the nearest tenth of a meter. Higher secchi depth readings mean that the disk is visible at greater depths and the water is clearer. Lower readings indicate turbid or colored water. Clarity is affected by numerous factors, including algae, soil particulates, and other suspended materials (Michaud 1994; EPA 2006).

Clear water is important for aquatic life as it allows light to penetrate deeper in the lake than murky or cloudy water. The light allows photosynthesis to occur and oxygen to be produced. In general, light can penetrate 1.7 times the measured secchi depth. Secchi depth naturally varies seasonally with changes in photosynthesis and algal growth. As a result, secchi depth readings often are lowest in the summer when algal growth is greatest, and increase with cooler weather as growth decreases. Secchi depths may also decrease in the fall with fall turnover. Rainstorms that may increase suspended particulate concentrations in inflowing streams may also decrease secchi depth readings (Michaud 1994).

## pH

A pH value is a measure of the activity of hydrogen ions in a water sample. Various types of chemical reactions that occur in natural waters produce hydrogen ions, which are then consumed by participating in subsequent chemical reactions in the system. These interrelated chemical reactions that produce and consume hydrogen ions control the pH value of a water body. It is a useful index of the status of equilibrium reactions in which the water participates. A pH of 7 is considered neutral, values less than 7 are acidic, and values greater than 7 are basic. The units of pH are logarithmic; so a difference of one unit represents a 10 -fold change in hydrogen ion concentration. The higher the pH , the fewer free hydrogen ions are present in the water. The pH of natural fresh waters ranges from 4.0 to 10.0, with most waters falling between 6.5 and 8.5 (EPA 1986; Hem 1989; MELP 1998).

The pH of water determines the solubility (the amount that can be dissolved in water) and biological availability (the amount that can be used by aquatic biota) of chemical constituents, such as nutrients (i.e. carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus) and heavy metals (i.e. lead, copper). Unusually high or low pH can have adverse effects on aquatic biota. Values above 9.5 and below 4.5 are considered lethal to aquatic organisms (EPA 1996; MELP 1998). For heavy metals, the degree to which they are soluble determines their toxicity. They tend to be more toxic when pH is lower because they are more soluble and bioavailable.

The pH of water is naturally variable, although the amount of change in natural waters tends to be very small due to many chemical reactions. This ability of the water to maintain a stable pH is called buffering capacity. The initial pH of water is influenced by the geology of the watershed and the original source of the water. In particular, alkalinity, which is typically low in granitic drainages, is usually the primary factor that influences pH values. This causes the waters to be more acidic ( $\mathrm{pH}<7.0$ ) in these types of watersheds (Wetzel 2001). The greatest natural cause for variation is the daily and seasonal changes in photosynthesis. Photosynthesis uses up hydrogen molecules and therefore increases the pH . The pH increases during the day (with maximum
values up to 9.0) and decreasing at night. Respiration and decomposition processes lower pH . The pH also tends to be higher during the growing season when photosynthesis is greater. As a result, most streams that drain coniferous forests tend to be slight acidic ( 6.5 to 6.8 ). A pH may also vary with depth in a lake, due to changes in photosynthesis and other chemical reactions. During the summer, the upper portions of a lake tend to have higher pH values, ranging between 7.5 and 8.5. The lower portions of the lake where production by aquatic organisms is less tend to more acidic (pH ranging between 6.5 and 7.5) (Hem 1989; Michaud 1994; Wetzel 2001).

## Temperature

Ambient water temperature is a measurement of the intensity of heat stored in a volume of water and is generally reported in degrees Celsius $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ or Fahrenheit ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ ). Natural heat sources include solar radiation, air transfer, condensation of water vapor at the water surface, sediments, precipitation, surface runoff, and groundwater. Anthropogenic sources of heat include industrial effluents, agriculture, and forest harvesting, decrease in streamside vegetation coverage, urban development, and mining.

Water temperature has important effects on aquatic biota. Increased water temperature reduces oxygen solubility while elevating metabolic oxygen demand. This causes lower oxygen concentrations that may be detrimental to some aquatic organisms. Reproductive and other biological activities, such as migration, spawning, egg incubation, and fry rearing, are often triggered by water temperature. A rise in water temperature can also provide conditions for the growth of disease-causing organisms. Temperature also influences the solubility of many chemical compounds, thus affecting their toxicity to aquatic life (EPA 1986, MELP, 1998).

## Specific Conductance

Specific conductivity is a measurement of the ability of water to conduct an electric current and provides an estimate of the concentration of dissolved solids. This property is related to water temperature and total ion content (e.g. chloride, sulfate, sodium, and calcium), and depends on the concentration of dissolved metals and other dissolved materials. Water carries more current with increased ion content in the water. Specific conductivity is lower in cooler waters. Specific conductivity is measured in terms of resistance and reported in microsiemens per centimeter ( $\mu \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{cm}$ ) at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Water source and geologic composition of the watershed are important controlling factors of specific conductivity. Streams that flow through granite bedrock, for example, have lower conductivity than those that flow through limestone or clay soils. The conductivity of pure waters is $0.055 \mu \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{cm}$. The conductivity of freshwater at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ varies between 50 and $1,500 \mu \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{cm}$ (Hem 1989; MELP 1998). Specific conductivity measurements in streams flowing through granitic, siliceous, or other igneous rocks usually range between 10 and $50 \mu \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{cm}$. In comparison, it generally ranges between 150 and 500 $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$ in streams that are flowing through limestones.

Conductivity itself is not an aquatic health concern, but serves as an indicator of other water quality concerns.

### 2.0 LABORATORY ANALYSIS PARAMETER

### 2.1 General Parameters

## Calcium

Calcium (Ca) is the most abundant of the alkaline-earth metals and is a major constituent of many common rock minerals and of the solutes present in the water (Hem 1989). It is generally the main cation in surface waters. It is most commonly present as the calcium ion $\left(\mathrm{Ca}^{2+}\right)$ and is generally derived from weathering or dissolution of minerals in soil and rocks. Under conditions of high bicarbonate or sulfate concentration, calcium bicarbonate or calcium sulfate may exist (Hem 1989). It contributes to the total hardness of water. Calcium is reported in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. Water bodies with less than $\quad 10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ are considered calcium poor, whereas greater than 20 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ are considered calcium rich. Average dissolved concentration in river waters ranges from $13.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ to $15 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, but can vary substantially due to geology and climate (Hem 1989). Although calcium is an important constituent of igneous rocks, its concentration in associated water bodies is generally low (Hem 1989) ( $0.039 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ for granitic watersheds, Wetzel 2001) due to slow decomposition rates of igneous rock materials (Hem 1989).

Calcium is an essential element for metabolism in most plants and animals (Hem 1989). The distribution of many freshwater species, particularly invertebrates, is related to calcium concentration. Significant changes in calcium concentration in a water body can influence the presence or absence of these organisms. Most calcium in surface waters is derived from waters flowing over limestone, dolomite, gypsum, and other calcium-containing sedimentary rocks and minerals.

## Chloride

Chloride (CI-) is among the important anions found in natural waters (Hem 1989). Chloride is reported in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. It originates from the dissociation of salts, such as sodium chloride or calcium chloride, in water. Concentrations tend to be low in fresh waters ( $8.3 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, on average) (Schlesinger 1997; MELP 1998), and essentially zero in granite drainages (Wetzel 2001). Water will taste salty when the chloride concentrations are greater than 250 to $400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$.

Chloride influences osmotic salinity balance and ion exchange in aquatic organisms, thus making it an important ion for metabolic processes. Increased chloride levels may reduce the toxicity of nitrite to aquatic life (MELP 1998). Fish and invertebrates appear to be more sensitive to increases in chloride levels than aquatic plants. High chloride content can adversely affect plant growth. Fairly low concentrations can be lethal to fish (EPA 1986). Chloride is common in areas with limestone deposits. It is uncommon in most other soils, rocks, or minerals (Hem 1989). Anthropogenic sources of chloride
include municipal water supplies, sewage plant effluents, urban development, rock salt, agricultural runoff, and industrial effluents (MELP 1998).

## Hardness

The hardness of water is based on its content of calcium and magnesium salts, combined with bicarbonate and carbonate (temporary hardness) and with sulfates, chlorides, and other anions of mineral acids (permanent harness) (MELP 1989). Hardness is expressed in degrees of hardness or $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ of calcium carbonate $\left(\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}\right)$. Values greater than $120 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ are considered hard, while values less than $60 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ are considered soft (Hem 1989; MELP 1989). The EPA (1986) utilizes the following hardness classification:

| Concentration $\left.\mathrm{CaCO}_{3} \mathbf{( m g} / \mathrm{L}\right)$ | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| $<75$ | Soft Water |
| $75-150$ | Moderately Hard Water |
| $150-300$ | Hard Water |
| $>300$ | Very Hard Water |

Water hardness can have indirect effects on aquatic biota, primarily affecting the toxicity of certain metals (MELP 1989). The binding activity of major ions such as calcium and magnesium with metals such as copper, lead, and zinc, will lower the toxicity of these metals by decreasing the bioavailability. Therefore, when water hardness is low, the toxic effects of these metals may increase.

Hardness is influenced by the underlying rock-types, such as limestone. Anthropogenic sources of hardness include the inorganic chemical industry and mines (EPA 1986). The effects of hardness on freshwater fish and other aquatic life appear to be related to the ions causing the hardness rather than hardness (EPA 1986). For this reason, technical guidance groups recommend providing the concentrations of specific ions, rather than using hardness.

## Magnesium

Magnesium ( Mg ) is a common alkaline-earth metal found in igneous, sedimentary, and other rock types. It contributes to the total hardness of water. Magnesium concentration is reported in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$. It is much more soluble than calcium, with an average concentration of $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ in North American rivers (Schlesinger 1997) and 0.031 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ in granite drainage basins (Wetzel 2001).

Magnesium is an essential nutrient in the metabolic activity of plants and animals. It is commonly present as an ion $\left(\mathrm{Mg}^{2+}\right)$ and is typically derived from weathering of ferromagnesian minerals in soil and rocks or dissolution of limestone. Similar to calcium, magnesium may exist as magnesium bicarbonate or magnesium sulfate under
certain conditions. Magnesium concentrations are not strongly influenced by anthropogenic activities (Hem 1989).

## Nitrate/Nitrite

Nitrate $\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}^{-}\right)$and nitrite $\left(\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{-}\right)$ions are produced during nitrification of reduced and organic forms of nitrogen. Nitrate and nitrite are typically reported in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$. Nitrite is usually present in only minute quantities in water ( $<0.001 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) because it in an intermediate, unstable form of nitrogen within the nitrogen cycle (MELP 1998). It is formed from nitrate or ammonium ions by certain microorganisms found in soil and water (EPA 1986). Nitrate is formed by the complete oxidation of ammonium by microorganism in the soil and water. It is the most oxidized and stable form of nitrogen in water, and therefore is the principle form of combined nitrogen. Most surface waters contain less than $0.01 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ of nitrite and less than $0.2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ nitrate (MELP 1998; Wetzel 2001).

Nitrate is the primary form of nitrogen used during plant growth. Excessive amounts of nitrate may cause phytoplankton or macrophyte outbreaks. Nitrite is toxic to aquatic life at relatively low concentrations (MELP 1998). Although it is an essential plant nutrient, excessive nitrogen can cause proliferation of algae and macrophytes, resulting in eutrophic water conditions. Eutrophication causes decreased oxygen levels which may cause stress or mortality of fish and invertebrates (EPA 1986). Sources of elevated nitrate and nitrite come from municipal and industrial wastewaters, agricultural runoff, urban development, and automobile exhausts.

## Ammonia

Ammonia is found in two forms, ammonium $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{4}{ }^{+}\right)$that is not toxic and $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$, which is (ESA 1986). Ammonium is readily adsorbed onto mineral surfaces (Hem 1989). It is reported as $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$, with typical surface water values less than $0.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (MELP 1998; Wetzel 2001). Ammonia as $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ is reported to be toxic to various aquatic organisms over a range of concentrations ( 0.53 to $22.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) (Oram 2007).

Complex nitrogen cycling and processes occur within aquatic systems. Nitrogen is an essential plant nutrient which contributes to the productivity of a water body. However, excessive ammonia over-stimulates the growth of algae and other plants, leading to eutrophication of a water body. The resulting decrease of oxygen levels may cause stress and mortality of fish and invertebrates (EPA 1986). High ammonia concentrations are also toxic to aquatic life. The specific concentration at which ammonia is harmful to organism depends upon the temperature and pH of the water. At higher temperatures and pH , a greater proportion of the total ammonia is present as $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$, increasing the toxicity of the water (EPA 1986). The distribution of ammonia in surface waters varies spatially and seasonally depending upon productivity and the amount of organic matter. Anthropogenic sources of ammonia include fertilizers, livestock wastes, residential effluents (e.g. cleaning products), mining, sewage treatments plans, and effluent from various types of industries (Oram 2007).

## Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen

Total kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN) is a measure of both the ammonia and organic forms of nitrogen. Organic nitrogen includes organic compounds, such as proteins, polypeptides, amino acids, and urea. TKN is reported in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ (MELP 1998). In lakes and reservoirs in the western United States, total phosphorus concentrations are usually between 0.01 and $3.52 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (EPA 2000a). In Sierra Nevadan rivers and streams, TKN values typically range between 0.025 and $0.65 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (EPA 2000).

High ammonia concentrations can be deleterious to aquatic life, as it contributes to the eutrophication of water bodies. Organic nitrogen is not biologically available. As a result, it does not influence plant growth or water quality condition until it is transformed to the inorganic forms of nitrogen (MELP 1998). Natural sources of TKN include decaying organic material such as plants and animals wastes. Some species of streamside vegetation, such as alders, are nitrogen fixers. Elevated nitrogen concentrations have been measured in waters with decaying alder leaves (Wetzel 2001). Anthropogenic sources of TKN include effluents from sewage treatment plants and industry, agriculture (fertilizers), urban developments, paper plants, recreation, and mining.

## Total Phosphorus

Phosphorus $(P)$ is a nutrient that is essential for growth, and is a measure of both organic and inorganic forms of phosphorus. It can be measured as total phosphorus or ortho-phosphate. Total phosphorus is the total amount of phosphorus in the sample. Ortho-phosphate is the portion that is available to organisms for growth. Total phosphorus measurements include phosphorus that is in biological tissue, as well as the insoluble mineral particles (Michaud 1991; MELP 1998). Phosphorus is fairly abundant in sediments, but concentrations are usually less than a few tenths of a milligram per liter in surface waters (Hem 1989). In lakes and reservoirs in the western United States, total phosphorus concentrations are usually between 0 and $508 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (EPA 2000a). Total phosphorus concentrations in the rivers and streams in the Sierra Nevada typically range between 2.5 and $485 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (EPA 2000). It is usually reported in $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$.

Phosphorus is essential for plant growth and is often the most limiting nutrient for plant growth in surface waters. As a result, inputs of phosphorus into surface waters can cause algal blooms. In lakes unaffected by anthropogenic inputs, total phosphorus values are generally less than $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$. Lakes with total P values greater than $25 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ are considered eutrophic (MELP 1998). Anthropogenic sources of phosphorus include effluents from sewage treatment plants and industry, agriculture, and urban developments (EPA 1986; Hem 1989; MELP 1998).

## Ortho-phosphate

Ortho-phosphate $\left(\mathrm{PO}_{4}\right)$ is a measure of the inorganic oxidized form of soluble phosphorus. It is generally reported in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$. Background concentrations of orthophosphate in surface waters generally average $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (Hem 1989).

Along with nitrogen, phosphorus is a necessary nutrient for plant growth. Orthophosphate is the most readily available form of phosphorus for uptake during photosynthesis. Animals obtain phosphorus through the consumption of plant materials. Excess ortho-phosphate causes prolific algal growth, causing the same detrimental water conditions as described for nitrogen and total phosphorus (MELP 1998). Since phosphorus is typically the most limiting nutrient for plant growth in fresh water, additions of this element are often the primary causes of eutrophication of water bodies. Phosphate ions readily and strongly adsorb onto soils, suspended solids, and streambed sediments. As a result, soil erosion can be a source of ortho-phosphate. Other sources include agricultural, urban, and industrial wastewater effluents.

## Potassium

Potassium (K) is a common element in most rock types, but occurs in generally lower concentrations and is less soluble than calcium and magnesium (Hem 1989). Potassium is reported in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$, with an average concentration of $1.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ in North American rivers and $0.008 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ in granite drainage basins (Wetzel 2001).

Potassium is important in the cellular ion transport and exchange processes of plants and animals, especially for algae growth (Wetzel 2001). Potassium is derived during the weathering of feldspar and mica minerals from rocks and soil. Another potential source of potassium is release through the decay of plant materials (Hem 1989). The alteration of potassium concentration in natural waters is not common, except when effluent from industrial, agricultural, or urban sources exist or runoff from road salts reaches a water body (Wetzel 2001). This type of pollution can cause significant alteration in the ionic composition of water bodies and ultimately change the balance of plant and animal productivity.

## Sodium

Sodium ( Na ) is the most abundant of the alkaline-earth metals and is commonly found in solution (Hem 1989). It generally has lower water concentrations than calcium, except in igneous dominated watersheds (Wetzel 2001). Sodium is typically reported in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, with concentrations that range from less than $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ to more than $500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. An average sodium concentration of $9.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ is found in North American rivers (Schlesinger 1997) and $0.088 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ in granite drainage basins (Wetzel 2001).

Sodium is important in the cellular ion transport and exchange processes of plants and animals (Wetzel 2001). Certain species of cyanobacteria require high amounts of sodium for photosynthesis, metabolism, and nitrogen fixation. The enrichment of water with high levels of sodium and phosphorus from domestic effluents can result in large
cyanobacteria populations (Wetzel 2001). Sodium is typically present as an ion $\left(\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right)$ and is commonly derived from the weathering of rocks and soil or the dissolution of sodium salts (Hem 1989). Similar to potassium, sodium concentrations in natural water bodies are not easily altered, except by pollutants such as road salts, industrial effluent, and agricultural runoff (Hem 1989; Wetzel 2001).

## Sulfate

Sulfate $\left(\mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{2-}\right)$ is a relatively common anion produced during geochemical weathering of sulfides (reduced form) from igneous and sedimentary rocks and soils (Hem 1989; Wetzel 2001). Sulfate is reported in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$, with an average concentration of 20 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ in North American rivers (Schlesinger 1997) and $0.031 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ in granite drainage basins (Wetzel 2001).

Sulfur is essential for proper metabolic functioning of all organisms. The primary sources of sulfur compounds to water bodies is atmospheric precipitation, which is largely due to the combustion of fossil fuels, oxidation of metallic sulfides, and smelting of ores (Hem 1989; Wetzel 2001). Sulfate is naturally released from volcanic regions, during rock weathering, and through sulfur-reducing bacterial activity (Hem 1989; Wetzel 2001). The most extensive natural occurrence of sulfate is in evaporate sediments and rocks. Sulfate tends to form complex ions with sodium and calcium (Hem 1989). Strong acids associated with sulfate are major contributors to acidifications of lakes and rivers (Hem 1989; Wetzel 2001).

## Total Dissolved Solids

Total dissolved solids (TDS) is a measure of the concentration of inorganic salts (e.g. sodium, chloride, potassium, calcium, magnesium, and sulfate), small amounts of organic material, and dissolved materials in the water column and is reported in mg/L. The value of TDS in fresh water naturally ranges from 0 to $1,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (EPA 1986; MELP 1998). Concentrations tend to be comparatively low in streams in granitic and sandstone-dominated watersheds than watersheds with abundant limestone.

The effect of elevated TDS levels on aquatic biota depends on the ionic composition of the dissolved material and the extent of the increase in concentration. Under natural conditions, all aquatic life must be able to survive a range of TDS concentrations (EPA 1986). Sources of total dissolved solids include sewage, stormwater and agricultural runoff, salts from roads, and industrial and water treatment plant wastewater discharges. Total dissolved solids can also be derived from natural sources, including carbonate and salt deposits and mineral springs.

## Total Suspended Solids

Total suspended solids (TSS) is a measurement of particulate matter suspended in the water column and is typically reported in mg/L (MELP 1998). Turbidity units (NTUs) correspond approximately to TSS concentrations. Total suspended solids fluctuate with stream flow and may increase significantly during snowmelt and runoff from rain events.

Streams in forested watersheds tend to have low TSS concentrations, usually less than $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, although concentrations can be naturally much higher in some streams and rivers (Windell 1992). Waters with TSS concentrations less than $20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ are usually considered to be clear. Concentrations between 40 and $80 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ are considered to be cloudy. Waters with concentrations greater than $150 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ appear dirty.

High TSS concentrations can increase turbidity, resulting in reduced light penetration, reduced primary productivity, damage to fish gills, and impaired fish feeding ability. Once the suspended solids settle on the stream or lake bottom, invertebrate and other benthic organisms and fish spawning can be adversely affected (EPA 1986).

The freshwater aquatic life criterion for TSS set forth in the EPA's Quality Criteria for Water (1976) states that 'settable and suspended solids should not reduce the depth of the composition point for photosynthetic activity by more than 10 percent from the seasonally established norm for aquatic life.' In other words, light penetration should not be decreased more than 10 percent.

## Turbidity

Turbidity is a measurement of the amount of light that is scattered or absorbed from a water sample. It is an indicator of suspended particulate matter in a water body. More suspended particles in the water cause greater scattering. Materials that contribute to turbidity include silt, clay, finely divided organic material, soluble organic compounds, and microorganisms (Michaud 1994; MELP 1998). Turbidity values are reported in Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU). In general, turbidity values in lakes of 10 NTU or less represent very clear water; 50 NTU is cloudy; and 100 to 500 NTU is very cloudy or muddy. Rivers and streams in the Sierra Nevada are typically very clear, with turbidity measurements ranging between 1.65 and 5.73 NTU (EPA 2000).

High turbidity levels can have adverse effects in aquatic ecosystems. High turbidity reduces light penetration, which impairs photosynthesis of submerged vegetation and algae (MELP 1998; Michaud 1994). A reduction in plant growth will reduce the production of aquatic invertebrates and fish species. In addition, as particulates settle, they can adversely affect larvae by filling in the spaces between the rocks that may be used as habitat. High turbidity also affects the ability of fish to find and capture food and can impair gill function in some fish under chronically high levels (Michaud 1994). High turbidity also increases the total available surface area of suspended solids upon which metals and other pollutants can attach and bacteria can grow.

Turbidity values can be naturally variable. Waters are often more turbid following rain events, which may increase erosion and urban runoff. In lakes, variations in turbidity are often caused by seasonal changes in algal growth through the year. These algal blooms may result from higher temperatures in the summer, longer daylight hours, or increased nutrients from decomposition (Michaud 1994). Turbidity increases can also be caused by effluents from wastewater and septic systems, decaying plants and animals, and bottom-feeding fish.

## TOC

Total Organic Carbon (TOC) is a measure of the dissolved and particulate organic carbon in water, which is primarily composed of humic substances and decomposing plant and animal materials. Total organic carbon is reported as $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. Values in natural waters are usually between 1 and $30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (Hem 1989; MELP 1998). In small streams, the proportion of dissolved organic carbon relative to particulate organic carbon increases downstream as particles are broken down and decomposed. In slower moving larger rivers, TOC can also be derived from phytoplankton growth and rooted plants (Schlesinger 1997).

Carbon is required for biological processes. Dissolved oxygen concentrations are inversely related to organic carbon concentrations. The amount of TOC in the water varies with flow with generally higher concentrations at higher flows (Schlesinger 1997). Natural sources include decomposing leaves and roots that may enter directly into a stream or waterbody, particularly from the adjacent riparian zone and floodplain. Dissolved sources include soluble carbohydrates and amino acids that are leached from decomposing leaves and roots and humic acids from soil organic matter (Schlesinger 1997). Sources of TOC include agriculture and municipal and industrial water discharges (MELP 1998).

## Total Alkalinity (as $\mathrm{CaCo3}$ )

Alkalinity is a measurement of the ability of water to neutralize acids (buffering capacity). Alkalinity is the concentration of bases in dissolved in water. These bases are usually carbonate and bicarbonate, but can also be hydroxides. These buffers are important because they slow the rate at which the pH changes. The pH can change naturally as a result of photosynthetic activity of the aquatic vegetation. When the pH is very high (greater than 9 ) hydroxide ions may also be present. In addition, carbonate and bicarbonate reduce the toxicity of some toxic heavy metals (EPA 1986; Hem 1989; Wetzel 2001). Alkalinity is typically expressed as an equivalent amount of calcium carbonate $\left(\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}\right)$ in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ and generally ranges from 0 to $500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ in fresh waters (MELP 1998). Alkalinity levels up to $400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ are not considered to be detrimental to human health (EPA 1986). Alkalinity values less than $10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ are considered very low and the pH of these waters is very susceptible to acid inputs. Alkalinity values are often very low in granitic drainages (Wetzel 2001). Values between 10 and $20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ are considered moderately susceptible to acid inputs.

In general, very low or high alkalinity itself does not cause detrimental effects to aquatic organisms. However, the concentration of the dissolved materials (alkalinity) and their ratio to one another determines the actual pH and buffering capacity in a given water system (EPA 1986; Wetzel 2001). Waters with very low alkalinity values have little capacity to buffer acid inputs and are thus susceptible to acidification (MELP 1998). As previously discussed, extreme pH values can adversely affect aquatic biota, particularly in low pH (acidic) waters. Acidified drainage basins are known to possess increased sulfate and dissolved aluminum concentrations, as well as significant changes in the ion species and ratios (Wetzel 2001). In some inland waters of extremely high salinity,
hydroxide, borate, silicate, phosphate, and sulfide may be the major sources of alkalinity (Wetzel 2001). Relatively few aquatic organisms are adapted to these unusual conditions.

### 2.2 Metals Dissolved

## Arsenic

Arsenic (As) is a widely distributed element in the Earth's crust (ATSDR 2007). It is highly volatile and is an important component in many biochemical processes (Hem 1989). In its elemental form, it appears as a metal-like substance but it is usually found in compounds with other elements and appears as white or colorless powder. Inorganic arsenic results from compounds with elements such as oxygen, chlorine, or sulfur. Organic arsenic results from compounds with hydrogen and carbon. Organic arsenic is generally less harmful than inorganic arsenic (ATSDR 2007). Arsenic is measured in $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. Natural surface water normally contains an arsenic concentration of about $1 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$.

Arsenic can be highly toxic to most organisms in excess concentrations. Concentrations above $5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ have been shown to reduce growth and reproduction in aquatic invertebrates and algae (MELP 1998). Concentrations of $550 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ have produced mortality in fish (MELP 1998). In addition, organic arsenic can bioaccumulate in fish and shellfish (ATSDR 2007). Concentrations above $25 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ can have negative effects on livestock and, therefore, are potentially toxic to wildlife (MELP 1998). Arsenic is used as a preservative for wood, and is used in pesticides, metal alloys (especially in automobile batteries), and semiconductors and light diodes. Anthopogenic sources of arsenic include coal-fired power plants, industrial water discharge, and agricultural runoff (Hem 1989). It occurs naturally in soil and can enter water from wind-blown dust, runoff, and leaching. Volcanoes are another natural source of arsenic (ATSDR 2007).

## Cadmium

Cadmium (Cd) is an element that occurs naturally in the environment. It is usually found combined with other elements, such as zinc and leadm rather than occurring as a pure metal (MELP 1998; ATSDR 1999). It can be measured in either the dissolved (as in this study) or in the total state in water. It dissolves in water at varying degrees depending on which other elements it is combined. Cadmium most easily dissolves in water when it is in a compound with chlorides and sulfates. These compounds are usually present only in small amounts in the environment (ATSDR 1999). It is reported in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$. It usually found in very small concentrations (less than $0.1 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ ) (Wetzel 2001).

Cadmium has highly toxic effects on aquatic plants and animals in all chemical forms. It is extremely toxic to fish and zooplankton, and has been found to accumulate in plant cells and some aquatic organisms. It also diminishes plant growth. Its toxicity increases with the presence of other metals, including zinc and copper (MELP 1998; Odam 2007). The majority of cadmium is released into the environment from natural
sources, primarily from the weather of rocks that naturally contain various amounts of cadmium. In addition, it can be releases into the environment by forest fires and volcanoes. Anthropogenic sources of cadmium include industrial effluents, fossil fuels burning, and mining (ATSDR 1999).

## Copper

Copper $(\mathrm{Cu})$ is a metallic element, which can occur as a free native metal or combined with ionic metals (Hem 1989). It is measured in either the total or dissolved state in water samples, and reported in $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mathrm{mh} / \mathrm{L}$. Copper is typically found in trace concentrations from 1 to $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (MELP 1998) and levels near $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ are common in river water (Hem 1989). The fresh water aquatic life criterion for copper depends on the hardness of the water body being tested. Copper toxicity decreases with increasing hardness and increases with increasing pH (EPA 1986; Wetzel 2001).

Copper is an essential element in plant and animal metabolism, but quantities above normal trace concentrations are highly toxic to most aquatic life forms (MELP 1998). Many of the deleterious effects of copper, such as inhibition of phosphorus uptake in green algae, are highly variable depending on other environmental conditions such as pH , alkalinity, total organic carbon, and water hardness (EPA 1986; Wetzel 2001). Copper may be released during industrial, agricultural, and mining activities. Other common sources include copper plumbing and equipment (Hem 1989; MELP 1998).

## Iron

Iron (Fe) is the second most abundant metallic element in the Earth's outer crust, but concentrations in water tend to be small (Hem 1989). Iron can be measured in either the total or dissolved state and reported as $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ or $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. Average iron concentrations of $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ are found in the world's lake and rivers. The typical amount found in neutral and alkaline surface waters ranges from 0.05 to $0.20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (Wetzel 2001), with an average of $0.16 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ in surface waters in North America (Schlesinger 1997). High concentrations of iron are generally only found in acidic waters ( pH less than 3 to 4), such as in runoff of streams from strip mines (Wetzel 2001). Concentrations of iron above $0.3 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ cause undesirable taste, and when precipitated out of solution due to oxidation, cause a reddish brown color to the water.

Iron is an essential element in plant and animal respiration and its availability in lakes and streams can limit photosynthetic productivity (Wetzel 2001). The chemical behavior of iron is highly dependent on oxidation intensity and is a function of pH and temperatures (Hem 1989; Wetzel 2001). Iron is released in sediment when igneous rock minerals are broken down by water. Iron is also present in organic matter in soils and can be processed into surface water through oxidation and reduction activities that often involve microorganism (Hem 1989). Industrial effluent, acid mine drainage, and smelters are also sources of iron (MELP 1998).

## Lead

Lead $(\mathrm{Pb})$ is a metallic element, which is widely dispersed in sedimentary rocks, but has low natural mobility due to low solubility (Hem 1989). The criterion for lead is expressed in terms of dissolved metal in the water column (MELP 1998). Lead concentration is reported in $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$. The relative abundances of different species of lead are pH dependent and solubility increases with increasing alkalinity (EPA 1986). The freshwater aquatic life criterion for lead depends on the hardness of the water body being tested. The toxic effects of lead decreases as DO and hardness concentrations increase (MELP 1998).

Lead is toxic to all animals (MELP 1998) and is particularly toxic to aquatic organism at relatively low concentrations (Wetzel 2001). Fossil fuel combustion, especially of leaded gasoline, contributed greatly to the deposition of lead in waterways in the twentieth century. Other sources of lead include industrial effluent, smelting and refining, batteries, and lead pipe used to transport drinking water (Wetzel 2001).

## Manganese

Manganese $(\mathrm{Mn})$ is one of the more abundant metallic elements, although there is only one-fiftieth the amount of manganese in the Earth's crust as there is iron (Hem 1989). It does not naturally occur as a metal, but is found in association with various salts and minerals, often with iron compounds (EPA 1986). Its chemical reactivity is very similar to that of iron and they behave much the same way in freshwater systems (Wetzel 2001). It is a minor constituent of many igneous and metamorphic minerals (Hem 1989). It can substitute for iron, magnesium, or calcium in silicate structures, but it is not an essential element of silicate rock minerals (Hem 1989). Small amounts of manganese are often present in dolomite or limestone as a substitute for calcium. Concentrations in lake basins range between 10 and $850 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$, depending on lithology and other characteristics of the drainage basin. The average concentration of manganese in surface waters is about $35 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (Wetzel 2001). It is rarely found in surface waters at concentrations greater than $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (EPA 1986).

Manganese is an essential nutrient for microflora, plants, and animals as an enzyme catalyst and as an important component of photosynthesis and nitrogen fixation (EPA 1986; Hem 1989). High concentrations of manganese can have an inhibitory effect on cyanobacteria and green algae and tend to favor diatom growth (Wetzel 2001). Divalent manganese is released into aqueous solution during weathering of rock and through organic processes (Hem 1989).

## Nickel

Nickel (Ni) is one of the five ferromagnetic elements. It only occurs as a very small fraction ( $0.018 \%$ ) in the Earth's crust (HSDB 2007). It can be combined with various other metals, including iron, copper, chromium, and zinc, and may substitute for iron in igneous rocks. Nickel also may be precipitated with iron oxides and manganese oxides (Hem 1989; ATSDR 2005). In addition, nickel can also be combined with other elements, most commonly sulfur, and oxygen. Many of the compounds containing
nickel easily dissolve in water (ATSDR 2005). Concentrations in natural surface waters are usually low ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$, Hem (1989)).

Nickel is an essential element in some enzymes found in bacteria and plants. It is an important component in nitrogen fixation and some enzymes (Wetzel 2001). However, when it occurs in large quantities and is combined with some elements, for example nitrate, sulfur, and chloride, nickel can be very toxic to aquatic biota. It may accumulate in some plants (ATSDR 2005). The toxicity of nickel to aquatic biota is dependent on hardness. Toxicity is greater when the water is softer compared to harder water conditions. It can also be released from volcanoes. Nickel is naturally found in all soils, and strongly attaches to particles that contain iron or magnesium. When this occurs, it is not readily available for uptake by plants and animals. Nickel is found in surface waters as a result of weathering of rocks containing nickel. Anthropogenic sources of nickel include industrial effluent, oil-burning and coal-burning power plants, mining, and trash incinerators (ATSDR 2005).

## Chromium

Chromium ( Cr ) is naturally present in the environment and has a number of oxidation states. The most common forms are chromium (0), trivalent (chromium (III)), and hexavalent (chromium (VI)). Hexavalent chromium (chromium VI) compounds are the most toxic state. It is usually measured as total chromium. Naturally, chromium concentrations in surface water are usually less than $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ (Hem 1989).

Chromium (VI) compounds adversely affect all aquatic biota, including algae. It does not appear to bioaccumulate in plants and animals. It is also a known human carcinogen (EPA 1986). The toxicity of chromium (VI) increases as hardness and pH increase. Chromium (III) is more toxic in soft waters. Chromium naturally occurs in rocks and soil, but in very small amounts. It is also released during volcanic eruptions. Anthopogenic sources of chromium (0), (III) and (VI) include emissions from coal and oil burning and industrial effluents (ATSDR 2000).

### 2.3 Metals - Total

## Mercury

Mercury $(\mathrm{Hg})$ is a trace element in the Earth's crust that normally occurs in quantities of only 1 to $2 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{L}$ in natural waters (MELP 1998). It may be present in the environment as elemental mercury $\left(\mathrm{Hg}^{0}\right)$, inorganic mercury $\left(\mathrm{Hg}^{2+}\right)$, or organic mercury (primarily methyl mercury, MeHg). Elemental mercury was commonly used in thermometers. Methyl mercury is the most toxic of these mercury compounds (EPA 1986). It is a serious neuron-toxin and has been found in high concentrations in lakes far removed from sources of mercury (EPA 1986). Methyl mercury bioaccumulates, which is the process by which organisms that are exposed to chemicals either from their diet, water, or other sources accumulate and retain the chemicals. Inorganic mercury does not accumulate in aquatic organisms. Various chemical and biological processes can readily convert the various forms of mercury. Anaerobic bacteria in sediments readily
convert inorganic mercury into methyl mercury. With the exception of gold mining areas where elemental mercury is used, mercury is typically present in surface waters, sediment, or soils as inorganic mercury.

Mercury is highly toxic and has a long retention time in animal cells. Rates of methyl mercury production and bioaccumulation depend not only on the abundance of inorganic mercury but also on a complex assortment of environmental variables which affect the activities and species composition of the bacteria and the availability of the inorganic mercury for methylation (USGS 2003; HSDB 2007). These variables include, but are not limited to, pH of the water, the length of the food chain, dissolved organic matter, soil type, and the proportion of wetlands in the watershed. Once converted to methyl mercury by bacteria, it can bioaccumulate in aquatic organisms and be passed up the food chain (Hem 1989). Temperature, pH, alkalinity, suspended sediment load, and the geomorphology of the watershed are known to affect the accumulation of mercury in fish (Klasing et al 2006). In addition to bioaccumulating, methyl mercury also biomagnifies (higher concentrations at higher levels in the food chain) (USGS 2003). Because bacteria mediate the rate of methyl mercury formation, fish living in even mildly contaminated waters are not safe to eat.

Detectible levels of mercury are found in almost all fish, with more than $95 \%$ of it occurring as methyl mercury (Klasing et al 2006). People primarily become exposed to methyl mercury by consuming fish (Klasing et al 2006). Fish at the highest trophic levels (higher up the food chain) tend to have higher levels of methyl mercury than those lower in the food chain. Larger and older fish of a given species also tend to have higher methyl mercury levels than smaller and younger fish of the same species. It is particularly toxic to the fetus and young children and can cause serious neurological abnormalities to a fetus even without symptoms in the mother. Recent studies indicate that the fetus is more sensitive to methyl mercury than adults. As a result, the OEHHA has established separate 'reference doses', which is "the daily exposure likely to be without significant risk of deleterious health effects during a lifetime". The reference dose for women of childbearing age and children aged 17 and younger is $1 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ day. For men and women beyond childbearing age, the reference dose is $3 \times 10^{-4}$ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$-day (Klasing et al 2006).

Mercury contamination can occur from both natural processes and human activities. Mercury is highly volatile and thus, atmospheric deposition is a major pathway into aquatic systems (Hem 1989; MELP 1998). Impounded water and flooding also cause the release of sedimentary mercury (MELP 1998). Sources of mercury contamination include coal combustion, water incineration, mining and smelting and production of fertilizers (MELP 1998; USGS 2003). Mercury is typically measured as the total mercury in water, soil, or tissue samples. Water samples containing just 5 to $10 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{L}$ are considered polluted (MELP 1998). OEHHA has reviewed studies that have reported mercury levels in fish in numerous watersheds in the Sierra Nevada and others near the MFP area. In the Lower Feather River, mercury levels ranged between 0.13 to 2.26 ppm (ppm = mg/kg) in Sacramento pikeminnow (total length range: 256 to 500 mm ), 0.18 to 2.35 ppm in large mouth bass (total length range: 305 to 495 mm ), and 0.32 to 3.50 ppm in striped bass (total length range: 533 to 817 mm ) (Klasing et al 2006). In
the lower American River and Lake Natoma, average mercury concentrations in rainbow trout was 0.02 ppm (average total length: 324 mm ), 0.57 ppm in Sacramento pikeminnow (average total length: 292 mm ), and 0.28 ppm in striped bass (average total length: 559 mm ) (Klasing and Brodberg 2004). In addition, composite mercury analyses were conducted on fish tissue samples from various reservoirs as part of the SMUD relicensing studies (FERC Project Number 2101). Mercury levels in brown trout from Loon Lake, Gerle Creek Reservoir, and Slab Creek Reservoir were 0.137 ppm (fork length range: 342 to 374 mm ), 0.321 ppm (fork length: 510 mm ), and 0.595 ppm (fork length: 485 mm ), respectively. Mercury levels in rainbow trout in Ice House Reservoir were 0.036 ppm (fork length range: 214 to 340 mm ). In Chili Bar Reservoir, mercury levels in a composite of Sacramento pikeminnows was 0.075 ppm (fork length range: 238 to 325 mm ) (SMUD 2005).

### 2.4 Hydrocarbons

## Methyl-tertiary Butyl Ether (MtBE)

MtBE is a chemical compound manufactured by the reaction of methanol and isobutylene. It is produced in mass quantities and used as an additive to raise the oxygen content of gasoline. It had been added to gasoline in relatively low concentrations beginning in the late 1970's. Since the 1990's it has been added in considerably higher concentration (up to $15 \%$ ) to reduce the emissions of carbon monoxide and other pollutants. This has contributed to significant reductions in carbon monoxide and ozone levels in many areas in California (USGS 2007). The EPA has not set a national standard for MtBE nor has the CTR set a standard. MtBE is measured in parts per billion, $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, or $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$.

MtBE readily dissolves in water, can rapidly move through the soil and aquifers, and is not affected by microbial decomposition. It is classified as a carcinogen by the EPA (USGS 2007). Lakes subjected to recreational activities are at the greatest potential risk of ecological effects from MtBE (Zogorski et. al. 2001). Recreational watercraft with two-cycle engines pass as much as $25 \%$ of their fuel into the water column through their exhaust. Although MtBE seems to be relatively persistent in groundwater, it does volatilize from surface water. Volatilization from surface waters is dependent on a number of factors, including the depth and flow velocity of the water. Rates are slower in fast moving, shallow waters (Squillace et. al. 1998). MtBE binds weakly to soils (Squillace et. al. 1998). MtBE does not appear to bioaccumulate in fish and is rapidly metabolized or excreted. The typical levels of MtBE that are found in surface waters are considerable less than those that would be toxic to various aquatic biota. For example, negative affects were not observed in algae until concentrations reaches $2,400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. In invertebrates, amphibians, and fish, the lowest concentrations at which negative effects were observed were $44 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}, 2,500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, and $574 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, respectively (Werner and Hinton 1998). In addition to two-stroke engines, MtBE can enter surface waters from fuel spill, leaking storage tanks and pipelines, storm run-off, and precipitation from atmospheric MtBE (Squillace et. al. 1998; Zogorski et. al. 2001).

## Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons

Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) is a term used to describe a large family of chemical compounds originating from crude oil. These chemical compounds are made up primarily of hydrogen and carbon and are called hydrocarbons. It is impractical to measure each hydrocarbon individually because there are so many of them. Instead, TPH are used to measure hydrocarbon contamination (ATSDR 1999b). Some of the chemicals in TPH include hexane, benzene, toluene, xylenes, naphthalene, and flourene, as well as jet fuels and mineral oils (ATSDR 1999b).

Total petroleum hydrocarbon compounds can affect the lungs, liver, kidneys, and central nervous systems of animals as well as reproduction and fetus development (ASTDR 1999b). Total petroleum hydrocarbons can be released into water through spills or leaks or directly through storm runoff. Sources include industrial release, automobiles, and manufacturing.

### 2.5 Oil and Grease

The 'oil and grease' category includes thousands of organic compounds with different physical, chemical, and toxicological properties. Volatility, solubility, and persistence of the compound also vary considerably among the different compounds. Petroleum and non-petroleum oils can occur throughout a lake or stream system, including floating on the water's surface, emulsified in the water column, solubilized, or settled on the river or lake bottom (EPA 1986).

Oil can be very toxic to various aquatic organisms, as well as birds. Oil and gasoline spills, in particular, can be lethal to a wide variety of organisms. Petroleum products can be harmful to aquatic organisms at low levels (as low as $1 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ ). Oil pollutants may also be buried in the sediments, relatively unchanged, which can cause long-term detrimental effects to benthic organisms (EPA 1986).

### 2.6 BACTERIA

## Total Coliform

Coliform bacteria are a group of several genera of relatively harmless microorganisms that live in soil, water, and the intestines of cold- and warm-blooded animals including humans (Murphy 2007). Total coliform concentrations are reported as the number of bacteria colonies present per 100 mL of sample water (\#/100 mL, Michaud 1994).

Total coliform bacteria occur naturally in surface and shallow ground waters and are essential in the breakdown or organic matter in water. Oxygen is not a requirement for these bacteria, but they can use it. They produce acid and gas from the fermentation of lactose. Coliform bacteria are not pathogenic and are only mildly infectious. The total coliform group is relatively easy to culture in the lab, and therefore, has been selected as the primary indicatory bacteria for the presence of disease-causing organisms. If large numbers of coliform bacteria are found in water, there is a high probability that pathogenic bacteria or organisms, such as Giardia may be present. Coliform bacteria,
rather than actual pathogens, are used to assess water quality because they are easier to isolate and identify (Murphy 2007).

## Fecal Coliform

Fecal coliform is a subgroup of the coliform bacteria that live in the intestinal tract and feces of warm-blooded animals (Murphy 2007). The most common member of this group is Escherichia coli. Fecal coliform concentrations are reported as the number of bacteria colonies present per 100 mL of sample water (\#/100 mL, Michaud 1991). Fecal coliform bacteria can multiply quickly under optimum growing conditions and die off rapidly when conditions change. For this reason, fecal coliform counts are difficult to predict (Michaud 1994).

Fecal coliform species by themselves are not usually harmful, but are an indicator of the possible presence of pathogenic organisms, such as bacteria, viruses, and parasites, that live in the same environment (Windell 1992; Murphy 2007). Thus, it is used as a parameter for testing the quality of waters used for recreation. The presence of fecal coliform indicates contamination from the feces of humans or other animals. Swimming in waters with high levels of fecal coliform bacteria (over 200 colonies $/ 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) presents a health risk of contracting diseases such as typhoid fever, hepatitis, gastroenteritis, ear infection, and dysentery (Windell 1992; Murphy 2007). Some strains of E. coli, such as E. coli $\mathrm{O} 157: \mathrm{H} 7$, which is found in the digestive tract of cattle, can cause intestinal illness. The major sources of fecal coliform to freshwater are wastewater treatment plant effluent, failing septic systems, and human and animal wastes. Human and animal wastes can be washed into storm drains, streams, and lakes during storms (Michaud 1994; Murphy 2007).
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## APPENDIX B

Glossary of Analytical Laboratory Terminology,
Units of Measurements and Calculations

## Glossary

## Method Detection Limit (MDL):

Is a measure of the method sensitivity. The MDL is the lowest concentration that can be detected by an instrument with correction for the effects of sample matrix and methodspecified parameters such as sample preparation. It is the minimum concentration of a substance that can be measured and reported with 99 percent confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero, as defined in 40 CFR 136, Appendix B, revised as of July 1, 2003.

## Practical Quantitation Limit (PQL):

The concentration that can be reliably measured within specified limits and accuracy during routine laboratory operating conditions. It is typically determined by a combination of the IDL (instrument detection limit-the lowest the instrument is capable of seeing with specified confidence limits) and the lowest calibration standard used. The calibration level is selected (usually greater than the IDL) based upon the needs of the specified batch of samples being run.

## Reference Dose (RfD):

The daily exposure of mercury likely to be without significant risk of deleterious health effects during a lifetime. It is an estimate, with uncertainty spanning perhaps an order of magnitude (Klasing and Brodberg 2006).

## Screening Value (SV):

Concentration of mercury in fish or shellfish tissue that are of potential public health concern and that are used as threshold values against which levels of contamination in similar tissue collected from the ambient environment can be compared. Exceedance of these SVs should be taken as an indication that more intensive site-specific monitoring and/or evaluation of human health risk should be conducted (Cal EPA 2005).

## Units of Measure

The following table summarizes common mass ratios for solutions and solids.

| Unit | Solutions |  | Solids |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ppm (parts per million) $10^{-6}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{mL}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{g}$ |
| ppb (parts per billion) $10^{-9}$ | $\mu \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{mL}$ | $\mu \mathrm{gg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{g}$ |
| ppt (parts per trillion) $10^{-12}$ | $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{pg} / \mathrm{mL}$ | $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{kg}$ | $\mathrm{pg} / \mathrm{g}$ |

The following table summarizes the laboratory units and conversions used in the report.

| Water Quality Analytes | Laboratory Given Unit | Water Quality Standard Unit | Conversion to Water Quality Standard Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Parameters |  |  |  |
| Calcium | mg/L | mg/L | No conversion |
| Chloride | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | mg/L | No conversion |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No conversion |
| Magnesium | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | ug/L | Multiply by 1,000 |
| Nitrate/Nitrite ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}$ ) | mg/L | mg/L | No conversion |
| Ammonia as N | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No conversion |
| Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No conversion |
| Total Phosphorus | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | mg/L | No conversion |
| Ortho-phosphate | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | mg/L | No conversion |
| Potassium | mg/L | mg/L | No conversion |
| Sodium | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No conversion |
| Sulfate ( $\mathrm{SO}_{4}$ ) | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No conversion |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mg/L | mg/L | No conversion |
| Total Suspended Solids | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | mg/L | No conversion |
| Turbidity | NTU | NTU | No conversion |
| Organic Carbon, Total (TOC) | mg/L | mg/L | No conversion |
| Total Alkalinity (as $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | mg/L | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No conversion |
| Metals-Dissolved |  |  |  |
| Arsenic | ug/L | ug/L | No conversion |
| Cadmium | ug/L | ug/L | No conversion |
| Copper | ug/L | mg/L | Divide by 1,000 |
| Iron | ug/L | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Divide by 1,000 |
| Lead | ug/L | ug/L | No conversion |
| Manganese | ug/L | ug/L | No conversion |
| Nickel | ug/L | ug/L | No conversion |
| Chromium-Total | ug/L | ug/L | No conversion |
| Metals-Total |  |  |  |
| Mercury | $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{g}$ | ug/L | Divide by 1,000 |
| Methyl mercury | $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{g}$ fish | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ fish | Divide by 1,000 |
| Hydrocarbons |  |  |  |
| Methyl-tertiary-butyl Ether (MtBE) | ug/L | ug/L | No conversion |
| Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (as gasoline and as diesel) | ug/L | ug/L | No conversion |
| Oil and Grease | mg/L | mg/L | No conversion |
| Bacteria |  |  |  |
| Total Coliform ( $3 \times 5,6 \mathrm{hr} \mathrm{hold)}$ | MPN/100 mL | MPN/100 mL | No conversion |
| Fecal Coliform ( $3 \times 5$ ) | MPN/100 mL | MPN/100 mL | No conversion |

## Calculations

Several criteria must be calculated on a site-by-site basis. The following equations apply to those analytes.

## Ammonia:

Criteria are temperature and pH dependent.
Criteria Continuous Concentration (CCC) with fish early life stages present (mg/L)=

$$
\mathrm{CCC}=\left(\frac{0.0577}{1+10^{7.688-\mathrm{PH}}}+\frac{2.487}{1+10^{\mathrm{PH}-7.688}}\right) \times \operatorname{MIN}\left(2.85,1.45 \times 10^{0.028 \times(25-\mathrm{T})}\right)
$$

Where $\mathrm{T}=$ temperature in degrees C .

## Cadmium (Cd):

Criteria are hardness dependent.
California Toxics Rule (CTR) Criteria to Protect Freshwater Aquatic Life:

Criteria Continuous Concentration (CCC) (4-day Average, dissolved, ug/L)= $(\exp \{0.7852[\ln ($ hardness in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})]-2.715\}) \times(1.101672-\{[\ln ($ hardness in mg/L) $] \times[0.041838]\})$

Criteria Maximum Concentration (CMC) (24-hour Average, dissolved, ug/L)= $(\exp \{1.128[\ln ($ hardness in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})]-3.6867\}) \times(1.136672-\{[\ln ($ hardness in mg/L) $) \times[0.041838]\})$

National Toxics Rule (NTR) Criteria to Protect Freshwater Aquatic Life (more stringent):
Criteria Continuous Concentration (CCC) (4-day Average, dissolved, ug/L)= $(\exp \{0.7409[\ln ($ hardness in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})]-4.719\}) \times(1.101672-\{[\ln ($ hardness in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})] \times[0.041838]\})$

Criteria Maximum Concentration (CMC) (24-hour Average, dissolved, ug/L)= $(\exp \{1.0166[\ln ($ hardness in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})]-3.924\}) \times(1.136672-\{[\ln ($ hardness in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})] \times[0.041838]\})$

## Copper (Cu):

Criteria are hardness dependent.
California Toxics Rule (CTR) Criteria to Protect Freshwater Aquatic Life:
Criteria Continuous Concentration (CCC) (4-day Average, dissolved, mg/L)= (e\{0.8545[ln(hardness in mg/L)]-1.702\}) x (0.960)

Criteria Maximum Concentration (CMC) (24-hour Average, dissolved, mg/L)= (e\{0.9422[In(hardness in mg/L)]-1.700\}) x (0.960)

## Lead (Pb):

Criteria are hardness dependent.
California Toxics Rule (CTR) Criteria to Protect Freshwater Aquatic Life:
Criteria Continuous Concentration (CCC) (4-day Average, dissolved, ug/L)= (e\{1.273[In(hardness in mg/L)]-4.705\}) x (1.46203- \{[ln(hardness in mg/L)] x [0.145712]\})

Criteria Maximum Concentration (CMC) (24-hour Average, dissolved, ug/L)= (e\{1.273[In(hardness in mg/L)]-1.460\}) x (1.46203- \{[ln(hardness in mg/L)] x [0.145712]\})

Nickel (Ni):
Criteria are hardness dependent.
California Toxics Rule (CTR) Criteria to Protect Freshwater Aquatic Life: Criteria Continuous Concentration (CCC) (4-day Average, dissolved, ug/L)= (e\{0.8460[ln(hardness in mg/L)]+0.0584\}) x (0.997)

Criteria Maximum Concentration (CMC) (24-hour Average, dissolved, ug/L)= (e\{0.8460[ln(hardness in mg/L)]+2.255\}) x (0.998)

## APPENDIX C

## Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen Profile Measurements
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Table C-1. Summary Table of In-situ Ralston Afterbay Profile Measurements.

| Date: <br> Site ID: | $\begin{gathered} 5 / 29 / 2007 \\ \text { RA-1 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Depth below Water |  |  |  |
|  | Surface (m) | Depth (ft)* | Temperature (deg) | Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) |
|  | 0 | 1,177 | 19.15 | 10.3 |
|  | 1 | 1,174 | 17.92 | 10.5 |
|  | 2 | 1,170 | 17.63 | 10.5 |
|  | 3 | 1,167 | 15.46 | 11.0 |
|  | 4 | 1,164 | 13.61 | 11.3 |
|  | 5 | 1,161 | 12.30 | 11.3 |
|  | 6 | 1,157 | 12.03 | 11.4 |
|  | 7 | 1,154 | 11.37 | 11.6 |
|  | 8 | 1,151 | 11.23 | 11.4 |
|  | 9 | 1,147 | 10.80 | 11.3 |
|  | 10 | 1,144 | 10.56 | 11.6 |
|  | 11 | 1,141 | 10.52 | 10.8 |
|  | 12 | 1,138 | 10.55 | 10.6 |
|  | 13 | 1,134 | 10.49 | 10.9 |
|  | 14 | 1,131 | 10.49 | 10.7 |
| Date: Site ID: | 9/26/2007 |  |  |  |
|  | RA-1 |  |  |  |
|  | Depth below Water |  |  |  |
|  | Surface (m) | Depth (ft)* | Temperature (deg) | Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) |
|  | 0 | 1,175 | 13.55 | 10.9 |
|  | 1 | 1,172 | 13.00 | 11.2 |
|  | 2 | 1,168 | 12.72 | 11.3 |
|  | 3 | 1,165 | 12.32 | 11.4 |
|  | 4 | 1,162 | 12.35 | 11.4 |
|  | 5 | 1,159 | 12.25 | 11.3 |
|  | 6 | 1,155 | 12.21 | 11.3 |
|  | 7 | 1,152 | 12.21 | 11.3 |
|  | 8 | 1,149 | 12.20 | 11.3 |
|  | 9 | 1,145 | 12.19 | 11.2 |
|  | 10 | 1,142 | 12.19 | 11.2 |

*Maximum operating water surface elevation: 1,178 feet

Table C-2. Summary Table of In-situ Hell Hole Reservoir Profile Measurements.

| Date: <br> Site ID: | $\begin{gathered} 5 / 30 / 2007 \\ \mathrm{HH}-1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Depth below |  |  | Dissolved |
|  | Water Surface (m) | Depth (ft)* | Temperature (deg) | Oxygen <br> (mg/L) |
|  | 0 | 4,583 | 14.52 | 8.5 |
|  | 1 | 4,580 | 14.12 | 8.3 |
|  | 2 | 4,576 | 13.93 | 8.3 |
|  | 3 | 4,573 | 13.88 | 8.3 |
|  | 4 | 4,570 | 13.84 | 8.3 |
|  | 5 | 4,567 | 13.81 | 8.1 |
|  | 6 | 4,563 | 13.80 | 8.1 |
|  | 7 | 4,560 | 13.75 | 8.1 |
|  | 8 | 4,557 | 13.63 | 8.2 |
|  | 9 | 4,553 | 13.44 | 8.2 |
|  | 10 | 4,550 | 13.25 | 8.1 |
|  | 11 | 4,547 | 13.00 | 8.2 |
|  | 12 | 4,544 | 12.84 | 8.3 |
|  | 13 | 4,540 | 12.72 | 8.3 |
|  | 14 | 4,537 | 12.38 | 8.3 |
|  | 15 | 4,534 | 11.54 | 8.3 |
|  | 16 | 4,531 | 11.15 | 8.4 |
|  | 17 | 4,527 | 10.41 | 8.5 |
|  | 18 | 4,524 | 9.88 | 8.6 |
|  | 19 | 4,521 | 9.68 | 8.6 |
|  | 20 | 4,517 | 9.20 | 8.5 |
|  | 21 | 4,514 | 8.90 | 8.6 |
|  | 22 | 4,511 | 8.63 | 8.5 |
|  | 23 | 4,508 | 8.15 | 8.6 |
|  | 24 | 4,504 | 7.70 | 8.7 |
|  | 25 | 4,501 | 7.25 | 8.8 |
|  | 26 | 4,498 | 7.21 | 8.8 |
|  | 27 | 4,494 | 6.89 | 8.8 |
|  | 28 | 4,491 | 6.76 | 8.8 |
|  | 29 | 4,488 | 6.68 | 8.7 |
|  | 30 | 4,485 | 6.65 | 8.7 |
|  | 31 | 4,481 | 6.61 | 8.7 |
|  | 32 | 4,478 | 6.55 | 8.7 |
|  | 33 | 4,475 | 6.53 | 8.6 |
|  | 34 | 4,471 | 6.53 | 8.7 |
|  | 35 | 4,468 | 6.42 | 8.7 |
|  | 36 | 4,465 | 6.43 | 8.8 |
|  | 37 | 4,462 | 6.35 | 8.8 |
|  | 38 | 4,458 | 6.34 | 8.8 |
|  | 39 | 4,455 | 6.33 | 8.8 |
|  | 40 | 4,452 | 6.32 | 8.8 |
|  | 42 | 4,445 | 6.29 | 8.8 |
|  | 44 | 4,439 | 6.28 | 8.8 |
|  | 46 | 4,432 | 6.28 | 8.7 |
|  | 48 | 4,426 | 6.27 | 8.7 |
|  | 50 | 4,419 | 6.26 | 8.7 |
|  | 52 | 4,412 | 6.24 | 8.7 |
|  | 54 | 4,406 | 6.24 | 8.7 |
|  | 56 | 4,399 | 6.23 | 8.7 |
|  | 58 | 4,393 | 6.23 | 8.7 |
|  | 60 | 4,386 | 6.20 | 8.7 |
|  | 62 | 4,380 | 6.20 | 8.6 |
|  | 64 | 4,373 | 6.19 | 8.7 |
|  | 66 | 4,366 | 6.19 | 8.6 |
|  | 68 | 4,360 | 6.19 | 8.6 |
|  | 70 | 4,353 | 6.18 | 8.7 |


| Date: <br> Site ID: | 10/1/2007 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Depth below |  |  |  |
|  | Water Surface |  | Temperature | Dissolved |
|  | (m) | Depth (ft)* | (deg) | Oxygen (mg/L) |
|  | 1 | 4,514 | 16.13 | 7.2 |
|  | 2 | 4,511 | 16.27 | 6.8 |
|  | 3 | 4,507 | 16.16 | 6.7 |
|  | 4 | 4,504 | 16.03 | 6.6 |
|  | 5 | 4,501 | 15.96 | 6.6 |
|  | 6 | 4,498 | 15.92 | 6.6 |
|  | 7 | 4,494 | 15.89 | 6.6 |
|  | 8 | 4,491 | 15.88 | 6.5 |
|  | 9 | 4,488 | 15.87 | 6.5 |
|  | 10 | 4,484 | 15.86 | 6.5 |
|  | 11 | 4,481 | 15.85 | 6.5 |
|  | 12 | 4,478 | 15.84 | 6.5 |
|  | 13 | 4,475 | 15.84 | 6.5 |
|  | 14 | 4,471 | 15.84 | 6.5 |
|  | 15 | 4,468 | 15.83 | 6.5 |
|  | 16 | 4,465 | 15.83 | 6.5 |
|  | 17 | 4,462 | 15.83 | 6.5 |
|  | 18 | 4,458 | 15.83 | 6.5 |
|  | 19 | 4,455 | 15.83 | 6.5 |
|  | 20 | 4,452 | 15.83 | 6.5 |
|  | 21 | 4,448 | 15.82 | 6.5 |
|  | 22 | 4,445 | 15.82 | 6.4 |
|  | 23 | 4,442 | 15.82 | 6.4 |
|  | 24 | 4,439 | 15.82 | 6.4 |
|  | 25 | 4,435 | 15.82 | 6.4 |
|  | 26 | 4,432 | 15.81 | 6.4 |
|  | 27 | 4,429 | 15.81 | 6.4 |
|  | 28 | 4,425 | 15.81 | 6.4 |
|  | 29 | 4,422 | 15.81 | 6.4 |
|  | 30 | 4,419 | 15.81 | 6.4 |
|  | 31 | 4,416 | 15.80 | 6.4 |
|  | 32 | 4,412 | 15.80 | 6.4 |
|  | 33 | 4,409 | 15.80 | 6.4 |
|  | 34 | 4,406 | 15.77 | 6.4 |
|  | 35 | 4,402 | 15.73 | 6.4 |
|  | 36 | 4,399 | 15.70 | 6.4 |
|  | 37 | 4,396 | 15.69 | 6.4 |
|  | 38 | 4,393 | 15.50 | 6.3 |
|  | 39 | 4,389 | 15.40 | 6.3 |
|  | 40 | 4,386 | 15.36 | 6.3 |
|  | 41 | 4,383 | 15.32 | 6.3 |
|  | 42 | 4,379 | 15.30 | 6.3 |
|  | 43 | 4,376 | 15.16 | 6.3 |
|  | 44 | 4,373 | 15.11 | 6.2 |
|  | 45 | 4,370 | 15.01 | 6.2 |
|  | 46 | 4,366 | 14.96 | 6.2 |
|  | 47 | 4,363 | 14.92 | 6.2 |
|  | 48 | 4,360 | 14.88 | 6.2 |
|  | 49 | 4,357 | 14.80 | 6.2 |
|  | 50 | 4,353 | 14.71 | 6.2 |
|  | 51 | 4,350 | 14.63 | 6.2 |
|  | 52 | 4,347 | 14.53 | 6.2 |
|  | 53 | 4,343 | 14.27 | 6.1 |
|  | 54 | 4,340 | 13.97 | 6.0 |
|  | 55 | 4,337 | 13.57 | 5.9 |

*Maximum operating water surface elevation: 4,630 fee

Table C-2. Summary Table of In-situ Hell Hole Reservoir Profile Measurements (continued).

| Date: <br> Site ID: | $\begin{gathered} 5 / 30 / 2007 \\ \mathrm{HH}-2 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Depth below |  |  | Dissolved |
|  | Water Surface (m) | Depth (ft)* | Temperature (deg) | Oxygen (mg/L) |
|  | 0 | 4,583 | 14.72 | 8.1 |
|  | 1 | 4,580 | 14.64 | 8.2 |
|  | 2 | 4,576 | 14.16 | 8.3 |
|  | 3 | 4,573 | 14.07 | 8.2 |
|  | 4 | 4,570 | 14.02 | 8.2 |
|  | 5 | 4,567 | 13.98 | 8.2 |
|  | 6 | 4,563 | 13.95 | 8.2 |
|  | 7 | 4,560 | 13.10 | 8.3 |
|  | 8 | 4,557 | 13.09 | 8.4 |
|  | 9 | 4,553 | 12.80 | 8.4 |
|  | 10 | 4,550 | 12.61 | 8.5 |
|  | 11 | 4,547 | 12.00 | 8.5 |
|  | 12 | 4,544 | 11.62 | 8.5 |
|  | 13 | 4,540 | 11.22 | 8.6 |
|  | 14 | 4,537 | 11.21 | 8.5 |
|  | 15 | 4,534 | 11.11 | 8.5 |
|  | 16 | 4,531 | 10.84 | 8.6 |
|  | 17 | 4,527 | 10.63 | 8.6 |
|  | 18 | 4,524 | 10.75 | 8.6 |
|  | 19 | 4,521 | 10.68 | 8.5 |
|  | 20 | 4,517 | 9.98 | 8.6 |
|  | 21 | 4,514 | 10.38 | 8.6 |
|  | 22 | 4,511 | 9.37 | 8.6 |
|  | 23 | 4,508 | 8.86 | 8.8 |
|  | 24 | 4,504 | 8.73 | 8.7 |
|  | 25 | 4,501 | 8.59 | 8.7 |
|  | 26 | 4,498 | 8.36 | 8.7 |
|  | 27 | 4,494 | 8.29 | 8.7 |
|  | 28 | 4,491 | 8.31 | 8.7 |
|  | 29 | 4,488 | 8.32 | 8.7 |
|  | 30 | 4,485 | 7.99 | 8.8 |
|  | 31 | 4,481 | 7.87 | 8.8 |
|  | 32 | 4,478 | 7.58 | 8.8 |
|  | 33 | 4,475 | 7.27 | 8.8 |
|  | 34 | 4,471 | 6.93 | 8.8 |
|  | 35 | 4,468 | 6.80 | 8.7 |
|  | 36 | 4,465 | 6.77 | 8.7 |
|  | 37 | 4,462 | 6.54 | 8.8 |
|  | 38 | 4,458 | 6.47 | 8.8 |
|  | 39 | 4,455 | 6.52 | 8.7 |
|  | 40 | 4,452 | 6.50 | 8.8 |
|  | 41 | 4,448 | 6.54 | 8.8 |
|  | 42 | 4,445 | 6.46 | 8.8 |
|  | 43 | 4,442 | 6.46 | 8.7 |
|  | 44 | 4,439 | 6.33 | 8.8 |
|  | 45 | 4,435 | 6.30 | 8.6 |
|  | 46 | 4,432 | 6.36 | 8.7 |
|  | 47 | 4,429 | 6.35 | 8.8 |
|  | 48 | 4,426 | 6.32 | 8.8 |
|  | 49 | 4,422 | 6.27 | 8.8 |
|  | 50 | 4,419 | 6.26 | 8.8 |
|  | 51 | 4,416 | 6.26 | 8.7 |
|  | 52 | 4,412 | 6.26 | 8.8 |
|  | 53 | 4,409 | 6.25 | 8.8 |
|  | 54 | 4,406 | 6.26 | 8.7 |
|  | 56 | 4,399 | 6.25 | 8.7 |
|  | 58 | 4,393 | 6.25 | 8.7 |
|  | 60 | 4,386 | 6.24 | 8.8 |
|  | 62 | 4,380 | 6.24 | 8.7 |
|  | 64 | 4,373 | 6.23 | 8.7 |
|  | 66 | 4,366 | 6.20 | 8.8 |
|  | 68 | 4,360 | 6.20 | 8.7 |
|  | 70 | 4,353 | 6.21 | 8.7 |


*Maximum operating water surface elevation: 4,630 fee

Table C-2. Summary Table of In-situ Hell Hole Reservoir Profile Measurements (continued).

| Date: <br> Site ID: | $\begin{gathered} 10 / 1 / 2007 \\ \mathrm{HH}-3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Depth below Water Surface (m) | Depth (ft)* | Temperature (deg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dissolved } \\ \text { Oxygen } \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 0 | 4,583 | 12.72 | 8.8 |
|  | 1 | 4,580 | 12.17 | 8.8 |
|  | 2 | 4,576 | 12.03 | 8.7 |
|  | 3 | 4,573 | 11.99 | 8.8 |
|  | 4 | 4,570 | 11.97 | 8.8 |
|  | 5 | 4,567 | 11.95 | 8.7 |
|  | 6 | 4,563 | 11.94 | 8.7 |
|  | 7 | 4,560 | 11.87 | 8.7 |
|  | 8 | 4,557 | 11.70 | 8.7 |
|  | 9 | 4,553 | 11.18 | 8.8 |
|  | 10 | 4,550 | 10.85 | 8.8 |
|  | 11 | 4,547 | 10.76 | 8.8 |
|  | 12 | 4,544 | 10.61 | 8.8 |
|  | 13 | 4,540 | 10.52 | 8.9 |
|  | 14 | 4,537 | 10.23 | 8.9 |
|  | 15 | 4,534 | 10.14 | 8.9 |
|  | 16 | 4,531 | 10.09 | 8.9 |
|  | 17 | 4,527 | 10.09 | 8.9 |
|  | 18 | 4,524 | 10.05 | 8.9 |
|  | 19 | 4,521 | 9.79 | 8.9 |
|  | 20 | 4,517 | 9.39 | 9.0 |
|  | 21 | 4,514 | 9.34 | 8.9 |
|  | 22 | 4,511 | 9.14 | 9.0 |
|  | 23 | 4,508 | 8.97 | 8.9 |
|  | 24 | 4,504 | 8.92 | 9.0 |
|  | 25 | 4,501 | 8.83 | 9.0 |
|  | 26 | 4,498 | 8.71 | 9.0 |
|  | 27 | 4,494 | 8.53 | 8.9 |
|  | 28 | 4,491 | 8.55 | 9.0 |
|  | 29 | 4,488 | 8.37 | 9.0 |
|  | 30 | 4,485 | 7.97 | 9.0 |
|  | 31 | 4,481 | 7.80 | 9.0 |
|  | 32 | 4,478 | 7.53 | 9.0 |
|  | 33 | 4,475 | 7.55 | 9.0 |
|  | 34 | 4,471 | 7.33 | 9.0 |
|  | 35 | 4,468 | 7.00 | 9.0 |
|  | 36 | 4,465 | 6.98 | 9.0 |
|  | 37 | 4,462 | 6.76 | 9.0 |
|  | 38 | 4,458 | 6.65 | 9.0 |
|  | 39 | 4,455 | 6.55 | 9.0 |
|  | 40 | 4,452 | 6.43 | 9.0 |
|  | 41 | 4,448 | 6.38 | 9.0 |
|  | 42 | 4,445 | 6.38 | 9.0 |
|  | 43 | 4,442 | 6.37 | 9.0 |
|  | 44 | 4,439 | 6.84 | 9.0 |
|  | 45 | 4,435 | 6.30 | 9.0 |
|  | 46 | 4,432 | 6.39 | 9.0 |
|  | 47 | 4,429 | 6.29 | 8.9 |
|  | 48 | 4,426 | 6.28 | 9.0 |
|  | 49 | 4,422 | 6.24 | 9.0 |
|  | 50 | 4,419 | 6.22 | 9.0 |
|  | 51 | 4,416 | 6.21 | 9.0 |
|  | 52 | 4,412 | 6.20 | 9.0 |
|  | 54 | 4,406 | 6.20 | 9.0 |
|  | 56 | 4,399 | 6.20 | 8.9 |
|  | 58 | 4,393 | 6.20 | 9.0 |
|  | 60 | 4,386 | 6.19 | 8.9 |
|  | 62 | 4,380 | 6.19 | 8.4 |
|  | 63 | 4,376 | 6.19 | 8.4 |


| Date: <br> Site ID: | $\begin{gathered} 10 / 2 / 2007 \\ \mathrm{HH}-3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Depth below |  |  |  |
|  | Water Surface (m) | Depth (ft)* | Temperature (deg) | Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) |
|  | 0 | 4,514 | 15.80 | 6.3 |
|  |  | 4,511 | 15.81 | 6.3 |
|  | 2 | 4,507 | 15.80 | 6.3 |
|  | 3 | 4,504 | 15.79 | 6.3 |
|  | 4 | 4,501 | 15.78 | 6.3 |
|  | 5 | 4,498 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 6 | 4,494 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 7 | 4,491 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 8 | 4,488 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 9 | 4,484 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 10 | 4,481 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 11 | 4,478 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 12 | 4,475 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 13 | 4,471 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 14 | 4,468 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 15 | 4,465 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 16 | 4,462 | 15.77 | 6.3 |
|  | 17 | 4,458 | 15.76 | 6.3 |
|  | 18 | 4,455 | 15.76 | 6.3 |
|  | 19 | 4,452 | 15.76 | 6.3 |
|  | 20 | 4,448 | 15.76 | 6.3 |
|  | 21 | 4,445 | 15.76 | 6.3 |
|  | 22 | 4,442 | 15.76 | 6.3 |
|  | 23 | 4,439 | 15.76 | 6.3 |
|  | 24 | 4,435 | 15.74 | 6.3 |
|  | 25 | 4,432 | 15.69 | 6.2 |
|  | 26 | 4,429 | 15.68 | 6.2 |
|  | 27 | 4,425 | 15.66 | 6.2 |
|  | 28 | 4,422 | 15.63 | 6.1 |
|  | 29 | 4,419 | 15.62 | 6.1 |
|  | 30 | 4,416 | 15.58 | 6.1 |
|  | 31 | 4,412 | 15.56 | 6.1 |
|  | 32 | 4,409 | 15.53 | 6.1 |
|  | 33 | 4,406 | 15.50 | 6.1 |
|  | 34 | 4,402 | 15.45 | 6.0 |
|  | 35 | 4,399 | 15.34 | 5.9 |
|  | 36 | 4,396 | 15.31 | 5.8 |
|  | 37 | 4,393 | 15.29 | 5.8 |
|  | 38 | 4,389 | 15.28 | 5.7 |
|  | 39 | 4,386 | 15.17 | 5.4 |

*Maximum operating water surface elevation: 4,630 fee
Table C-3. Summary Table of In-situ French Meadows Reservoir Profile Measurements.



Figure C-3. Hell Hole Reservoir (HH-1, HH-2, HH-3) Temperature Profiles for the Spring and Fall Sampling Events.
 Temperature (deg C )
*It w as difficult to measure to the bottom of the reservoir because submerged rocks or trees are located near the bottom of the reservoir. Measurements may not have been taken at the bottom to avoid damaging or losing the probe.
Figure C-4. Hell Hole Reservoir (HH-1, HH-2, HH-3)Dissolved Oxygen Profiles for the Spring and Fall Sampling Events. ,

(H) чıdəa
*It $w$ as difficult to measure to the bottom of the reservoir because submerged rocks or trees are located near the bottom of the reservoir. Measurements may not have been taken at the bottom to avoid damaging or losing the probe.
Figure C-5. French Meadows Reservoir (FMH-1, FM-2, FMH-3) Temperature Profiles for the Spring and Fall Sampling Events.


*It $w$ as difficult to measure to the bottom of the reservoir because submerged rocks or trees are located near the bottom of the reservoir. Measurements may not have been taken at the bottom to avoid damaging or losing the probe.
Figure C-6. French Meadows Reservoir (FMH-1, FM-2, FMH-3) Dissolved Oxygen Profiles for the Spring and Fall Sampling Events.

*It w as difficult to measure to the bottom of the reservoir because submerged rocks or trees are located near the bottom of the reservoir. Measurements may not have been taken at the bottom to avoid damaging or losing the probe.

## APPENDIX D

## Quality Assurance/Quality Control Laboratory Review

Table D-1. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Review of Spring 2007 Sample Laboratory Analyses.

Table D-1. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Review of Spring 2007 Sample Laboratory Analyses (continued).

| ReportiD | TA: MQE0964 | BR: 078R0714 and 078R0741 | TA: MQE0868 | TA:MQE0992 | \|BR: 078R0763 and 078R0771 | TA:MQE0980 | TA: MQF0012 | BR: 078R1155 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Locations | $\mathrm{HH}-1,2$, and $3, \mathrm{HH}-1(\mathrm{~S}), 2(\mathrm{~S})$, and 3(S) | MFAR-1 RM51.6 MFAR-2 RM46.6, MFAR-7 RM26.1, DC-1 RM8.9, DC-2 RM8.8, RR-1 RM35.9, RR-2 RM30.2, RR-4 RM22.5, RR-2A, RR-2B, RR2EC, RR-2DEC, HH-1, HH-2, HH-3, HH-1(S), HH-1(S), HH-3(S), SFRR-1 RM0. 2 | RR-3 RM22.8, RR-4 RM22.5, SFRR- 1 RM0. | RR-1 RM35.9, HH-2 | RA-1, RA-1 (S), FM-1, FM-2, FM- 3, FM-1 (S), FM-2(S), FM-3(S) | RA-1, RA-1(S) | FM-1, $\mathrm{FM}-2$, FM-3, $\mathrm{FM}-1(\mathrm{~S}), \mathrm{FM}-2(\mathrm{~S})$, $\mathrm{FM}-3(\mathrm{~S})$ | , FM-A, B, C, D, and E |
| Date Sampled | 5/22/2007 | 5/22/07, 5/23/07, 5/24/07 | 5/23/2007 | 5/24/2007 | 5/29907, 5/3107 | 5/29/2007 | 5/31/2007 | 81712007 |
| Analysis | General Parameters and Hydrocarbons | Metals (Dissolved and Total) | General Parameters | General Parameters and Hydrocarbons | Metals (Dissolved and Total) | General Parameters and Hydrocarbons | General Parameters and Hydrocarbons | Metals (Dissolved and Total) |
| Do all samples match COC? | No: VOAs (TPH and MtBE) of HH-2 were not received. VOAs for $\mathrm{HH}-2$ were collected at a later date | No: RR-4 RM22.5 was mislabeled with the wrong RM, sample date and time were confirmed for correct sample. Sample dates were accidentally omitted on the COC for $5 / 23 / 07$, relinquished date on COC and sample bottled confirmed sample date. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Is sample ID consistent throughout report? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Were all sample holding times met? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Were there any quality control data issues? | Yes <br> M2: TKN for all samples <br> M8: Calcium for $\mathrm{HH}-1, \mathrm{HH}-2, \mathrm{HH}-3$, HH-2(S), HH-3(S) <br> M8: Hardness for $\mathrm{HH}-1, \mathrm{HH}-2, \mathrm{HH}-3$, HH-2(S), HH-3(S) <br> M7: Hardness for $\mathrm{HH}-1(\mathrm{~S})$ <br> R2: Oil and grease for all samples | No | Yes <br> L: Potassium for all samples <br> R2: TDS for all samples | Yes <br> M2: TKN for RR-1 <br> M7: Hardness for RR-1 | No | Yes <br> M2: TKN for all samples R2: TDS for all samples M7: Hardness for all samples M8: Chloride and Sulfate for all samples | Yes <br> M2: Ammonia for FM-1, FM-2, FM-3, FM-1(S), FM-2(S) <br> M8: Sulfate and Chloride for all samples | Yes BR1: Calcium for all samples |
| Were there any quality control data issues that potentially effect the sample result? | Yes <br> MNR1: Oil and grease for all samples | No | YesL1: TDS for RR-3 RM22.8, RR-4 <br> RM22.5 | No | No | YesMNR1: Oil and Grease for all <br> samples | Yes <br> MHA: MtBE for FM-2, FM-3, FM-1(S), FM-2(S), FM-3(S) MNR1: Oil and grease for all samples $\mathrm{pH}:$ TOC for $\mathrm{FM}-3(\mathrm{~S})$ | No |

[^4]| Table D-2. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Review of Fall 2007 Sample Laboratory Analyses. |
| :--- |
| \|TA: ${ }^{\text {TA }}$. MQ10774 |


| Reportid | TA: MQ010723 | TA: MQ10774 | BR: $078 \mathrm{BR1361}$ | TA: MQ10807 | BR: 078R1389 and 07BR1397 | TA: MQJ0097 | TA: MQJ0128 | FM-1 (S) <br> MNR: Ammonia for $\mathrm{FM}-1$ and | BR: 078 R 1399 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Locations | MFAR-5 FM36.3, MFAR-6 RM35.5, MFAR-10 RM9.1, IR-1 RM35.7 | RR-3 RM22.8, RR-4 RM22.5, SFRR-1 RM 0.2, NFAR-1 RM20.6, MFAR-11 RMO.1, DC1 RM 8.9, DC-2 RM8. 8 | MFAR-7 RM26.1, MFAR-8 RM24.7. MFAR9 RM24.3. MFAR10 RM9.1, MFAR-11 RM0.1, NFAR-1 RM20.6. RR-3 RM22.8, RR-4 RM22.5, RR-7 RM0.7 SFRR-1 RM0.2, DC-1 RM8.9, DC 2 RM8.8, RA-1, RA-1(S) | RA-1, RA-1(S); MFAR-7 RM26.1, MFAR-8 RM24.7 MFAR-9 RM24.3; RR-5 RM3.8, RR-6 RM3.5, RR-7 RM0. 7 LCC-2 RMO. 3 | LCC-2 RM0.3, RR-5 RM3.8, RR-6 RM3.5, HH-1, HH-2, HH1(S), HH-2(S) | HH-1, HH1(S), HH-2, HH-2(S) | RR-1 RM35.9, HH-3. HH-3(S), NFLC-1 RM3.2. NFLC-2 RM2.9, NFLC-3 RMO.3, SFLC- 1 RM3 4. SFLCLC-3 RMO.2. RM3.1, LCC-1 RM11.3 | FM-1, FM-2, FM-3, FM-1(S), FM-2(S), FM-3(S), MFAR-1 RM51.6, MFAR-2 RM46.6, RR2 RM30.2 | MFAR-1 RM51.6, MFAR-2 RM46.6, RR-1 RM35.9, RR-2 RM30.2, LCC-1 RM11.3, NFLC-1 RM3.1, NFLC-2 RM2.9, NFLC-3 RM0.3, SFLC-1 RM3.4, SFLC-2 RM3.1, SFLC-3 RM0.2, HH-3, HH 3(S), FM-1, FM-2, and FM-3, FM1(S), FM1-2(S), FM-3(S) |
| Date Sampled | 9/24/2007 | 9/25/2007 | 9/24/2007-9/26/2007 | 9/26/2007-9/27/2007 | 9/27/07 and 101/107 | 10/1/2001 | 10/2/2007 | 10/3/2007 | 10/2/07-10/3/07 |
| Analysis | General Parameters | General Parameters | Metals (Dissolved and Total) | General Parameters and Hydrocarbons | Metals (Dissolved and Total) | General Parameters and Hydrocarbons | General Parameters and Hydrocarbons | General Parameters and Hydrocarbons | Metals (Dissolved and Total) |
| Do all samples match COC? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Is sample ID consistent throughout report? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Were all sample holding times met? | No, TDS at IR-1 RM35.7 was sampled on the 9th day. Holding times are only 7 days. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Were there any quality control data issues? | Yes | Yes | No | Yes <br> R: TDS for RA-1 and RA-1(S), MFAR-7 RM26.1, MFAR-8 RM24.7, RR-5 RM3.8, RM-6 RM3.5, and RM-7 RM0.7, LCC2 RMO. 3 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | M1: TOC at MFAR-5 RM36.3 | L: Phosphorus for all samples |  |  | BR2: Fe for all samples | R2: TDS for all samples | R2: TDS for all samples | R2: TDS for all samples | BR2: Fe for all samples |
|  | R2: TDS at R-1 RM 35.7 | R:TDS for all samples |  | R2: TDS for MFAR-9 RM24.3 | BR3: Fe for LCC-2 RMO.3 | M8: Chloride for all samples <br> M8: TKN for all samples | M8: Chloride for $\mathrm{HH}-3, \mathrm{HH}-$ 3(S), NFLC-1 RM3.1, NFLC-2 RM2.9, NFLC-3 RM0.3, SFLC1 RM3.4, SFLC-2 RM3.1, SFLC-3 RM0.2, LCC-1 RM11.3 M8: TKN for all samples | R2: Ammonia for FM-2, FM-3, FM-2(S), FM-3(S), MFAR-1 RM51.6, MFAR-2 RM 46.6, RR2 RM30.2 |  |
|  | M8: for Ortho-Phosphate at all locations <br> M7: Nitrate/Nitrite, Chloride and Sulfate at all locations | M8: Sulfate and Chloride for RR-4 RM22.5, SFRR-1 RM0.2, NFAR-1 RM20.6, MFAR-11 RM0.1, DC-1 RM8.9, DC-2 RM8.8 <br> R2: TKN for RR-3 RM22.8, RR4 RM22.5, SFRR-1 RM0.2, NFAR-1 RM20.6, MFAR-11 RM0.1, DC-1 RM8.9 |  | M7: Hardness for all samples M8, R2: TKN for all samples |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R2: Nitrite/Nitrate at al locations <br> R2: TKN for all locations | R2, M2, R8: TKN for DC-2 RM8.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Where there any quality control data issues that potentially effect the sample result? | No | No | Yes | No | No |  |  | Yes | No |
|  |  |  | BR4: Mn for RR-4 RM22.5 |  |  | MNR1: Oil and Grease for all samples | MHA: Chloride for RR-1 | MNR: Ammonia for FM-1 and FM-1(S) |  |

[^5]Table D-3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Review of Additional Sampling below Project Reservoir Laboratory Analyses.

| Report ID | BR: 07BR0714 | BR: 07BR1155 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sample Locations | RR-2A, RR-2EC, RR-2DEC | FM-A, FM-B, FM-C, FM-D, and FM-E |
| Date Sampled | $5 / 22 / 2007$ | $8 / 7 / 2007$ |
| Analysis | Metals (Dissolved and Total) | Metals (Dissolved and Total) |
| Do all samples match COC? | Yes | Yes |
| Is sample ID consistent <br> throughout report? | Yes | Yes |
| Were all sample holding times <br> met? | Yes | Yes |
| Were there any quality control <br> data issues? | No | BR1: Calcium for all samples |
| Were there any quality control <br> data issues that potentially effect <br> the sample result? | No | Yes |

TA: Test America Laboratory
BR: Brooks Rand Laboratory
BR1: Method blank in trace metals batch \#07-0863 produced results that were greater than the PQL. These blank results were omitted as Grubb's outliers and were not used to method correct the results. All results from these batches were blank-corrected with the average of the three remaining method blanks.
Table D-4. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Review of Fish Tissue Sampling of Methyl Mercury Laboratory Analyses.

| Report ID | BR: 07BR1337 | BR: 07BR1353 | BR: 07BR1467 | BR: 07BR1438 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Locations | FM-2B-2B-3, FM-2C-BT-1, HH-3B-BT-1, FM-3D-RT-2, FM-2F-RT-1, RA-3A-SPM-20, RA-3A-SPM-21, RA 2B-SPM-8, RA-2B-SPM-7, RA-1D-SPM-4, RA-3B-BT-7, RA-2B-BT-6, RA-2A-BT-14, RA-2A-BT-7, RA-3B-RT-19, FM-1E-RT-1 | HH-BT-1, FM-BT-1 | I-U2-BNT-1, OC-RBT-1 | HH-1-US2-RBT-1, HH-1-MIDL-LT-1, HH-1-US1-LT-1, HH-1-MID3-LT-1, HH-1-MID1-BNT-3, HH-1-MID1-BNT-3, HH-1-DS-1-BNT-2, HH-1-US2-BNT-2, HH-1-US2-BNT-3, I-US2-RBT-5, I-LT-RBT-1, I-US1-RBT-1, I-US1-BNT-2, I-US2-BNT-2, I-US2-BNT-3, I-US1-BNT-3, I-US-1-BNT1, OC-1-RBT-1, OC-1-RBT-2, OC-1-RBT 3, OC-1-RBT-4, OC-1-RBT-5, OC-1-RBT 6, OC-1-RBT-7, OC-1-RBT-8, OC-1-BNT |
| Date Sampled | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9/11/2007, 9/12/2007, 9/13/2007, } \\ & \text { 9/14/2007 } \end{aligned}$ | 9/11/2007, 9/12/2007 | 9/21/2007, 10/16/2007 | 9/21/2007, 10/2/2007, 10/11/2007 |
| Analysis | Methyl Mercury | Methyl Mercury | Methyl Mercury | Methyl Mercury |
| Do all samples match COC? | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OC-RBT-1: sample time was } \\ & \text { not entered on COC, field } \\ & \text { notes indicate fish was caught } \\ & \text { at 14:00 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OC-1-BNT-1: sample date was wrong on } \\ & \text { COC (10/2/2007), fish was caught on } \\ & \text { 10/9/2007, field notes confirmed with fish } \\ & \text { ID and sample time. } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  | OC-1-RBT-7: sample date was wrong on COC (10/2/2007), fish was caught on 10/9/2007, field notes confirmed with fish ID and sample time. |
|  |  |  |  | OC-1-RBT-8: sample date was wrong on COC (10/2/2007), fish was caught on 10/9/2007, field notes confirmed with fish ID and sample time |
| Is sample ID consistent throughout report? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Were all sample holding times met? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Were there any quality control data issues? | No | No | No | No |
| Were there any quality control data issues that potentially effect the sample result? | No | No | No | No |

BR: Brooks Rand Laboratory

## APPENDIX E

Flows within the Leakage Channels below French Meadows Dam and Hell Hole Dam

Figure E-1. Flows in Leakage Channels below French Meadows Dam with Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations (a), at Reservoir Elevation 5,220 feet (b), and at Reservoir Elevation 5,250 feet. ${ }^{1}$


Note: FM-A was collected from Weir 5; FM-B was collected from Weir 4; and FM-C was collected from Weir 3.
${ }^{1}$ Figures are from PCWA (2008).

Figure E-1. Flows in Leakage Channels below French Meadows Dam with Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations (a), at Reservoir Elevation 5,220 feet (b), and at Reservoir Elevation 5,250 feet (continued).


Figure E-1. Flows in Leakage Channels below French Meadows Dam with Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations (a), at Reservoir Elevation 5,220 feet (b), and at Reservoir Elevation 5,250 feet (continued).


Figure E-2. Flows in Leakage Channel below Hell Hole Dam with Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1978 to 1985 (a), Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1986 to 1995 (b), Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1996 to 2007 (c), and at Reservoir Elevations 4,580 and 4,540 feet (d).


Figure E-2. Flows in Leakage Channel below Hell Hole Dam with Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1978 to 1985 (a), Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1986 to 1995 (b), Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1996 to 2007 (c), and at Reservoir Elevations 4,580 and 4,540 feet (d) (continued).


Figure E-2. Flows in Leakage Channel below Hell Hole Dam with Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1978 to 1985 (a), Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1986 to 1995 (b), Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1996 to 2007 (c), and at Reservoir Elevations 4,580 and 4,540 feet (d) (continued).


Figure E-2. Flows in Leakage Channel below Hell Hole Dam with Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1978 to 1985 (a), Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1986 to 1995 (b), Changes in Reservoir Water Surface Elevations 1996 to 2007 (c), and at Reservoir Elevations 4,580 and 4,540 feet (d) (continued).
d HELL HOLE DAM WEIR SEEPAGE DATA - 1978 through 2007
Note: Weir replaced 8/24/06


## Attachment F(b)

## ARPS Title 22 Water Quality Sampling Results 2010-2012


System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL $\quad$ System Number: 3110025
Name or Number of Sample Source: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

| User ID: BUG |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Date/Time of Sample: | $\frac{112\|08\| 28\|15\| 00}{Y Y}$ |
|  | Station Number: $3110025-010$ |
| Submitted By: Weck Laboratories, Inc | Laboratory Code: 9588 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TEST } \\ & \text { METHOD } \end{aligned}$ | CHEMICAL | Units | ENTRY <br> \# | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL | DLR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -[INORGANG CHEMICALS] |  |  |  | , | DLR |
|  | Odor Threshold at 60 C (TON) | TON | 00086 | 1.0 | 3 | 1 |

Laboratory Comments and Description of Additional Components Found (Comments in this section are for Client Information only and will NOT be transmitted to CDPH via EDT):
American River RW (3110025-010) :

# North Coast Laboratories, LTD. <br> 5680 West End Road <br> Arcata, CA 95521 <br> GENERAL MINERAL \& PHYSICAL \& INORGANIC ANALYSIS (9/99) 

L of Report: 10/15/2012
Laboratory Name:NORTH COAST LABS
Name of Sampler:COLLIN MCSORLEY
Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/16/2012 7:25:00 AM

Sample ID No. 1208289/0
Signature Lab Director: $\qquad$
Employed by:PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Date Sample Received: 8/17/2012 Data Analysis Completed: 10/11/2012

System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

System number: 3110025

Station number: 3110025-010
Laboratory Code: 3334
Data Analysis Completed: 10/11/2012 Phone:
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| MCL | REPORTING UNITS | CHEMICAL | $\begin{gathered} \text { ENTRY } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | DLR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Total Hardness (as CaCO3) (mg/L) | 00900 | 14 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Calcium ( Ca ) (mg/L) | 00916 | 4.2 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Magnesium (Mg) (mg/L) | 00927. | 0.93 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Sodium ( Na ) (mg/L) | 00929 | 1.6 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Potassium (K) (mg/L) | 00937 | $<2.0$ |  |
|  | Total Cations | Meq/L Value: |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Total Alkalinity (AS CaCO3) (mg/L) | 00410 | 36 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Hydroxide ( OH ) (mg/L) | 71830 | $<1.0$ |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Carbonate (CO3) (mg/L) | 00445 | $<1.0$ |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Bicarbonate ( HCO ) ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) | 00440 | 36 |  |
| * | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}+$ | Sulfate (SO4) (mg/L) | 00945 | 1.4 | . 500 |
| * | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}+$ | Chloride (Cl) (mg/L) | 00940 | 1.1 |  |
| - 45 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Nitrate (as NO3) (mg/L) | 71850 | ND | 2.000 |
| 2 | . $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Fluoride (F) (Natural-Source) | 00951 | ND | . 100 |
|  | Total Anions | Meq/L Value: |  |  |  |
|  | Std.Units | PH (Laboratory) (Std.Units) | 00403 | 7.7 |  |
| *** | umho/cm+ | Specific Conductance (E.C.) (umhos/cm) | 00095 | 39 |  |
| **** | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}+$ | Total Filterable Residue@180C(TDS)(mg/L) | 70300 | 27 |  |
| 15 | Units | Apparent Color (Unfiltered) (Units) | 00081 | 3.0 |  |
| 3 | TON | Odor Threshold at 60 C (TON) | 00086 |  | 1. |
| 5 | NTU | Lab Turbidity (NTU) | 82079 | 0.37 |  |
| ). 5 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}+$ | MBAS ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) | 38260 | $<0.050$ |  |



## BSK Associates

| ite of Re <br> Laboratory <br> Name of S | Name: $12\|09\| 0$ <br> BSK  <br> Nampler:  | ratories | Sample ID <br> Signature | : A2H1893-07 <br> Director: $R$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date/Time Sample |  | Date/Time Sample |  |  |  |  |
| Collected: | 12108\|1610725 | Received @ Lab : | 12108\|2111030 | Completed: 12\|08|28 |  |  |
| System Na | PLACER CWA - Fo |  |  |  | System Number: 311 |  |
| Name or Number of Sample Source: |  | AMERICAN RIVER - RAW |  |  |  |  |
| User ID: BUG Station Number: 3110025-010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date/Time | of Sample: | 08/16\|0725 |  | Laboratory Code: 5810 |  | 5810 |
| Submitted by: BSK Associates |  |  |  | Date Analyses Completed: 12108/28 |  |  |
| Phone \#: 559-497-2888 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MCL | REPORTING | CHEMLCAL |  | ENFRY | ANALYSES | - LR $^{\text {- }}$ |
|  | UNITS |  |  | \# | RESULTS |  |
| ADDITIONAL ANALYSES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 150 | ug/L |  |  | 01291 | ND | 100 |

## BSK Associates

| Ite of Report: 12,09/06,0906 |  |  | Sample ID No.: A2H1893-08 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Laboratory Name: BSK Analytical Laboratories |  |  | Signature Lab Director: |  |  |  |
| Date/Time Sample |  | Date/Time Sample | Date Analyses |  |  |  |
| Collected: | 12108/1610725 | Received @ Lab : | 12\|08|21/1030 | 12108\|23 |  |  |
| System Name: PLACER CWA - FO |  |  |  | System Number: 3110 |  |  |
| Name or Number of Sample Source: |  | AMERICAN RIVER - RAW |  |  |  |  |
| User ID: BUG |  |  |  | Station Number: 3110025-010 |  |  |
| Date/Time of Sample: |  | 12\|08|16|0725 |  | Laboratory Code: 5810 |  |  |
| Submitted by: BSK Associates |  |  |  | Date Analyses Completed: 12108 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Phone \#: 559-497-2888 |  |  |
| MCL | REPORTING | CHEM |  | ENT-RY | ANALYSES | -BLR |
|  | UNITS |  |  | \# | RESULTS |  |
| 2200 | umho/cm | uctance (E.C.) (umho |  | 00095 | 39 |  |



L. ratory Comments and Description of Additional Components Found (Comments in this section are for Client Information only and will NOT be transmitted to CDPH via EDT):
American River RW (3110025-010) :

Weck Laboratories, Inc.
Analytical Laboratory Service - Since 1964


System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
System Number: 3110025
Name or Number of Sample Source: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

| User ID: BUG |  | Station Number: $3110025-010$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date/Time of Sample: $\downarrow 11 / 08\|17\| 13 \mid 55$ |  | Laboratory Code: 9588 |  |  |  |  |
| Submitted By: Weck Laboratories, Inc |  | Date of Analyses Completed: $\frac{1.11\|08\| 18 \mid}{\mathrm{YY} \text { MM DD }}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Phone \#: (626) 336-2139 |  |  |  |  |
| TEST METHOD | CHEMICAL | Units | $\begin{gathered} \text { ENTRY } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL | DLR |
|  | --[INORGANIC CHEMICALS] <br> Odor Threshold at 60 C (TON) | TON | 00086 | 1 | 3 | 1 |

Li ratory Comments and Description of Additional Components Found (Comments in this section are for Client Information only and will NOT be transmitted to CDPH via EDT):
American River TX (3110025-010) :
of Report: 8/18/2011
Laboratory Name: NORTH COAST LABS
Name of Sampler: Cody Coleman
Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/2/2011 10:50:00

Sample ID No. 1108076\%01
Signature Lab Director: + Employed by:PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Date Sample Received: 8/3/2011 Data Analysis Completed: 8/15/2011

System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

| User ID: BUG | Station number: 3110025-010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/2/2011 10:50:00 | Laboratory Code: 3334 |
| Submitted by: | Data Analysis Completed: 8/15/2011 |
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INORGANIC CHEMICALS
1108076/01

| , MCL | REPORTING UNITS | CHEMICAL | ENTRY \# | ANALYSES RESULTS | DLR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1000 | ug/L | Aluminum (Al) (ug/L) | 01105 | ND | 50.000 |
| 6 | ug/L | Antimony (ug/L) | 01097 | ND | 6.000 |
| 10 | ug/L | Arsenic (As) (ug/L) | 01002 | ND | 2.000 |
| 1000 | ug/L | Barium (Ba) (ug/L) | 01007 | ND | 100.000 |
| 4 | ug/L | Beryllium (ug/L) | 01012 | ND | 1.000 |
| 5 | ug/L | Cadmium ( Cd ) (ug/L) | 01.027 | ND | 1.000 |
| 50 | ug/L | Chromium (Total Cr) (ug/L) | 01034 | ND | 10.000 |
| 1000 | ug/L+ | Copper ( Cu ) (ug/L) | 01042 | ND | 50.000 |
| 300 | ug/L+ | Iron (Fe) (ug/L) | 01045 | ND | 100.000 |
|  | ug/L | Lead ( Pb ) (ug/L) | 01051 | ND | 5.000 |
| 50 | ug/L+ | Manganese (Mn) (ug/L) | 01055 | ND | 20.000 |
| 2 | $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ | Mercury ( Hg ) (ug/L) | 71900 | ND | 1.0 |
| 100 | ug/L | Nickel (ug/L) | 01067 | ND | 10.000 |
| 50 | ug/L | Selenium (Se) (ug/L) | 01147 | ND | 5.000 |
| 100 | ug/L+ | S Silver (Ag) (ug/L) | 01077 | ND | 10.000 |
| 2 | ug/L | Thallium ( $u \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ ) | 01059 | ND | 1.000 |
| 5000 | ug/L | Zinc (Zn) (ug/L) | 01092 | ND | 50.000 |
| ADDITIONAL ANALYSES |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Langelier Index Source Temp. | 71814 | -1.8 |  |
| 000 | ug/L | Nitrate + Nitrite as Nitrogen(N) (ug/L) | A-029 | ND | 400 |
| 1000 | $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ | Nitrite as Nitrogen( N ) ( $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ ) | 00620 | ND | 400 |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Total Organic Carbon (TOC) (mg/L) | 00680 | 0.87 | 0.300 |

## E.S.BABCOCK\&Sons,inc.

Environmental Laboratories est 1906

GENERAL MINERAL \& PHYSICAL \& INORGANIC ANALYSIS (9/99)

Date of Report: 11/08/17
Laboratory
Name:
E.S. Babcock \& Sons, Inc.

Name of Sampler: Cody Coleman
Date/Time Sample Date/Time Sample
Collected: $11 / 08 / 02$ 10:50 Received @ Lab:

Sample ID No. A1H0948-02
Project
Manager:
Hsin-Yi Lee
Empioyed By: Placer CWA - Foothill Date Analyses
11/08/09 09:00 Completed: 11/08/16

System
PLACER CWA - FO
System
Name:
Number: 3110025
Name or Number of Sample Source: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW



## E.S.BABCOCK\&Sons,Ine.

Environmental Laboratories ast 1006

GENERAL MINERAL \& PHYSICAL \& INORGANIC ANALYSIS (9/99)

Date of Report: 11/08/17
Laboratory
Name:
E.S. Babcock \& Sons, Inc.

Name of Sampler: Cody Coleman
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Date/Time Sample } & & \text { Date/Time Sample } \\ \text { Collected: } & 11 / 08 / 0210: 50 & \text { Received @ Lab: }\end{array}$

Sample ID No. A1H0948-03
Project
Manager:
Hsin-Yi Lee
Employed By: Placer CWA - Foothill Date Analyses
11/08/09 09:00 Completed: 11/08/16

System
Name: PLACER CWA - FO
System
Name or Number of Sample Source: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW


Date of Report: 11/06/01
L. . Jratory Name: Weck Laboratories, Inc

Name of Sampler: Tom Baehr

Sample ID No.: 1E25002-02
Signature Lab Director:


Date Analyses Completed: 11/05/25

| Date/Time Sample | Date/Time Sample |
| :--- | :--- |
| Collected: $11 / 05 / 241345$ | Received @ Lab: 11/05/25 1000 |

System Number: 3110025
Name or Number of Sample Source: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

| User ID: BUG |  | Station Number: 3110025-010 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date/Time of Sample: $\frac{\perp 11\|05\| 24\|13\| 45}{\text { YY MM DD TT TT }}$ |  | Laboratory Code: 9588 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Submitted By: Weck Laboratories, Inc |  | Date of Analyses Completed: $\frac{\|11\| 05\|25\|}{\mathrm{YY} \text { MM DD }}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Phone \#: (626) 336-2139 |  |  |  |  |
| TEST METHOD | CHEMICAL | Units | $\begin{gathered} \text { ENTRY } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL | DLR |
|  | --[INORGANIC CHEMICALS]--- <br> Odor Threshold at 60 C (TON) | TON | 00086 | 1.0 | 3 | 1 |

Liauratory Comments and Description of Additional Components Found (Comments in this section are for Client Information only and will NOT be transmitted to CDPH via EDT):
American River TX (3110025-010) :

Date of Report: 11/02/28
L. Juratory Name: Week Laboratories, Inc

Name of Sampler: Ken Yuk


Date/Time Sample
Received @ Lab: 11/02/17 0915

Sample ID No.: 1B17001-02
Signature Lab
Director: $\qquad$
Date Analyses
Completed: 11/02/17

System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
System Number: 3110025
Name or Number of Sample Source: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

| User ID: BUG <br> Date/Time of Sample: $\frac{111\|02\| 16\|15\| 35}{\text { MY MM DD TY TM }}$ |
| :--- |

Li....uratory Comments and Description of Additional Components Found (Comments in this section are for Client Information only and will NOT be transmitted to CDPH via EDT):
American River RW (3110025-010) :
[] of Report: 2/28/2011
Laboratory Name:NORTH COAST LABS

Name of Sampler:Tom Baehr
Date/Time Sample Collected: 2/15/2011 08:40:00

Sample ID No. 1102293
Signature Lab Director: $\qquad$ Employed by:PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Date Sample Received: 2/16/2011 Data Analysis Completed: 2/25/2011

System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

System number:3110025

Station number: 3110025-010
Laboratory Code: 3334
Data Analysis Completed: 2/25/2011
Phone:
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| MCL | REPORTING UNITS | CHEMICAL | ENTRY \# | ANALYSES RESULTS | DLR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Total Hardness (as CaCO3) (mg/L) | 00900 |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Calcium (Ca) (mg/L) | 00916 |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Magnesium (Mg) (mg/L) | 00927 |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Sodium ( Na ) ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) | 00929 |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Potassium (K) (mg/L) | 00937 |  |  |
|  | Total Cations | Meq/L Value: |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Total Alkalinity (AS CaCO3) (mg/L) | 00410 | 48 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Hydroxide ( OH ) (mg/L) | 71830 |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Carbonate (CO3) (mg/L) | 00445 |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Bicarbonate ( HCO ) ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) | 00440 |  |  |
| * | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}+$ | Sulfate (SO4) (mg/L) | 00945 |  | . 500 |
| * | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}+$ | Chloride (Cl) (mg/L) | 00940 |  |  |
| 45 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Nitrate (as NO3) (mg/L) | 71850 |  | 2.000 |
| 2 | . mg/L | Fluoride (F) (Natural-Source) | 00951 |  | . 100 |
|  | Total Anions | Meq/L Value: |  |  |  |
|  | Std.Units | PH (Laboratory) (Std.Units) | 00403 |  |  |
| *** | umho/cm+ | Specific Conductance (E.C.) (umhos/cm) | 00095 |  |  |
| **** | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}+$ | Total Filterable Residue@180C(TDS)(mg/L) | 70300 |  |  |
| 15 | Units | Apparent Color (Unfiltered) (Units) | 00081 |  |  |
| 3 | TON | Odor Threshold at 60 C (TON) | 00086 |  | 1. |
| 5 | NTU | Lab Turbidity (NTU) | 82079 |  |  |
| . 5 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}+$ | MBAS (mg/L) | 38260 |  |  |

* 250-500-600 ** 0.6-1.7 *** 900-1600-2200 **** 500-1000-1500

| MCL | REPORTING <br> UNITS | CHEMICAL | ENTRY <br> $\#$ | ANALYSES <br> RESULTS | DLR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1000 | $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ | Aluminum (Al) (ug/L) | 01105 | ND | 50.000 |
|  | ADDITIONAL ANALYSES |  |  |  |  |

## GENERAL MINERAL \& PHYSICAL \& INORGANIC ANALYSIS (9/99)

r. ff Report: 12/27/2010

Laboratory Name: NORTH COAST LABS
Name of Sampler: Ken Punk
Date/Time Sample Collected: 12/14/2010 12:10:00 PM

Sample ID No. 1012370/05
Signature Lab Director: T. Sherman for JGC

System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

| User ID: BUG | Station number: $3110025-010$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date/Time Sample Collected: $12 / 14 / 201012: 10: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ | Laboratory Code: 3334 |
| Submitted by: | Data Analysis Completed: 12/17/2010 |

Page 1 of 1 INORGANIC CHEMICALS

| MCL | REPORTING <br> UNITS | CHEMICAL | ENTRY <br> $\#$ | ANALYSES <br> RESULTS | DLR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1000 | $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ | Aluminum (AI) (ug/L) | 01105 | 65 | 50.000 |

Weck Laboratories, Inc.


System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
System Number: 3110025
Name or Number of Sample Source: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

| User ID: BUG | Station Number: 3110025-010 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Date/Time of Sample: $\frac{\|10\| 11\|23\| 12 \mid 50}{\mathrm{YY} \text { MM DD TT TT }}$ | Laboratory Code: 9588 |
| Submitted By: Weck Laboratories, Inc | Date of Analyses Completed: $\frac{\|10-\|-1\|\| 30 \mid}{Y Y \text { MM DD }}$ Phone \#: (626) $336-2139$ |


| TEST METHOD | CHEMICAL | Units | $\begin{gathered} \text { ENTRY } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL | DLR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | --[INORGANIC CHEMICALS] Odor Threshold at 60 C (TON) | TON | 00086 | 6.0 | 3 | 1 |

oratory Comments and Description of Additional Components Found (Comments in this section are for Client Information only and will NOT be transmitted to CDPH via EDT):
American River TX (3110025-010) :

# North Coast Laboratories, LTD. 

## GENERAL MINERAL \& PHYSICAL \& INORGANIC ANALYSIS (9/99)

r. Jf Report: 10/1/2010

Laboratory Name: NORTH COAST LABS
Name of Sampler:Ken Yunk
Date/Time Sample Collected: 9/28/2010 11:45:00

Sample ID No. 1009521/01
Signature Lab Director: $\qquad$

Employed by:PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Date Sample Received: 9/29/2010 Data Analysis Completed: 9/30/2010

System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
System number: 3110025
Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

| User ID: BUG | Station number: 3110025-010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date/Time Sample Collected: 9/28/2010 11:45:00 | Laboratory Code: 3334 |
| Submitted by: | Data Analysis Completed: 9/30/2010 |
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| MCL | REPORTING <br> UNITS | CHEMICAL | ENTRY <br> $\#$ | ANALYSES <br> RESULTS | DLR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1000 | $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ | Aluminum (AI) (ug/L) | 01105 | ND | 50.000 |



System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
System Number: 3110025
Name or Number of Sample Source: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

| User ID: BUG | Station Number: 3110025-010 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Date/Time of Sample: $110\|08\| 26\|13\| 20$ | Laboratory Code: 9588 |
| YY MM DD TT T'T |  |
| Date of Analyses Completed: $\frac{1101-081271}{}$ |  |
| Submitted By: Weck Laboratories, Inc | Phone \#: (626) 336-2139 |


| TEST METHOD | CHEMICAL | Units | $\begin{gathered} \text { ENTRY } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL | DLR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | --[INORGANIC CHEMICALS]Odor Threshold at 60 C (TON) | TON | 00086 | 1.0 | 3 | 1 |

ratory Comments and Description of Additional Components Found (Comments in this section are for Client Information only and will NOT be transmitted to CDPH via EDT):
American River (3110025-010) :

# GENERAL MINERAL \& PHYSICAL \& INORGANIC ANALYSIS (9/99) 

[. If Report: 8/31/2010
Laboratory Name: NORTH COAST LABS
Name of Sampler: Ken Punk
Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/10/2010 08:20:00

Sample ID No. 1008201
Signature Lab Director: $\qquad$

Employed by:PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Date Sample Received: 8/11/2010 Data Analysis Completed: 8/20/2010

System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

System number: 3110025

| User ID: BUG | Station number: 3110025-010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date/Time Sample Collected: $8 / 10 / 2010$ 08:20:00 | Laboratory Code: 3334 |
| Submitted by: | Data Analysis Completed: 8/20/2010 |
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[^6]INORGANIC CHEMICALS
1008201

| MCL | REPORTING <br> UNITS | CHEMICAL | $\begin{gathered} \text { ENTRY } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | DLR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1000 | ug/L | Aluminum (Al) (ug/L) | 01105 | 94 | 50.000 |
| 6 | ug/L | Antimony (ug/L) | 01097 | ND | 6.000 |
| 10 | ug/L | Arsenic (As) (ug/L) | 01002 | ND | 2.000 |
| 1000 | ug/L | Barium (Ba) (ug/L) | 01007 | ND | 100.000 |
| 4 | ug/L | Berylium (ug/L) | 01012 | ND | 1.000 |
| 5 | ug/L | Cadmium (Cd) (ug/L) | 01027 | ND | 1.000 |
| 50 | ug/L | Chromium (Total Cr) (ug/L) | 01034 | ND | 10.000 |
| 1000 | ug/L+ | Copper (Cu) (ug/L) | 01042 | ND | 50.000 |
| 300 | ug/L+ | Iron ( Fe ) (ug/L) | 01045 | ND | 100.000 |
|  | ug/L | Lead (Pb) (ug/L) | 01051 | ND | 5.000 |
| 50 | ug/L+ | Manganese (Mn) (ug/L) | 01055 | ND | 20.000 |
| 2 | ug/L | Mercury ( Hg ) (ug/L) | 71900 | ND | 1.0 |
| 100 | ug/L | Nickel (ug/L) | 01067 | ND | 10.000 |
| 50 | ug/L | Selenium ( Se ) ( $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ ) | 01147 | ND | 5.000 |
| 100 | ug/L+ | Silver ( Ag ) (ug/L) | 01077 | ND | 10.000 |
| 2 | ug/L | Thallium (ug/L) | 01059 | ND | 1.000 |
| 5000 | ug/L | Zinc (Zn) (ug/L) | 01092 | ND | 50.000 |
| ADDITIONAL ANALYSES |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Langelier Index Source Temp. | 71814 | -1.7 |  |
| 300 | ug/L | Nitrate + Nitrite as Nitrogen(N) (ug/L) | A-029 | ND | 400 |
| 1000 | $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ | Nitrite as Nitrogen ( N ) ( $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ ) | 00620 | ND | 400 |
|  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Total Organic Carbon (TOC) (mg/L) | 00680 | 1.2 | 0.300 |

## BSK Analytical Laboratories

EDT


| MCL | REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UNITS | CHEMICAL | ENTRY | ANALYSES | DLR |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 150 | ug/L | Cyanide (ug/L) | ADDITIONAL ANALYSES | RESULTS |  |  |

- te of Report: 10|08|25|0907
.boratory Name: BSK Analytical Laboratories
Name of Sampler:

| Date/Time Sample |  | Date/Time Sample |  | Date Analyses |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Collected: | 10\|08|10|0820 | Received @ Lab : | 10\|08|13|1000 | Completed: | 10\|08|17 |
| System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL |  |  |  | System Number: | 3110025 |
| Name or Number of Sample Source: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW |  |  |  |  |  |



ADDITIONAL ANALYSES

| 6 | $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ | Perchlorate (ug/L) | A-031 | ND | 4.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

# North Coast Laboratories, LTD. <br> 5680 West End Road <br> Arcata, CA 95521 <br> ORGANIC CHEMICAL ANALYSIS (9/99) 

EDT

D If Report: 9/25/2012
Laboratory Name: NORTH COAST LABS
Name of Sampler: COLLIN MCSORLEY
Date/Time Sample Collected; 8/16/2012 7:25:00 AM

Sample ID No. 1208289/08
Signature Lab Director:
$\qquad$ (Thomas FOR TC Employed by:PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL Date Sample Received: 8/17/2012 Data Analysis Completed: 8/24/2012

System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

System number: 3110025

Station number: 3110025-010
Laboratory Code: 3334
Data Analysis Completed: 8/24/2012
Phone: $\qquad$

Page 1 of 3 . REGULATED ORGANIC CHEMICALS


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TEST } \\ & \text { METHOD } \end{aligned}$ | CHEMICAL ALL CHEMICALS REPORTED ug/L | $\underset{\#}{\text { ENTRY }}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL ug/L | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DLR } \\ & \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 324.2 | Trichlorofluoromethane (FREON 11) | 34488 | ND | 150 | 5.00 |
| 524.2 | Trichlorotrifluoroethane (FREON 113) | 81611 | ND | 1200 | 10.00 |
| 524.2 | Vinyl Chloride (VC) | 39175 | ND | . 5 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | m,p-Xylene | A-014 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | o-Xylene | 77135 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Total Xylenes ( $\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{p}$, \& o 0 ) | 81551 | ND | 1750 |  |
| 507 | Atrazine (AATREX) | 39033 | ND | 1 | . 50 |
| 507 | Molinate (ORDRAM) | 82199 | ND | 20 | 2.00 |
| 507 | Simazine (PRINCEP) | 39055 | ND | 4 | 1.00 |
| 507 | Thiobencarb (BOLERO) | A-001 | ND | 70 | 1.00 |
| 507 | Alachlor (ALANEX) | 77825 | ND | 2 | 1.00 |

UNREGULATED ORGANIC CHEMICALS


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TEST } \\ & \text { METHOD } \end{aligned}$ | CHEMICAL <br> ALL CHEMICALS REPORTED ug/L | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ENTRY } \\ & \# \end{aligned}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL ug/L | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DLR } \\ & \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.7 | Diazinon | 39570 | < 0.025 |  |  |
| 507 | Dimethoate (CYGON) | 38458 | < 0.050 |  |  |
| 507 | Metolachlor | 39356 | < 0.50 |  |  |
| 507 | Metribuzin | 81408 | < 0.25 |  |  |
| 507 | Prometryn (CAPAROL) | 39057 | ND |  | 2.00 |
| 507 | Propachlor | 38533 | ND |  | . 50 |

of Report: $9 / 25 / 2012$
Laboratory Name: NORTH COAST LABS
Name of Sampler: COLLIN MCSORLEY
Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/16/2012 7:25:00 AM

Sample ID No. 1208289/08
Signature Lab Director: $\qquad$ Aromas Yo r $T 6 \mathrm{C}$

Employed by:PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Date Sample Received: 8/17/2012 Data Analysis Completed: 8/24/2012
System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL System number:3110025

Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| User ID: BUG | Station number: $3110025-010$ |
| Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/16/2012 7:25:00 AM | Laboratory Code: 3334 |
| Submitted by: | Data Analysis Completed: 8/24/2012 |

Page 1 of 1

| TEST <br> METHOD | CHEMICAL <br> ALL CHEMICALS REPORTED ug/L | ENTRY <br> $\#$ | ANALYSES <br> RESULTS | MOL <br> $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ | DLR <br> $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 524.2 | cis-1,3-Dichioropropene (D-D) | 34704 | $<0.50$ | 0.5 |  |
| 524.2 | trans-1,3-Dichloropropene | 34699 | $<0.50$ | 0.5 |  |

# North Coast Laboratories, LTD. 5680 West End Road Arcata, CA 95521 

EDT
fif Report: 8/18/2011
Laboratory Name:NORTH COAST LABS
Name of Sampler:Cody Coleman
Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/2/2011 10:50:00
Employed by:PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Date Sample Received: 8/3/2011 Data Analysis Completed: 8/8/2011

System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

User ID: BUG
Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/2/2011 10:50:00
Submitted by:

System number: 3110025

Station number: 3110025-010
Laboratory Code: 3334
Data Analysis Completed: 8/8/2011 Phone: $\qquad$
REGULATED ORGANIC CHEMICALS

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TEST } \\ & \text { METHOD } \end{aligned}$ | CHEMICAL <br> ALL CHEMICALS REPORTED ug/L | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ENTRY } \\ & \# \end{aligned}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL ug/L | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DLR } \\ & \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 524.2 | Total Trihalomethanes (TTHMS) | 82080 | ND | 80 |  |
| 524.2 | Bromodichloromethane | 32101 | ND |  | 1.0 |
| 524.2 | Bromoform | 32104 | ND |  | 1.0 |
| 4.2 | Chloroform (Trichloromethane) | 32106 | ND |  | 1.0 |
| 524.2 | Dibromochloromethane | 32105 | ND |  | 1.0 |
| 524.2 | Benzene | 34030 | ND | 1 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Carbon Tetrachloride | 32102 | ND | . 5 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,2-Dichlorobenzene (o-DCB) | 34536 | ND | 600 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,4-Dichlorobenzene (p-DCB) | 34571 | ND | 5 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,1-Dichloroethane (1,1-DCA) | 34496 | ND | 5 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,2-Dichloroethane (1,2-DCA) | 34531 | ND | . 5 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,1-Dichloroethylene (1,1-DCE) | 34501 | ND | 6 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene ( $\mathrm{c}-1,2$-DCE) | 77093 | ND | 6 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene ( t -1,2-DCE) | 34546 | ND | 10 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Dichloromethane (Methylene Chloride) | 34423 | ND | 5 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,2-Dichloropropane | 34541 | ND | 5 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Total 1,3-Dichloropropene | 34561 | ND | . 5 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Ethyl Benzene | 34371 | ND | 300 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Methyl tert-Butyl Ether(MTBE) | 46491 | ND | 5 | 3.00 |
| 524.2 | Monochlorobenzene (ChJorobenzene) | 34301 | ND | 70 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Styrene | 77128 | ND | 100 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane | 34516 | ND | 1 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Tetrachloroethylene (PCE) | 34475 | ND | 5 | . 50 |
| `.2 | Toluene | 34010 | ND | 150 | . 50 |
| Ј 4.2 | 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene | 34551 | ND | 5 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,1,1-Trichloroethane ( $1,1,1$-TCA ) | 34506 | ND | 200 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,1,2-Trichloroethane ( $1,1,2-T C A$ ) | 34511 | ND | 5 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Trichloroethylene (TCE) NORTH COAST LABORATORIES | 39180 | ND | 5 | . 50 |

| 524.2 | tert-Amyl Methyl Ether (TAME) |  | A-034 |  | ND | 3.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 524.2 | Bromobenzene |  | 81555 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Bromochloromethane |  | A-012 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Bromomethane (Methyl Bromide) |  | 34413 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | tert-Butyl Alcohol (TBA) |  | 77035 | $<$ | 15 | 2.00 |
| 4.2 | n-Butylbenzene |  | A-010 |  | ND | . 50 |
| S24.2 | sec-Butylbenzene |  | 77350 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | tert-Butylbenzene |  | 77353 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Chloroethane |  | 34311 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Chloromethane (Methyl Chloride) |  | 34418 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 2-Chlorotoluene |  | A-008 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 4-Chlorotoluene |  | A-009 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Dibromomethane |  | 77596 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,3-Dichlorobenzene (m-DCB) |  | 34566 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12) |  | 34668 |  | ND | 0.50 |
| 524.2 | 1,3-Dichloropropane |  | 77173 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 2,2-Dichloropropane |  | 77170 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,1-Dichloropropene |  | 77168 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Diisopropyl Ether (DIPE) |  | A-036 |  | ND | 3.00 |
| 524.2 | Ethyl tert-Butyl Ether (ETBE) |  | A-033 |  | ND | 3.00 |
| 524.2 | Hexachlorobutadiene |  | 34391 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Isopropylbenzene (Cumene) |  | 77223 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | p-Isopropyltoluene |  | A-011 | $<$ | 0.50 |  |
| 524.2 | Naphthalene |  | 34696 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | n -Propylbenzene |  | 77224 |  | ND | . 50 |
| -74.2 | 1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane |  | 77562 |  | ND | . 50 |
| . 4.2 | 1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene |  | 77613 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,2,3-Trichloropropane |  | 77443 | $<$ | 0.50 | . 005 |
| 524.2 | 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene |  | 77222 |  | ND | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene | NORTH COAST LABORATORIES | 77226 |  | ND | . 50 |
| TEST METHOD | CHEMICAL <br> ALL CHEMICALS REPORTED ug/L | ENTRY <br> \# | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL ug/L | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DLR } \\ & \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| コல์ | Bromacil (HYVAR) | 82198 | ND |  | 10.00 |
| 507 | Butachlor | 77860 | ND |  | . 38 |
| 507 | Diazinon | 39570 | $<0.025$ |  |  |
| 507 | Dimethoate (CYGON) | 38458 | $<0.050$ |  |  |
| 507 | Metolachlor | 39356 | $<0.50$ |  |  |
| 507 | Metribuzin | 81408 | < 0.25 |  | , |
| 507 | Prometryn (CAPAROL) | 39057 | ND |  | 2.00 |
| 507 | Propachlor | 38533 | ND |  | . 50 |

# AGRICULTURAL CHEMICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS ORGANIC ANALYSIS (10/97) 

Q of Report: 8/18/2011
Laboratory Name: NORTH COAST LABS
Name of Sampler:Cody Coleman
Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/2/2011 10:50:00
Sample ID No. 1108076/01
Signature Lab Director:

Employed by:PLACER CWA - FOOTHIL


Date Sample Received: 8/3/2011
Data Analysis Completed: 8/7/2011

System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

Page 1 of 1

| TEST <br> METHOD | CHEMICAL | ENTRY <br> $\#$ | ANALYSES <br> RESULTS | MCL <br> ug/L | DLR <br> ug/L |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 524.2 | ALS-1,3-Dichloropropene (D-D) | 34704 | $<$ | 0.50 | 0.5 |
| 524.2 | trans-1,3-Dichloropropene | 34699 | $<$ | 0.50 | 0.5 |

E.S.BABCOCK\&Sons,Inc.

## Environmental Laboratories est 1906

ORGANIC ANALYSIS (9/99)
EDT

Date of Report: 11/08/17
Laboratory
Name:
E.S. Babcock \& Sons, Inc.

Name of Sampler: Cody Coleman Date/Time Sample Collected: $\quad 11 / 08 / 02 \quad 10: 50$ Received @ Lab:

Sample ID No. A1H0948-01
Project Hsin-Yi Lee
Manager:
Employed By: Placer CWA - Foothill Date Analyses
1/08/09 09:00 Completed: 11/08/11

Name: PLACER CWA - FO
Number: 3110025
Name or Number of Sample Source: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW


| TEST METHOD | CHEMICAL <br> ALL CHEMICALS REPORTED ug/L | $\begin{gathered} \text { ENTRY } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL ug/L | DLR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EPA 525.2 | DEH-Phthalate | 39100 | $<3.0$ | 4 | 3.0 |
| PA 525.2 | DEH-Adipate | A-026 | $<\quad 5.0$ | 400 | 5.0 |



CAlIFP not 2698 HIALHO CAOOMO
(\% of Report: 8/31/2010
Laboratory Name: NORTH COAST LABS

Name of Sampler: Ken Punk
Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/10/2010 08:20:00

Sample ID No. 1008201
Signature Lab Director: T. Sherman for JGC

Employed by:PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Date Sample Received: 8/11/2010 Data Analysis Completed: 8/24/2010

System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW

System number: 3110025

| User ID: BUG | Station number: 3110025-010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/10/2010 08:20:00 | Laboratory Code: 3334 |
| Submitted by: | Data Analysis Completed: 8/24/2010 |

Page 1 of 3
REGULATED ORGANIC CHEMICALS


NORTH COAST LABORATORIES

Station number: 3110025-010
Laboratory Code: 3334
Data Analysis Completed: 8/24/2010
Phone: $\qquad$

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TEST } \\ & \text { METHOD } \end{aligned}$ | CHEMICAL <br> ALL CHEMICALS REPORTD ug/L | $\begin{gathered} \text { ENTRY } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DLR } \\ \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| د<4.2 | Trichlorofluoromethane (FREON 11) | 34488 | ND | 150 | 5.00 |
| 524.2 | Trichlorotrifluoroethane (FREON 113) | 81611 | ND | 1200 | 10.00 |
| 524.2 | Vinyl Chloride (VC) | 39175 | ND | . 5 | . 50 |
| 524.2 | m,p-Xylene | A-014 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | o-Xylene | 77135 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Total Xylenes ( $\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{p}$, \& 0 ) | 81551 | ND | 1750 |  |
| 524.2 | Dibromochloropropane (DBCP) | 38761 | $<2.0$ | . 2 | . 01 |
| 524.2 | Ethylene Dibromide (EDB) | 77651 | $<0.50$ | . 05 | . 02 |
| 507 | Atrazine (AATREX) | 39033 | ND | 1 | . 50 |
| 507 | Molinate (ORDRAM) | 82199 | ND | 20 | 2.00 |
| 507 | Simazine (PRINCEP) | 39055 | ND | 4 | 1.00 |
| 507 | Thiobencarb (BOLERO) | A-001 | ND | 70 | 1.00 |
| 507 | Alachlor (ALANEX) | 77825 | ND | 2 | 1.00 |
| UNREGULATED ORGANIC CHEMICALS |  |  |  |  |  |
| 524.2 | tert-Amyl Methyl Ether (TAME) | A-034 | ND |  | 3.00 |
| 524.2 | Bromobenzene | 81555 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Bromochloromethane | A-012 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Bromomethane (Methyl Bromide) | 34413 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | tert-Butyl Alcohol (TBA) | 77035 | < 15 |  | 2.00 |
| 4.2 | n-Butylbenzene | A-010 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | sec-Butylbenzene | 77350 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | tert-Butylbenzene | 77353 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Chloroethane | 34311 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Chloromethane (Methyl Chloride) | 34418 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 2-Chlorotoluene | A-008 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 4-Chlorotoluene | A-009 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Dibromomethane | 77596 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,3-Dichlorobenzene (m-DCB) | 34566 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12) | 34668 | ND |  | 0.50 |
| 524.2 | 1,3-Dichloropropane | 77173 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 2,2-Dichloropropane | 77170 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,1-Dichloropropene | 77168 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Diisopropyl Ether (DIPE) | A-036 | ND |  | 3.00 |
| 524.2 | Ethyl tert-Butyl Ether (ETBE) | A-033 | ND |  | 3.00 |
| 524.2 | Hexachlorobutadiene | 34391 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | Isopropylbenzene (Cumene) | 77223 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | p-IsopropyItoluene | A-011 | $<0.50$ |  |  |
| 524.2 | Naphthalene | 34696 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | n-Propylbenzene | 77224 | ND |  | . 50 |
| -7.4.2 | 1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane | 77562 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 4.2 | 1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene | 77613 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,2,3-Trichloropropane | 77443 | $<0.50$ |  | . 005 |
| 524.2 | 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene | 77222 | ND |  | . 50 |
| 524.2 | 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene | 77226 | ND |  | . 50 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TEST } \\ & \text { METHOD } \end{aligned}$ | CHEMICAL <br> ALL CHEMICALS REPORTD ug/L | $\begin{gathered} \text { ENTRY } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | ANALYSES RESULTS | MCL ug/L | $\begin{gathered} \text { DLR } \\ u g / L \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 307 | Bromacil (HYVAR) | 82198 | ND |  | 10.00 |
| 507 | Butachlor | 77860 | ND |  | . 38 |
| 507 | Diazinon | 39570 | $<0.025$ |  |  |
| 507 | Dimethoate (CYGON) | 38458 | $<0.10$ |  |  |
| 507 | Metolachlor | 39356 | $<0.50$ |  |  |
| 507 | Metribuzin | 81408 | $<0.25$ |  |  |
| 507 | Prometryn (CAPAROL) | 39057 | ND |  | 2.00 |
| 507 | Propachlor | 38533 | ND |  | . 50 |

# AGRICULTURAL CHEMICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS ORGANIC ANALYSIS (10/97) 

(7. of Report: 8/31/2010

Laboratory Name: NORTH COAST LABS
Name of Sampler: Ken Punk
Date/Time Sample Collected: 8/10/2010 08:20:00

Sample ID No. 1008201
Signature Lab Director: $\qquad$

Employed by:PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL
Date Sample Received: 8/11/2010 Data Analysis Completed: 8/24/2010
System Name: PLACER CWA - FOOTHILL System number: 3110025

Sample Source Name: AMERICAN RIVER - RAW



[^0]:    Items in parentheses () are footnotes.
    NS: no standard available

[^1]:    Note: Bold results do not meet the listed criteria
    
    
    

[^2]:    Note: Bold results do not meet the listed criteria
    U: Results less than or equal to the method detection limit (MDL) and are considered 'non-detect'. . Results are above the MDL and less than or equal to the practical quatide California Toxics Rule (CTR) standard was used unless otherwise noted
    Calculations are provided in Appendix C.
    B: Results are above the MDL and less than or equal to the practical quantitation limit (PQL) and should be considered estimates

[^3]:    MPN: Most Probable Number of Bacterial colonies per 100 mL of water.
    Criteria: Geometric mean of 5 samples within a 30-day period shall not exceed a geometric mean of $200 \mathrm{MPN} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$, nor shall >10\% of total samples exceed
    400/100mL.
    ${ }^{1}$ Geometric Mean: $n^{\text {th }}$ root of the product of ' $n$ ' numbers.
    ${ }^{2}$ Values of '<2' were changed to ' 2 ' for the calculation of the geometric mean to represent the maximum geometric mean possible.
    ${ }^{3}$ Sampling location was adjusted during the first week of sampling and a sample was not collected. A sample was collected at this site for 5 subsequent weeks.

[^4]:    TA: Test America Laboratory
    BR: Brooks Rand Laboratory
    Brooks Rand Labaratory Qc
    Sroxks Rand Laboratory QC Code:
    BR1: Method blank in trace metals sath \#07-0863 produced results that were greater than the PQL. These blank results were omitted as Grubb's outliers and were not used to method correct the results.
    All results from these batches were blank-corrected with the average of the three remaining method blanks. Test Americits Laboratory cac code:
    H: Sample analysis performed past method-specified holding time.
    
    
    M7:The MSMSD were above hhe acceplance einits.
    M8.The matrix spike/ matrix spike cuplicate (MSMSD) were below the acceptance linits.
    MHA: Due to
    
    PH: PH=7. Preservative was not present in the samplete.
    R2: The ereative percenn difference (RPD) was greater than acceptance levels.

[^5]:    TA: Test America Laboratory
    BR: Brooks Rand Laboratory
     Broorss Rand Laboratory ( (BR) QC Code:
    BR2: Sample result procuced high negative

    BR4: The methoo culica ( $)$ ac ode:
    Test America Laboratory (A) act
    
    
    
     pH: pH H.7. Preservative was not present in the sample.
    R2: The ereative percent difference (RPD) was greater than acceplance levels.

[^6]:    * 250-500-600 ** 0.6-1.7 *** 900-1600-2200

