


2012/14 Status of Water Quality Arizona's Integrated 305(b) Assessment and 303(d) Listing Report

August 2015



2012/14 Status of Water Quality in Arizona

Arizona's Integrated 305(b) Assessment and 303(d) Listing Report

Drafted by:

Jason Sutter, Aiko Condon and Peter Bierly

Editing, Graphics, and Database Assistance:

Steve Callaway, Aiko Condon, and Peter Bierly

A special thanks to ADEQ's monitoring staff that traveled across the state collecting the data used in this report:

Susan Fitch, Lee Johnson, Doug McCarty, Kyle Palmer, Samuel Rector, Meghan Smart, John Woods, Jade Dickens, Patti Spindler, Jason Sutter, Jason Jones, Doug Towne. Elizabeth Boettcher, Jake Breedlove, Krista Osterberg

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Every two years, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) is required by the federal Clean Water Act to conduct a comprehensive analysis of water quality data associated with Arizona's surface waters to determine whether surface water quality standards are being attained and designated uses are being supported. This integrated surface water assessment and impaired waters listing report (2012/14 Integrated Assessment Report) serves three functions.

- Nationally, it fulfills a reporting requirement of the Clean Water Act, and is submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and used to report on national water quality issues and concerns.
- For ADEQ, it provides a mandate to compile environmental data and information from ADEQ's surface water quality monitoring and protection programs, as well as from other agencies, organizations, and individuals. This comprehensive evaluation of quality of water in Arizona is used to set priorities, allocate resources, and make decisions about land use activities, discharges to the water, future monitoring, and program initiatives.
- For the public, it provides an opportunity to learn about and comment on the status of water quality in the state.

Surface Water Assessment Methods and Technical Support

ADEQ has created a separate assessment methods document. It is assumed that the reader will obtain and reference this technical support document when using the information in this assessment.

The Assessment Methods and Technical Support document provides a description of the assessment process and specific assessment and impaired water listing criteria. It also provides information about the monitoring data and information used in this assessment and Arizona's credible data requirements.

Report Overview

Chapter I –	Introduction and Purpose
Chapter II –	Assessments of individual surface waters, organized by watershed
Chapter III –	Summary Information
Chapter IV –	Action Plan
Appendix A –	Alphabetical List of Waters Included in the Assessment
Appendix B –	Waters Grouped by Assessment Category
Appendix C –	Impaired Waters List
Appendix D –	Critical Conditions
Appendix E –	Delisting Impairments
Appendix F –	Water Quality Improvements
Appendix G –	TMDL Priority Ranking

Although an attempt was made to avoid technical jargon and unnecessary abbreviations, this is a technical report. Acronyms and terms used in the assessment report are defined in the Assessment Methods and Technical Support document.

CHAPTER II

WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENTS BY WATERSHED

Assessment summaries are reported alphabetically by individual assessment units (stream reaches and lakes) in this chapter and grouped by the 10 watersheds, as illustrated on the following map: Bill Williams Watershed, Colorado /Grand Canyon Watershed, Colorado / Lower Gila Watershed, Little Colorado/San Juan Watershed, Middle Gila Watershed, Salt Watershed, San Pedro Watershed, Santa Cruz Watershed, Upper Gila Watershed, and Verde Watershed. If the reader is uncertain about which watershed to look in for assessment information, an alphabetical listing of surface waters assessed is provided in Appendix A.

Assessment Information

A summary page is provided for each assessed waterbody indicating:

- Designated use support and an overall assessment
- Impairment status and pollutant causing impairment (if applicable)
- Monitoring data used in the assessment
- List of Exceedances
- Data gaps and monitoring priorities.

Page 3 of this chapter provides an example summary page with information on “How to Read” the individual waterbody assessment pages.

The reader should refer to the Surface water Assessment Methods and Technical Support document for information concerning the assessment process, determining exceedances, assessment criteria, assessment categories, and monitoring prioritization criteria.

Watershed Information

General background information and maps are provided for each watershed to provide some context for the assessments. One map (or a series of maps) shows the assessed surface waters.

2012/2014 Statewide Assessed Waters




Legend

- Assessed Waters
- Arizona's Ten Major Watersheds
- Streams
- Incorporated City Boundaries
- Indian Reservation Boundaries



Note: See Watershed Assessment Maps for the names and locations of each assessed water in detail.



How to Read an Assessment Summary Page

"Attaining" or "Inconclusive" Summary Page

Waterbody Name
- Each watershed report is organized alphabetically by waterbody names.

Assessment Unit Information
- Reach Description
- Waterbody ID (8 digit HUC + reach/ lake number)
- Reach Length/ Lake Area

Overall Assessment Category
- The worst-case designated use support represents overall category for the assessment unit.

Watershed Name
- appears as a side-header on each page

Parameter Name
- Superscript "d" after a metal name denotes dissolved constituent.
- No superscript after a metal name denotes total.

Number and Types of Samples
- Number of events used in assessment.
An event is represented by samples collected at a site during a 7-day period.

Monitoring Priority
- High, Medium, or Low based on the criteria defined in the Assessment Methods and Technical Support document
- Used to schedule and prioritize future monitoring

Data Gaps
- "Inconclusive" parameters with insufficient data to assess
- Core parameters and seasonal distribution determine attainment. Missing core parameters and/or seasonal distribution means inconclusive use support (even if parameter-level assessment is attaining).
- Parameters that could not be assessed due to detection limits higher than the standards

Designated Use Support
- Based on exceedances and data gaps

Parameter-Level Assessment Based on Exceedances
- Exceedances determine impairment (core parameters and seasonal coverage are not examined here. See Data Gaps.)
- Comments on assessment methods (e.g., binomial, 2-year median, etc.) and applicable assessment windows (e.g., 5-year assessment period vs last 3 years)
- Comments on exemptions

Parameter	Sampling Location	Date	Exceedance Type
...

Location and Monitoring Needs	Monitoring Needs
...	...

Location	Monitoring Needs
...	...

"Impaired" or "Not Attaining" Summary Page

Pollutant Causing Impairment
- Impaired parameters and years first added to the 303(d) list of impaired waters
- May include EPA Impairments (parameters over-filed by EPA based on federal regulations)

See the Assessment Methods and Technical Support document for more information on the assessment process.

Parameter	Sampling Location	Date	Exceedance Type
...

Location and Monitoring Needs	Monitoring Needs
...	...

Location	Monitoring Needs
...	...