

Alamosa River Watershed Restoration Master Plan and Environmental Assessment

Final Report

July 2005



MWH

in association with

**Agro Engineering
Lidstone & Associates
SWCA**

Alamosa River Foundation

Summitville Natural Resource Damage Trustees

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment

Colorado Attorney General

Colorado Department of Natural Resources

U.S. Department of the Interior

U.S.D.A. Forest Service

Table of Contents

Section 1.0 – Introduction	1-1
1.1 Overview of Alamosa River Watershed.....	1-1
1.1.1 Issues of Historical Significance.....	1-3
1.2 Master Plan Purpose and Needs	1-3
1.3 Authorization.....	1-4
Section 2.0 – Environmental Impacts	2-1
2.1 Introduction to Environmental Impacts	2-1
2.1.1 Climate.....	2-1
2.1.2 Key Structures in the Watershed	2-1
2.1.3 Land Ownership	2-3
2.1.4 Segments	2-3
2.2 Channel of Alamosa River and Major Tributaries.....	2-8
2.2.1 Upper Watershed (Reaches T1, 12, and 11).....	2-10
2.2.2 Wightman to Beaver Creek (Reaches 10, 9, and 8)	2-13
2.2.3 Beaver Creek to French Creek (Reach 7)	2-13
2.2.4 French Creek to Terrace Reservoir (Reach 6).....	2-13
2.2.5 Terrace Reservoir (Reach 5)	2-14
2.2.6 Terrace Reservoir to Terrace Main Canal (Reach 4).....	2-16
2.2.7 Terrace Main Canal to Gunbarrel (Reach 3)	2-17
2.2.8 Gunbarrel to County Road 10 (Reach 2).....	2-18
2.2.9 County Road 10 to Highway 285 (Reach 1).....	2-19
2.2.10 Floodplain Mapping	2-19
2.2.11 Summary of Channel Issues	2-19
2.3 Surface Water Quantity	2-22
2.3.1 Streamflow	2-22
2.3.2 Tributary Average Flow Estimate.....	2-27
2.3.3 Terrace Reservoir Levels.....	2-30
2.3.4 Flood Frequency	2-31
2.3.5 Flood Events	2-32
2.3.6 Water Rights and Usage.....	2-33
2.3.7 Summary of Surface Water Quantity Issues.....	2-40
2.4 Surface Water Quality.....	2-40
2.4.1 Effects of Geology on Regional Water Quality.....	2-40
2.4.2 The Summitville Legacy	2-42
2.4.3 Sources of Water Quality Contamination.....	2-43
2.4.4 Water Quality Data Methodology.....	2-58
2.4.5 Water Quality Standards	2-61
2.4.6 Water Quality Changes Related to Summitville.....	2-65
2.4.7 Current Water Quality in Alamosa River Watershed	2-76
2.4.8 Seasonal Variation in Water Quality.....	2-83
2.4.9 Contaminant Loads	2-89
2.4.10 Suspended Sediments	2-91
2.4.11 Expected Future Trends	2-92
2.4.12 Summary of Water Quality Issues	2-93

2.5	Ground Water.....	2-94
2.5.1	Ground Water Sources.....	2-94
2.5.2	Ground Water Use.....	2-98
2.5.3	Decline in Ground Water Levels.....	2-99
2.5.4	Ground Water Quality.....	2-103
2.5.5	Ground Water Summary.....	2-104
2.5.6	Key Ground Water Issues.....	2-104
2.6	Terrace Reservoir.....	2-104
2.6.1	Terrace Reservoir Facilities.....	2-105
2.6.2	Spillway Assessment.....	2-113
2.6.3	Terrace Reservoir Operation.....	2-113
2.6.4	Terrace Reservoir Water Quality.....	2-113
2.6.5	Summary of Terrace Reservoir Issues.....	2-121
2.7	Sediment.....	2-121
2.7.1	Upper Watershed above Terrace Reservoir.....	2-123
2.7.1	Terrace Reservoir.....	2-125
2.7.2	Terrace Reservoir to Gunbarrel Road.....	2-126
2.7.3	Gunbarrel Road to Highway 285.....	2-127
2.7.4	Sediment Quality.....	2-128
2.7.5	Summary.....	2-132
2.8	Riparian Habitat.....	2-132
2.8.1	Riparian Vegetation.....	2-132
2.8.2	Aquatic Ecosystem.....	2-137
2.8.3	Riparian Wildlife.....	2-141
2.8.4	Riparian Habitat Issues.....	2-143
2.9	Biological Resources.....	2-143
2.9.1	Current Habitat Condition.....	2-143
2.9.2	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	2-144
2.9.3	Birds.....	2-145
2.9.4	Reptiles and Amphibians.....	2-147
2.9.5	Mammals, Including Big Game.....	2-147
2.10	Fishes.....	2-149
2.10.1	Key Biological Resources Issues.....	2-153
2.11	Agricultural Uses.....	2-153
2.11.1	Agricultural Resources.....	2-154
2.11.2	Water Availability and Irrigation Diversions.....	2-154
2.11.3	Agricultural Impacts Due to Water Quality.....	2-160
2.11.4	Key Agricultural Issues.....	2-165
2.12	Recreational Uses.....	2-165
2.12.1	Middle Watershed, Wightman Fork to Terrace Reservoir.....	2-168
2.12.2	Lower Watershed, Terrace Reservoir Downstream to the San Luis Valley.....	2-170
2.12.3	Key Recreation Issues.....	2-170
2.13	Segment/Subwatershed Characterization.....	2-170

Section 3.0 – Development of THE Watershed Restoration Plan (Proposed Actions)	3-1
3.1 Overall Strategy for Restoration Planning.....	3-1
3.1.1 Watershed Restoration Vision.....	3-1
3.1.2 Restoration Project Planning Process	3-2
3.2 Evaluation of Natural Resources Impacts.....	3-3
3.3 Process of Analyzing Potential Restoration Projects.....	3-5
3.3.1 Universe of Projects	3-5
3.3.2 Project Evaluation Criteria	3-9
3.4 River Channel and Adjacent Corridor.....	3-10
3.4.1 Stream Restoration.....	3-10
3.4.2 Dead Tree Management.....	3-14
3.4.3 Flood Control.....	3-15
3.5 Water Quantity Improvement.....	3-16
3.5.1 Development of Instream Flow.....	3-17
3.5.2 Change in Terrace Reservoir Operations for Instream Flow Storage	3-19
3.5.3 New Reservoirs	3-21
3.5.4 Aquifer Storage for Instream Flow.....	3-24
3.5.5 Water Quantity Projects Eliminated from Further Consideration.....	3-25
3.6 Ground Water Improvement	3-25
3.7 Terrace Reservoir Improvements	3-25
3.7.1 Increase Spillway Capacity	3-26
3.7.2 Raise Crest of Dam.....	3-29
3.7.3 Sediment Removal to Increase Capacity.....	3-30
3.7.4 Improvements to Outlet Works	3-31
3.7.5 Power Generation at Terrace Reservoir	3-32
3.8 Sediment Management	3-32
3.8.1 Lower Watershed Sediment Deposition Locations.....	3-33
3.8.2 Road Management in Upper Watershed.....	3-33
3.8.3 Sediment Traps at Upper Tributary Confluences.....	3-34
3.9 Water Quality Improvement.....	3-39
3.9.1 Reclamation of Abandoned Mines Other Than Summitville	3-39
3.9.2 Passive Water Quality Improvement on Altered Tributaries.....	3-41
3.9.3 Active Water Quality Improvement on Altered Tributaries	3-45
3.9.4 Lake or Reservoir on Alamosa River below Wightman Fork.....	3-46
3.9.5 Consolidation of Tributaries for Active Water Quality Improvement.....	3-49
3.9.6 Conveyance of Tributaries to Area of Alkaline Soils	3-50
3.9.7 Summer Land Application of Acidic Flows	3-51
3.9.8 Winter Freezing of Acidic Flows	3-51
3.9.9 Water Quality Projects Eliminated From Future Consideration.....	3-52
3.10 Riparian Habitat.....	3-53
3.10.1 Noxious Weed Management	3-53
3.10.2 Revegetation of Disturbed Riparian Areas in the Lower Watershed.....	3-54
3.10.3 Grazing Management	3-55
3.10.4 Riparian Buffer Zone	3-57
3.10.5 Acquisition of Equivalent Resource in San Luis Valley.....	3-57
3.10.6 Purchase Land Downstream of Wightman Fork for Recreation and Habitat.....	3-58

3.11 Biological Resources	3-59
3.11.1 Fish–Stocking Programs Throughout Watershed	3-59
3.11.2 Construction of Fish Barriers to Protect Native Trout	3-60
3.11.3 Conservation Easements.....	3-61
3.12 Lost Agricultural Uses	3-62
3.12.1 Ditch Headgate Consolidation.....	3-62
3.12.2 Replacement of Ditch Headgates with Corrosion Resistant Materials.....	3-64
3.13 Lost Recreational Uses	3-64
3.13.1 Improve Public Access to Terrace Reservoir.....	3-64
3.13.2 Accessing Main Stem of River Across Private Lands	3-65
3.14 Studies and Administrative Activities.....	3-66
3.14.1 Funding for Citizen Group to Help Implement and Monitor the Master Plan	3-66
3.14.2 Site Specific Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) Study	3-67
3.14.3 Ice Jam Flooding Study.....	3-67
3.14.4 Capulin Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan	3-67
3.14.5 Dewatering Management Plan for Terrace Reservoir.....	3-67
3.14.6 Terrace Reservoir Sediment Quality Study.....	3-69
3.14.7 Ground Water Monitoring Plan.....	3-69
3.15 Scoring and Ranking of Projects.....	3-69
Section 4.0 – Alternatives and Preferred Plan	4-1
4.1 Development of Watershed Restoration Alternatives.....	4-1
4.1.1 Project Rank Alternative	4-1
4.1.2 Watershed Objectives Alternative	4-2
4.1.3 No Action Alternative.....	4-3
4.1.4 Trustee Preferences Alternative	4-4
4.2 Evaluation of Impacts of Watershed Alternatives	4-4
4.2.1 Project Priority Comparison.....	4-4
4.2.2 Project Benefits and Uncertainties	4-5
4.3 Preparation of Preferred Alternative	4-7
4.4 Preferred Restoration Alternative.....	4-9
4.4.1 Funding for Alamosa River Foundation to Help Implement and Monitor the Master Plan	4-11
4.4.2 Instream Flow Projects	4-12
4.4.3 Stream Restoration and Vegetation Projects.....	4-14
4.4.4 Riparian Buffer Zone	4-16
4.4.5 Sediment Trap Pilot Project with Water Quality BMPs on Alum Creek	4-16
4.4.6 Reclamation of Pass–Me–By Mine.....	4-17
4.4.7 Easements	4-17
4.4.8 Mainstem Lake for Water Quality	4-18
4.4.9 Increased Access to Terrace Reservoir	4-18

4.5	Environmental Consequences.....	4-18
4.5.1	Alternative 1 – No Action	4-19
4.5.2	Environmental Consequences Common to Alternatives 2 through 5 (Action Alternatives).....	4-20
4.5.3	Alternative 2 – Project Rank Alternative	4-22
4.5.4	Alternative 3 – Watershed Objectives Alternative	4-23
4.5.5	Alternative 4 – Trustee Preferences Alternative	4-24
4.5.6	Alternative 5 – Preferred Alternative / Proposed Action	4-25
4.5.7	Summary of Environmental Consequences	4-27
Section 5.0 – Implementation of Preferred Alternative		5-1
5.1	Implementation of Actions Under the Preferred Alternative	5-1
5.2	Possible Implementation Schedule.....	5-1
5.2.1	Options for Variation.....	5-4
5.3	Funding Opportunities.....	5-5
5.3.1	NRD Funding.....	5-5
5.3.2	Other Sources of Funding	5-7
5.4	Implementation Steps.....	5-10
5.5	Monitoring Plan.....	5-12
5.5.1	Reporting Responsibilities of the Alamosa River Foundation.....	5-12
5.5.2	Stream Restoration Monitoring.....	5-13
5.5.3	Vegetation Monitoring	5-13
5.5.4	Water Quality Monitoring.....	5-13
5.5.5	Water Quantity Monitoring.....	5-14
5.5.6	Recreation Monitoring	5-14
Section 6.0 – Bibliography		6-1

List of Appendices

- Appendix A – Summary of Water Quality Data by Year, Program, and Location
- Appendix B – Stream Classifications and Water Quality Standards
- Appendix C – Monthly Estimated Flow in Upper Tributaries
- Appendix D – Water Rights and Water Usage
- Appendix E – Vegetation Maps
- Appendix F – Individual Segment Maps
- Appendix G – Colorado Supreme Court Decision No. 80SA288
- Appendix H – Glossary of Terms
- Appendix I – Public Comment on Draft Environmental Assessment and Response
- Appendix J – Written Public Comment on Draft Environmental Assessment

List of Figures

Figure 1–1. Alamosa River Watershed Overview.....	1-2
Figure 2–1. Average Annual Precipitation in Alamosa River Watershed.....	2-2
Figure 2–2. Land Ownership in the Alamosa River Watershed.....	2-4
Figure 2–3. Alamosa River Segments and Subwatersheds.....	2-5
Figure 2–4. Alamosa River Profile and Segments.....	2-6
Figure 2–5. Alluvial Fan.....	2-9
Figure 2–6. Preliminary Stream Classification.....	2-11
Figure 2–7. Rosgen Stream Classification Methodology.....	2-12
Figure 2–8. Photo of Burnt Creek and Sediment Load.....	2-13
Figure 2–9. Photo of Sediment Influences by the Backwater of Terrace Reservoir.....	2-14
Figure 2–10. Photo of Sediment Deposition in Terrace Reservoir.....	2-14
Figure 2–11. Rating Curve Above Terrace Reservoir.....	2-15
Figure 2–12. Rating Curve Below Terrace Reservoir.....	2-16
Figure 2–13. Photo Above Irrigation Diversion (photo by Alan Miller).....	2-17
Figure 2–14. Photo Below Irrigation Diversion (photo by Alan Miller).....	2-17
Figure 2–15. Photo Near Capulin at Straightened Channel Section (photo by Alan Miller).....	2-18
Figure 2–16. 100–year Flood Boundary Upstream of Highway 371.....	2-20
Figure 2–17. 100–year Flood Boundary Downstream of Highway 371.....	2-21
Figure 2–18. Alamosa Basin Stream Gage Locations.....	2-23
Figure 2–19. Mean Monthly Streamflow in Wightman Fork.....	2-25
Figure 2–20. Mean Monthly Streamflow in Upper Alamosa River.....	2-25
Figure 2–21. Historical Flow – Alamosa River Near Terrace Reservoir.....	2-26
Figure 2–22. Mean Monthly Flow for Alamosa River near Terrace Reservoir.....	2-26
Figure 2–23. Flow Duration Curve for Alamosa River (October 1981 to September 2002).....	2-27
Figure 2–24. Subwatersheds and Precipitation Isohyetals for Runoff Estimates.....	2-29
Figure 2–25. Terrace Reservoir Historic Water Storage.....	2-30
Figure 2–26. Average Monthly Surface Area and Evaporation from Terrace Reservoir.....	2-31
Figure 2–27. Alamosa River Flood Frequency Curve.....	2-32
Figure 2–28. Diversions compared with Streamflow.....	2-35
Figure 2–29. Average Water Usage for Irrigation Years 1992 to 2002 compared to Water Right.....	2-37
Figure 2–30. Rio Grande Compact Delivery Requirements Verses Annual Index Flows.....	2-38
Figure 2–31. Rio Grande Basin in Colorado.....	2-39
Figure 2–32. Photo of Lookout Mountain in Stunner Altered Area.....	2-41
Figure 2–33. Hydrothermally Altered Areas in Alamosa River Watershed.....	2-41
Figure 2–34. Photo of Summitville Site in 1980 Prior to SCMCI Operations.....	2-45
Figure 2–35. Photo of Summitville Site in 1991 During Summitville Operations.....	2-45
Figure 2–36. Summitville Drainage Areas and Seeps.....	2-47
Figure 2–37. Impacts of SDI release on downstream pH in July 1997.....	2-48
Figure 2–38. Contaminant Point Sources Alamosa River Watershed.....	2-51
Figure 2–39. Photo of Drainage from the Pass–Me–By Mine Portal.....	2-52
Figure 2–40. Photo of Drainage from the Miser Mine.....	2-52
Figure 2–41. Aerial Photo of Lower Iron Creek.....	2-54
Figure 2–42. Aerial Photo of Alum Creek.....	2-54
Figure 2–43. Aerial Photo of Bitter Creek.....	2-55
Figure 2–44. Aerial Photo of Wightman Fork.....	2-55
Figure 2–45. Aerial Photo of Upper Jasper Creek.....	2-56
Figure 2–46. Aerial Photo of Upper Burnt Creek.....	2-56
Figure 2–47. Photo of “Ferrosinter” Mound in Burnt Creek.....	2-57
Figure 2–48. Photo of Acidic Ecosystem in Burnt Creek.....	2-57
Figure 2–49. Water pH in Response to Rainfall Event at USGS gages.....	2-58
Figure 2–50. Distribution of Compiled Water Quality Samples by Year and Month.....	2-59

Figure 2–51. Total Iron Concentration below Terrace Reservoir and Gomez Bridge by Month.....	2-60
Figure 2–52. Box and Whisker Plot Schematic.....	2-61
Figure 2–53. Regulatory Stream Segments Alamosa River Watershed.....	2-63
Figure 2–54. Dissolved Copper Concentrations in Reynolds Adit by Year.....	2-66
Figure 2–55. Water Quality Downstream of Summitville by Year – pH.....	2-67
Figure 2–56. Water Quality Downstream of Summitville by Year – Dissolved Copper.....	2-68
Figure 2–57. Water Quality Downstream of Summitville by Year – Dissolved Zinc.....	2-69
Figure 2–58. Water Quality Downstream of Summitville by Year – Total Iron.....	2-70
Figure 2–59. Water Quality Downstream of Summitville by Year – Dissolved Manganese.....	2-71
Figure 2–60. Water Quality Downstream of Summitville by Year – Dissolved Aluminum.....	2-72
Figure 2–61. Water Quality in Alamosa River Mainstem Following SCMCI; pH, Cu, Zn, Fe.....	2-73
Figure 2–62. Water Quality in Alamosa River Mainstem Following SCMCI; Mn, Al, Pb, Cd.....	2-74
Figure 2–63. Current Water Quality in Alamosa River Mainstem; pH, Cu, Zn, Fe.....	2-77
Figure 2–64. Current Water Quality in Alamosa River Mainstem; Mn, Al, Pb, Cd.....	2-78
Figure 2–65. Current Water Quality for Alamosa River Tributaries; pH, Cu, Zn, Fe.....	2-81
Figure 2–66. Current Water Quality for Alamosa River Tributaries; Mn, Al, Pb, Cd.....	2-82
Figure 2–67. Seasonal Water pH for Alamosa River and Tributaries.....	2-84
Figure 2–68. Seasonal Copper Concentrations for Alamosa River and Tributaries.....	2-85
Figure 2–69. Seasonal Zinc Concentrations for Alamosa River and Tributaries.....	2-86
Figure 2–70. Seasonal Iron Concentrations for Alamosa River and Tributaries.....	2-87
Figure 2–71. Seasonal Aluminum Concentrations for Alamosa River and Tributaries.....	2-88
Figure 2–72. Concentrations of Total Suspended Solids in Mainstem and Tributaries.....	2-92
Figure 2–73. Year 2003 Water Treatment Plant Influent and Effluent Water Quality.....	2-93
Figure 2–74. Hydrogeologic Units of the San Luis Valley.....	2-96
Figure 2–75. Transmissivity of the Unconfined Aquifer, San Luis Valley.....	2-97
Figure 2–76. Water Table of the Unconfined Aquifer of the San Luis Valley, Late 1996–Early 1997.....	2-98
Figure 2–77. Decline in Water Levels in the San Luis Valley.....	2-100
Figure 2–78. RGDSS Model Target Well Location Map.....	2-102
Figure 2–79. Area–Elevation–Capacity Curve for Terrace Reservoir.....	2-105
Figure 2–80. Terrace Reservoir Plan View.....	2-106
Figure 2–81. Infrared Aerial Photo of Terrace Reservoir Dam, Spillway, and Control Building.....	2-106
Figure 2–82. Terrace Reservoir Spillway from Downstream.....	2-107
Figure 2–83. Terrace Reservoir South Abutment and Spillway from Downstream.....	2-108
Figure 2–84. Condition of Terrace Reservoir Spillway Concrete and Masonry Approach Walls.....	2-108
Figure 2–85. Terrace Reservoir Discharge Portal and Access Tunnel.....	2-109
Figure 2–86. Terrace Reservoir Inlet Structure and Collapsed Trash Racks.....	2-110
Figure 2–87. Terrace Reservoir Inlet Structure with New Beams and Trash Racks.....	2-110
Figure 2–88. Gate Valve Chamber in Tunnel.....	2-111
Figure 2–89. Howell–Bunger Valve at Outlet.....	2-111
Figure 2–90. Total versus Dissolved Metal Concentrations in Terrace Reservoir, 1998 to 2001.....	2-116
Figure 2–91. Location of Terrace Reservoir Sediment Samples.....	2-119
Figure 2–92. Sediment Sample Locations.....	2-122
Figure 2–93. Photo of Alum Creek Channel Showing High Sediment Load.....	2-124
Figure 2–94. Upper Watershed Sediment Distribution Curves.....	2-124
Figure 2–95. Photo of the Pass Me By Mine Spoils Pile.....	2-125
Figure 2–96. Photo of Terrace Sediments Deposited Near USGS Gage in 2003/2004.....	2-126
Figure 2–97. Middle Watershed Sediment Distribution Curves.....	2-127
Figure 2–98. Lower Watershed Sediment Distribution Curves.....	2-128
Figure 2–99. Sediment Aluminum and Iron Concentrations in the Alamosa River.....	2-130
Figure 2–100. Sediment Zinc and Copper Concentrations in the Alamosa River.....	2-131
Figure 2–101. Sediment Cadmium, Arsenic, Lead, and Nickel Concentrations in the Alamosa River.....	2-131
Figure 2–102. Dead Cottonwood Trees in Riparian Corridor.....	2-135
Figure 2–103. Location of Dead Cottonwood Trees.....	2-136
Figure 2–104. Diversions and Irrigated Areas.....	2-155

Figure 2–105. Poor River Condition– San Jose Ditch No. 1	2-158
Figure 2–106. Dam Constructed of Marginal Materials – Cristobal Rivera Ditch.....	2-158
Figure 2–107. Photo of Terrace Sediments Flushed into Head Overflow #5 Ditch	2-160
Figure 2–108. Photo of damage to culvert after exposure to Alamosa River Water	2-161
Figure 2–109. Alamosa Watershed Recreation Resources Map.....	2-166
Figure 3–1. Map of Segments/Subwatersheds Most Impacted by Human Activities.....	3-4
Figure 3–2. Watershed Areas with Observed Erosion Problems	3-11
Figure 3–3. Fish Habitat Features	3-12
Figure 3–4. Stream Restoration Detail	3-13
Figure 3–5. Bendway Weir Layout.....	3-14
Figure 3–6. Instream flow project.....	3-17
Figure 3–7. Schematic of Trade of Direct Flow Right for Storage for Instream Flow	3-20
Figure 3–8. Potential Reservoir Sites	3-23
Figure 3–9. Two Methods for Artificial Recharge.....	3-24
Figure 3–10. Multi–level Tower	3-31
Figure 3–11. Artificial Cutoff Channel.....	3-33
Figure 3–12. Photo of Alum Creek Sediment Fan Being Eroded by Alamosa River.....	3-35
Figure 3–13. Aerial Photo of Alum Creek Confluence	3-36
Figure 3–14. Photo of Potential Area for Settling Pond Upstream of Alum Creek Confluence	3-36
Figure 3–15. Plan View Schematic of Alum Creek Settling Pond	3-37
Figure 3–16. Photo of Sediment Downstream of Alum Creek Confluence	3-38
Figure 3–17. Conceptual Design of Potential Sulfate Reducing Wetlands on Wightman Fork	3-44
Figure 3–18. Conceptual View of Lake and Reservoir Options Below Wightman Fork.....	3-48
Figure 3–19. Aerial Photo of Alum Creek Confluence	3-52
Figure 3–20. Weed Management.....	3-54
Figure 3–21. Native Plant Revegetation, Before and After.....	3-55
Figure 3–22. Cattle Fencing Options.....	3-56
Figure 3–23. Fish Barrier	3-60
Figure 3–24. Potential Consolidation of Miller, R. Valdez, Rivera, San Jose #1 and #2 Ditches.....	3-63
Figure 3–25. Consolidation of Union, Scand., Morganville, TK Walsh and Flintham Ditches.....	3-63
Figure 3–26. Potential Locations of Cofferdams Below Terrace Reservoir	3-68
Figure 4–1. Project Rank Alternative.....	4-2
Figure 4–2. Watershed Objectives Alternative.....	4-3
Figure 4–3. Trustee Preferences Alternative	4-4
Figure 4–4. Preferred Alternative Project Locations.....	4-11
Figure 4–5. Schematic of Trade of Direct Flow Right for Storage for Instream Flow	4-13
Figure 4–6. Artificial Cutoff Channel.....	4-15
Figure 4–7. Photo of Alum Creek Sediment Fan Being Eroded by Alamosa River.....	4-17
Figure 4–8. Conceptual View of Small Mainstem Lake Below Wightman Fork	4-18
Figure 5–1. Possible Implementation Sequence of Preferred Alternative.....	5-3

List of Tables

Table 2–1. Alamosa River Segment and Subwatershed Characteristics.....	2-3
Table 2–2. Wightman Fork Alamosa River Segment and Subwatershed Characteristics	2-7
Table 2–3. Comparison of CDPHE and Master Plan Segments for the Alamosa River.....	2-7
Table 2–4. Alamosa River Channel Geometry Data.....	2-10
Table 2–5. Alamosa Basin Stream Gage Information	2-24
Table 2–6. Tributary Average Flow Estimates.....	2-28
Table 2–7. Alamosa River Flood Frequency Data	2-32
Table 2–8. Senior Water Rights in the Alamosa Watershed.....	2-33
Table 2–9. USFS Appropriated Flows on Alamosa River for Rio Grande National Forest (cfs).....	2-34
Table 2–10. Priority Numbers Expected to be Fulfilled in a Given Month	2-34
Table 2–11. Summary of Water Rights Abandonments Since April 1997	2-35
Table 2–12. Untreated Releases from Summitville Site.....	2-48
Table 2–13. Water Quality and Contaminant Loads from Mine Sites and Major Natural Springs.....	2-50
Table 2–14. Summary of Critical Water Quality Standards for Alamosa River.....	2-62
Table 2–15. Water Quality Estimates for Period Before Mining and SCMCI Activities.....	2-65
Table 2–16. Comparison of Pre–Summitville, Summitville, and Post–Remediation Water Quality	2-75
Table 2–17. Current Water Quality Conditions and Instream Standards by WQCC Segment	2-79
Table 2–18. Approximate Annual Loads from Contaminant Sources.....	2-89
Table 2–19. Loads of Metals in 1997 in Alamosa River Reaches	2-90
Table 2–20. Approximate Current Annual Contaminant Loads in Alamosa River.....	2-91
Table 2–21. Selected Wells in the Alamosa River Watershed.....	2-99
Table 2–22. Selected RGDSS Wells in the Vicinity of Capulin, Colorado.....	2-101
Table 2–23. Summary of Terrace Reservoir Valve Repairs	2-112
Table 2–24. Water Quality in Terrace Reservoir Following SCMCI Activities	2-115
Table 2–25. Annual Metal Loads in Terrace Reservoir; 1994–1995, 1997, and 1998–2003.....	2-118
Table 2–26. Chemical Composition of Terrace Reservoir Sediment Samples	2-119
Table 2–27. Alamosa River Sediment Quality Data.....	2-129
Table 2–28. Acreages Irrigated by Alamosa River by Crop.....	2-154
Table 2–29. Water Rights, Average Ditch Diversions and Water Sufficiency.....	2-157
Table 2–30. Stream Segment and Subwatershed Evaluation Criteria.....	2-171
Table 2–31. Stream Segment and Subwatershed Rating.....	2-171
Table 3–1. Segments Most Impacted by Human Activities.....	3-3
Table 3–2. Universe of All Potential Improvement Projects Upstream of Terrace Reservoir	3-5
Table 3–3. Universe of All Potential Improvement Projects in Terrace Reservoir Subwatershed	3-6
Table 3–4. Universe of All Potential Improvement Projects Downstream of Terrace Reservoir.....	3-7
Table 3–5. Universe of All Potential Improvement Projects Covering the Entire Watershed.....	3-8
Table 3–6. Projects Eliminated in Initial Screening	3-8
Table 3–7. Summary of Project Evaluation Criteria	3-9
Table 3–8. Pros and Cons of Stabilizing Banks	3-14
Table 3–9. Pros and Cons of Dead Tree Management	3-15
Table 3–10. Pros and Cons of Modifying Land Use Regulations.....	3-15
Table 3–11. Pros and Cons of Setback Levees.....	3-16
Table 3–12. Water Quantity Project Types and Specific Project Examples	3-16
Table 3–13. Pros and Cons of Purchasing Appropriate Priority Water Rights	3-18
Table 3–14. Pros and Cons of Filing a New Junior Water Right.....	3-18
Table 3–15. Pros and Cons of Controlled Releases from Terrace Reservoir with Ground Water Backup.....	3-19
Table 3–16. Pros and Cons of Trade of Direct Flow Diversion Right for Reservoir Storage.....	3-21
Table 3–17. Potential Reservoir Sites	3-22
Table 3–18. Pros and Cons of Building New Reservoirs.....	3-22
Table 3–19. Pros and Cons of Aquifer Storage	3-25
Table 3–20. Terrace Reservoir Spillway Rehabilitation Alternatives	3-26

Table 3–21. Pros and Cons of Upstream Embankment Raise.....	3-29
Table 3–22. Pros and Cons of Downstream Embankment Raise.....	3-30
Table 3–23. Pros and Cons of Downstream Embankment Raise.....	3-30
Table 3–24. Pros and Cons of Concrete Parapet Walls.....	3-30
Table 3–25. Pros and Cons of Sediment Removal in Terrace Reservoir.....	3-31
Table 3–26. Pros and Cons of Installing Gated, Multi–Level Tower.....	3-32
Table 3–27. Pros and Cons of Power Generation at Terrace Reservoir.....	3-32
Table 3–28. Pros and Cons of Sediment Deposition Areas in Lower Watershed.....	3-33
Table 3–29. Pros and Cons of a Road Management Plan.....	3-34
Table 3–30. Pros and Cons of Sediment Traps at Tributary Confluences.....	3-34
Table 3–31. Pros and Cons of Alum Creek Sediment Trap and Lime Addition.....	3-38
Table 3–32. Pros and Cons of Treatment of Mine Drainage from Abandoned Mines.....	3-40
Table 3–33. Pros and Cons of Sulfate Reducing Wetlands on Wightman Fork.....	3-44
Table 3–34. Pros and Cons of Lime Injection System on Alum Creek.....	3-46
Table 3–35. Pros and Cons of Lake or Reservoir on Alamosa Mainstem.....	3-47
Table 3–36. Pros and Cons of Conveyance of Tributaries to Area of Alkaline Soils.....	3-50
Table 3–37. Pros and Cons of Summer Land Application of Acidic Flows.....	3-51
Table 3–38. Pros and Cons of Winter Freezing of Acidic Flows.....	3-52
Table 3–39. Pros and Cons of Noxious Weed Management in the Upper Watershed.....	3-54
Table 3–40. Pros and Cons of Noxious Weed Management in the Lower Watershed.....	3-54
Table 3–41. Pros and Cons of Revegetaton in the Lower Watershed.....	3-55
Table 3–42. Pros and Cons of Grazing Management.....	3-56
Table 3–43. Pros and Cons of Stream/Riparian Buffer.....	3-57
Table 3–44. Pros and Cons of Acquisition of Equivalent Resource.....	3-58
Table 3–45. Pros and Cons of Purchase Land Downstream of Wightman Fork.....	3-59
Table 3–46. Pros and Cons of Developing Fish–Stocking Programs.....	3-59
Table 3–47. Pros and Cons of Building Fish Barriers.....	3-61
Table 3–48. Pros and Cons of Establishing Conservation Easements.....	3-61
Table 3–49. Pros and Cons of Ditch Consolidation.....	3-64
Table 3–50. Pros and Cons of Replacing Ditch Headgates with Corrosion Resistant Materials.....	3-64
Table 3–51. Pros and Cons of Improving Public Access to Terrace Reservoir.....	3-65
Table 3–52. Pros and Cons of Improved Access to Main Stem of the River Across Private Lands.....	3-65
Table 3–53. Pros and Cons of Funding for Citizen Group to Help Implement and Monitor the Master Plan...	3-66
Table 3–54. Pros and Cons of Condcuting a Site Specific PMF Study.....	3-67
Table 3–55. Pros and Cons of Ice Jam Flooding Study.....	3-67
Table 3–56. Pros and Cons of Capulin Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan.....	3-67
Table 3–57. Pros and Cons of a Dewatering Management Plan for Terrace Reservoir.....	3-68
Table 3–58. Pros and Cons of Terrace Reservoir Sediment Study.....	3-69
Table 3–59. Pros and Cons of Ground Water Study.....	3-69
Table 3–60. Weighted Project Scores.....	3-70
Table 3–61. Project Prerequisites and Logical Combinations.....	3-72
Table 4–1. Three Preliminary Watershed Alternatives.....	4-6
Table 4–2. List of Projects in the Preferred Alternative.....	4-10
Table 4–3. Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative.....	4-27
Table 5–1. Possible Project Sequencing and Duration of Preferred Alternative.....	5-4
Table 5–2. Project Potential for NRD Funding.....	5-6
Table 5–3. Summary of Potential National Funding Sources.....	5-8
Table 5–4. Summary of Potential State and Local Funding Sources.....	5-9
Table 5–5. Trustees’ Selection Criteria for Potential NRD–funded Projects.....	5-10
Table 5–6. Implementation Steps for Each Project in Preferred Alternative.....	5-10

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

ASR	aquifer storage and recovery
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMP	best management practice
CDOW	Colorado Division of Wildlife
CDPHE	Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment
CDWR	Colorado Division of Water Resources
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980
cfs	cubic feet per second
cy	cubic yards
CGS	Colorado Geological Survey
CR	County Road
CWCB	Colorado Water Conservation Board
DMG	Colorado Division of Minerals and Geology
EPA	US Environmental Protection Agency
FR	Forest Road
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
gpm	gallons per minute
HMWMD	Hazardous Materials Waste Management Division of CDPHE
lbs	pounds
Ma	million years ago
MLRB	Mined Land Reclamation Board
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
msl	mean seal level
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOAMS	naturally occurring acidic, metal rich springs
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resource Conservation Service
NRD	natural resource damage
PMF	probable maximum flood
PRP	potentially responsible parties
RCC	roller compacted concrete
RFP	request for proposals
RGDSS	Rio Grande Decision Support System
SCMCI	Summitville Consolidated Mining Company Inc.
SDI	Summitville dam impoundment
TIC	Terrace Irrigation Company
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Loads
TRV	toxicological reference value
TVS	table value standards
UAA	Use Attainability Analysis
USDA	US Department of Agriculture
USFS	US Forest Service
USGS	US Geological Survey
USFWS	US Fish and Wildlife Service
WQCC	Water Quality Control Commission of CDPHE
WQCD	Water Quality Control Division of CDPHE
µg/l	micrograms per liter

List of Agencies and Persons Consulted

We would like to thank the following individuals for their significant contributions to the Master Plan.

Colorado Water Conservation Board

Brian Hyde – Project Manager, Trustee Representative

Federal Natural Resource Trustees, Management Officials, and Representatives

Gale Norton, Secretary of the Interior

Mike Johanns, Secretary of Agriculture

Ron Wenker, State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior

Ralph Morganweck, Regional Director, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior

Rick Cables, Regional Forester, US Forest Service, Department of Agriculture

Rob Robinson – Bureau of Land Management

Paul Meyer – Bureau of Land Management

Laura Archuleta – US Fish and Wildlife Service

Diann Gese – US Forest Service/Bureau of Land Management

Polly Hays – US Forest Service

Suzanne Buntrock – US Forest Service

State of Colorado Natural Resource Trustees and Representatives

John Suthers, Colorado Attorney General

Doug Benevento, Director, Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment

Ron Cattany, Director, Colorado Division of Mines and Geology

Steve Brown – Office of Colorado Attorney General

Austin Buckinham – Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment

Daniel Scheppers – Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment

Andrew Ross – Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment

Alamosa River Foundation Board

Cindy Medina

Rod Reinhardt

Dwight Martin

Alan Miller

Mike Gibson

John Shawcroft

State of Colorado Division of Water Resources

Steve Vandiver, Division Engineer, Division 3, Rio Grande

Joe McCann

Other Involved Citizens and Organizations

Paul Sinder

Capulin Water District

Terrace Irrigation Company

Alamosa/La Jara Conservancy District

Alamosa RIVERKEEPERS®

Alamosa River Water Restoration Project

Consultant Team

Chip Paulson – MWH

Andrew Smith – SWCA

Tracy Wilcox – MWH

Heather Neail – SWCA

Kazu Martinez – MWH

Chris Lidstone – Lidstone and Associates

Kelley Thompson – Agro Engineering

Glenn Krogman – Lidstone and Associates

Larry Semo – SWCA

Erin Martin – Lidstone and Associates