

CHAPTER 2

STUDY REGIONS

2.1. OVERVIEW OF THE LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER VALLEY IN COLORADO

The Upstream Study Reach (USR) extends from just west of Manzanola to near Las Animas and is representative of the hydrology, soil, crop, and irrigation conditions upstream of John Martin Reservoir. The Downstream Study Reach (DSR) is representative of the 5 conditions downstream of John Martin Reservoir. It extends from Lamar to the Colorado-Kansas state line. Both study reaches are located in the LARV which starts at the outlet of Pueblo Reservoir, approximately 10.5 km (6.5 mi) miles west of Pueblo, Colorado and extends into Kansas. This study is only concerned with the portions of the Arkansas River and LARV in Colorado. All portions of the LARV in Colorado are within Division 2 of the 10 Colorado Department of Water Resources (CDWR). Division 2 offices are located in Pueblo, Colorado. The CDWR is the state agency responsible for the legal administration of all surface and sub-surface waters in the State of Colorado. Figure 2.1 shows the location of the LARV, USR, DSR, and adjacent irrigated valley lands that contribute to the non-point source (NPS) return flows and loads to the study reaches in this thesis.

15 *Regional Geology of the LARV.*

The LARV is wide, with widths up to approximately 20 km (12.5 mi), but shallow with maximum elevation differences approaching 130 m (425 ft). The un-confined aquifer sits in alluvium made of a series of late Cambrian to Tertiary sedimentary formations (—DARTON 1906—). The bedrock underlying the alluvium consists primarily of marine-derived shales 20 of the Pierre, Niobrara, Carlisle, and Graneros series and limestones for most of the valley. As the river nears the Colorado-Kansas border, the bedrock is Dakota sandstone (—Moore

2




Figure 2.1. Lower Arkansas River Valley.

and Wood 1967—). The river is characterized as a shifting sand channel that meanders along the alluvial flood plain which is incised into the flood way. The alluvial aquifer and the Arkansas River and its tributaries have a strong hydraulic connection with the Arkansas River (—Konikow and Bredehoeft 1974, Person and Konikow 1986—).

5 Evidence indicates that the marine-derive shale bedrocks that underly most of the LARV and their weathered residuum yield a variety of salts, Se, and U under the dissolving action of natural and irrigation flows (—Zielinski et al 1995, 1997; Gates et al 2009, Bailey et al 2012—). In the US, selenium is readily abundant in some, but not all areas west of the western Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, and Oklahoma to the west cost (Painter, 1940). Figure
10 2.2 is a set of geochemical distribution maps developed by the U.S.G.S. Mineral Resources Program that shows the distribution of Se in the conterminous U.S. in the 0 cm to 5 cm layer, the top soil (A horizon) layer, and the parent rock (C horizon) layer (Smith et al., 2014).

Regional Climate and Hydrology of the LARV

Regionally, the climate is arid with large temperature fluctuations. Most of the
15 rainfall comes during the growing season in the form of heavy thunderstorms. Summers are hot with an average high temperature of 93°F (34°C) and winters are cold, with an average low temperature of 14°C –10°C. Snowfall is usually light, but is prone to drifting with the low humidity and moderately high velocity, steady winter winds.

The historic stream flows show considerable seasonal variability. Most of the total
20 annual flow is influenced primarily by snow melt and runoff in the Upper Arkansas River Basin, above Pueblo Reservoir. Additionally, groundwater base flow, runoff from precipitation events in the Eastern Colorado plains, and releases from Pueblo and John Martin Reservoirs in compliance with operational rules contribute to flow rates (Miller et al., 2010).

Average annual precipitation within the LARV ranges between 31.52 cm (12.41 in) in Pueblo, and varies eastwardly to 39.65 cm (15.61 in) in Holly. Figure 2.3 is a map of the LARV with the Average Annual Precipitation from 1981 - 2010 as reported by the U.S.D.A N.R.C.S. Average reference ET (ET_{Ref}) during the irrigation season (15 March - 5 15 November) is 1.3 m (4.25 ft) based on data collected from CoAgMet weather stations over the period 1992 - 2008 (—Clifford and Doesken 2009—). The Arkansas River riparian zone in the flood way is primarily characterized by heavy growth of Russian Olive (*Elaeagnus angustifolia*), multiple species of salt cedar (*Tamarix*), willows and other non-native species that are major contributors to regional evapo-transpiration (ET) losses (Nagler et al., 2010).

10 *Anthropogenic Factors for the LARB Study Regions*

Morph this section

Historically, prior to the advent of irrigated agriculture in the Ark River Basin during the 19th century, groundwater recharge in the basin occurred primarily from infiltration of precipitation through the unsaturated zone and from infiltration of surface water from losing streams. By mid-1880s, the waters of the Arkansas R. and its tributaries were fully 15 appropriated for normal or average years (Abbott, 1985). In areas where surface water was diverted for irrigation, infiltration of irrigation water from canals and fields became a primary source of groundwater recharge. Natural recharge is about 0.08 inches/year in the southeast corner of the state (Wolock, 2003).

The LARV river-aquifer system supplies water to towns and industries through shallow 20 aquifer wells. Water is returned either directly to the river after treatment or into the aquifer through groundwater seepage from treatment lagoons. Water supplied to these entities is a very small portion when compared to the demand from agriculture in the valley.




Figure 2.2. Distribution of Se in Soil in the Conterminous United States (Smith et al., 2014). This is a composite of three individual maps.




Figure 2.3. Precipitation in the LARV. Values on the isolines are reported as inches of average annual rainfall.

Agriculture is the primary industry in the LARV with approx 270,00 acres irrigated (Bailey et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2010). There are 25 main irrigation canals in the LARV with diversion structures crossing the river. Many fields near the river drain excess irrigation water directly back to the river (Bailey et al., 2012; Morway et al., 2013). There are also 5 about 2,400 groundwater pumping wells that tap into the riparian aquifer, thereby taking water, albeit indirectly, from the river. The floodplain is characterized by heavy agriculture on fertile soils. The region is known for a wide variety of crops including but not limited to alfalfa, corn, grass hay, wheat, sorghum, dry beans, cantaloupe, watermelon, and onions in order of cropped area (USDA NASS Colorado Field Office 2009). There are also a few 10 diaries and cattle feed lots. Most fields are irrigated using surface-irrigation methods with less than about 5% irrigated with sprinklers or drip lines. Surface and sprinkler irrigation efficiencies are varied depending on the crop and location Bailey (2012) refGates et al 2015

Precipitation in the LARV is substantially insufficient to support crop production by about 0.9 m (3 ft). It has been estimated that appropriated water rights in the LARV 15 exceed the annual native river flow by as much as 40% in a low flow year (—Cain 1985, Sutherland and Knapp 1988—). Additional water is provided by releases from Pueblo and John Martin Reservoirs which store water during the winter period. Some of this water is provided through trans-basin transfers through the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project.

Seepage from canals contributes significantly to the water quantity and quality in 20 LARV aquifer. Canals are constructed at higher elevations, promoting the surface transport of water over long distances to fields. This elevation difference also places a higher hydraulic gradient between the canal and aquifer. Canals, as a rule, are not constructed such that groundwater infiltrates into the canal channel. The entire process promotes the movement of water and dissolved constituents, including NO_3^{2-} , Se, U, and salts directly into the

aquifer. Additionally, a significantly large quantity of the total canal length in the LARV is located away from the river. This has two results. Since the aquifer is receiving recharge water from the canals, it acts as a reservoir, delaying the return of that water to the river channel. This result is seen during low flow conditions when the river channel still contains 5 water, even though historic conditions would tell us otherwise. The second result is that dissolved constituents are introduced into the aquifer where it is the shallowest, along the edges of the valley. This brings NO_3^{2-} and dissolved oxygen into contact with the Se bearing bedrock before either can be significantly depleted through other redox reactions (Bailey, 2012; Morway et al., 2013).

– Paragraph describing how irrigation and flows from canal seepage induce high concentrations of salt, Se, U, and nutrients through evapotranspiration and dissolution processes. Tell how do these solutes travel to the stream system driven by the large ground-water gradients .

– Briefly describe the distinctions between the geologic sources of Se (Ref: Gates et al 2009) and irrigation practices in the regions feeding the

2.2. UPSTREAM STUDY REACH AND SURROUNDING REGION

The upstream boundary of the USR starts immediately downstream of the Catlin Canal diversion dam. The dam is approximately 4.5 miles (mi) (7 km) west of the intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and State Highway 207 in Manzanola and 4.5 mi (7 km) east of the intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and State Highway 164 in Fowler. The USR extends along 10 approximately 61.5 mi (99 km) of the river to where U.S. Highway 50 crosses the Arkansas River north of Las Animas. All portions of the USR are in CDWR Division 2, Water District 17 which extends from Fowler to Las Animas. There are three main tributaries, multiple minor tributaries, five main irrigation canals, and one return canal (for augmentation flow) are present in the USR. Figure 2.4 shows the extent and approximate path of the USR and 15 the irrigated region supplying return flow to the reach.

The USR is separated into five segments given designations from "A" to "E" (Figure 2.4). Segments are geographically separated by irrigation canal diversion dams. Segment B is the only segment that does not contain a stream gauge on the main stem of the river. It is relatively short and has an additional diversion dam within its boundary. Typically, 20 significantly different flows pass through the main channel of the river within each segment. Segments were defined to provide boundaries for river storage volume calculations. Within each segment, except for segment B, the water surface level is determined primarily by flowrate, hydraulic geometry, and hydraulic resistance. Knowledge of the water surface level is necessary for estimating the river storage volume. A discussion of the river geometry analysis and storage volume calculation is provided in sections ?? and ??.

Figure 2.5 is a line diagram representing the major flow paths in the USR. This diagram is not to scale and depicts only the major canals and tributaries. The segments within the reach are color coded. Four canal diversion dams separate the segments. Points in

10




Figure 2.4. Upstream Study Reach. River segments within the USR are color coded.

5 Figure 2.5 designated as "Water Quality" are locations where CSU field technicians routinely took water samples for analysis. A discussion of the sampling and analysis methods is presented in section ??.

The main tributaries are perennial and supply water to the Arkansas River under most conditions. These tributaries are Timpas Creek, Crooked Arroyo, and Horse Creek.

10 Most of the minor tributaries are usually dry and only convey water during larger rainfall events and flood conditions. All three major tributaries have a significant portion of their flows provided by agricultural runoff.

There are two minor tributaries that provide low volume, perennial flows to the Arkansas River: King Arroyo and Anderson Arroyo. King Arroyo is assumed to be primarily

15 fed by La Junta Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) effluent. The La Junta Water Treatment Plant (WTP) effluent spills into Anderson Arroyo. It is currently unknown what groundwater and other flows contribute to the discharge from King or Anderson Arroyos. No discharge data are provided for the La Junta WTP due to the very low discharge rates.

The discharge from the La Junta WWTP is included in the models.

20 Patterson Hollow, a poorly-defined natural drainage, is depicted on the line graph as connected to the Arkansas River. Flows from the upper reach of Patterson Hollow are diverted to the Otero Canal. The reasons for the diversion are unknown, but it is speculated that the majority of the flows upstream of Otero Canal are irrigation returns and the diversion was an attempt to re-use valuable irrigation water. Regardless, since Patterson Hollow, for the most part, was separated from the Arkansas River, it was not included in this study.

The five major canals diverting water from the Arkansas River along the USR are Holbrook Canal, Rocky Ford Canal, Fort Lyon Storage Canal, Fort Lyon Canal, and Jones Ditch. The Rocky Ford Return Canal is the only monitored canal returning augmentation




Figure 2.5. Upstream Study Reach Flow Diagram.

5 water to the Arkansas River in the USR. The Rocky Ford Return Canal diverts water from the Rocky Ford Canal and returns it directly to the Arkansas River. This system is in place to monitor and augment flows in conjunction with trans-basin flows used by the City of Aurora. The Otero and Rocky Ford Highline Canals run parallel to the USR. They divert water from the Arkansas River upstream of the USR upstream boundary. Overflows from these two canals pass through the tributary gauge in Crooked Arroyo.

5

2.3. DOWNSTREAM STUDY REACH AND SURROUNDING REGION

The DSR begins at the U.S. Highway 50/U.S. Highway 287 Arkansas River crossing in Lamar, Colorado, and extends approximately 71 km to the Colorado/Kansas state line (Figure 2.6). Figure 2.7 is a line diagram representing the flow structure within the DSR. Similar symbology is used on these maps as in Figures 2.4 and 2.5 for the USR. For a 10 period of time, there were four tributaries and drains in the DSR where flows were measured manually gauged on an infrequent basis. The results of the this stream gauging activity do not affect the calculation or analysis of this study, but will be discussed in the conclusion. The entirety of the DSR lies within CDWR Division 2, District 67 and contains two major tributaries, multiple minor tributaries, and one irrigation canal.

15 The DSR is separated into Segment F and Segment G as shown in figure 2.6. The diversion dam for the Buffalo Ditch irrigation canal is the boundary between the two DSR segments. Field technicians have observed complete diversion of the Arkansas River at the Buffalo Ditch diversion with small but significant flows reappearing in the Arkansas River channel only a few kilometers downstream. This leads to the speculation that significant 20 portions of the downstream in-channel flow are from groundwater return flow.

The major tributaries within the DSR are Big Sandy Creek and Wild Horse Creek. CSU field technicians have observed that the stream gauge on Big Sandy Creek has been affected by beaver dams constructed downstream of the gauge and upstream of the culvert passing under State Highway 196. The stream gauge on Wild Horse Creek is operated seasonally from April through November. CSU has made many visual flow observations in these creeks outside of the irrigation season. The off season flows are either extremely low or the stream is frozen.



Figure 2.6. Downstream Study Reach. River segments within the DSR are color coded.




Figure 2.7. Downstream Study Reach Flow Diagram.

5 Unlike the USR, most of the minor tributaries in the DSR flow most of the year except
in drought conditions. The primary source of water in the minor tributaries is irrigation
runoff flowing into the streams through surface and subsurface flow paths. Most minor
tributaries in the DSR do not have definitive entry points to the Arkansas River channel
resulting in doubt as to whether these flows reach the Arkansas River as surface water. It was
10 assumed herein that the minor tributary flows enter the main stem primarily as groundwater.
Minor surface return flows that do reach the Arkansas River are not gauged and most are
difficult to access.

Buffalo Canal is the only functioning canal diversion within the DSR. There is historical and aerial imagery evidence for another diversion, but the Arkansas River has been
routed around the structure and neither the CDWR nor the USGS maintain a flow gauge
190 for the canal serviced by the diversion.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, P. (1985). Description of water-systems operations in the arkansas river basin, colorado. water resources investigations report 85-4092. Technical report, U.S. Geological Society.
- Andales, A., T. Bauder, and N. Doesken (2009, October). The colorado agricultural meteorological network (CoAgMet) and crop et reports. Fact sheet no. 4.723, Colorado State University.
- Bailey, R. T. (2012). *Regional Selenium Cycling In An Irrigated Agricultural Groundwater System: Conceptualization, Modeling, And Mitigation*. Ph.d., Colorado State University.
- Bailey, R. T., W. J. Hunter, and T. K. Gates (2012). The influence of nitrate on selenium in irrigated agricultural groundwater systems. *Journal of environmental quality* 41(3), 783–792.
- Bailey, R. T., E. C. Romero, and T. K. Gates (2015). Assessing best management practices for remediation of selenium loading in groundwater streams in an irrigated region. *Journal of Hydrolog* (521), 341–359.
- Colorado Climate Center (2012). About CoAgMet. WWW.
- Doesken, N. J., R. A. S. Pielke, and O. A. B. Bliss (2003). Climatology of the united state no. 60. Technical report, National Climatic Data Center.
- Miller, L. D., K. R. Watts, R. F. Ortiz, and T. Ivahnenko (2010). Occurrence and distribution of dissolved solids, selenium, and uranium in groundwater and surface water in the Arkansas River basin from the headwaters to Coolidge, Kansas, 1970-2009: U.S. Geological Survey scientific investigation report 2010-5069. Technical report, US Geological Survey.

Morway, E. D., R. G. Niswonger, C. D. Langevin, R. T. Bailey, and R. W. Healy (2013).

Modeling variably saturated subsurface solute transport with modflow-uzf and mt3dms.

Groundwater (51), 237251.

Nagler, P. L., E. P. Glenn, C. S. Jarnevich, and P. B. Shafroth (2010). *Distribution and Abundance of Saltcedar and Russian Olive in the Western United States*, Chapter 2, pp. 7–32. U.S. Geological Survey.

Painter, E. P. (1940). *The Chemistry And Toxicity Of Selenium Compounds, With Special Reference To The Selenium Problem*. North Dakota State University.

Rantz, S. E. et al. (1982a). Measurement and computation of streamflow: Volume 1. measurement of stage and discharge. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 2175, U.S.G.S.

Rantz, S. E. et al. (1982b). Measurement and computation of streamflow: Volume 2. computation of discharge. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 2175, U.S.G.S.

Sauer, V. B. and D. P. Turnipseed (2010). Stage measurement at gaging stations, techniques and methods 3a7. Technical report, USGS.

Smith, D. B., W. F. Cannon, L. G. Woodruff, F. Solano, and K. J. Ellefsen (2014). Geochemical and mineralogical maps for soils of the conterminous united states, open-file report 2014-1082. Technical report, U.S. Geological Survey.

USEPA (1992, December). *Specifications and Guidance for Contaminant-Free Sample Containers*. Number Publication 9240.0-05A, EPA540/R-93/051, PB93-953316. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wolock, D. (2003). Infiltration-excess overland flow estimated by topmodel for the conterminous united states: U.s. geological survey open-file report 03-310. Electronic Data Set.