Goose Creek Subbasin Temperature Total Maximum Daily Loads:

Addendum to the Goose Creek Subbasin Assessment and Total Maximum Daily Loads

Public Comment Draft

State of Idaho
Department of Environmental Quality

September 2011

Goose Creek Subbasin Temperature Total Maximum Daily Loads

September 2011

Prepared by:
State Technical Services Office
Department of Environmental Quality
1410 N. Hilton St.
Boise, ID 83706

This page intentionally left blank for correct double-sided printing.

Acknowledgments

Cover photo: Goose Creek below Emery Creek (Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, 2008).

This page intentionally left blank for correct double-sided printing.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments ... iii
Table of Contents ... v
List of Tables ... vi
List of Figures ... vi
List of Appendices ... vi
Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Symbols ... vii
Executive Summary ... ix
Subbasin at a Glance ... ix
Key Findings ... xi
Public Participation ... xii
Introduction ... 1
5. Total Maximum Daily Loads ... 1
5.1 Instream Water Quality Targets ... 2
Potential Natural Vegetation for Temperature TMDLs ... 2
Aerial Photo Interpretation ... 4
Pathfinder Methodology ... 4
Stream Morphology ... 5
Design Conditions ... 7
Target Selection ... 7
Monitoring Points ... 9
5.2 Load Capacity ... 9
5.3 Estimates of Existing Pollutant Loads ... 10
5.4 Load Allocation ... 16
Wasteload Allocation ... 17
Margin of Safety ... 17
Seasonal Variation ... 17
Construction Stormwater and TMDL Wasteload Allocations ... 17
Construction Stormwater ... 17
The Construction General Permit ... 18
Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan ... 18
Construction Stormwater Requirements ... 18
5.5 Public Participation ... 18
5.6 Implementation Strategies ... 19
Time Frame ... 19
Approach ... 19
Responsible Parties ... 19
Monitoring Strategy ... 19
5.7 Conclusions ... 19
References Cited ... 21
GIS Coverages ... 22
Glossary ... 23
Appendix A. State and Site-Specific Water Quality Standards and Criteria ... 33
Appendix B. Unit Conversion Chart ... 35
Appendix C. Data Sources, Solar Pathfinder Results, and Temperature Data ... 39
Appendix D. Public Comments ... 43

List of Tables

Table A. Streams and pollutants for which TMDLs were developed. xi
Table B. Summary of assessment outcomes..... xi
Table 1. Regional curve estimates and existing measurements of bankfull width for Goose Creek subbasin streams (US = Upper Snake). 6
Table 2. Shade targets for the persistent lodgepole pine (PVG 10) vegetation type at various stream widths. 8
Table 3. Shade targets for the quaking aspen vegetation type at various stream widths. 8
Table 4. Shade targets for the yellow willow vegetation type at various stream widths. 8
Table 5. Shade targets for the Geyer willow vegetation type at various stream widths. 8
Table 6. Shade targets for the sagebrush/grass vegetation type at various stream widths. 8
Table 7. Shade targets for the meadow vegetation type at various stream widths. 8
Table 8. Existing and target solar loads for Trout Creek. 11
Table 9. Existing and target solar loads for upper Goose Creek. 12
Table 10. Total existing, target, and excess solar loads; percent reductions; and average lack of shade for Goose and Trout Creeks. 16
Table 11. Summary of assessment outcomes. 20

List of Figures

Figure A. Subbasin at a glance.....x
Figure 1. Bankfull width as a function of drainage area. 6
Figure 2. Existing shade estimated for the Goose Creek subbasin by aerial photo interpretation. 13
Figure 3. Target shade for the Goose Creek subbasin. 14
Figure 4. Lack of shade (difference between existing and target) for the Goose Creek subbasin. 15

List of Appendices

Appendix A. State and Site-Specific Water Quality Standards and Criteria 33
Appendix B. Unit Conversion Chart 35
Appendix C. Data Sources, Solar Pathfinder Results, and Temperature Data.....39
Appendix D. Public Comments 43

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Symbols

§303(d)	Refers to section 303 subsection (d) of the Clean Water Act, or a list of impaired water bodies required by this section
AU	assessment unit
BMP	best management practice
C	Celsius
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CGP	Construction General Permit
CWA	Clean Water Act
DEQ	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
GIS	geographic information systems
IDAPA	Refers to citations of Idaho administrative rules
kWh	kilowatt-hour
LA	load allocation
LC	load capacity
m	meter
mi	mile
MOS	margin of safety
NB	natural background
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NREL	National Renewable Energy Laboratory
PNV	potential natural vegetation
PVG	potential vegetation group
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TMDL	total maximum daily load
U.S.	United States
U.S.C.	United States Code
WAG	watershed advisory group
WLA	wasteload allocation

This page intentionally left blank for correct double-sided printing.

Executive Summary

The federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires that states and tribes restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters. States and tribes, pursuant to Section 303 of the CWA, are to adopt water quality standards necessary to protect fish, shellfish, and wildlife while providing for recreation in and on the nation's waters whenever possible. Section 303(d) of the CWA establishes requirements for states and tribes to identify and prioritize water bodies that are water quality limited (i.e., water bodies that do not meet water quality standards). States and tribes must periodically publish a priority list (a "§303(d) list") of impaired waters. Currently this list must be published every two years and is included as the Category 5 list in the Integrated Report. For waters identified on this list, states and tribes must develop a total maximum daily load (TMDL) for the pollutants, set at a level to achieve water quality standards.

This document addresses two water bodies in the Goose Creek subbasin that have temperature exceedances of water quality standards. This document only addresses the temperature TMDLs for these streams. For more information about these watersheds and the subbasin as a whole, see the *Goose Creek Subbasin Assessment and Total Maximum Daily Loads* (DEQ 2003).

This TMDL analysis has been developed to comply with Idaho's TMDL requirements. The TMDL analysis quantifies pollutant sources and allocates responsibility for load reductions needed to return listed waters to a condition meeting water quality standards.

Subbasin at a Glance

The Goose Creek subbasin (hydrologic unit code 17040211) is located in south-central Idaho south of Burley, Idaho (Figure A). Within the subbasin, Beaverdam Creek, Cold Creek, and Goose Creek were listed on the Idaho 1998 §303d list for temperature pollution. A temperature TMDL for these streams was completed in 2003; however, only the lower portion of Goose Creek from the Utah border to Goose Creek Reservoir was included (DEQ 2003). In the current §303d list (i.e., the 2008 Integrated Report), upper Goose Creek (headwaters to Nevada border) and Trout Creek have been added to the list of streams with temperature impairments. Both streams are located in the Sawtooth National Forest and drain south from the Monument Peak area to the Nevada border (Figure A). The following analysis includes the temperature TMDLs for upper Goose Creek and Trout Creek.



Figure A. Subbasin at a glance.

Key Findings

Two creeks (upper Goose Creek and Trout Creek) were placed on the 2008 §303d list of impaired waters for reasons associated with temperature criteria violations (Table A). Effective shade targets were established for the two streams based on the concept of maximum shading under potential natural vegetation resulting in natural background temperatures. Shade targets were derived from effective shade curves developed for similar vegetation types in Idaho. Existing shade was determined from aerial photo interpretation and partially field verified with Solar Pathfinder data.

Both streams examined lacked shade compared to target levels (Table B). The lack of shade is likely the result of a combination of factors, including natural and human-influenced dewatering of the stream channel and historic removal of riparian vegetation associated with livestock grazing and agricultural practices. Much of this lack of shade is due to high target levels set for narrow streams with various tree-dominated vegetation types (e.g., aspen and lodgepole pine). Many such streams now lack these historic vegetation types or only have remnant stands of aspen or lodgepole pine. The reasons for this change in vegetation may be many and varied, from the lack of aspen regeneration due to grazing to a lack of water from diversion and drought throughout the subbasin. While not much can be done to address channel dewatering, most streams would recover riparian vegetation if temporarily or permanently excluded from use.

Target shade levels for individual reaches should be the goal managers strive for with future implementation plans. Managers should focus on the largest differences between existing and target shade as locations to prioritize implementation efforts.

Table A. Streams and pollutants for which TMDLs were developed.

Stream	Pollutant(s)
Upper Goose Creek	Temperature
Trout Creek	Temperature

Table B. Summary of assessment outcomes.

Water Body Segment/ Assessment Unit	Pollutant	TMDL(s) Completed	Recommended Changes to §303(d) List	Justification
Goose Creek ID17040211SK008_02 ID17040211SK008_03 ID17040211SK008_04	Temperature	Yes	Move to Category 4a	Excess solar load due to lack of shade
Trout Creek ID17040211SK007_02 ID17040211SK007_03	Temperature	Yes	Move to Category 4a	Excess solar load due to lack of shade

Public Participation

The Lake Walcott Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) was created in 1995 and contributed to the original Goose Creek subbasin assessment and TMDL. The Lake Walcott WAG has continued to meet several times annually since the approval of the original document. They reviewed the Goose Creek temperature TMDL document and discussed it at their July 21, 2011, meeting. The WAG was given a draft copy and was asked to submit comments to the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). An email was sent to the WAG members the following week that included the DEQ website address to access the draft document and comments were again requested before August 30, 2011. No comments were received. The DEQ Twin Falls Regional Office can provide copies of the document by request.

The general public will be able to comment on this draft document during the public comment period.

Introduction

This total maximum daily load (TMDL) is an addendum to the *Goose Creek Subbasin Assessment and Total Maximum Daily Loads* (DEQ 2003). That document, like all Idaho TMDL documents since 2001 that combine a subbasin assessment with a TMDL determination, has five sections, the first four of which make up the subbasin assessment. This document contains only an addendum to the TMDL determination section (section 5) and is based on the original subbasin assessment and characteristics from the 2003 Goose Creek subbasin assessment and TMDL.

This document addresses two water bodies in the Goose Creek subbasin (hydrologic unit code 17040211) that have temperature exceedances of water quality standards. Upper Goose Creek and Trout Creek were both added to the §303(d) for temperature impairment on the 2008 Integrated Report. Effective shade targets were established for the two streams based on the concept of maximum shading under potential natural vegetation (PNV) resulting in natural background temperatures.

5. Total Maximum Daily Loads

A TMDL prescribes an upper limit (i.e., load capacity) on discharge of a pollutant from all sources so as to ensure water quality standards are met. It further allocates this load capacity among the various sources of the pollutant. Pollutant sources fall into two broad classes: point sources, each of which receives a wasteload allocation, and nonpoint sources, each of which receives a load allocation. Natural background contributions, when present, are considered part of the load allocation but are often broken out on their own because they represent a part of the load not subject to control. Because of uncertainties regarding quantification of loads and the relation of specific loads to attainment of water quality standards, the rules regarding TMDLs (Water Quality Planning and Management, 40 CFR Part 130) require a margin of safety be a part of the TMDL. Practically, the margin of safety and natural background are both reductions in the load capacity available for allocation to pollutant sources.

The load capacity can be summarized by the following equation:

$$LC = MOS + NB + LA + WLA = TMDL.$$

Where:

LC = load capacity
MOS = margin of safety
NB = natural background
LA = load allocation
WLA = wasteload allocation

The equation is written in this order because it represents the logical order in which a load analysis is conducted. First the load capacity is determined. Then the load capacity is broken down into its components. After the necessary margin of safety and natural background, if relevant, are determined, the remainder is allocated among pollutant sources (i.e., the load

allocation and wasteload allocation). When the breakdown and allocation are complete, the result is a TMDL, which must equal the load capacity.

The load capacity must be based on critical conditions—the conditions when water quality standards are most likely to be violated. If protective under critical conditions, a TMDL will be more than protective under other conditions. Because both load capacity and pollutant source loads vary, and not necessarily in concert, determination of critical conditions can be more complicated than it may appear on the surface.

Another step in a load analysis is the quantification of current pollutant loads by source. This step allows the specification of load reductions as percentages from current conditions, considers equities in load reduction responsibility, and is necessary in order for pollutant trading to occur. A load is fundamentally a quantity of a pollutant discharged over some period of time and is the product of concentration and flow. Due to the diverse nature of various pollutants, and the difficulty of strictly dealing with loads, the federal rules allow for "other appropriate measures" to be used when necessary. These "other measures" must still be quantifiable and relate to water quality standards, but they allow flexibility to deal with pollutant loads in more practical and tangible ways. The rules also recognize the particular difficulty of quantifying nonpoint loads and allow "gross allotment" as a load allocation where available data or appropriate predictive techniques limit more accurate estimates. For certain pollutants whose effects are long term, such as sediment and nutrients, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) allows for seasonal or annual loads.

5.1 Instream Water Quality Targets

For the Goose Creek subbasin temperature TMDLs, the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) used a PNV approach. The Idaho water quality standards include a provision (IDAPA 58.01.02.200.09) establishing that if natural conditions exceed numeric water quality criteria, exceedance of the criteria is not considered a violation of water quality standards. In these situations, natural conditions essentially become the water quality standard, and the natural level of shade and channel width become the target of the TMDL. The instream temperature that results from attaining these conditions is consistent with the water quality standards even if it exceeds numeric temperature criteria. See Appendix A for further discussion of water quality standards and background provisions.

The PNV approach is described briefly below. Additionally, the procedures and methodologies to develop PNV target shade levels and to estimate existing shade levels are described in Shumar and de Varona (2009). For a more complete discussion of shade and its effects on stream water temperature, see *The Potential Natural Vegetation (PNV) Temperature Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Procedures Manual* (Shumar and de Varona 2009).

Potential Natural Vegetation for Temperature TMDLs

There are several important contributors of heat to a stream, including ground water temperature, air temperature, and direct solar radiation (Poole and Berman 2001). Of these, direct solar radiation is the source of heat that is most likely to be controlled. The parameters that affect the amount of solar radiation hitting a stream throughout its length are shade and stream morphology. Shade is provided by the surrounding vegetation and other physical features such as hillsides, canyon walls, terraces, and high banks. Stream morphology affects

the density of riparian vegetation and water storage in the alluvial aquifer. Streamside vegetation and channel morphology are the factors influencing shade that are most likely to have been influenced by anthropogenic activities and can be most readily corrected and addressed by a TMDL.

Depending on how much vertical elevation surrounds the stream, vegetation further away from the riparian corridor can also provide shade. However, riparian vegetation provides a substantial amount of shade on a stream by virtue of its proximity. We can measure or estimate the amount of shade that a stream receives in a number of ways. Effective shade (i.e., that shade provided by all objects that intercept the sun as it makes its way across the sky) can be measured in a given location with a Solar Pathfinder or other optical equipment that works similar to a fish-eye lens on a camera. Effective shade can also be modeled using detailed information about riparian plants and their communities, topography, and stream aspect. In addition to shade, canopy cover is a similar parameter that affects solar radiation. Canopy cover is the vegetation that hangs directly over the stream and can be measured using a densiometer or estimated visually either on-site or using aerial photography. All of these methods provide information about how much of the stream is covered and how much is exposed to direct solar radiation.

PNV along a stream is that riparian plant community that has grown to an overall mature state, although some level of natural disturbance is usually included in the development and use of shade targets. Vegetation can be removed by natural disturbance (e.g., wildfire, disease/old age, wind damage, wildlife grazing) or anthropogenically (e.g., domestic livestock grazing, vegetation removal, erosion). The idea behind PNV as targets for temperature TMDLs is that PNV provides a natural level of solar loading to the stream without any anthropogenic removal of shade-producing vegetation. Anything less than PNV results in the stream heating up from anthropogenically created additional solar inputs.

We can estimate potential vegetation (and therefore target shade) from models of plant community structure (i.e., shade curves for specific riparian plant communities), and we can measure or estimate existing canopy cover or shade. Comparing the two (target and existing shade) tells us how much excess solar load the stream is receiving and what potential there is to decrease solar gain. Streams disturbed by wildfire, flood, or some other natural disturbance will be at less than PNV and require time to recover. Streams that have been disturbed by human activity may require additional restoration above and beyond natural recovery.

Existing shade was estimated for the two water bodies from visual interpretation of aerial photos. These estimates were partially field verified by measuring shade with a Solar Pathfinder at systematically located points along the streams (see below for methodology). PNV targets were determined from an analysis of probable vegetation at the streams and comparing that to shade curves developed for similar vegetation communities in Idaho (see Shumar and de Varona 2009). A shade curve shows the relationship between effective shade and stream width. As a stream gets wider, shade decreases as vegetation has less ability to shade the center of wide streams. As the vegetation gets taller, the more shade the plant community is able to provide at any given channel width.

Existing and PNV target shade was converted to solar loads from data collected on flat-plate collectors at the nearest National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) weather station collecting these data. In this analysis for Goose and Trout Creeks, we used data from the

station in Pocatello, Idaho. The difference between existing and target solar load, assuming existing load is higher, is the load reduction necessary to bring the stream back into compliance with temperature water quality standards (Appendix A). PNV shade and the associated target solar loads are assumed to be the natural condition; thus, stream temperatures under PNV conditions are assumed to be natural (so long as there are no point sources or any other anthropogenic sources of heat in the watershed) and are considered to be consistent with the Idaho water quality standards even if they exceed numeric criteria by more than 0.3 °C.[1]

Aerial Photo Interpretation

Estimates of shade based on plant type and density were marked out on a 1:100,000 or 1:250,000 hydrography taking into account natural breaks in vegetation density. Each interval was assigned a single value representing the bottom of a 10% shade class (adapted from the cumulative watershed effects process, IDL 2000*)*. For example, if shade for a particular stretch of stream was estimated somewhere between 50% and 59%, we assigned a 50% shade-class value to that section. The estimate is based on a general intuitive observation about the kind of vegetation present, its density, and stream width. Streams where the banks and water are clearly visible are usually in low shade classes (10%, 20%, or 30%). Streams with dense forest or heavy brush where no portion of the stream is visible are usually in high shade classes (70%, 80%, or 90%). More open canopies where portions of the stream may be visible usually fall into moderate shade classes (40%, 50%, or 60%).

Visual estimates made from aerial photos are strongly influenced by canopy cover and do not always take into account topography or any shading that may occur from physical features other than vegetation. It is not always possible to visualize or anticipate shade characteristics resulting from topography and landform. However, research has shown that shade and canopy cover measurements are remarkably similar (OWEB 2001), reinforcing the idea that riparian vegetation and objects proximal to the stream provide the most shade. The visual estimates of shade in this TMDL were partially field verified with a Solar Pathfinder, which measures effective shade and takes into consideration other physical features that block the sun from hitting the stream surface (e.g., hillsides, canyon walls, terraces, man-made structures).

Pathfinder Methodology

The Solar Pathfinder is a device that allows one to trace the outline of shade-producing objects on monthly solar path charts. The percentage of the sun's path covered by these objects is the effective shade on the stream at the location where the tracing is made. To adequately characterize the effective shade on a stream reach, ten traces are taken at systematic intervals along the length of the stream in question.

At each sampling location, the Solar Pathfinder was placed in the middle of the stream at about the bankfull water level. Traces were taken following the manufacturer's instructions. Systematic sampling was used because it is easiest to accomplish while still not biasing the location of sampling. For each sampled reach, the sampler started at a unique location (such as 50 meters [m] from a bridge or fence line) and proceeded upstream or downstream stopping to take additional traces at fixed intervals (e.g., every 50 m, 50 paces, etc.). One can

[1] A unit conversion table is provided in Appendix B.

also randomly locate points of measurement by generating random numbers to be used as interval distances.

When possible, the sampler also measured bankfull widths, took notes, and photographed the stream at several unique locations while taking the traces. Special attention was given to changes in riparian plant communities and what kinds of plant species (the large, dominant, shade-producing ones) were present. One can also take densiometer readings at the same location as Solar Pathfinder traces. These readings provide the potential to develop relationships between canopy cover and effective shade for a given stream.

Stream Morphology

Measures of current bankfull width or near stream disturbance zone width may not reflect widths that were present under PNV. As impacts to streams and riparian areas occur, width-to-depth ratios tend to increase such that streams become wider and shallow. Shadows produced by vegetation cover a lower percentage of the water surface in wider streams, and widened streams can also have less vegetative cover if shoreline vegetation has been eroded away.

This width factor (i.e., near stream disturbance zone or bankfull width) may not be discernible from the aerial photo interpretations. This parameter must be estimated from available information. DEQ used regional curves for the major basins in Idaho—developed from data compiled by Diane Hopster of the Idaho Department of Lands—to estimate natural bankfull width (Figure 1).

For both streams evaluated in the load analysis, bankfull width was estimated based on the drainage area of the Upper Snake curve from Figure 1. Additionally, existing width was evaluated from available data. If the stream's existing width was wider than predicted by the Upper Snake curve in Figure 1, then the estimate of bankfull width from Figure 1 was used in the load analysis for natural bankfull width. If existing width was smaller, then existing width was used in the load analysis as the natural bankfull width (i.e., existing = natural).



Figure 1. Bankfull width as a function of drainage area.

In general, the majority of existing bankfull width data showed that streams are typically smaller than or equal to what is predicted by regional curves (Table 1). This is not surprising in an arid environment where a lack of precipitation results in a predominance of ephemeral and intermittent streams. Only a few locations had existing widths larger than predicted. Therefore, in most cases existing width was used for natural width in the load analysis tables that follow in section 5.3 (Estimates of Existing Pollutant Loads). In only a few cases did existing widths indicate an over-widening of stream channels.

Table 1. Regional curve estimates and existing measurements of bankfull width for Goose Creek subbasin streams (US = Upper Snake).

Location	area (sq mi)	US (m)	existing in meters (year measured)
Trout Cr @ stateline	18.8	6	3.1(98), 2.7(03)
Trout Cr @ 5800ft	14	5	3.8(97),2.8(02),3.4(05),4.2(06),1.9(07)
Trout Cr @ 6200ft	3.9	3	3.6(02), 7.3(08), 7.9(08)
Trout Cr @ 6800ft	1.9	2	
Upper Goose Cr ab Thoroughbred Cr	38	8	8.1(97),9.1(99), 6.3(01),7.1(06),4.9(07)
Upper Goose Cr @ 5800ft	32	7	5.3(97),5.4(04),4.3(06),4.2(07)
Upper Goose Cr @ 6000ft	25.7	7	5.4(99),4.6(02),3.9(03),4.7(04),4.9(06)
Upper Goose Cr @ 6400ft	8.9	4	3.4(97),2.5(05)
Upper Goose Cr @ 6800ft	1.69	2	8.8(08, near ponds)
green = low existing			
yellow = high existing			

Design Conditions

The majority of the Goose Creek subbasin lies within the Northern Basin and Range ecoregion (level III) of McGrath et al. (2001). However, the outlet from Goose Creek Reservoir and several other drainages (e.g., Big Cottonwood Creek, Mill Creek) drain to the Magic Valley Province of the Snake River Plain level III ecoregion. The high elevations of Magic Mountain and the Albion Mountains are within the High Elevation Forests and Shrublands level IV ecoregion and are characterized by a mix of conifers, mountain brush, and sagebrush grasslands. North-facing slopes and flatter areas typically contain open Douglas-fir, aspen, and lodgepole pine. On lower slopes of these mountains and Middle Mountain (between Goose Creek and Birch Creek), the Semiarid Hills and Low Mountains level IV ecoregion predominates. Vegetation is characterized by mostly sagebrush steppe with juniper woodlands prevalent on rocky outcrops. In the valleys close to the town of Oakley, Idaho, the Sagebrush Steppe Valleys level IV ecoregion is present. A small portion of lower Goose Creek at the Utah border lies within the Dissected High Lava Plateau level IV ecoregion, a sagebrush grassland that is slightly less wooded and more arid than other provinces in this ecoregion.

Riparian vegetation along streams varies greatly from higher-elevation Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) or lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*) forests and quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) stands to willow-dominated areas at lower elevations. Generally the mid-elevation (5,000–6,000 feet) willow communities are lumped into a yellow willow (*Salix lutea*) type, and lower elevation (below 5,000 feet) willow communities are dominated by a coyote willow (*S. exigua*) type. Above 6,000 feet are willow-dominated riparian communities interspersed among lodgepole pine and aspen communities. The willow species were not identified, but for the purposes of developing shade targets a Geyer willow/sedge community type was used to represent these areas. Geyer willow (*Salix geyeriana*) is a typical mid-elevation willow that could exist in these areas. West-facing streams emanating from the Albion Mountains tend to have mountain alder (*Alnus incana*) riparian communities instead of aspen as along Magic Mountain streams. Occasionally streamflows are low enough that only a small ribbon of grass occurs at the interface between the stream and the upland vegetation. These community types are identified as grass-dominated or sagebrush/grass-dominated depending on the proximity of upland sagebrush plants to the stream edge. Grass-dominated streams typically occur in high-elevation meadows, while sagebrush/grass-dominated streams are usually lowland segments.

Target Selection

To determine PNV shade targets for streams in the Goose Creek subbasin, effective shade curves developed specifically for southern Idaho were examined (Shumar and de Varona 2009). For this analysis, we used shade curves from the southern Idaho non-forest group developed from data by Hansen and Hall (2002) and the persistent lodgepole pine potential vegetation group (PVG 10) shade curve developed for the Sawtooth National Forest. Effective shade curves include percent shade on the vertical axis and stream width on the horizontal axis. As a stream becomes wider, a given vegetation type loses its ability to shade wider and wider streams. For the streams in the Goose Creek subbasin, curves for the most similar vegetation type were selected for shade target determinations. Targets are based on averaging the individual curves for the three aspects (i.e., N/S, E/W, and NE/SW/NW/SE) for any given community type at a particular stream width (Tables 2–7).

Table 2. Shade targets for the persistent lodgepole pine (PVG 10) vegetation type at various stream widths.

Persistent Lodgepole (PVG 10)	1m	2m	3m	4m	5m	6m	7m	8m	9m	10m	11m	12m	13m
0/180 aspect	96	94	91	87	81	75	70	65	61	58	55	52	49
45/135/225/315 aspect	96	94	91	86	81	76	70	65	62	58	55	52	49
90/270 aspect	97	95	90	87	83	76	70	64	59	54	49	45	42
Target (%)	**96**	**94**	**91**	**87**	**82**	**76**	**70**	**65**	**61**	**57**	**53**	**50**	**47**

Table 3. Shade targets for the quaking aspen vegetation type at various stream widths.

Aspen	1m	2m	3m	4m	5m	6m	7m	8m	9m	10m	11m	12m	13m
0/180 aspect	99	99	99	96	93	90	86	82	78	75	71	68	65
45/135/225/315 aspect	100	99	99	96	93	89	85	81	77	73	69	65	62
90/270 aspect	100	99	99	97	95	91	84	76	67	61	56	52	48
Target (%)	**100**	**99**	**99**	**96**	**94**	**90**	**85**	**80**	**74**	**70**	**65**	**62**	**58**

Table 4. Shade targets for the yellow willow vegetation type at various stream widths.

Yellow willow	1m	2m	3m	4m	5m	6m	7m	8m	9m	10m	11m	12m	13m
0/180 aspect	88	75	60	51	45	39	35	32	29	26	24	22	21
45/135/225/315 aspect	88	74	58	48	42	36	32	29	26	24	22	20	19
90/270 aspect	91	71	50	38	31	27	23	20	18	17	15	14	13
Target (%)	**89**	**73**	**56**	**46**	**39**	**34**	**30**	**27**	**24**	**22**	**20**	**19**	**18**

Table 5. Shade targets for the Geyer willow vegetation type at various stream widths.

Geyer Willow/sedge	1m	2m	3m	4m	5m	6m	7m	8m	9m	10m	11m	12m	13m
0/180 aspect	92	83	68	59	51	45	41	37	33	31	28	26	24
45/135/225/315 aspect	92	82	66	56	48	42	38	34	31	28	26	24	22
90/270 aspect	94	82	58	45	37	31	27	24	21	19	18	16	15
Target (%)	**93**	**82**	**64**	**53**	**45**	**39**	**35**	**32**	**28**	**26**	**24**	**22**	**20**

Table 6. Shade targets for the sagebrush/grass vegetation type at various stream widths.

Graminoid/Sagebrush	1m	2m	3m	4m	5m	6m	7m	8m	9m	10m	11m	12m	13m
0/180 aspect	71	46	33	25	20	17	15	13	12	10	9	9	8
45/135/225/315 aspect	68	41	28	21	17	14	12	11	10	9	8	7	7
90/270 aspect	55	29	20	15	12	10	9	8	7	6	6	5	5
Target (%)	**65**	**39**	**27**	**20**	**16**	**14**	**12**	**11**	**10**	**8**	**8**	**7**	**7**

Table 7. Shade targets for the meadow vegetation type at various stream widths.

Graminoid	1m	2m	3m	4m	5m	6m	7m	8m	9m	10m	11m	12m	13m
0/180 aspect	62	38	26	20	16	14	12	10	9	8	7	7	6
45/135/225/315 aspect	58	33	22	17	14	11	10	9	8	7	6	6	5
90/270 aspect	45	23	16	12	10	8	7	6	5	5	4	4	4
Target (%)	**55**	**31**	**21**	**16**	**13**	**11**	**10**	**8**	**7**	**7**	**6**	**6**	**5**

The locations where the various vegetation types were applied to streams in the load analysis tables in section 5.3 were dependent upon our best professional judgment based on field observations and experience to determine where vegetation types occur on streams. The lodgepole pine PVG and aspen locations were enhanced by the Sawtooth National Forest PVG overlay for those lands.

Monitoring Points

The accuracy of the aerial photo interpretations was field verified with a Solar Pathfinder at three sites on Goose Creek and Trout Creek. The aerial photo estimate of shade proved to be accurate at one of the three Solar Pathfinder sites (see Appendix C for Solar Pathfinder results). At the other two sites, the aerial photo estimates were too high compared to field-measured shade, with an overall average difference of 17% ± 17.3 (mean ± 95% confidence interval). The original aerial photo estimates were corrected accordingly. Specific Solar Pathfinder sites were corrected to represent their field-measured values and data were used to recalibrate our visual estimates to reinterpret all other shade interpretations.

Effective shade monitoring can take place on any reach throughout the Goose or Trout Creek watersheds and be compared to estimates of existing shade described in Tables 8 and 9 and seen on Figure 2. Those areas with the largest disparity between existing and target shade should be monitored with Solar Pathfinders to further verify the existing shade levels and to determine progress towards meeting shade targets. It is important to note that many existing shade estimates have not been field verified and may require adjustment during the implementation process. Stream segment length for each estimate of existing shade varies depending on land use or landscape that has affected that shade level. It is appropriate to monitor within a given existing shade segment to see if that segment has increased its existing shade towards target levels. Ten equally spaced Solar Pathfinder measurements averaged together within that segment should suffice to determine new shade levels in the future.

5.2 Load Capacity

The load capacity for a stream under PNV is essentially the solar loading allowed under the shade targets specified for the reaches within that stream (Figure 3). These loads are determined by multiplying the solar load received by a flat-plate collector (under full sun) for a given period of time by the percent of solar radiation that is not blocked by shade (i.e., the percent open or 100 minus percent shade). In other words, if a shade target is 60% (or 0.6), then the solar load hitting the stream under that target is 40% of the load hitting the flat-plate collector under full sun.

We obtained solar load data from flat-plate collectors at the NREL weather station in Pocatello, Idaho. The solar loads used in this TMDL are spring/summer averages (i.e., an average load for the 6-month period from April through September). These months coincide with the time of year when stream temperatures are increasing and deciduous vegetation is in leaf. Tables 8 and 9 show the PNV shade targets and their corresponding target summer load (in kilowatt-hours [kWh] per m^2 per day and kWh/day) that serve as the load capacities for the streams. Existing and target loads in kWh/day can be summed for the entire stream or portion of stream examined in a single load analysis table. These total loads are shown at the bottom of their respective columns in each table.

The effective shade calculations are based on a 6-month period from April through September. This time period coincides with the critical time period when temperatures affect beneficial uses such as spring and fall salmonid spawning and when cold water aquatic life criteria may be exceeded during summer months. Late July and early August typically represent the period of highest stream temperatures. Solar gains can begin early in the spring

and affect not only the highest temperatures reached later in the summer but also salmonid spawning temperatures in spring and fall. Thus, solar loading in these streams is evaluated from spring (April) to early fall (September).

5.3 Estimates of Existing Pollutant Loads

Regulations allow that loadings "...may range from reasonably accurate estimates to gross allotments, depending on the availability of data and appropriate techniques for predicting the loading" (Water Quality Planning and Management, 40 CFR § 130.2(I)). An estimate must be made for each point source. Nonpoint sources are typically estimated based on the type of sources (land use) and area (such as a subwatershed) but may be aggregated by type of source or land area. To the extent possible, background loads should be distinguished from human-caused increases in nonpoint loads.

Existing loads in this temperature TMDL come from estimates of existing shade as determined from aerial photo interpretations. Like target shade, existing shade was converted to a solar load by multiplying the fraction of open stream by the solar radiation measured on a flat-plate collector at the NREL weather station. Existing shade data are presented in Tables 8 and 9 and Figure 2. Like load capacities (target loads), existing loads in Tables 8 and 9 are presented on an area basis (kWh/m^2/day) and as a total load (kWh/day).

Like target loads, existing loads in kWh/day are summed for the entire stream or portion of stream examined in a single load analysis table. The difference between target load and existing load is also summed for the entire table. Should existing load exceed target load, this difference becomes the excess load (i.e., lack of shade) to be discussed in the load allocation section and as seen in Figure 4. The percent reduction shown in the right-hand column of each table represents how much total excess load there is in relation to total existing load for that particular stream segment (Tables 8 and 9).

Table 8. Existing and target solar loads for Trout Creek.

Segment Details					Target					Existing					Summary	
AU	Stream Name	Number (top to bottom)	Length (m)	Vegetation Type	Shade	Solar Radiation (kWh/m^2/day)	Segment Width (m)	Segment Area (m^2)	Solar Load (kWh/day)	Shade	Solar Radiation (kWh/m^2/day)	Segment Width (m)	Segment Area (m^2)	Solar Load (kWh/day)	Excess Load (kWh/day)	Lack of Shade
007_02	Trout Creek	1	1100	meadow	55%	2.77	1	1,000	3,000	50%	3.08	1	1,000	3,000	0	-5%
007_02	Trout Creek	2	2300	lodgepole	94%	0.37	2	5,000	2,000	80%	1.23	2	5,000	6,000	4,000	-14%
007_02	Trout Creek	3	210	Geyer willow	82%	1.11	2	400	400	70%	1.85	2	400	700	300	-12%
007_02	Trout Creek	4	350	Geyer willow	82%	1.11	2	700	800	40%	3.69	2	700	3,000	2,000	-42%
007_02	Trout Creek	5	520	lodgepole	94%	0.37	2	1,000	400	80%	1.23	2	1,000	1,000	600	-14%
007_02	Trout Creek	6	1500	aspen	99%	0.06	2	3,000	200	70%	1.85	2	3,000	6,000	6,000	-29%
007_02	Trout Creek	7	220	lodgepole	94%	0.37	2	400	100	80%	1.23	2	400	500	400	-14%
007_02	Trout Creek	8	570	aspen	99%	0.06	3	2,000	100	80%	1.23	3	2,000	2,000	2,000	-19%
007_02	Trout Creek	9	1800	Geyer willow	64%	2.21	3	5,000	10,000	20%	4.92	4	7,000	30,000	20,000	-44%
007_02	Trout Creek	10	220	aspen	99%	0.06	3	700	40	30%	4.31	6	1,000	4,000	4,000	-69%
007_02	Trout Creek	11	240		99%	0.06	3	700	40	60%	2.46	6	1,000	2,000	2,000	-39%
007_02	Trout Creek	12	300	yellow willow	56%	2.71	3	900	2,000	40%	3.69	6	2,000	7,000	5,000	-16%
007_02	Trout Creek	13	180		56%	2.71	3	500	1,000	30%	4.31	6	1,000	4,000	3,000	-26%
007_02	Trout Creek	14	530		56%	2.71	3	2,000	5,000	10%	5.54	5	3,000	20,000	20,000	-46%
007_02	Trout Creek	15	560		46%	3.32	4	2,000	7,000	20%	4.92	5	3,000	10,000	3,000	-26%
007_02	Trout Creek	16	2100		46%	3.32	4	8,000	30,000	30%	4.31	4	8,000	30,000	0	-16%
007_03	Trout Creek	17	800		46%	3.32	4	3,000	10,000	20%	4.92	4	3,000	10,000	0	-26%
007_03	Trout Creek	18	340		46%	3.32	4	1,000	3,000	30%	4.31	4	1,000	4,000	1,000	-16%
007_03	Trout Creek	19	250		46%	3.32	4	1,000	3,000	10%	5.54	4	1,000	6,000	3,000	-36%
007_03	Trout Creek	20	820		46%	3.32	4	3,000	10,000	0%	6.15	4	3,000	20,000	10,000	-46%
007_03	Trout Creek	21	1100		46%	3.32	4	4,000	10,000	10%	5.54	4	4,000	20,000	10,000	-36%
007_03	Trout Creek	22	420		46%	3.32	4	2,000	7,000	0%	6.15	4	2,000	10,000	3,000	-46%
007_03	Trout Creek	23	270		46%	3.32	4	1,000	3,000	10%	5.54	4	1,000	6,000	3,000	-36%
							Totals		110,000					210,000	100,000	

Note: All assessment unit (AU) numbers start with ID17040211SK.

Table 9. Existing and target solar loads for upper Goose Creek.

Segment Details					Target					Existing					Summary	
AU	Stream Name	Number (top to bottom)	Length (m)	Vegetation Type	Shade	Solar Radiation (kWh/m^2/day)	Segment Width (m)	Segment Area (m^2)	Solar Load (kWh/day)	Shade	Solar Radiation (kWh/m^2/day)	Segment Width (m)	Segment Area (m^2)	Solar Load (kWh/day)	Excess Load (kWh/day)	Lack of Shade
008_02	Goose Creek	1	1270	lodgepole	96%	0.25	1	1,000	200	90%	0.62	1	1,000	600	400	-6%
008_02	Goose Creek	2	380	Geyer willow	93%	0.43	1	400	200	70%	1.85	1	400	700	500	-23%
008_02	Goose Creek	3	410	sage/grass	65%	2.15	1	400	900	60%	2.46	1	400	1,000	100	-5%
008_02	Goose Creek	4	740	Geyer willow	82%	1.11	2	1,000	1,000	80%	1.23	2	1,000	1,000	0	-2%
008_02	Goose Creek	5	1300		82%	1.11	2	3,000	3,000	60%	2.46	2	3,000	7,000	4,000	-22%
008_02	Goose Creek	6	470		82%	1.11	2	900	1,000	30%	4.31	2	900	4,000	3,000	-52%
008_02	Goose Creek	7	700		82%	1.11	2	1,000	1,000	60%	2.46	2	1,000	2,000	1,000	-22%
008_02	Goose Creek	8	1200		64%	2.21	3	4,000	9,000	60%	2.46	3	4,000	10,000	1,000	-4%
008_02	Goose Creek	9	580		64%	2.21	3	2,000	4,000	40%	3.69	3	2,000	7,000	3,000	-24%
008_02	Goose Creek	10	720		64%	2.21	3	2,000	4,000	50%	3.08	3	2,000	6,000	2,000	-14%
008_03	Goose Creek	11	990		53%	2.89	4	4,000	10,000	50%	3.08	4	4,000	10,000	0	-3%
008_03	Goose Creek	12	610		53%	2.89	4	2,000	6,000	40%	3.69	4	2,000	7,000	1,000	-13%
008_03	Goose Creek	12	1800		53%	2.89	4	7,000	20,000	50%	3.08	4	7,000	20,000	0	-3%
008_03	Goose Creek	13	3700		45%	3.38	5	20,000	70,000	40%	3.69	5	20,000	70,000	0	-5%
008_04	Goose Creek	14	970		45%	3.38	5	5,000	20,000	40%	3.69	5	5,000	20,000	0	-5%
008_04	Goose Creek	15	330		45%	3.38	5	2,000	7,000	30%	4.31	5	2,000	9,000	2,000	-15%
008_04	Goose Creek	16	900	aspen	94%	0.37	5	5,000	2,000	40%	3.69	5	5,000	20,000	20,000	-54%
008_04	Goose Creek	18	170		94%	0.37	5	900	300	10%	5.54	5	900	5,000	5,000	-84%
008_04	Goose Creek	19	1000	yellow willow	39%	3.75	5	5,000	20,000	20%	4.92	5	5,000	20,000	0	-19%
008_04	Goose Creek	20	1500		39%	3.75	5	8,000	30,000	30%	4.31	5	8,000	30,000	0	-9%
008_04	Goose Creek	22	1660		34%	4.06	6	10,000	40,000	20%	4.92	6	10,000	50,000	10,000	-14%
008_04	Goose Creek	23	660		34%	4.06	6	4,000	20,000	40%	3.69	6	4,000	10,000	(10,000)	0%
008_04	Goose Creek	24	410		34%	4.06	6	2,000	8,000	20%	4.92	6	2,000	10,000	2,000	-14%
008_04	Goose Creek	25	910		34%	4.06	6	5,000	20,000	30%	4.31	6	5,000	20,000	0	-4%
008_04	Goose Creek	26	1130		30%	4.31	7	8,000	30,000	20%	4.92	7	8,000	40,000	10,000	-10%
008_04	Goose Creek	27	420		30%	4.31	7	3,000	10,000	30%	4.31	7	3,000	10,000	0	0%
							Totals		340,000					390,000	55,000	

Note: All assessment unit (AU) numbers start with ID17040211SK.



Figure 2. Existing shade estimated for the Goose Creek subbasin by aerial photo interpretation.



Figure 3. Target shade for the Goose Creek subbasin.



Figure 4. Lack of shade (difference between existing and target) for the Goose Creek subbasin.

5.4 Load Allocation

Because this TMDL is based on PNV, which is equivalent to background loading, the load allocation is essentially the desire to achieve background conditions. However, in order to reach that objective, load allocations are assigned to nonpoint source activities that have affected or may affect riparian vegetation and shade as a whole. Load allocations are therefore reach specific and are dependent upon the target load for a given reach. Tables 8 and 9 show the target shade, which is converted to a target summer solar load by multiplying the inverse fraction (1 minus shade fraction) by the average load received by a flat-plate collector for the months of April through September. This calculation results in the load capacity of the stream, and it is necessary to achieve background conditions. At that point, there is no opportunity to further remove shade from the stream by any activity without exceeding its load capacity. Additionally, because this TMDL is dependent upon background conditions for achieving water quality standards, all tributaries to the waters examined here need to be in natural conditions in order to prevent excess heat loads to the system.

Table 10 shows the total existing, total target, and excess heat load (kWh/day) for each water body examined, as well as the percent reduction needed to meet target loads. The table also presents the average lack of shade, which is the result of averaging all the differences between existing shade and target shade for the creek. The last column of each load analysis table (Tables 8 and 9) shows these differences between existing and target shade for each segment examined.

Table 10. Total existing, target, and excess solar loads; percent reductions; and average lack of shade for Goose and Trout Creeks.

Water Body	Total Existing Load (kWh/day)	Total Target Load (kWh/day)	Excess Load (kWh/day)	Necessary Percent (%) Reduction	Average Lack of Shade (%)
Goose Creek	390,000	340,000	55,000	14	-16
Trout Creek	210,000	110,000	100,000	48	-29

Note: Load data are rounded to two significant figures, which may present rounding errors.

Although Goose Creek is larger than Trout Creek as depicted by a larger target load, Goose Creek had a smaller excess load and necessary percent reduction than Trout Creek. The average lack-of-shade values reflect that Goose Creek is generally in better condition than Trout Creek. Trout Creek had more segments where lack of shade exceeded 20% (Figure 4).

Both streams lacked shade and had excess loads. Much of this excess can be attributed to high target levels due to narrow streams with various tree-dominated vegetation types (aspen, lodgepole pine, etc.). Many of these streams now lack these vegetation types or only have remnant stands of aspen or lodgepole. The reasons for this vegetation change may be many and varied, from the lack of aspen regeneration due to grazing to a lack of water from diversion and drought throughout the subbasin.

Although this analysis focuses on total heat loads for streams in the subbasin, it is important to note that differences between existing shade and target shade, as depicted in Figure 4, are the key to successfully restoring these waters to achieving water quality standards. Target shade levels for individual reaches should be the goal managers strive for with future

implementation plans. Managers should focus on the largest differences between existing and target shade as locations to prioritize implementation efforts.

A certain amount of excess load, and hence necessary percent reduction, is potentially created by the existing shade/target shade difference inherent in the load analysis. Because existing shade is reported as a 10% shade class and target shade is a unique integer, there is usually a difference between the two. For example, say a particular stretch of stream has a target shade of 86% based on its vegetation type and natural bankfull width. If existing shade on that stretch of stream was at target level, it would be recorded as 80% existing shade in the load analysis because it falls into the 80% existing shade class. There is an automatic difference of 6%, which could be attributed to the margin of safety.

Wasteload Allocation

There are no known National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitted point sources in the affected watersheds and therefore no wasteload allocations. Should a point source be proposed that would have thermal consequences on these waters, then background provisions in Idaho water quality standards addressing such discharges (i.e., IDAPA 58.01.02.200.09 and IDAPA 58.01.02.401.01) should be involved (see Appendix A).

Margin of Safety

The margin of safety in this TMDL is considered implicit in the design. Because the target is essentially background conditions, loads (shade levels) are allocated to lands adjacent to these streams at natural background levels. Because shade levels are established at natural background or system potential levels, it is unrealistic to set shade targets at higher, or more conservative, levels. Additionally, existing shade levels are reduced to the next lower 10% shade-class interval, which likely underestimates actual shade in the loading analysis. Although the load analysis used in this TMDL involves gross estimations that are likely to have large variances, load allocations are applied to the stream and its riparian vegetation rather than specific nonpoint source activities and can be adjusted as more information is gathered from the stream environment.

Seasonal Variation

This TMDL is based on average summer loads. All loads have been calculated to be inclusive of the 6-month period from April through September. This time period was chosen because it represents the time when the combination of increasing air and water temperatures coincide with increasing solar inputs and vegetative shade. The critical time period is June when spring salmonid spawning is occurring, July and August when maximum temperatures may exceed cold water aquatic life criteria, and September during fall salmonid spawning. Water temperature is not likely to be a problem for beneficial uses outside of this time period because of cooler weather and lower sun angle.

Construction Stormwater and TMDL Wasteload Allocations

Construction Stormwater

The Clean Water Act requires operators of construction sites to obtain permit coverage to discharge stormwater to a water body or municipal storm sewer. In Idaho, EPA has issued a general permit for stormwater discharges from construction sites. In the past, stormwater was

treated as a nonpoint source of pollutants. However, because stormwater can be managed on-site through management practices or when discharged through a discrete conveyance such as a storm sewer, it now requires an NPDES permit.

The Construction General Permit

If a construction project disturbs more than 1 acre of land (or is part of a larger common development that will disturb more than 1 acre), the operator is required to apply for a Construction General Permit (CGP) from EPA after developing a site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

In order to obtain the CGP, operators must develop a site-specific SWPPP. The operator must document the erosion, sediment, and pollution controls they intend to use; inspect the controls periodically; and maintain best management practices (BMPs) throughout the life of the project.

Construction Stormwater Requirements

When a stream is on Idaho's §303(d) list and has a TMDL developed, DEQ may incorporate a gross wasteload allocation for anticipated construction stormwater activities. TMDLs developed in the past that did not have a wasteload allocation for construction stormwater activities will be considered in compliance with provisions of the TMDL if they obtain a CGP under the NPDES program and implement the appropriate BMPs.

Typically, specific requirements must be followed to be consistent with any local pollutant allocations. Many communities throughout Idaho are currently developing rules for post-construction stormwater management. Sediment is usually the main pollutant of concern in stormwater from construction sites. The application of specific BMPs from Idaho's *Catalog of Stormwater Best Management Practices for Idaho Cities and Counties* (DEQ 2005) is generally sufficient to meet the standards and requirements of the CGP, unless local ordinances have more stringent and site-specific standards that are applicable.

5.5 Public Participation

The Lake Walcott Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) was created in 1995 and contributed to the original Goose Creek subbasin assessment and TMDL. The Lake Walcott WAG has continued to meet several times annually since the approval of the original document. They reviewed the Goose Creek temperature TMDL document and discussed it at their July 21, 2011, meeting. The WAG was given a draft copy and was asked to submit comments to DEQ. An email was sent to the WAG members the following week that included the DEQ website address to access the draft document, and comments were again requested before August 30, 2011. No comments were received. The DEQ Twin Falls Regional Office can provide copies of the document by request.

The general public will have the opportunity to comment on this draft document during the public comment period. In the final version of this addendum, a summary of public comments will be included as Appendix D.

5.6 Implementation Strategies

Implementation strategies for TMDLs produced using PNV-based shade and solar loading should incorporate the load analysis tables presented in this TMDL (Tables 8 and 9). These tables need to be updated, first to field verify the existing shade levels that have not yet been field verified and second to monitor progress towards achieving load reductions and the goals of the TMDL. Using the Solar Pathfinder to measure existing shade levels in the field is important to achieving both objectives. It is likely that further field verification will find discrepancies with reported existing shade levels in the loading tables. Due to the inexact nature of the aerial photo interpretation technique, these tables should not be viewed as complete until verified. Implementation strategies should include Solar Pathfinder monitoring to simultaneously field verify the TMDL and mark progress towards achieving desired reductions in solar loads.

DEQ recognizes that implementation strategies for TMDLs may need to be modified if monitoring shows that the TMDL goals are not being met or significant progress is not being made toward achieving the goals.

Time Frame

The time frame for implementation will follow the goals as outlined in the *Goose Creek Subbasin Assessment and Total Maximum Daily Loads* (DEQ 2003, p. 205), which includes a time span from year 1 through year 25.

Approach

The approach for implementation will be similar to that in the Goose Creek subbasin assessment and TMDL (DEQ 2003, p. 202). With the use of past management experiences to evaluate success and failures, insight into the practices that promote the best implementation techniques and restoration of beneficial uses can be utilized.

Responsible Parties

The responsible parties for implementation will be similar to those outlined in the Goose Creek subbasin assessment and TMDL (DEQ 2003, p. 201). These include state and federal agencies as well as private stakeholders.

Monitoring Strategy

The monitoring strategy for implementation will be similar to that listed in the Goose Creek subbasin assessment and TMDL (DEQ 2003, p. 204). The strategy includes tracking the implementation progress of specific plans and tracking the progress of improving water quality by monitoring physical, chemical, and biological parameters.

5.7 Conclusions

Effective shade targets were established for upper Goose Creek and Trout Creek based on the concept of maximum shading under PNV resulting in natural background temperature levels. Shade targets were derived from effective shade curves developed for vegetation types in southern Idaho. Existing shade was determined from aerial photo interpretation and partially field verified with Solar Pathfinder data.

Both streams examined lacked shade compared to target levels (Table 11). The lack of shade is likely the result of a combination of factors, including natural and human-influenced dewatering of the stream channel and historic removal of riparian vegetation associated with livestock grazing and agricultural practices. Much of the lack of shade is also due to high target levels set for narrow streams with various tree-dominated vegetation types (e.g., aspen, lodgepole pine). Many of these streams now lack these vegetation types or only have remnant stands of aspen or lodgepole pine. The reasons for this vegetation change may be many and varied, from the lack of aspen regeneration due to grazing to a lack of water from diversion and drought throughout the subbasin. While not much can be done about dewatered channels, most streams would recover riparian vegetation if temporarily or permanently excluded from use.

Target shade levels for individual reaches should be the goal managers strive for with future implementation plans. Managers should focus on the largest differences between existing and target shade as locations to prioritize implementation efforts.

Table 11. Summary of assessment outcomes.

Water Body Segment/ Assessment Unit	Pollutant	TMDL(s) Completed	Recommended Changes to §303(d) List	Justification
Goose Creek ID17040211SK008_02 ID17040211SK008_03 ID17040211SK008_04	Temperature	Yes	Move to Category 4a	Excess solar load due to lack of shade
Trout Creek ID17040211SK007_02 ID17040211SK007_03	Temperature	Yes	Move to Category 4a	Excess solar load due to lack of shade

References Cited

American Geological Institute. 1962. Dictionary of geological terms. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company. 545 p.

Armantrout, N.B., compiler. 1998. Glossary of aquatic habitat inventory terminology. Bethesda, MD: American Fisheries Society. 136 p.

Clean Water Act (Federal water pollution control act), 33 U.S.C. § 1251-1387. 1972.

DEQ (Idaho Department of Environmental Quality). 2003. Goose Creek Subbasin Assessment and Total Maximum Daily Loads. Boise, ID: DEQ.

DEQ (Idaho Department of Environmental Quality). 2005. Catalog of Stormwater Best Management Practices for Idaho Cities and Counties. Boise, ID: DEQ.

EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 1996. Biological criteria: Technical guidance for streams and small rivers. Washington, DC: EPA, Office of Water. EPA 822-B-96-001. 162 p.

Grafe, C.S., C.A. Mebane, M.J. McIntyre, D.A. Essig, D.H. Brandt, and D.T. Mosier. 2002. The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality water body assessment guidance, second edition-final. Boise, ID: Department of Environmental Quality. 114 p.

Hansen, P.L., and J.B. Hall. 2002. Classification and Management of USDI BLM's Riparian and Wetland Sites in Eastern and Southern Idaho. Corvallis, MT: Bitterroot Restoration, Inc. 272 p.

Hughes, R.M. 1995. Defining acceptable biological status by comparing with reference condition. In: Davis, W.S. and T.P. Simon, editors. Biological assessment and criteria: Tools for water resource planning and decision making. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press. pp. 31–48.

Idaho Code § 39.3611. Development and implementation of total maximum daily load or equivalent processes.

Idaho Code § 39.3615. Creation of watershed advisory groups.

IDAPA 58.01.02. Idaho water quality standards.

IDL (Idaho Department of Lands). 2000. Forest Practices Cumulative Watershed Effects Process for Idaho. Boise, ID: IDL.

Karr, J.R. 1991. Biological integrity: A long-neglected aspect of water resource management. Ecological Applications 1:66–84.

McGrath, C.L., A.J. Woods, J.M. Omernik, S.A. Bryce, M. Edmondson, J.A. Nesser, J. Shelden, R.C. Crawford, J.A. Comstock, and M.D. Plocher. 2001. Ecoregions of Idaho. Reston, VA: U.S. Geological Survey.

OWEB (Oregon's Watershed Enhancement Board). 2001. Addendum to Water Quality Monitoring Technical Guide Book: Chapter 14 Stream Shade and Canopy Cover Monitoring Methods. Salem, OR: OWEB.

Poole, G.C., and C.H. Berman. 2001. An ecological perspective on in-stream temperature: Natural heat dynamics and mechanisms of human-caused thermal degradation. Environmental Management 27(6):787–802.

Rosgen, D.L. 1996. Applied River Morphology. Pagosa Springs, CO: Wildland Hydrology.

Shumar, M.L., and J. de Varona. 2009. The Potential Natural Vegetation (PNV) Temperature TMDL Procedures Manual. Boise, ID: Idaho Department of Environmental Quality.

USGS (U.S. Geological Survey). 1987. Hydrologic unit maps. Denver, CO: USGS. Water supply paper 2294. 63 p.

Water Environment Federation. 1987. The Clean Water Act of 1987. Alexandria, VA: Water Environment Federation. 318 p.

Water Quality Act of 1987, Public Law 100-4. 1987.

Water quality planning and management, 40 CFR Part 130.

GIS Coverages

Restriction of liability: Neither the State of Idaho, nor the Department of Environmental Quality, nor any of their employees make any warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information or data provided. Metadata is provided for all data sets, and no data should be used without first reading and understanding its limitations. The data could include technical inaccuracies or typographical errors. The Department of Environmental Quality may update, modify, or revise the data used at any time, without notice.

Glossary

§303(d)	Refers to section 303 subsection "d" of the Clean Water Act. 303(d) requires states to develop a list of water bodies that do not meet water quality standards. This section also requires total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) be prepared for listed waters. Both the list and the TMDLs are subject to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency approval.
Acre-foot	A volume of water that would cover an acre to a depth of one foot. Often used to quantify reservoir storage and the annual discharge of large rivers.
Alevin	A newly hatched, incompletely developed fish (usually a salmonid) still in nest or inactive on the bottom of a water body, living off stored yolk.
Algae	Non-vascular (without water-conducting tissue) aquatic plants that occur as single cells, colonies, or filaments.
Ambient	General conditions in the environment (Armantrout 1998). In the context of water quality, ambient waters are those representative of general conditions, not associated with episodic perturbations or specific disturbances such as a wastewater outfall (EPA 1996).
Anthropogenic	Relating to, or resulting from, the influence of human beings on nature.
Aquatic	Occurring, growing, or living in water.
Aquifer	An underground, water-bearing layer or stratum of permeable rock, sand, or gravel capable of yielding of water to wells or springs.
Assemblage (aquatic)	An association of interacting populations of organisms in a given water body; for example, a fish assemblage or a benthic macroinvertebrate assemblage (also see Community) (EPA 1996).

Assessment Unit (AU)	A segment of a water body that is treated as a homogenous unit, meaning that any designated uses, the rating of these uses, and any associated causes and sources must be applied to the entirety of the unit.
Beneficial Use	Any of the various uses of water, including, but not limited to, aquatic life, recreation, water supply, wildlife habitat, and aesthetics, which are recognized in water quality standards.
Benthic	Pertaining to or living on or in the bottom sediments of a water body
Best Management Practices (BMPs)	Structural, nonstructural, and managerial techniques that are effective and practical means to control nonpoint source pollutants.
Best Professional Judgment	A conclusion and/or interpretation derived by a trained and/or technically competent individual by applying interpretation and synthesizing information.
Biological Integrity	1) The condition of an aquatic community inhabiting unimpaired water bodies of a specified habitat as measured by an evaluation of multiple attributes of the aquatic biota (EPA 1996). 2) The ability of an aquatic ecosystem to support and maintain a balanced, integrated, adaptive community of organisms having a species composition, diversity, and functional organization comparable to the natural habitats of a region (Karr 1991).
Biota	The animal and plant life of a given region.
Clean Water Act (CWA)	The Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly known as the Clean Water Act), as last reauthorized by the Water Quality Act of 1987, establishes a process for states to use to develop information on, and control the quality of, the nation's water resources.
Community	A group of interacting organisms living together in a given place.

Criteria	In the context of water quality, numeric or descriptive factors taken into account in setting standards for various pollutants. These factors are used to determine limits on allowable concentration levels, and to limit the number of violations per year. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency develops criteria guidance; states establish criteria.
Cubic Feet per Second	A unit of measure for the rate of flow or discharge of water. One cubic foot per second is the rate of flow of a stream with a cross-section of one square foot flowing at a mean velocity of one foot per second. At a steady rate, once cubic foot per second is equal to 448.8 gallons per minute and 10,984 acre-feet per day.
Designated Uses	Those water uses identified in state water quality standards that must be achieved and maintained as required under the Clean Water Act.
Discharge	The amount of water flowing in the stream channel at the time of measurement. Usually expressed as cubic feet per second (cfs).
Disturbance	Any event or series of events that disrupts ecosystem, community, or population structure and alters the physical environment.
Ecosystem	The interacting system of a biological community and its non-living (abiotic) environmental surroundings.
Environment	The complete range of external conditions, physical and biological, that affect a particular organism or community.
Ephemeral Stream	A stream or portion of a stream that flows only in direct response to precipitation. It receives little or no water from springs and no long continued supply from melting snow or other sources. Its channel is at all times above the water table (American Geological Institute 1962).
Erosion	The wearing away of areas of the earth's surface by water, wind, ice, and other forces.

Exceedance

A violation (according to DEQ policy) of the pollutant levels permitted by water quality criteria.

Existing Beneficial Use or Existing Use

A beneficial use actually attained in waters on or after November 28, 1975, whether or not the use is designated for the waters in Idaho's *Water Quality Standards* (IDAPA 58.01.02).

Flow

See *Discharge*.

Fully Supporting

In compliance with water quality standards and within the range of biological reference conditions for all designated and exiting beneficial uses as determined through the *Water Body Assessment Guidance* (Grafe et al. 2002).

Ground Water

Water found beneath the soil surface saturating the layer in which it is located. Most ground water originates as rainfall, is free to move under the influence of gravity, and usually emerges again as streamflow.

Habitat

The living place of an organism or community.

Headwater

The origin or beginning of a stream.

Hydrologic Basin

The area of land drained by a river system, a reach of a river and its tributaries in that reach, a closed basin, or a group of streams forming a drainage area (also see Watershed).

Hydrologic Unit

One of a nested series of numbered and named watersheds arising from a national standardization of watershed delineation. The initial 1974 effort (USGS 1987) described four levels (region, subregion, accounting unit, and cataloging unit) of watersheds throughout the United States. The fourth level is uniquely identified by an eight-digit code built of two-digit fields for each level in the classification. Originally termed a cataloging unit, fourth field hydrologic units have been more commonly called subbasins. Fifth- and sixth-field hydrologic units have since been delineated for much of the country and are known as watershed and subwatersheds, respectively.

Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC)	The number assigned to a hydrologic unit. Often used to refer to fourth field hydrologic units.
Intermittent Stream	1) A stream that flows only part of the year, such as when the ground water table is high or when the stream receives water from springs or from surface sources such as melting snow in mountainous areas. The stream ceases to flow above the streambed when losses from evaporation or seepage exceed the available streamflow. 2) A stream that has a period of zero flow for at least one week during most years.
Load Allocation (LA)	A portion of a water body's load capacity for a given pollutant that is given to a particular nonpoint source (by class, type, or geographic area).
Load(ing)	The quantity of a substance entering a receiving stream, usually expressed in pounds or kilograms per day or tons per year. Loading is the product of flow (discharge) and concentration.
Load(ing) Capacity (LC)	A determination of how much pollutant a water body can receive over a given period without causing violations of state water quality standards. Upon allocation to various sources, and a margin of safety, it becomes a total maximum daily load.
Macroinvertebrate	An invertebrate animal (without a backbone) large enough to be seen without magnification and retained by a 500 micrometer mesh (U.S. #30) screen.
Margin of Safety (MOS)	An implicit or explicit portion of a water body's loading capacity set aside to allow the uncertainly about the relationship between the pollutant loads and the quality of the receiving water body. This is a required component of a total maximum daily load (TMDL) and is often incorporated into conservative assumptions used to develop the TMDL (generally within the calculations and/or models). The MOS is not allocated to any sources of pollution.
Mean	Describes the central tendency of a set of numbers. The arithmetic mean (calculated by adding all items in a list, then dividing by the number of items) is the statistic most familiar to most people.

Milligrams per Liter (mg/L)
A unit of measure for concentration. In water, it is essentially equivalent to parts per million (ppm).

Monitoring
A periodic or continuous measurement of the properties or conditions of some medium of interest, such as monitoring a water body.

Mouth
The location where flowing water enters into a larger water body.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
A national program established by the Clean Water Act for permitting point sources of pollution. Discharge of pollution from point sources is not allowed without a permit.

Natural Condition
The condition that exists with little or no anthropogenic influence.

Nonpoint Source
A dispersed source of pollutants, generated from a geographical area when pollutants are dissolved or suspended in runoff and then delivered into waters of the state. Nonpoint sources are without a discernible point or origin. They include, but are not limited to, irrigated and non-irrigated lands used for grazing, crop production, and silviculture; rural roads; construction and mining sites; log storage or rafting; and recreation sites.

Not Fully Supporting
Not in compliance with water quality standards or not within the range of biological reference conditions for any beneficial use as determined through the *Water Body Assessment Guidance* (Grafe et al. 2002).

Nuisance
Anything that is injurious to the public health or an obstruction to the free use, in the customary manner, of any waters of the state.

Nutrient
Any substance required by living things to grow. An element or its chemical forms essential to life, such as carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, and phosphorus. Commonly refers to those elements in short supply, such as nitrogen and phosphorus, which usually limit growth.

Parameter	A variable, measurable property whose value is a determinant of the characteristics of a system, such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, and fish populations are parameters of a stream or lake.
Phosphorus	An element essential to plant growth, often in limited supply, and thus considered a nutrient.
Point Source	A source of pollutants characterized by having a discrete conveyance, such as a pipe, ditch, or other identifiable "point" of discharge into a receiving water. Common point sources of pollution are industrial and municipal wastewater.
Pollutant	Generally, any substance introduced into the environment that adversely affects the usefulness of a resource or the health of humans, animals, or ecosystems.
Pollution	A very broad concept that encompasses human-caused changes in the environment which alter the functioning of natural processes and produce undesirable environmental and health effects. This includes human-induced alteration of the physical, biological, chemical, and radiological integrity of water and other media.
Population	A group of interbreeding organisms occupying a particular space; the number of humans or other living creatures in a designated area.
Reach	A stream section with fairly homogenous physical characteristics.
Reference	A physical or chemical quantity whose value is known and thus is used to calibrate or standardize instruments.
Reference Condition	1) A condition that fully supports applicable beneficial uses with little affect from human activity and represents the highest level of support attainable. 2) A benchmark for populations of aquatic ecosystems used to describe desired conditions in a biological assessment and acceptable or unacceptable departures from them. The reference condition can be determined through examining regional reference sites,

	historical conditions, quantitative models, and expert judgment (Hughes 1995).
Reference Site	A specific locality on a water body that is minimally impaired and is representative of reference conditions for similar water bodies.
Riparian	Associated with aquatic (stream, river, lake) habitats. Living or located on the bank of a water body.
River	A large, natural, or human-modified stream that flows in a defined course or channel or in a series of diverging and converging channels.
Runoff	The portion of rainfall, melted snow, or irrigation water that flows across the surface, through shallow underground zones (interflow), and through ground water to creates streams.
Sediments	Deposits of fragmented materials from weathered rocks and organic material that were suspended in, transported by, and eventually deposited by water or air.
Species	1) A reproductively isolated aggregate of interbreeding organisms having common attributes and usually designated by a common name. 2) An organism belonging to such a category.
Stream	A natural water course containing flowing water, at least part of the year. Together with dissolved and suspended materials, a stream normally supports communities of plants and animals within the channel and the riparian vegetation zone.
Stormwater Runoff	Rainfall that quickly runs off the land after a storm. In developed watersheds the water flows off roofs and pavement into storm drains that may feed quickly and directly into the stream. The water often carries pollutants picked up from these surfaces.
Subbasin	A large watershed of several hundred thousand acres. This is the name commonly given to 4th-field hydrologic units (also see Hydrologic Unit).

Subbasin Assessment (SBA)

A watershed-based problem assessment that is the first step in developing a total maximum daily load in Idaho.

Subwatershed

A smaller watershed area delineated within a larger watershed, often for purposes of describing and managing localized conditions. Also proposed for adoption as the formal name for 6th-field hydrologic units.

Surface Water

All water naturally open to the atmosphere (rivers, lakes, reservoirs, streams, impoundments, seas, estuaries, etc.) and all springs, wells, or other collectors that are directly influenced by surface water.

Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)

A TMDL is a water body's load capacity after it has been allocated among pollutant sources. It can be expressed on a time basis other than daily if appropriate. Sediment loads, for example, are often calculated on an annual bases. A TMDL is equal to the load capacity, such that load capacity = margin of safety + natural background + load allocation + wasteload allocation = TMDL. In common usage, a TMDL also refers to the written document that contains the statement of loads and supporting analyses, often incorporating TMDLs for several water bodies and/or pollutants within a given watershed.

Tributary

A stream feeding into a larger stream or lake.

Wasteload Allocation (WLA)

The portion of receiving water's loading capacity that is allocated to one of its existing or future point sources of pollution. Wasteload allocations specify how much pollutant each point source may release to a water body.

Water Body

A stream, river, lake, estuary, coastline, or other water feature, or portion thereof.

Water Pollution

Any alteration of the physical, thermal, chemical, biological, or radioactive properties of any waters of the state, or the discharge of any pollutant into the waters of the state, which will or is likely to create a nuisance or to render such waters harmful, detrimental, or injurious to public health, safety, or welfare; to fish and wildlife; or to domestic, commercial, industrial, recreational, aesthetic, or other beneficial uses.

Water Quality

A term used to describe the biological, chemical, and physical characteristics of water with respect to its suitability for a beneficial use.

Water Quality Criteria

Levels of water quality expected to render a body of water suitable for its designated uses. Criteria are based on specific levels of pollutants that would make the water harmful if used for drinking, swimming, farming, or industrial processes.

Water Quality Limited

A label that describes water bodies for which one or more water quality criterion is not met or beneficial uses are not fully supported. Water quality limited segments may or may not be on a §303(d) list.

Water Quality Limited Segment (WQLS)

Any segment placed on a state's §303(d) list for failure to meet applicable water quality standards, and/or is not expected to meet applicable water quality standards in the period prior to the next list. These segments are also referred to as "§303(d) listed."

Water Quality Standards

State-adopted and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency-approved ambient standards for water bodies. The standards prescribe the use of the water body and establish the water quality criteria that must be met to protect designated uses.

Water Table

The upper surface of ground water; below this point, the soil is saturated with water.

Watershed

1) All the land which contributes runoff to a common point in a drainage network, or to a lake outlet. Watersheds are infinitely nested, and any large watershed is composed of smaller "subwatersheds." 2) The whole geographic region which contributes water to a point of interest in a water body.

Appendix A. State and Site-Specific Water Quality Standards and Criteria

Water Quality Standards Applicable to Salmonid Spawning Temperature

Water quality standards for temperature are specific numeric values not to be exceeded during the salmonid spawning and egg incubation period, which varies with species. For spring spawning salmonids, the default spawning and incubation period recognized by the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is generally March 15 to July 1 each year (Grafe et al. 2002). Fall spawning can occur as early as August 15 and continue with incubation into the following spring up to June 1. Per IDAPA 58.01.02.250.02.f.ii., the water quality criteria that need to be met during those time periods are as follows:

- 13 ^{o}C as a daily maximum water temperature
- 9 ^{o}C as a daily average water temperature

For the purposes of a temperature total maximum daily load (TMDL), the highest recorded water temperature in a recorded data set (excluding any high water temperatures that may occur on days when air temperatures exceed the 90th percentile of the highest annual maximum weekly maximum air temperatures) is compared to the daily maximum criterion of 13 ^{o}C. The difference between the two water temperatures represents the temperature reduction necessary to achieve compliance with temperature standards.

Natural Background Provisions

For potential natural vegetation temperature TMDLs, it is assumed that natural temperatures may exceed these criteria during certain time periods. If potential natural vegetation targets are achieved yet stream temperatures are warmer than these criteria, it is assumed that the stream's temperature is natural (provided there are no point sources or human-induced ground water sources of heat) and natural background provisions of Idaho water quality standards apply:

> *When natural background conditions exceed any applicable water quality criteria set forth in Sections 210, 250, 251, 252, or 253, the applicable water quality criteria shall not apply; instead, there shall be no lowering of water quality from natural background conditions. Provided, however, that temperature may be increased above natural background conditions when allowed under Section 401.* (IDAPA 58.01.02.200.09)

Section 401 relates to point source wastewater treatment requirements. In this case, if temperature criteria for any aquatic life use are exceeded due to natural conditions, then a point source discharge cannot raise the water temperature by more than 0.3 °C (IDAPA 58.01.02.401.01.c).

This page intentionally left blank for correct double-sided printing.

Appendix B. Unit Conversion Chart

This page intentionally left blank for correct double-sided printing.

Table B-1. Metric–English unit conversions.

	English Units	Metric Units	To Convert	Example
Distance	Miles (mi)	Kilometers (km)	1 mi = 1.61 km 1 km = 0.62 mi	3 mi = 4.83 km 3 km = 1.86 mi
Length	Inches (in) Feet (ft)	Centimeters (cm) Meters (m)	1 in = 2.54 cm 1 cm = 0.39 in 1 ft = 0.30 m 1 m = 3.28 ft	3 in = 7.62 cm 3 cm = 1.18 in 3 ft = 0.91 m 3 m = 9.84 ft
Area	Acres (ac) Square Feet (ft^2) Square Miles (mi^2)	Hectares (ha) Square Meters (m^2) Square Kilometers (km^2)	1 ac = 0.40 ha 1 ha = 2.47 ac 1 ft^2 = 0.09 m^2 1 m^2 = 10.76 ft^2 1 mi^2 = 2.59 km^2 1 km^2 = 0.39 mi^2	3 ac = 1.20 ha 3 ha = 7.41 ac 3 ft^2 = 0.28 m^2 3 m^2 = 32.29 ft^2 3 mi^2 = 7.77 km^2 3 km^2 = 1.16 mi^2
Volume	Gallons (gal) Cubic Feet (ft^3)	Liters (L) Cubic Meters (m^3)	1 gal = 3.78 L 1 L= 0.26 gal 1 ft^3 = 0.03 m^3 1 m^3 = 35.32 ft^3	3 gal = 11.35 L 3 L = 0.79 gal 3 ft^3 = 0.09 m^3 3 m^3 = 105.94 ft^3
Flow Rate	Cubic Feet per Second (cfs)[a]	Cubic Meters per Second (m^3/sec)	1 cfs = 0.03 m^3/sec 1 m^3/sec = 35.31 cfs	3 cfs = 0.09 m^3/sec 3 m^3/sec = 105.94 cfs
Concentration	Parts per Million (ppm)	Milligrams per Liter (mg/L)	1 ppm = 1 mg/L[b]	3 ppm = 3 mg/L
Weight	Pounds (lb)	Kilograms (kg)	1 lb = 0.45 kg 1 kg = 2.20 lb	3 lb = 1.36 kg 3 kg = 6.61 lb
Temperature	Fahrenheit (°F)	Celsius (°C)	°C = 0.55 (F - 32) °F = (C x 1.8) + 32	3 °F = -15.95 °C 3 °C = 37.4 °F

[a] 1 cfs = 0.65 million gallons per day; 1 million gallons per day = 1.55 cfs.

[b] The ratio of 1 ppm = 1 mg/L is approximate and is only accurate for water.

This page intentionally left blank for correct double-sided printing.

Appendix C. Data Sources, Solar Pathfinder Results, and Temperature Data

Table C-1. Data sources for the Goose Creek subbasin TMDLs.

Water Body	Data Source	Type of Data	Collection Date
Goose Creek and Trout Creek	DEQ State Technical Services Office	Pathfinder effective shade and stream width	July–August 2008
Goose Creek and Trout Creek	DEQ State Technical Services Office	Aerial photo interpretation of existing shade and stream width estimation	June–September 2008 and June 2011
Goose Creek and Trout Creek	DEQ IDASA Database	Temperature	June – October 2001

Table C-2. Solar Pathfinder field verification results.

aerial class	pathfinder actual	pathfinder class	delta		stream site
30	29.7	30	0		trout1
30	18.4	10	20		trout2
60	35.5	30	30		goose
			17	average	
			15.28	std dev	
			17.29	95%CI	



Figure C-1. Listing temperature data for upper Goose Creek (2001IDFGTL083).



Figure C-2. Listing temperature data for Trout Creek (2001IDFGTL082).



Figure C-3. Listing temperature data locations.

Appendix D. Public Comments

This page intentionally left blank for correct double-sided printing.