Santa Clara Valley
Water District℠

5750 ALMADEN EXPWY
SAN JOSE, CA 95118-3686
TELEPHONE (408) 265-2600
FACSIMILE (408) 266-0271
www.valleywater.org
AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

December 23, 2011

Mr. Bruce H. Wolfe, Executive Officer
bwolfe@waterboards.ca.gov
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Francisco Region
1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400
Oakland, CA 94612

Subject: Technical Report on Methyl Mercury Production and Control Studies

Dear Mr. Wolfe:

Attached is the 2011 technical report on Methyl Mercury Production and Control Studies (Report). The Report provides an update of activities conducted voluntarily by the Santa Clara Valley Water District (District), to address the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Implementation Plan for Mercury in the Guadalupe River Watershed. The Report also describes the District's ongoing projects to evaluate treatment methods for reducing methyl mercury production in three reservoirs and one lake impacted by past mining activities in the Guadalupe River Watershed. The District voluntarily initiated these studies in 2005 and is pleased to report that:

1. The first treatment device installed in 2006, followed by three others in 2007 and 2008, continue to suppress methyl mercury production in the water column of Lake Almaden.
2. Similar treatment devices installed in 2007 have proven ineffective at improving water quality at Almaden and Guadalupe Reservoirs.
3. In November 2011, the District installed an oxygenation system at Calero reservoir, to address hypolimnetic methyl mercury production. Oxygenation is expected to commence in spring 2012.
4. In August 2011, the District purchased a portable oxygenation system for use at Almaden Reservoir to address hypolimnetic methyl mercury production. Oxygenation is expected to commence in summer 2012.
5. The District is planning to purchase and install an oxygenation system at Guadalupe Reservoir in 2012 to address hypolimnetic methyl mercury production. Oxygenation is expected to commence in spring 2013.

The purpose of this report is to address Special Studies 1 and 2 as described in the Basin Plan Amendment (BPA) of 2008. The data in this technical report are preliminary and subject to change as the study progresses.

Special Study 1 addresses the question "*How do the reservoirs and lakes in the Guadalupe River watershed differ from one another*?" The key findings so far that respond to this question are:

- Lake Almaden has much higher seasonal concentrations of nutrients and methyl mercury than the reservoirs;
- Lake Almaden is a net sink for methyl mercury;
- Reservoir outlet works do not affect methyl mercury concentrations, simplifying the method for calculating dry season loads;
- The data indicate that circulation has significant effects on water column methyl mercury concentrations in Lake Almaden; and
- The data indicate that circulation has had no observable effect on water column concentrations of methyl mercury in the reservoirs.

With respect to Special Study 2 where the District is required to assess the possibility of increasing the assimilative capacity for methyl mercury in reservoirs and lakes, our approach is to assess the effects of hypolimnetic circulation and hypolimnetic oxygenation. This will be done by measuring changes in seasonal methyl mercury maximum concentrations, correlating them with fish tissue mercury concentrations. In this context, assimilative capacity may be increased by reducing the amount of methyl mercury available for bioaccumulation.

Please note that this Report is a proactive effort by the District to comply with the 2008 BPA provisions. The District remains committed to environmental stewardship including addressing legacy issues such as mercury in the Guadalupe Watershed, and we are voluntarily transmitting this report as a proactive step in that direction.

If you have any questions, please contact Dave Drury or myself at (408) 265-2600.

Sincerely,

Ann Draper

Ann Draper
Assistant Operating Officer
Watershed Stewardship Division

Enclosure: Progress Report Methyl Mercury Production and Control in Lakes and Reservoirs Contaminated by Historic Mining Activities in the Guadalupe River Watershed, dated December 31, 2011

By Electronic Mail

cc/enc: Carrie Austin caustin@waterboards.ca.gov, California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Region, 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400 Oakland, CA 94612

cc: B. Goldie, A. Draper, S. Dharasker, B. Cabral, F. Brewster, D. Drury

PROGRESS REPORT

METHYL MERCURY PRODUCTION AND CONTROL IN LAKES AND RESERVOIRS CONTAMINATED BY HISTORIC MINING ACTIVITIES IN THE GUADALUPE RIVER WATERSHED

PREPARED BY:

David D. Drury, P.E.
Senior Engineer

December 31, 2011

Watershed Stewardship Division
Santa Clara Valley Water District

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ES-1

1.0. INTRODUCTION 1-1

2.0 BASE CONDITIONS 2-1

3.0 STUDY DESCRIPTIONS.. 3-1
- 3.1 Theoretical Basis 3-1
- 3.2 Study Approach 3-2
- 3.3 Hypotheses Tested 3-3
- 3.3.1 Almaden Reservoir—Hypolimnetic and Epilimnetic Circulation and Source Control 3-3
- 3.3.2 Guadalupe Reservoir—Epilimnetic Circulation and Hypolimnetic Oxygenation 3-3
- 3.3.3 Lake Almaden—Hypolimnetic Circulation 3-3
- 3.3.4 Calero Reservoir—Hypolimnetic Oxygenation 3-4

4.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS 4-1
- 4.1 Reservoir Monitoring Sites 4-1
- 4.2 Lake Monitoring Sites 4-1
- 4.3 Details of Monitoring 4-1
- 4.4 Laboratory Analysis Methods 4-2

5.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 5-1
- 5.1 Dissolved Oxygen 5-1
- 5.2 Nutrient Cycling 5-1
- 5.2.1 Nitrogen 5-1
- 5.2.2 Summary-Nitrogen 5-2
- 5.2.3 Phosphorus and Sulfate 5-3
- 5.2.4 Summary–Phosphorus and Sulfate 5-4
- 5.3 Mercury/Methyl Mercury Cycling 5-4
- 5.3.1 Almaden Reservoir 5-4
- 5.3.2 Guadalupe Reservoir 5-5
- 5.3.3 Calero Reservoir 5-5
- 5.3.4 Lake Almaden 5-6
- 5.4 Summary—Mercury/Methyl Mercury Cycling 5-7
- 5.5 Mercury/Methyl Mercury Loading 5-7
- 5.5.1 Outlet Load Calculations 5-8
- 5.5.2 Correlation Analysis 5-8
- 5.6 Coordinated Monitoring Program 5-9

6.0 CONCLUSIONS 6-1

7.0 IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE 7-1

APPENDIX A—LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: Annual Coincidence of Methyl Mercury Production with Seasonal Anoxia in Lake Almaden

FIGURE 2: Annual Coincidence of Methyl Mercury Production with Seasonal Anoxia in Two Reservoirs

FIGURE 3: Lake Almaden Bathymetry and Site Map

FIGURE 4: Seasonal Anoxic Volume (DO<1 mg/l) as a Percentage of Total Volume; Hypolimnion Methyl Mercury Concentrations (MeHg) in Almaden Reservoir

FIGURE 5: Seasonal Anoxic Volume (DO<1 mg/l) as a Percentage of Total Volume; Hypolimnion Methyl Mercury Concentrations (MeHg) in Calero Reservoir

FIGURE 6: Seasonal Anoxic Volume (DO<1 mg/l) as a Percentage of Total Volume; Hypolimnion Methyl Mercury Concentrations (MeHg) in Guadalupe Reservoir

FIGURE 7: Nitrate (NO_3) and Ammonia (NH_4) Concentrations in Almaden Reservoir-

FIGURE 8: Nitrate (NO_3) and Ammonia (NH_4) Concentrations in Guadalupe Reservoir

FIGURE 9: Nitrate (NO_3) and Ammonia (NH_4) Concentrations in Calero Reservoir

FIGURE 11: Nitrate (NO_3) and Ammonia (NH_4) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 2)

FIGURE 12: Total Phosphorus (TP) and Sulfate (SO_4) Concentrations in Almaden Reservoir

FIGURE 13: Total Phosphorus (TP) and Sulfate (SO_4) Concentrations in Guadalupe Reservoir

FIGURE 14: Total Phosphorus (TP) and Sulfate (SO_4) Concentrations in Calero Reservoir

FIGURE 15: Total Phosphorus (TP) and Sulfate (SO_4) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 1)

FIGURE 16: Total Phosphorus (TP) and Sulfate (SO_4) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 2)

FIGURE 17: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratifiction (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Almaden Reservoir

FIGURE 18: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Almaden Reservoir

FIGURE 19: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Almaden Reservoir

FIGURE 20: Unfiltered (Total) and Filtered (Dissolved) Mercury (Hg) in Almaden Reservoir

FIGURE 21: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Guadalupe Reservoir

FIGURE 22: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Guadalupe Reservoir

FIGURE 23: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Guadalupe Reservoir

FIGURE 24: Unfiltered Mercury (Total Hg) Concentrations in Guadalupe Reservoir

FIGURE 25: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Calero Reservoir

FIGURE 26: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Calero Reservoir

FIGURE 27: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Calero Reservoir

FIGURE 28: Unfiltered Mercury (Total Hg) Concentrations in Calero Reservoir

FIGURE 29: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 1)

FIGURE 30: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 1)

FIGURE 31: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 1)

FIGURE 32: Unfiltered Mercury (Total Hg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 1)

FIGURE 33: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 2)

FIGURE 34: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 2)

FIGURE 35: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 2)

FIGURE 36: Unfiltered Mercury (Total Hg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 2)

FIGURE 37: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 5)

FIGURE 38: Comparison of Hypolimnion and Outlet Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Almaden Reservoir

FIGURE 39: Comparison of Hypolimnion, Sill Elevation, and Outlet Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Guadalupe Reservoir

FIGURE 40: Comparison of Hypolimnion and Outlet Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Calero Reservoir

FIGURE 41: Comparison of Inlet and Outlet Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden

APPENDIX B—LIST OF COORDINATED MONITORING PLAN COMPANION DATA

Reservoir Laboratory Analysis Data
Lake Almaden Laboratory Analysis Data
Almaden Reservoir Field Data (8/16/11)
Almaden Reservoir Field Data (9/14/11)
Guadalupe Reservoir Field Data (8/16/11)
Guadalupe Reservoir Field Data (9/14/11)
Calero Reservoir Field Data (8/18/11)
Calero Reservoir Field Data (9/15/11)
Lake Almaden (Site 1) Field Data (8/17/11)
Lake Almaden (Site 1) Field Data (9/13/11)
Lake Almaden (Site 2) Field Data (8/17/11)
Lake Almaden (Site 2) Field Data (9/13/11)
Lake Almaden (Site 5) Field Data (8/17/11)
Lake Almaden (Site 5) Field Data (9/13/11)
Lake Almaden Inlet Field Data (8/17/11)
Lake Almaden Inlet Field Data (9/13/11)
Lake Almaden Outlet Field Data (8/17/11)
Lake Almaden Outlet Field Data (9/13/11)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document presents a description and interim findings of applied studies to reduce methyl mercury concentrations in three reservoirs and one lake in the Guadalupe River Watershed. These studies were voluntarily initiated in 2005 by the Santa Clara Valley Water District (District) as part of early implementation of actions by the District to restore these water bodies that have been identified as impaired due to mercury concentrations in fish that exceed applicable criteria. In October 2008, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) adopted a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Mercury in the Guadalupe River Watershed into its San Francisco Bay Basin Water Quality Control Plan. This TMDL recognizes the District's voluntary efforts and requires only that the District provide periodic progress reports regarding its studies of methyl mercury production and controls. The District voluntarily agreed to submit this progress report to the Regional Board by December 31, 2011.

The data interpretation, data analysis, and conclusions in this report are preliminary and subject to change as the study progresses.

In 2003, the District contracted with Tetra Tech, Inc. to collect data and prepare several technical reports regarding mercury contamination, fate and transport in the Guadalupe River Watershed. These reports, produced from 2003 through 2005, were voluntarily funded solely by the District to support the development of a science-based TMDL, to ensure that remedial actions would be cost-effective. A key finding of the effort relevant to this document was that methyl mercury concentrations in reservoirs and lakes achieved seasonal maxima during the summer months and these maxima appeared to coincide with anoxic conditions in the hypolimnia. In 2005, the District voluntarily initiated a monitoring program in the three reservoirs and one lake in the Guadalupe River Watershed that confirmed this finding.

After confirmation that methyl mercury concentrations varied with anoxia in the hypolimnia, the District reviewed various treatment alternatives available to reduce the extent and duration of anoxic conditions. In 2006, the District voluntarily conducted a pilot test of a treatment device in one lake to demonstrate whether or not methyl mercury concentrations could be affected by mechanical means. A solar-powered circulator was operated for approximately nine months to treat a portion of the lake, achieving reductions of methyl mercury concentrations as high as 90% in the water column as compared to the previous year. The portion of the lake untreated by the device produced similar year-over-year concentrations of methyl mercury in the water column, indicating that circulation alone can affect seasonal maximum concentrations of methyl mercury.

During the reporting period (January 1, 2010 –December 31, 2011), the District continued its monitoring and sampling program of its applied studies to test the hypotheses presented in the December 2009 Progress Report; completed a source removal project above Almaden Reservoir; purchased equipment to conduct pilot tests of hypolimnetic oxygenation in Almaden Reservoir; and purchased and installed a full scale oxygenation system in Calero Reservoir.

The hypotheses being tested in these applied studies are:

- Hypolimnetic circulation will reduce methyl mercury concentrations in Lake Almaden to meet the seasonal maximum concentration specified in the TMDL, which is expected to result in fish tissue concentrations that meet the objectives specified in the TMDL.

- Epilimnetic circulation will reduce blue green algae production in Guadalupe Reservoir in favor of green algae production, eventually reducing the extent and duration of anoxia in the hypolimnion while improving the fishery. This adjustment will promote lower seasonal maximum methyl mercury concentrations (due to less anoxia) and lower methyl mercury concentrations in fish (due to improved assimilation capacity).

- Epilimnetic and hypolimnetic circulation in Almaden Reservoir combined with source reduction will reduce mercury available for methylation, as well as reduce blue green algae production in favor of green algae production. This will eventually reduce the extent and duration of anoxia in the hypolimnion while improving the fishery. Decreasing the extent and duration of anoxia in the hypolimnion will lead to lower seasonal maximum methyl mercury concentrations (due to less anoxia and less mercury available for methylation) and lower methyl mercury concentrations in fish (due to improved assimilation capacity).

- Oxygenation of the hypolimnion in combination with circulation will accelerate the processes described above in Guadalupe Reservoir and in Almaden Reservoir.

- Oxygenation of the hypolimnion in Calero Reservoir will result in seasonal maximum concentrations of methyl mercury that meet the criterion specified in the TMDL and fish tissue concentrations that meet the targets specified in the TMDL.

The applied studies are scheduled to continue until the best available technology is identified for each water body. Monitoring of water quality parameters was initiated in 2005 and continues at the targeted frequency of monthly sampling during the months of October through March, and twice-monthly sampling from April through September. Treatment systems installed in the water bodies occurred or is planned as follows:

- In 2006, one circulator was installed in Lake Almaden; in 2007, a second circulator was installed; in 2009, two circulators were installed. The four circulators are sufficient to provide treatment of the entire lake.

- In 2007, three circulators were installed in Almaden Reservoir; one circulator provides hypolimnetic circulation of the deepest portion of the reservoir, and the other two provide epilimnetic circulation of the entire reservoir.

- In 2007, three circulators were installed in Guadalupe Reservoir; all of these together provide epilimnetic circulation of the entire lake.

- In 2011, a pilot hypolimnetic oxygenation system was purchased for use in Almaden Reservoir; the pilot tests are scheduled to begin in July 2012.

- In 2011, a full scale hypolimnetic oxygenation system was installed in Calero Reservoir and operation is scheduled to begin in April 2012.

Key findings presented in this progress report are as follows:

- Methyl mercury production in hypolimnetic sediments are the main source of methyl mercury in water (and, presumably fish).

- Low levels of methyl mercury persist in the water column of all of the water bodies year round, although concentrations at Calero Reservoir are substantially lower than those observed at the other water bodies.

- Bottom releases at the reservoirs result in lower seasonal maximum concentrations of methyl mercury in the hypolimnion as compared to the lake and to one reservoir with an outlet located about three meters above the bottom.

- Epilimnetic circulation has no apparent effect on algae blooms or methyl mercury.

- Hypolimnetic circulation significantly reduces seasonal maximum concentrations of methyl mercury in the metalimnion at Lake Almaden.

- Hypolimnetic circulation significantly reduces seasonal maximum concentrations of methyl mercury in the lower hypolimnion of Lake Almaden, but not Almaden Reservoir.

- Operational parameters of the circulators significantly affect the effectiveness of the devices in reducing methyl mercury concentrations.

- Outlet works do not alter methyl mercury concentrations in releases as compared to concentrations in the hypolimnion.

- Lake Almaden discharges less methyl mercury than it receives from Alamitos Creek.

1.0. INTRODUCTION

Santa Clara County is located at the southern end of San Francisco Bay, and includes the largest producing mercury mines in North America (New Almaden Mining District) which ceased operations circa 1970. The Santa Clara Valley Water District (District) provides wholesale water supply and flood protection services to the communities in the county. The District owns three reservoirs and one lake impacted by the mercury mines. These water bodies were listed as impaired in 1999, and a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) was adopted by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) in 2008 for these water bodies as part of the Guadalupe River Watershed TMDL. In the TMDL, it is recognized that the District initiated voluntary applied studies in these water bodies prior to its adoption, and that continuation of these studies is one means of compliance with regulatory enforcement of portions of the TMDL applicable to the District. In the TMDL, this progress report from the District regarding these studies is due December 31, 2011. This report covers the reporting period of January 2010 through December 2011. This study is intended to respond to the Special Studies 1 and 2 described in the TMDL and articulated as the following questions: “How do the reservoirs and lakes in the Guadalupe River watershed differ from one another?” and, “Is it possible to increase the assimilative capacity for methyl mercury in reservoirs and lakes?” The data collected to date do not fully address these questions, and the conclusions presented in this report are preliminary and subject to change as the study progresses.

Almaden, Calero and Guadalupe Reservoirs were constructed in the 1930’s for the purpose of water conservation, with design capacities of 1,780, 10,050, and 3,723 acre-feet, respectively. All three reservoirs are located in the Guadalupe River Watershed that drains to San Francisco Bay and all are impacted by mercury mining operations that began in the 1840’s and ended in the 1970’s. Lake Almaden was created by in- and off-stream gravel quarry operations circa 1950-1960. The lake is fed by Los Alamitos Creek (drains Almaden and Calero Reservoirs) and its outlet is the confluence with Guadalupe Creek (drains Guadalupe Reservoir) that forms the main stem of Guadalupe River. The lake is approximately 40 acres in area, with a maximum depth of 13 meters (43 feet), and is used for recreation, including boating, swimming, and fishing. Only Almaden Reservoir exhibits extensive macroscopic vegetation. Fish in these water bodies are contaminated with mercury at concentrations that exceed applicable criteria.

Solar-powered circulators have been installed in Almaden and Guadalupe Reservoirs and in Lake Almaden to evaluate the effect of circulation on methyl mercury production and methyl mercury concentrations in fish tissue. Three circulators in Almaden Reservoir provide both hypolimnetic (one device) and epilimnetic (two devices) circulation. Three circulators in Guadalupe Reservoir provide epilimnetic circulation. Four circulators in Lake Almaden provide hypolimnetic circulation.

This report examines the similarities and differences of methyl mercury production in these water bodies before, during, and after seasonal thermal stratification, and evaluates the effects of circulation on methyl mercury production spatially and temporally. Correlations and comparisons of other water quality parameters to methyl mercury production are also evaluated. The effects of circulation are expected to reduce seasonal methyl mercury maximum concentrations while improving the ecology of the water bodies, leading to a more robust fishery. In this context, assimilative capacity is to be increased by reducing the amount of methyl mercury available for bioaccumulation and increasing the biomass amongst which the methyl mercury is distributed.

2.0 BASELINE CONDITIONS

In 2003, the District contracted with Tetra Tech. Inc. to conduct a study of mercury fate and transport in the Guadalupe River Watershed. In the Tetra Tech, Inc. February 8, 2005 Data Collection Report, Volume I, page 4–31, a key finding was "[t]he most significant production of methylmercury occurred when the hypolimnion [of Almaden and Guadalupe Reservoirs] was largely anoxic (dissolved oxygen levels less than 1 mg/l), as expected for microbial transformations by sulfate reducers that require anoxia." Fish tissue concentrations in target species were also presented in this report.

In 2005, the District initiated a comprehensive monitoring program to develop a database of seasonal changes in concentrations of nutrients, physical parameters, and mercury species in three reservoirs (Almaden, Calero, Guadalupe) and Lake Almaden. These data (Figures 1 and 2, 4, 5 and 6) confirmed the seasonal production of methyl mercury associated with anoxia in the hypolimnion. These data are collected annually and serve as comparator data to similar data collected following the installation and operation of solar-powered circulators in two of the reservoirs and in Lake Almaden.

3.0 STUDY DESCRIPTIONS

3.1 Theoretical Basis

The basic premise of these applied studies is to determine the following:

- Can anoxia in the hypolimnion can be mechanically influenced in a manner that reduces methyl mercury production?
- Does reduction in methyl mercury production result in reduced concentrations of methyl mercury in fish?
- Does the method used to influence anoxia result in improved ecological conditions that supports a more robust fishery, thereby improving assimilative capacity of the water body?

The District has empirically shown the coincidence of methyl mercury production with seasonal anoxia in each of the water bodies. Numerous techniques are available for mechanically influencing anoxia in the hypolimnion, including aeration or oxygenation with bubblers, Speece cones, and circulation. Bubbler and Speece cone systems are energy intensive, requiring energy to produce and deliver oxygen or air to the delivery system and, in the case of the Speece cone, to operate the circulating pump. Circulation systems are less energy intensive, requiring energy only for pump circulation.

In (Stewart, et al. 2008) the authors state that the results of their study “suggest an important role for plankton dynamics in driving the MeHg content of zooplankton and ultimately MeHg bioaccumulation in top predators in pelagic-based food webs.” In the Tetra Tech, Inc. June 7, 2004, Draft Final Conceptual Model Report, pages 4-5 and 4-6, it is stated that “the largest single jump in concentration [of methyl mercury in the food web] occurs from the water to algae.” In the figure on page 4-6 of that report, it is shown that the biomagnification of methyl mercury is increased by 100,000 times from the water to algae, whereas the biomagnification factor is 2 to 5 times from algae to zooplankton, zooplankton to prey fish, and prey fish to predator fish. If these factors are correct, influencing methyl mercury concentrations in the water column is the most efficient method of reducing mercury in the food web.

The question posed in the TMDL (*Is it possible to increase the assimilative capacity for methyl mercury in reservoirs and lakes?*) relevant to these studies is being approached from the perspective of improving the water body to support a more robust fishery. The intent of this approach is to couple improved fish populations with less methyl mercury, in effect comparatively spreading less mercury amongst more fish so that each fish has less mercury than current measured concentrations. Several approaches may be considered (including fish management) that might shift the balance of and distribution of methyl mercury in the biomass of each water body.

In this study, the solar-powered circulators were chosen to provide the dual benefits of delivering oxygen to the hypolimnion and improving the ecology of the water bodies in a way that would improve the fisheries. The manufacturer of the devices suggests that circulation of the epilimnion eliminates the competitive advantage of Cyanobacteria (blue-green algae) over green algae and diatoms. How this competitive advantage is achieved is unclear. One hypothesis is that the competitive advantage of the former is control of buoyancy, so they can move faster toward nutrients (usually downward) and upward toward sunlight. However, if this advantage is removed, the green algae and diatoms have a greater advantage because they reproduce faster and therefore utilize nutrients faster than the Cyanobacteria. Another hypothesis is that circulation promotes more favorable conditions for zooplankton. A large standing crop of grazing cladocerans such as *Daphnia pulicaria* provides high rates of phytoplankton grazing and allow for some grazing of Cyanobacteria before their densities can reach nuisance proportions (Reinikainen et al. 1995). Others have suggested that artificial mixing may control Cyanobacteria through light limitation (Huisman et al. 2004). Others have suggested that artificial mixing may limit Cyanobacteria by promoting natural infections of viruses (cyanophage), viral particles, and other bacteria of the Cyanobacteria (Safferman and Morris 1964; Honjo et al. 2006; Middleboe et al. 2008). Regardless of the precise mechanism, artificial circulation appears to promote considerable control over Cyanobacteria, even in nutrient-rich environments (Hudnell et al. 2010).

Anoxia in the hypolimnion is primarily caused by digestion of organic matter, or utilization of nutrients in the water column, during naturally-occurring periods of stratification. Typically after many years of operation of a reservoir, there is a build-up of organic matter at the bottom (sometimes termed sediment oxygen demand) that would continue to cause anoxia even if all inputs of new organic matter and nutrients were eliminated. After dissolved oxygen is utilized, anaerobic digestion of organic matter produces ammonia, which is an important nutrient for the production of algae. This is why late season blooms of Cyanobacteria are common. The ammonia is near the thermocline and the Cyanobacteria can take advantage of this nutrient source using buoyancy control. In some waterbodies, the seasonal production of Cyanobacteria becomes the dominant source of organic matter that settles to the bottom and is available for digestion.

3.2 Study Approach

Circulation was chosen as the preferred method of improving water quality conditions in the two reservoirs and the lake because it is a method that somewhat mimics nature and can be implemented using solar power. The short term benefits of circulation include reduced nutrient cycling, improved planktonic assemblages, and reduced methyl mercury production. The long term benefits include improved fish assemblages and lower concentrations of mercury in fish. With respect to the TMDL, circulation is expected to achieve seasonal maximum concentrations of methyl mercury in the hypolimnion that approach target concentrations, and fish tissue concentrations that approach water quality objectives. It is expected that changes in fish tissue concentrations of methyl mercury in adult fish will temporally lag those in age-0+ fish, since age-0+ fish are a significant portion of the diet of larger fish.

Oxygenation of the hypolimnion in conjunction with circulation of the epilimnion may accelerate the digestion of accumulated organic material at the bottom sufficiently to allow the desired effects of circulation to be achieved sooner. This technique may be useful to maintain cold water temperatures in the hypolimnion (to comply with regulatory requirements to maintain cold water flows to support downstream fisheries) while achieving benefits of reduced nutrient cycling and reduced methyl mercury production. This may accelerate the achievement of seasonal maximum concentrations of methyl mercury in the hypolimnion that approach target concentrations, and fish tissue concentrations that approach water quality objectives.

3.3 Hypotheses Tested

The deployment of circulators was implemented in three ways: hypolimnetic-only circulation; epilimnetic-only circulation; and a combination of both. All three deployments were tested, along with additional supplemental activities to enhance the effects of circulation.

3.3.1 Almaden Reservoir—Hypolimnetic and Epilimnetic Circulation and Source Control

The hypothesis tested in this reservoir is multi-faceted:

- Epilimnetic circulation will improve planktonic assemblages and reduce organic load to the bottom of the reservoir.
- Hypolimnetic circulation will reduce methyl mercury production and accelerate digestion of historic organic matter.
- Source control will eliminate sediment-derived input of mercury to the reservoir, resulting in reduced methyl mercury production.
- As a result of these actions, fish tissue concentrations of methyl mercury will decrease as compared to present data.

In this reservoir, three circulators were deployed in April 2007. Two circulators provide epilimnetic circulation to improve the ecology (described above) while one provides hypolimnetic circulation to address anoxia and reduce methyl mercury production. In August-October 2009, the only source of mining waste mercury to the reservoir was removed by a creek restoration project conducted by the District and reported elsewhere (see Jacques Gulch Restoration at www.valleywater.org).

3.3.2 Guadalupe Reservoir—Epilimnetic Circulation and Hypolimnetic Oxygenation

The hypothesis tested in this reservoir is as follows:

- Epilimnetic circulation will improve planktonic assemblages and reduce organic load to the bottom of the reservoir.
- Hypolimnetic oxygenation will reduce methyl mercury production and accelerate digestion of historic organic matter.
- As a result of these actions, fish tissue concentrations of methyl mercury will decrease as compared to present data.

In this reservoir, three epilimnetic circulators were deployed in July 2007.

3.3.3 Lake Almaden—Hypolimnetic Circulation

The hypothesis tested in this reservoir is:

- Hypolimnetic circulation will reduce methyl mercury production and accelerate digestion of accumulated organic matter.

- As a result of this action, fish tissue concentrations of methyl mercury will decrease as compared to present data.

In this lake, four circulators have been deployed. The first was installed in 2006, and was later modified in October 2007 to improve performance. The second device was installed in March 2007; the other two devices were installed in January 2009.

3.3.4 Calero Reservoir—Hypolimnetic Oxygenation

The hypothesis tested in this reservoir is:

- Hypolimnetic oxygenation will reduce methyl mercury production and seasonal maxima to meet the target concentration in the TMDL.
- As a result of this action, fish tissue concentrations of methyl mercury will decrease as compared to present data.

4.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

4.1 Reservoir Monitoring Sites

One location in each reservoir was selected to obtain data profiles at depth intervals of ¼ - to 1-meter. Sampling locations corresponded with the deepest portion of the reservoir generally near the outlet works (all reservoirs are bottom-release penstocks), and located using a handheld sounding device. Sampling was also conducted at the outlet works downstream of the reservoirs.

4.2 Lake Monitoring Sites

The bathymetry of Lake Almaden has been developed using echo sounding equipment (Figure 3). The information indicates that there are four distinct areas of significant depth. The two deepest areas (maximum depths of 13 [Site 1] and 11 meters [Site 2], respectively) are separated from each other and from the portion of the lake through which Los Alamitos Creek enters and exits by remnant dike material that ranges 1 to 2 meters below the surface. Seven monitoring locations were established, five of which are in the deepest areas of the lake, and one at each of the inlet and the outlet of the lake.

4.3 Details of Monitoring

Field data collected at the reservoir outlets (beginning 2008) with a Horiba U-10 Water Quality Checker (replaced in September 2010 with Hanna Instruments HI 93414 Turbidity Meter and YSI Incorporated Professional *Plus* multi-parameter data collector) included pH, specific conductivity, turbidity, dissolved oxygen and temperature logged by hand. Field data collected with a Hydro-Lab DS5 Sonde included depth profiles of pH, temperature, ORP (beginning 2006), specific conductivity, dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll *a,* and phycocyanin (beginning 2006) logged into a portable computer. Profile data were logged at ¼-meter intervals to a depth of 1 meter, at 1-meter intervals through the epilimnion, at ¼-meter intervals through the thermocline, and at 1 meter intervals through the hypolimnion. Secchi Transparency Depth measurements were also recorded by hand at each sampling event.

Water samples were collected using a Wildco beta-type Van Dorn sampling device (2.2 liter) at discrete depths. In the epilimnion, water samples were collected at a depth of 2 meters. In the hypolimnion, water samples were collected at 1 meter or less above the bottom and at a mid-depth between the epilimnion and hypolimnion sample depths. During the methyl mercury production season, additional sample depths were utilized to collect samples for methyl mercury analyses to develop a more comprehensive profile of methyl mercury concentrations in the water column.

Samples were dispensed using “Clean Hands-Dirty Hands” procedures of EPA Method 1669 into:

- Unpreserved 1-liter volume amber glass containers for analyses for chlorophyll *a* (epilimnion only).

- Unpreserved 0.5-liter volume polypropylene containers for analyses for sulfate, nitrate, and nitrite (epilimnion and hypolimnion only).

- 0.5-liter and 0.25-liter volume polypropylene containers preserved with H_2SO_4 for analyses for ammonia and total phosphorus, respectively (epilimnion and hypolimnion only).

- 0.25-liter volume FPE containers (Brooks-Rand) preserved with HCl for analyses for methyl mercury (all depths).

- Unpreserved 0.25-liter polypropylene containers for low level total mercury analyses (epilimnion, hypolimnion and inlet/outlet only) and for low level dissolved mercury analyses (epilimnion, hypolimnion and outlet at Almaden Reservoir only).

- Unpreserved 0.5-liter volume polypropylene containers for Total Suspended Solids (TSS) analyses (hypolimnion only).

4.4 Laboratory Analysis Methods

- Unfiltered (Total) Methyl Mercury was determined using EPA Method 1630, with a Practical Quantification Limit of 0.050 ng/l.

- Unfiltered (Total) and Filtered (Dissolved) Mercury was determined using EPA Method 1631E, with a Reporting Limit of 0.500 ng/l.

- Ammonia as Nitrogen was determined using EPA Method 350.1, with a Reporting Limit of 0.100 mg/l. Prior to April 2009, lower Reporting Limits were sometimes achieved, as reported in the December 31, 2009 Progress report.

- Total Phosphorus was determined using EPA Method 365.3, with a Reporting Limit of 0.050 mg/l.

- Nitrate as NO3, Nitrite as NO2, and Sulfate as SO4 were determined using EPA Method 300.0, with Reporting Limits of 1.0 mg/l. Prior to April 2009, lower Reporting Limits were sometimes achieved, as reported in the December 31, 2009 Progress report.

- Total Suspended Solids (TSS) was determined using EPA Method SM 2540D, with a reporting Limit of 10 mg/l.

5.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Dissolved Oxygen

Oxygen depletion in the hypolimnia of lakes and reservoirs following thermal stratification is a well-documented phenomenon. Subsequent microbial digestion of other available forms of oxygen (e.g. nitrate, sulfate, carbon dioxide) leads to the production of nuisance chemical species and methyl mercury, as discussed below. Data from several years of monitoring were used to estimate the volume of anoxic water in acre-feet and as a percentage of total volume that occurs each year in Almaden, Calero, and Guadalupe reservoirs. This analysis allows for a comparison of the extent of oxygen depletion amongst the reservoirs and its relation to methyl mercury production (Figures 4, 5, 6).

Almaden Reservoir (Figure 4) seasonal maximum hypolimnion methyl mercury concentrations coincide with annual anoxia in the hypolimnion, remaining below 10 ng/L each year. Methyl mercury seasonal maxima do not fluctuate with the total volume of storage attained each year, nor with the percentage of total volume that becomes anoxic. The portion of the total volume that becomes anoxic ranges from 20 to 45 percent, and appears to be higher in the two most recent seasons displayed as compared to the three earlier seasons. The duration of anoxia ranges from one to four months. Circulation has had no apparent effect on methyl mercury concentrations or on algae production.

Calero Reservoir (Figure 5) is similar to Almaden Reservoir with respect to seasonal maximum hypolimnion methyl mercury concentrations (<10 ng/L annually); however, it differs in other parameters: higher portions of the total volume that become anoxic (35-55 percent) though that appears to be declining over the most recent three years displayed; the duration of anoxia, ranging from four to five months, is longer than Almaden Reservoir, and the pattern of methyl mercury production in Calero also appears to differ from that observed in Almaden Reservoir, with Calero exhibiting an attenuated rise to maximum.

Guadalupe Reservoir (Figure 6) differs from both Almaden and Calero reservoirs in all respects: seasonal maximum hypolimnion methyl mercury concentrations exceed 10 ng/L annually, ranging as high as 40 ng/L; the portion of total volume that becomes anoxic consistently ranges from 40 to 50 percent; the duration of anoxia ranges from six to seven months; and, the pattern of methyl mercury production is more variable during each season as compared to the other two reservoirs. This is likely due to the outlet works being located approximately 3 meters above the bottom of the reservoir, resulting in a stagnant hypolimnetic pool that persists for several months (see Mercury/Methyl Mercury Cycling, *Guadalupe Reservoir*).

5.2 Nutrient Cycling

5.2.1 Nitrogen

Nutrients required for living cells, in order of abundance, include carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen and phosphorous (Horne, A.J., Course Materials: Ecology and Management of Lakes and Reservoirs, Continuing Education in Business and Technology, University Extension, University of California, Berkeley 2004). Nitrate (NO_3) is the most common form of this nutrient in lakes and streams, and its concentration and rate of supply is directly related to land use practices in the watershed. Nitrate ions are easily soluble and move easily through soils. Ammonia (NH_4) is the preferred form of nitrogen for phytoplankton and plant growth, and is produced by decay of organic material under anoxic conditions. Generally in the reservoirs and lake of this study, Nitrate is the predominant form of nitrogen during the fall and winter and Ammonia is the predominant form of nitrogen during the summer (Figures 7 through 11).

In Almaden Reservoir (Figure 7), excursions of Nitrate concentrations above the laboratory analysis reporting limit did not occur in the epilimnion and occurred only once in the hypolimnion during the reporting period (2010-2011). Ammonia concentrations in both the epilimnion and hypolimnion exhibit seasonal cycling at relatively low concentrations (particularly as compared to Lake Almaden, see below). These results are generally similar to previous years.

In Guadalupe Reservoir (Figure 8), Nitrate concentrations above the laboratory reporting limit occurred only once in the hypolimnion and not at all in the epilimnion during the reporting period; this was similar to 2009 and 2010, but quite different from previous years' results when prolonged (up to several months) excursions above the reporting limit appeared in the hypolimnion in late spring and summer of 2006 and 2008. Ammonia concentrations in the hypolimnion exhibit a seasonal pattern, with higher concentrations in the summer months, as observed in previous years, although 2011 appears to be a greater ammonia production time period than past years. Ammonia concentrations in the epilimnion remained near the reportable limit throughout the year, also similar to previous years.

In Calero Reservoir (Figure 9), Nitrate concentrations above the laboratory analysis reporting limit occurred only once in the epilimnion and once in the hypolimnion during the reporting period; this was similar to 2009 and 2010, but quite different from previous years' results when prolonged excursions were observed in both the epilimnion and hypolimnion over the winter of 2006 and in the hypolimnion in the spring of 2008. Ammonia concentrations in the epilimnion and hypolimnion exhibited seasonal cycling, with concentrations in the epilimnion being somewhat more pronounced as compared to previous years.

Concentrations of Ammonia and Nitrate in Lake Almaden (Figures 10 and 11) remain significantly higher than those measured in the three reservoirs, which may reflect the urban surroundings of this lake location. Nitrate concentrations exhibited strong seasonal patterns in the epilimnion and hypolimnion at both sampling sites, similar to previous years, and appear to be unaffected by circulation. Ammonia concentrations exhibited strong seasonal patterns in the hypolimnion at both sampling sites prior to installation and operation of the circulators (2005 at Site 1 and 2005-2006 at Site 2), before modification of the device near Site 1 (2006-2007), and during the malfunction of the device near Site 2 (2009), and were suppressed during the reporting period due to effects of the circulators. Ammonia concentrations in the epilimnion remained near the laboratory analysis reporting limit year-round at both sites.

5.2.2 Summary-Nitrogen

Solar-powered circulators were installed in Almaden Reservoir (April 2007), Guadalupe Reservoir (July 2007), and Lake Almaden (2006 near Site 1, 2007 near Site 2), as described above. The circulators in Lake Almaden appear to have affected the seasonal cycling of Ammonia, particularly when the intake is set at the bottom. The intake of the circulator near Site 1 was originally set at one meter above the bottom for operation in 2006 and 2007; it was reset at the bottom in early 2008. The intake of the circulator near Site 2 is set at the bottom; in 2009 the circulator at Site 2 malfunctioned and did not provide sufficient circulation to affect Ammonia concentrations, which reverted to the pre-circulator seasonal pattern. The circulators functioned regularly during the reporting period and suppressed ammonia cycling in the hypolimnia as compared to uncirculated conditions in previous years. The circulators do not appear to have had any effect on nitrogen concentrations in the reservoirs (Almaden and Guadalupe).

5.2.3 Phosphorus and Sulfate

Phosphorus is an essential nutrient for living systems, as a structural link in genetic material, as a component of cell walls, and as a component in the energy system of cells (Horne, A.J., Course Materials: Ecology and Management of Lakes and Reservoirs, Continuing Education in Business and Technology, University Extension, University of California, Berkeley, 2004). It is naturally occurring in sediment and most of this form is organic and inert. The usable phosphorus is the organic form of phosphorus (PO4). Measurement of unfiltered samples for Total Phosphorus (TP) includes both inorganic and organic forms. Generally, in lake and river systems Total Phosphorus concentrations are high during winter when sediment is mobilized by runoff; organic phosphorus may also be important in urban or rural areas where excessive or improper use of fertilizers occurs. During the summer, phosphorus is bound in the sediment and becomes a limiting nutrient for phytoplankton; however, under anoxic conditions the organic form of phosphorus is released from the sediment into the hypolimnion.

Sulfate (SO4) is the oxygen source for sulfate-reducing bacteria, which are generally known to be associated with the production of methyl mercury in the hypolimnia of lakes. These bacteria convert sulfate into the acid hydrogen sulfide (HS^-) and the gas hydrogen sulfide (H_2S). The latter is associated with taste and odor problems for treated water, and as a potential factor in fish kills. Measurements of sulfate throughout the year provide a means of tracking the activity of these bacteria to supplement physical measurements of oxygen and oxidation reduction potential, and to observe the effects of circulation.

In Almaden Reservoir (Figure 12), Sulfate concentrations vary in a narrow range (+/- 3 mg/l) throughout the year, with maxima occurring during the winter, in both the hypolimnion and epilimnion, with one notable exception that occurred in the spring of 2010-2011. Total Phosphorus concentrations rarely exceed the laboratory analysis reporting limit (0.050 mg/l) in the epilimnion, with some notable occurrences in the winter of 2005 and the fall of 2009. In the hypolimnion, Total Phosphorus concentrations vary within a narrow range near the reporting limit (+/- 0.1 mg/l), exhibiting a summer seasonal effect, particularly in 2006 and 2007, which appears muted in 2008 and 2009. These data indicate that phosphorus in the water column is more a function of internal cycling of phosphorus than of sediment input.

In Guadalupe Reservoir (Figure 13), Sulfate concentrations vary over a range of +/- 20 mg/l throughout the year in the epilimnion and hypolimnion. The seasonal effect is exhibited strongly in the hypolimnion, with seasonal minima corresponding with seasonal maximum Total Phosphorus concentrations. This effect was profound in 2011, where sulfate concentrations in the hypolimnion approached the laboratory reporting limit of 1 mg/l. The seasonal effect in the epilimnion is present, but is not as pronounced as observed in the hypolimnion. Total Phosphorus concentrations rarely exceed the laboratory analysis reporting limit in the epilimnion. In the hypolimnion, Total Phosphorus concentrations vary within a narrow range near the reporting limit (+/- 0.1 mg/l), exhibiting a summer seasonal effect. These data indicate that phosphorus in the water column is more a function of internal cycling of phosphorus than of sediment input.

In Calero Reservoir (Figure 14), Sulfate concentrations vary over a range of +/- 20 mg/l throughout the year in the epilimnion and hypolimnion. The seasonal effect is exhibited in both the epilimnion and the hypolimnion, with seasonal minima corresponding with seasonal maximum Total Phosphorus concentrations in the hypolimnion. Total Phosphorus concentrations rarely exceed the laboratory reporting limit in the epilimnion. In the hypolimnion, Total Phosphorus concentrations vary within a narrow range near the reporting limit (+/-0.2 mg/l), exhibiting a summer seasonal effect. These data indicate that phosphorus in the water column is more a function of internal cycling of phosphorus than of sediment input.

Concentrations of Sulfate and Total Phosphorus in Lake Almaden (Figures 15 and 16) were significantly higher than those measured in Almaden and Guadalupe. Sulfate concentrations were somewhat higher than those observed in Calero. Concentrations of both species exhibited strong seasonal patterns in the hypolimnion at both sampling sites, varying widely (+/- 45 mg/l for Sulfate, and +/- 1.5 mg/l for Total Phosphorus) at both sampling sites prior to installation and operation of the circulators (2005 at Site 1 and 2005-2006 at Site 2), before modification of the device near Site 1 (2006-2007), and during the malfunction of the device near Site 2 (2009). Concentrations of both species in the epilimnion at both sites varied over a narrower range (+/- 20 mg/l for Sulfate, and +/- 0.15 mg/l for Total Phosphorus) and the seasonal effect was comparatively muted by the effects of circulation during the reporting period, with the exception of one notable event in the hypolimnion at Site 2.

5.2.4 Summary–Phosphorus and Sulfate

Solar-powered circulators were installed in Almaden Reservoir (April 2007), Guadalupe Reservoir (July 2007), and Lake Almaden (2006 near Site 1, 2007 near Site 2), as described above. The circulators in Lake Almaden appear to have affected the seasonal cycling of both Sulfate and Total Phosphorus, but only when the intake is set at the bottom. The intake of the circulator near Site 1 was originally set at one meter above the bottom for operation in 2006 and 2007; it was reset at the bottom in early 2008. The intake of the circulator near Site 2 is set at the bottom; in 2009 the circulator at Site 2 malfunctioned and did not provide sufficient circulation to affect Sulfate and Total Phosphorus concentrations, which reverted to the pre-circulator seasonal pattern. Suppression of the cycling of these species resumed during the reporting period, during which the circulators functioned normally. The circulators do not appear to have had any effect on Sulfate or Total Phosphorus concentrations in the reservoirs (Almaden and Guadalupe).

5.3 Mercury/Methyl Mercury Cycling

Methyl mercury concentrations vary seasonally in the reservoirs and the lake of this study, corresponding with anoxia in the hypolimnia (Figures 1 and 2). The intent of this study is to evaluate the effects of circulation on the methyl mercury concentrations in the water column, as deployed and as supplemented by additional actions as described above.

5.3.1 Almaden Reservoir

Methyl mercury concentrations measured in Almaden Reservoir (Figures 17 and 18) show a production season that lasts approximately three months from July through October annually. Methyl mercury increases in the water column are generally associated with areas of anoxia; however, Oxidation Reduction Potential (ORP) may be a more specific indicator of optimum conditions for methylation, as methyl mercury concentrations tend to increase as ORP values decrease below 100 millivolts (mV). During the reporting period, maximum concentrations in the hypolimnion, mid-depth and epilimnion were consistent with previous years. The TMDL target concentration (1.5 ng/l) for hypolimnetic seasonal maximum concentration is typically exceeded for 1-2 months between July and September annually (Figure 19). The only exception was in 2009 when the target concentration was exceeded for about 4 months between July and October. The circulators installed in this reservoir in 2007 do not appear to have had any effect on methyl mercury concentrations in the water column.

Mercury concentrations in the epilimnion and hypolimnion exhibit seasonal effects for both unfiltered (total) and filtered (dissolved) species (Figure 20). Generally, seasonal maximum concentrations of total mercury are observed during the wet season and seasonal maximum concentrations of dissolved mercury are observed during the dry season in both the epilimnion and hypolimnion. During the summer and fall of 2009, the Jacques Gulch Restoration Project was constructed above Almaden Reservoir, which resulted in significant removal of source mercury to the reservoir. The data indicate that seasonal maximum concentrations of total mercury in the epilimnion are lower in 2009-2011 than in previous years, and that seasonal maximum concentrations are about the same in the hypolimnion. Due to the attenuation effect of the reservoir, it may be some time before water column concentrations of total mercury react to the reduction of source material. Dissolved mercury seasonal maxima do not appear to have been affected by the restoration project, which is not unusual since dissolved mercury is largely a product of internal processes rather than loading. Note that seasonal maxima for the epilimnion since 2009 were below 30 ng/l, and below 40 ng/l in the hypolimnion.

5.3.2 Guadalupe Reservoir

Methyl mercury concentrations measured in Guadalupe Reservoir (Figures 21 and 22) show a production season that lasts from seven to nine months from April through November annually. Methyl mercury increases in the water column are generally associated with areas of anoxia; however, Oxidation Reduction Potential (ORP) may be a more specific indicator of optimum conditions for methylation, as methyl mercury concentrations tend to increase as ORP values decrease below 100 millivolts (mV). During the reporting period, maximum concentrations in the hypolimnion, mid-depth and epilimnion were consistent with previous years. The TMDL target concentration (1.5 ng/l) for hypolimnetic seasonal maximum concentration is typically exceeded for 5-8 months between April and November annually (Figure 23). Note that an anoxic zone is established early in the season in the bottom three meters of the reservoir (Figures 21 and 22). This volume of water is located below the sill elevation of the outlet works, and appears to accumulate methyl mercury in a manner similar to that of Lake Almaden. The upper layer resembles Almaden with respect to the pattern and extent of development of anoxia in July through September and related increased methyl mercury production in the anoxic zone, with target concentrations in samples collected at the depth of the outlet exceeding the TMDL target concentration of 1.5 ng/l for only 2 to 3 months. During the reporting period, maximum concentrations in the hypolimnion, mid-depth and epilimnion were consistent with previous years. The circulators installed in this reservoir in 2007 do not appear to have had any effect on methyl mercury concentrations in the water column.

Mercury concentrations in the epilimnion and hypolimnion exhibit seasonal effects for unfiltered (total) mercury (Figure 24). Generally, seasonal maximum concentrations of total mercury are observed during the wet season in both the epilimnion and hypolimnion. Note that seasonal maxima for the epilimnion since 2009 were below 30 ng/l, but were nearly 100 ng/l in the hypolimnion.

5.3.3 Calero Reservoir

Methyl mercury concentrations measured in Calero Reservoir (Figures 25 and 26) show a production season that lasts approximately four months from June through October annually.

Methyl mercury increases in the water column are generally associated with areas of anoxia; however, Oxidation Reduction Potential (ORP) may be a more specific indicator of optimum conditions for methylation, as methyl mercury concentrations tend to increase as ORP values decrease below 100 millivolts (mV). During the reporting period, maximum concentrations in the hypolimnion, mid-depth and epilimnion were consistent with previous years. The TMDL target concentration (1.5 ng/l) for hypolimnetic seasonal maximum concentration is typically exceeded for 5-8 months between April and November annually (Figure 27).

Mercury concentrations in the epilimnion and hypolimnion exhibit seasonal effects for unfiltered (total) mercury (Figure 28). Generally, seasonal maximum concentrations of total mercury are observed during the wet season in both the epilimnion and hypolimnion. These concentrations are significantly lower than the other two reservoirs and Lake Almaden, with seasonal maxima in the epilimnion below 10 ng/l since 2008, and below 20 ng/l in the hypolimnion.

5.3.4 Lake Almaden

Methyl mercury concentrations measured in Lake Almaden at Site 1 (Figures 29 and 30) show a production season that lasts approximately seven months from April through November annually. Methyl mercury increases in the water column are generally associated with areas of anoxia; however, Oxidation Reduction Potential (ORP) may be a more specific indicator of optimum conditions for methylation, as methyl mercury concentrations tend to increase as ORP values decrease below 100 millivolts (mV). Annual maximum concentrations in the hypolimnion varied over the study period, and were obviously affected by the circulator after it was set at the bottom in 2008 (Figure 31). In 2005-2007 the maximum concentration in the hypolimnion was about 70 ng/l; in 2008 through 2011, the maximum concentration was 30, 18, 24 and 15 ng/l, respectively. Mid-depth seasonal maximum concentrations were immediately affected by the circulator following installation in 2006, and remained below 10 ng/l during the reporting period. Hypolimnetic seasonal maxima concentrations above the target concentration (1.5 ng/l) are generally exceeded for 5-6 months in May-November annually.

Mercury concentrations in the epilimnion and hypolimnion exhibit seasonal effects for unfiltered (total) mercury (Figure 32). Generally, seasonal maximum concentrations of total mercury are observed during the wet season in both the epilimnion and hypolimnion, and are significantly higher than the three reservoirs, with seasonal maxima in the epilimnion above 50 ng/l since 2009, and ranging above 150 ng/l in the hypolimnion.

Methyl mercury concentrations measured in Lake Almaden at Site 2 (Figures 33 and 34) show a production season that lasts approximately seven months from April through November annually. Annual maximum concentrations in the hypolimnion varied over the study period, and were obviously affected by the circulator after it was installed in 2007 (Figure 35) and malfunctioned in 2009. In 2005 and 2006 the maximum concentration in the hypolimnion was about 60 and 70 ng/l, respectively; in 2007 and 2008, the maximum concentration was about 17 ng/l; in 2009, the maximum concentration was 48 ng/l; in 2010 and 2011 the maximum concentrations were 9 and 32 ng/l. Mid-depth seasonal maximum concentration was immediately affected by the circulator following installation in 2007, but was unaffected by the malfunction in 2009. The maximum concentration at mid-depth in 2005 and 2006 was 78 and 112 ng/l, respectively; in 2007-2011 the maximum concentration was 4.7, 18, 4.4, 2.9 and 7.3 ng/l, respectively. Hypolimnetic seasonal maxima concentrations above the target concentration (1.5 ng/l) are generally exceeded for 5-6 months in May-November annually.

Mercury concentrations in the epilimnion and hypolimnion exhibit seasonal effects for unfiltered (total) mercury (Figure 36). Generally, seasonal maximum concentrations of total mercury are observed during the wet season in both the epilimnion and hypolimnion, and are significantly higher than the three reservoirs, with seasonal maxima in the epilimnion above 50 ng/l since 2009, and ranging above 150 ng/l in the hypolimnion.

Methyl mercury concentrations measured in the hypolimnion of Lake Almaden at Site 5 (Figure 37) shows a production season that lasts six months from May to November. Only a partial background season of data were obtained at this site in 2008. In 2008 the maximum concentration measured in the hypolimnion was 38 ng/l. The maximum concentration measured in the hypolimnion was 7.6 ng/l in 2009, 4.2 ng/l in 2010, and 8.4 ng/l in 2011. Hypolimnetic seasonal maxima concentrations above the target concentration (1.5 ng/l) are generally exceeded for 5-6 months in May-November annually.

5.4 Summary—Mercury/Methyl Mercury Cycling

Solar-powered circulators were installed in Almaden Reservoir (April 2007), Guadalupe Reservoir (July 2007), and Lake Almaden (2006 near Site 1, 2007 near Site 2, and 2009 near Site 3 and Site 5), as described above. The circulators in the two reservoirs do not appear to have had any effect on methyl mercury production or algal blooms. The circulators in Lake Almaden appear to have affected the seasonal cycling of methyl mercury most effectively when the intake is set at the bottom. The intake of the circulator near Site 1 was originally set at one meter above the bottom for operation in 2006 and 2007; it was reset at the bottom in early 2008. The intake of the circulator near Site 2, Site 3 and Site 5 is set at the bottom; in 2009 the circulator at Site 2 malfunctioned and did not provide sufficient circulation to affect methyl mercury concentrations in the hypolimnion, which reverted to the pre-circulator seasonal maxima, but did maintain mid-depth concentrations at low levels compared to pre-circulation data. Mercury concentrations in the water column are significantly lower in Calero than in the other two reservoirs and Lake Almaden, and significantly higher in Lake Almaden than the three reservoirs.

5.5 Mercury/Methyl Mercury Loading

In the September 2008 Guadalupe River Watershed Mercury TMDL Staff Report (Staff Report, page 9-31), the Regional Board stated that the District would be "required to quantify dry season loads of methylmercury… discharged from reservoirs and lakes" using a method proposed in Section 4.4 of the Staff Report. The method proposed in Section 4.4 made a variety of assumptions, each of which would add and compound to error in estimating the load of methyl mercury. The District proposes the more direct and conventional method of sampling outlet flows and using concentration and gauged flow data to estimate loads.

In 2007 through 2011, the District collected samples from the outlet of the three reservoirs, and from the inlet and outlet of Lake Almaden, at the sampling frequency described above. As shown in Figure 38, the hypolimnion and outlet concentrations of methyl mercury for Almaden Reservoir are about the same; there is no loss of methyl mercury in the outlet works as postulated in the Staff Report (page 9-26).

In Figure 39, the hypolimnion and outlet concentrations of methyl mercury for Guadalupe Reservoir differ widely during the methyl mercury production season. This is not due to any losses in the outlet works; rather, it is due to the difference between the elevation of the outlet works sill (approximately three meters above the bottom of the reservoir) and the sample collection depth (within one meter above the bottom). Comparison of the concentrations of methyl mercury in samples collected at the sill elevation and the outlet (also shown in Figure 39) are essentially the same.

As shown in Figure 40, the hypolimnion and outlet concentrations of methyl mercury for Calero Reservoir are about the same; there is no loss of methyl mercury in the outlet works as postulated in the Staff Report (page 9-26). As shown in Figure 41, the inlet and outlet concentrations of methyl mercury for Lake Almaden indicate that the lake is a sink for methyl mercury (discharges less methyl mercury than it receives).

5.5.1 Outlet Load Calculations

Using Santa Clara Valley Water District gauge data, and mercury (Hg) and methyl mercury (MeHg) concentrations in the outlet discharge, wet season and annual loads were calculated for the Almaden, Calero, and Guadalupe reservoirs for the period October 1, 2009 through April 30, 2010 (wet season) and October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010 (annual). Daily flow rates were multiplied by the measured concentrations in order to determine the amounts of Hg and MeHg discharged per year and per wet season, as shown in the table below:

Reservoir	Hg Discharged		MeHg Discharged	
	g/wet season	g/year	g/wet season	g/year
Almaden	67	88	3.4	5.9
Guadalupe	147	183	2.6	4.7
Calero	21	31	5.4	8.8

These results are similar to those reported by Tetra Tech, Inc. in their *Final Conceptual Model Report*, May 20, 2005. These reservoirs do not appear to be significant sources of Hg to the Guadalupe River or San Francisco Bay as compared to other local sources. The Guadalupe River annual discharge as stated in the San Francisco Bay TMDL is 92 kg Hg per year, whereas these three reservoirs in total discharged just 0.3 kg Hg in the past year.

5.5.2 Correlation Analysis

The District investigated the relationship between turbidity and mercury species at the outlet of the three reservoirs Almaden, Calero, and Guadalupe. Hypolimnion samples were also analyzed for Total Suspended Solids; however, only samples from Guadalupe Reservoir had a sufficient number of detectable results to conduct a preliminary analysis for correlation with mercury species (data not shown).

When comparing two variables (x and y) in a data set, the relationship between them can be determined using the unitless linear correlation coefficient (r). This value looks at the strength of the relationship between x and y, assuming that they can be related to one another using a linear expression ($y = mx + b$, where m is the slope and b is the y-intercept). The values of r lie between -1 and +1; values close to either end point indicate a strong relationship between the two variables. Values near 0 indicate that the variables have either a non-linear relationship or do not relate to one another at all. The linear correlation coefficient can only provide information about linearly related variables.

The linear correlation coefficient also indicates at the direction of this relationship. If the values of x increase as values of y also increase, the correlation is said to be positive. If the values of x increase as the values of y decrease, the correlation is said to be negative.

The potential of a correlation between measurements of turbidity and mercury species concentrations across the yearly wet/dry season cycle was examined, using data from samples taken at the outlets of the reservoirs. A linear analysis was used to test the assumption that mercury species are associated with sediment, and that turbidity is a linear function of suspended sediment, since suspended sediment samples are frequently below laboratory detection limits. The figures below show these data, and the table below lists the correlation factors.

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR MERCURY (HG) SPECIES AND TURBIDITY

RESERVOIR OUTLETS

Reservoir	Turbidity – Total Hg	Turbidity – Methyl Hg	Turbidity – Dissolved Hg
Almaden	0.654	- 0.344	-0.005
Calero	0.292	- 0.428	No data
Guadalupe	0.543	- 0.133	No data

The comparisons of turbidity with mercury species indicate that there is some positive correlation between turbidity and total mercury at each reservoir outlet but it is very weak at Calero and weak at Almaden and Guadalupe. There is no correlation between turbidity and dissolved mercury (data collected only at Almaden), which would be expected. Interestingly, there is a weak negative correlation between turbidity and methyl mercury, suggesting that methyl mercury is not associated with particles. None of these relationships are strong enough to use turbidity as a surrogate for mercury species concentrations.

5.6 Coordinated Monitoring Program

In 2010, the District, along with Santa Clara County, Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, and the Guadalupe Rubbish Disposal Company, Inc., developed and received regulatory approval of the November 15, 2010 Guadalupe River Coordinated Monitoring Plan (Plan). This Plan includes sampling of fish tissue in the watershed and monitoring mass loading of mercury to San Francisco Bay. In 2011, fish tissue sampling was conducted in Calero Reservoir and Lake Almaden on August 29, in Almaden Reservoir on August 30, and in Guadalupe Reservoir on September 1. Field data and relevant water quality data collected by the District during this time period are presented as Appendix B.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

The data interpretation, data analysis, and conclusions in this report are preliminary and subject to change as the study progresses.

The Hypothesis being tested for Lake Almaden is:

> *Hypolimnetic circulation will reduce methyl mercury concentrations in Lake Almaden to meet the seasonal maximum concentration specified in the TMDL, which is expected to result in fish tissue concentrations that meet the objectives specified in the TMDL.*

To date, it has been demonstrated that the solar-powered circulators have significantly reduced methyl mercury concentrations in the water column as compared to pre-circulated conditions. With proper deployment and operation, near-bottom concentrations of methyl mercury in the water column are significantly reduced as well; however, the target concentrations in the TMDL have not yet been achieved.

The first Hypothesis being tested for Guadalupe Reservoir is

> *Epilimnetic circulation will reduce blue green algae production in Guadalupe Reservoir in favor of green algae production, eventually reducing the extent and duration of anoxia in the hypolimnion while improving the fishery, resulting in lower seasonal maximum methyl mercury concentrations (due to less anoxia) and lower methyl mercury concentrations in fish (due to biodilution).*

To date, the data indicate that current blooms of blue green algae are low to modest in this reservoir. There is no background data for comparison, and collection and quantification of algae production is problematic, so it is not possible to quantifiably demonstrate if the circulators have had any effect on the blue green algae blooms; however, there is has been no visual change observed. The data indicate that there has been no effect of circulation on hypolimnetic anoxia or water column concentrations of methyl mercury.

The second Hypothesis being tested for Guadalupe Reservoir is

> *Oxygenation of the hypolimnion in combination with epilimnetic circulation will accelerate the processes described above in Guadalupe Reservoir*.

An oxygenation system is being budgeted for installation in calendar year 2012. To date, there are no data available to test this hypothesis.

The Hypothesis being tested for Almaden Reservoir is

> *Epilimnetic and hypolimnetic circulation in Almaden Reservoir combined with source reduction will reduce mercury available for methylation, reduce blue green algae production in favor of green algae production, eventually reduce the extent and duration of anoxia in the hypolimnion while improving the fishery, resulting in lower seasonal maximum methyl mercury concentrations (due to less anoxia and less mercury available for methylation) and lower methyl mercury concentrations in fish (due to biodilution)*.

The data indicate that there has been no effect of circulation on hypolimnetic anoxia or water column concentrations of methyl mercury. The restoration of Jacques Gulch in the summer and fall of 2009 has removed the only source of mining waste to this reservoir. While annual maximum total mercury concentrations in the water column appear to be lower than those measured prior to 2009, the annual maximum methyl mercury concentrations measured in the water column have not been reduced. Seasonal blooms of Cyanobacteria were visually observed annually each November, indicating that the epilimnetic circulation has not substantially affected the composition of phytoplankton in the reservoir.

A pilot scale oxygenation system has been procured for use in this reservoir in calendar year 2012. This will revise the Hypothesis to: *Oxygenation of the hypolimnion in Almaden Reservoir combined with source reduction will result in seasonal maximum concentrations of methyl mercury that meet the criterion specified in the TMDL and fish tissue concentrations that meet the targets specified in the TMDL*.

The Hypothesis being tested for Calero Reservoir is

> *Oxygenation of the hypolimnion in Calero Reservoir will result in seasonal maximum concentrations of methyl mercury that meet the criterion specified in the TMDL and fish tissue concentrations that meet the targets specified in the TMDL.*

A full scale oxygenation system was installed in Calero Reservoir in November 2011. The system is planned to be operated beginning in the spring of 2012.

7.0 IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

To date, the District has conducted the following activities:

2003–2009	Source removal on all known source areas on District-owned property on Alamitos Creek.
2005–present	Monitoring and Sampling Program for three reservoirs and one lake.
2006–present	Installation and operation of a circulator at Site 1 in Lake Almaden, with modifications to deployment in 2008.
2007–present	Installation and operation of a circulator at Site 2 in Lake Almaden; Installation and operation of three circulators in Almaden Reservoir and three circulators in Guadalupe Reservoir; source removal of mining waste to Almaden Reservoir (Jacques Gulch Restoration).
2009–present	Installation and operation of two additional circulators in Lake Almaden; application for grant funding for oxygenation system for Calero Reservoir; application for grant funding for feasibility study for Alamitos Creek Restoration/Lake Almaden Bypass; application for grant funding for source reduction on private property on Alamitos Creek. All grant applications were unsuccessful.
2011	Installation of oxygenation system in Calero Reservoir; equipment procurement for oxygenation of Almaden Reservoir; completion of internal opportunities and constraints document for remediation of Lake Almaden.

Planned activities for the next reporting period:

2012–2013	Monitoring and Sampling Program for three reservoirs and one lake, continued operation of existing circulators.
2012–2013	Oxygenation system operation in Almaden Reservoir and Calero Reservoir.
2012–2013	Installation and operation of oxygenation system in Guadalupe Reservoir.
2012–2013	Further evaluation of alternatives for remediation of Lake Almaden.

APPENDIX A

Figures



Lake Almaden - Site 1



Lake Almaden - Site 2

Figure 1: Annual Coincidence of Methyl Mercury Production with Seasonal Anoxia in Lake Almaden





Figure 2: Annual Coincidence of Methyl Mercury Production with Seasonal Anoxia in Two Reservoirs



Figure 3: Lake Almaden Bathymetry and Site Map

Inlet = Sampling/Monitoring Location

✲ = Solar-powered Circulator Location

Figure 3: Lake Almaden Bathymetry and Site Map



Figure 4: Seasonal Anoxic Volume (DO<1 mg/l) as a Percentage of Total Volume; Hypolimnion Methyl Mercury Concentrations (MeHg) in Almaden Reservoir



Figure 5: **Seasonal Anoxic Volume (DO<1 mg/l) as a Percentage of Total Volume; Hypolimnion Methyl Mercury Concentrations (MeHg) in Calero Reservoir**



Figure 6: **Seasonal Anoxic Volume (DO<1 mg/l) as a Percentage of Total Volume; Hypolimnion Methyl Mercury Concentrations (MeHg) in Guadalupe Reservoir**





Figure 7: Nitrate (NO_3) and Ammonia (NH_4) Concentrations in Almaden Reservoir





Figure 8: Nitrate (NO_3) and Ammonia (NH_4) Concentrations in Guadalupe Reservoir





Figure 9: Nitrate (NO_3) and Ammonia (NH_4) Concentrations in Calero Reservoir





Figure 10: Nitrate (NO_3) and Ammonia (NH_4) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 1)





Figure 11: Nitrate (NO_3) and Ammonia (NH_4) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 2)





Figure 12: Total Phosphorus (TP) and Sulfate (SO$_4$) Concentrations in Almaden Reservoir





Figure 13: Total Phosphorus (TP) and Sulfate (SO_4) Concentrations in Guadalupe Reservoir





Figure 14: Total Phosphorus (TP) and Sulfate (SO_4) Concentrations in Calero Reservoir



Lake Almaden Site 1 - Hypolimnion



Lake Almaden Site 1 - Epilimnion

Figure 15: Total Phosphorus (TP) and Sulfate (SO$_4$) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 1)





Figure 16: Total Phosphorus (TP) and Sulfate (SO_4) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 2)



Figure 17: **Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Almaden Reservoir**



Figure 18: **Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Almaden Reservoir**



Figure 19: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Almaden Reservoir





Figure 20: Unfiltered (Total) and Filtered (Dissolved) Mercury (Hg) in Almaden Reservoir



Figure 21: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Guadalupe Reservoir

(Continued on Next Page)



Figure 21: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Guadalupe Reservoir



Figure 22: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Guadalupe Reservoir

(Continued on Next Page)



Figure 22: **Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Guadalupe Reservoir**



Figure 23: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Guadalupe Reservoir





Figure 24: Unfiltered Mercury (Total Hg) Concentrations in Guadalupe Reservoir



Figure 25: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Calero Reservoir

(Continued on Next Page)



Figure 25: **Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Calero Reservoir**



Figure 26: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Calero Reservoir

(Continued on Next Page)



Figure 26: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Calero Reservoir



Figure 27: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Calero Reservoir





Figure 28: Unfiltered Mercury (Total Hg) Concentrations in Calero Reservoir



Figure 29: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 1)

(Continued on Next Page)



Figure 29: **Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 1)**



Figure 30: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 1)

(Continued on Next Page)



Figure 30: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 1)



Figure 31: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 1)





Figure 32: Unfiltered Mercury (Total Hg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 1)



Figure 33: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 2)

(Continued on Next Page)



Figure 33: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2010 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 2)



Figure 34: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 2)

(Continued on Next Page)



Figure 34: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) 2011 Production Season Relation to Stratification (left) and Oxidation Reduction Potential [ORP] (right) in Lake Almaden (Site 2)



Figure 35: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 2)





Figure 36: Unfiltered Mercury (Total Hg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 2)



Figure 37: Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden (Site 5)



Figure 38: **Comparison of Hypolimnion and Outlet Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Almaden Reservoir**



Figure 39: Comparison of Hypolimnion, Sill Elevation, and Outlet Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Guadalupe Reservoir



Figure 40: **Comparison of Hypolimnion and Outlet Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Calero Reservoir**



Figure 41: Comparison of Inlet and Outlet Unfiltered Methyl Mercury (Total MeHg) Concentrations in Lake Almaden

APPENDIX B

Coordinated Monitoring Plan Companion Data

RESERVOIR LABORATORY ANALYSIS DATA

Sampling Location	Date	Sample Depth	Parameter		
			Total Hg (ng/l)	MeHg (ng/l)	TSS (mg/l)
Almaden Reservoir	8/16/11	2	2.89	0.539	
		6		0.693	
		10		2.05	
		13.5		3.77	
		17	7.91	3.72	<10
Almaden Reservoir	9/14/11	2	2.97	0.547	
		5.5		0.591	
		9		0.539	
		12.5		1.10	
		16.25	7.43	2.49	<10
Calero Reservoir	8/18/11	2	1.67	0.159	
		6		0.195	
		10		1.44	
		13.5		2.37	
		17	8.04	4.22	<10
Calero Reservoir	9/15/11	2	1.45	0.208	
		6		0.208	
		10		1.63	
		13.5		3.35	
		16	5.94	4.44	<10
Guadalupe Reservoir	8/16/11	2	12.8	0.294	
		7		0.315	
		12		0.193	
		18		2.27	
		21	63.5	25.1	<10
Guadalupe Reservoir	9/14/11	2	7.9	0.217	
		6		0.266	
		10.5		3.14	
		15.5		5.57	
		18.5	54.3	23.6	16

LAKE ALMADEN LABORATORY ANALYSIS DATA

Sampling Location	Date	Sample Depth	Parameter		
			Total Hg (ng/l)	MeHg (ng/l)	TSS (mg/l)
Lake Almaden Site 1	8/17/11	2	11.3	1.29	
		4.5		0.421	
		7		0.522	
		9.5		4.27	
		12	47.0	15.4	<10
Lake Almaden Site 1	9/13/11	2	10.5	1.40	
		4.5		2.25	
		7		4.43	
		9.5		6.95	
		12	40.1	12.8	<10
Lake Almaden Site 2	8/17/11	2	16.3	1.57	
		4		1.12	
		6		1.09	
		8		0.879	
		10	26.6	4.06	
Lake Almaden Site 2	9/13/11	2	23.9	5.06	
		4		6.59	
		6		7.25	
		8		7.16	
		10	81.3	13.9	
Lake Almaden Site 5	8/17/11	7.5		2.60	
Lake Almaden Site 5	9/13/11	7.75		8.36	
Lake Almaden Inlet	8/17/11	0.5	22.3	7.03	
Lake Almaden Inlet	9/13/11	0.5	33.3	5.25	
Lake Almaden Outlet	8/17/11	2.5	18.2	0.875	
Lake Almaden Outlet	9/13/11	2.5	17.4	1.89	

ALMADEN RESERVOIR FIELD DATA (8/16/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	LDO% [Sat]	LDO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
24.22	9.51	198	342	100.6	8.24	0
24.22	9.54	198	342	100.4	8.23	0
24.2	9.55	199	343	100.9	8.27	0.25
24.21	9.56	200	342	101.2	8.29	0.5
24.21	9.57	201	342	101.1	8.28	0.75
24.14	9.58	202	342	101.1	8.29	1
23.93	9.58	203	342	100.5	8.28	2
23.88	9.57	205	342	99.8	8.23	3
23.82	9.56	207	342	98.2	8.11	4
23.45	9.01	219	373	50.5	4.2	5
23.36	8.71	225	385	26	2.17	5.25
23.26	8.59	225	390	11.8	0.99	5.5
23.18	8.52	225	394	6.1	0.51	5.75
23.11	8.48	223	395	2.3	0.2	6
23.05	8.46	220	395	1.5	0.13	6.25
22.99	8.45	215	395	1.3	0.11	6.5
22.9	8.43	190	396	1.1	0.09	7
22.7	8.42	140	397	1	0.08	8
22.5	8.4	96	399	0.9	0.07	9
22.28	8.39	68	400	0.9	0.08	10
22.06	8.37	50	402	0.8	0.07	11
21.77	8.35	31	403	0.8	0.07	12
21.67	8.34	18	405	0.7	0.06	12.5
21.55	8.33	6	405	0.7	0.06	13
21.31	8.32	-4	407	0.7	0.06	14
21.17	8.31	-13	408	0.7	0.06	15
21.09	8.29	-22	409	0.6	0.05	16
21.01	8.29	-29	409	0.6	0.06	17
20.78	8.22	-36	415	0.6	0.06	17.6
20.79	8.19	-41	413	0.7	0.06	17.6

ALMADEN RESERVOIR FIELD DATA (9/14/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
23.77	9.3	185	363	99.8	8.25	0
23.74	9.3	186	363	99.6	8.24	0
23.68	9.3	187	363	98.8	8.18	0.25
23.74	9.3	188	363	98.8	8.17	0.5
23.71	9.32	190	362	98.6	8.16	0.75
23.67	9.33	190	362	98.7	8.17	1
23.64	9.31	191	362	98.9	8.19	2
23.49	9.26	194	362	97	8.06	3
23.49	9.27	196	363	96.6	8.02	3
23.47	9.24	198	363	92	7.65	4
23.42	9.21	199	364	85.9	7.14	5
23.35	8.99	205	367	66.2	5.51	6
23.17	8.7	209	370	26.7	2.23	7
23.06	8.58	210	373	9.7	0.81	8
22.96	8.5	201	375	3.4	0.28	9
22.85	8.46	162	378	1.9	0.16	10
22.78	8.43	126	381	1.5	0.13	11
22.69	8.41	101	383	1.4	0.12	12
22.56	8.37	81	386	1.3	0.11	13
22.43	8.35	69	389	1.2	0.1	14
22.35	8.34	60	390	1.1	0.09	15
22.27	8.32	50	391	0.9	0.08	16
22.17	8.29	40	399	0.9	0.08	16.6
22.17	8.3	25	393	1.1	0.09	16.6

GUADALUPE RESERVOIR FIELD DATA (8/16/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
24.73	9.23	290	378	100.2	8.13	0
24.72	9.21	290	378	100.4	8.15	0
24.73	9.21	289	378	100.1	8.12	0.25
24.73	9.21	289	378	100.1	8.12	0.5
24.73	9.19	290	378	100	8.12	0.75
24.73	9.2	290	378	100	8.12	1
24.71	9.21	290	378	99.7	8.09	2
24.69	9.19	291	378	99.1	8.05	3
24.67	9.19	292	378	99.2	8.06	4
24.65	9.16	294	378	98.4	8	5
24.43	8.84	300	389	90.8	7.41	5.5
24.1	8.59	306	399	77.5	6.36	6
23.96	8.47	309	400	71.6	5.9	6.25
23.78	8.42	310	398	68.4	5.65	6.5
23.09	8.38	312	387	64.6	5.41	6.75
22.38	8.35	312	375	58.5	4.96	7
21.89	8.32	313	368	52.3	4.48	7.25
21.57	8.28	314	368	45.9	3.95	7.5
21.1	8.27	315	361	39.2	3.41	7.75
20.61	8.22	316	365	34.6	3.03	8
20.15	8.21	316	362	32.5	2.88	8.25
19.8	8.19	317	361	29.6	2.64	8.5
19.4	8.21	316	357	28.6	2.57	8.75
19.22	8.2	317	355	27.8	2.51	9
19.05	8.19	317	354	25.7	2.32	9.25
18.79	8.19	317	351	23.8	2.16	9.5
18.39	8.18	317	353	21.6	1.98	9.75
18.06	8.21	316	348	20.8	1.93	10
17.9	8.21	316	345	19.7	1.83	10.25
17.54	8.21	317	344	19.3	1.8	10.5
17.37	8.2	317	345	19.1	1.79	10.75
17.16	8.19	318	346	19.3	1.81	11
16.95	8.16	318	347	14.6	1.38	11.25
16.72	8.16	318	345	12.6	1.2	11.5
16.58	8.13	319	347	10.7	1.02	11.75
16.4	8.12	319	350	10.8	1.04	12
16.18	8.11	319	350	11.8	1.13	12.5
16.08	8.11	319	349	12.8	1.24	13
15.84	8.1	320	348	12.8	1.24	14
15.49	8.1	320	344	14	1.36	15
15.26	8.1	320	342	15.2	1.49	16
14.95	8.06	321	346	11.6	1.15	17
14.18	8.04	314	340	4.8	0.48	18
13.26	8.02	186	330	1.7	0.17	19
12.43	8.02	99	322	1.1	0.11	20
12.2	8.01	38	326	0.9	0.09	21
12.17	8.01	-3	330	0.8	0.09	21.4

GUADALUPE RESERVOIR FIELD DATA (9/14/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
24.24	9.17	233	410	100	8.18	0
24.23	9.17	233	410	100	8.19	0
24.25	9.16	233	410	99.9	8.18	0.25
24.25	9.15	233	410	99.5	8.15	0.5
24.25	9.15	232	410	99.5	8.14	0.75
24.25	9.15	233	410	99.5	8.14	1
24.25	9.15	233	410	99.2	8.12	2
24.25	9.15	234	409	99.1	8.11	3
24.25	9.13	234	410	98.7	8.08	4
24.06	8.77	242	422	86.4	7.1	5
23.98	8.75	243	417	78.8	6.48	5.5
23.86	8.64	246	414	69.7	5.75	6
23.68	8.5	249	413	51.6	4.27	6.5
23.59	8.43	250	412	39.9	3.31	6.75
23.51	8.38	250	410	30.2	2.51	7
23.36	8.34	251	410	29.9	2.49	7.5
23.09	8.27	252	407	8.1	0.68	8
22.89	8.22	251	406	4	0.34	8.25
22.75	8.19	250	405	2.2	0.18	8.5
22.59	8.16	238	402	1.5	0.13	8.75
22.44	8.13	218	399	1.3	0.11	9
22.07	8.1	184	397	1.1	0.09	9.5
21.65	8.07	156	390	1	0.08	10
21.54	8.05	142	389	0.9	0.08	10.25
21.3	8.04	128	386	0.8	0.07	10.5
20.85	8.03	114	382	0.8	0.07	10.75
20.42	8.03	96	380	0.8	0.07	11
20.12	8.03	80	378	0.8	0.07	11.25
19.75	8.02	74	373	0.7	0.06	11.5
19.34	8.03	68	371	0.6	0.05	11.75
19.16	8.03	64	370	0.6	0.06	12
19.07	8.03	60	369	0.6	0.06	12.25
18.96	8.03	57	368	0.6	0.06	12.5
18.75	8.03	53	368	0.6	0.06	13
18.25	8.03	49	365	0.6	0.05	14
17.55	8.03	45	365	0.5	0.05	15
16.29	8.02	35	364	0.6	0.05	16
13.97	7.98	13	351	0.6	0.06	17
15.17	8	0	362	0.5	0.05	16.25
14.63	7.99	-9	354	0.6	0.06	16.5
14.24	7.99	-19	352	0.6	0.06	16.75
13.83	7.98	-28	346	0.6	0.06	17
12.85	7.96	-37	346	0.6	0.06	18
12.49	7.89	-41	366	0.5	0.05	19
12.51	7.9	-45	368	0.6	0.06	19

CALERO RESERVOIR FIELD DATA (8/18/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
23.18	10.05	205	416	99.8	8.36	0
23.18	10.05	205	416	99.1	8.3	0
23.18	10.06	205	416	99.8	8.36	0.25
23.18	10.07	205	416	99.8	8.36	0.5
23.18	10.06	206	416	99.7	8.35	0.75
23.18	10.06	206	416	99.8	8.36	1
23.12	10.07	206	416	99.7	8.36	2
23.07	10.07	206	416	99.3	8.33	3
23.04	10.06	207	416	98.9	8.31	4
22.48	9.69	215	422	60.5	5.14	5
22.33	9.52	219	425	44.4	3.78	5.25
22.23	9.32	223	427	28.6	2.44	5.5
22.22	9.23	223	427	27.4	2.34	5.75
22.13	9.06	227	429	14.8	1.27	6
21.99	8.88	224	432	4	0.34	6.5
21.77	8.82	206	435	1.9	0.17	7
21.53	8.76	187	438	1.5	0.13	7.5
21.27	8.71	137	441	1.3	0.12	8
20.91	8.65	91	444	1.1	0.1	8.5
20.68	8.63	61	446	1.1	0.1	9
20.64	8.63	43	446	1	0.09	9.5
20.63	8.61	29	446	1	0.09	10
20.44	8.61	17	446	0.9	0.08	11
19.99	8.59	8	444	0.9	0.08	12
19.74	8.54	-1	442	0.9	0.08	13
19.62	8.53	-9	441	0.8	0.07	14
19.52	8.51	-18	440	0.8	0.07	15
19.26	8.49	-27	438	0.8	0.07	16
19.19	8.47	-36	438	0.8	0.07	17
19.02	8.45	-44	440	0.8	0.07	17.6

CALERO RESERVOIR FIELD DATA (9/15/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
22.86	10.19	201	430	100.1	8.44	0
22.87	10.2	201	430	100.2	8.44	0
22.88	10.2	201	430	100.6	8.47	0.25
22.88	10.2	200	430	100.6	8.47	0.5
22.88	10.2	201	430	100.2	8.44	0.75
22.88	10.2	201	430	100.2	8.44	1
22.87	10.19	201	430	98.7	8.31	2
22.87	10.19	202	430	99.4	8.38	3
22.87	10.2	202	430	99.4	8.38	4
22.87	10.19	203	430	99.3	8.37	5
22.85	10.15	205	430	94.8	7.99	6
22.41	9.35	218	438	16.2	1.38	7
22.18	9.12	209	438	3.7	0.32	8
21.84	8.95	160	440	2.3	0.2	9
21.8	8.86	106	440	1.7	0.15	10
21.6	8.78	65	442	1.3	0.11	11
21.46	8.71	36	443	1.2	0.1	12
21.08	8.62	13	446	1	0.09	13
20.92	8.58	-10	447	0.9	0.08	14
20.74	8.53	-28	448	0.9	0.08	15
20.64	8.51	-43	449	0.8	0.07	16
20.49	8.49	-56	450	0.8	0.07	17

LAKE ALMADEN (SITE 1) FIELD DATA (8/17/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
23	9.97	153	509	98.9	8.38	0
23.04	9.96	155	509	99.8	8.45	0
22.85	9.93	158	510	97.8	8.31	0.25
22.62	9.9	161	511	95.6	8.16	0.5
22.56	9.89	163	511	94.5	8.08	0.75
22.42	9.85	165	513	90.6	7.76	1
21.41	8.82	184	533	20.2	1.77	2
20.68	8.61	184	531	9.6	0.85	3
20.27	8.51	182	530	5.2	0.47	4
20.04	8.46	180	530	4.2	0.38	5
19.95	8.44	179	531	5.7	0.52	6
19.9	8.41	178	531	5	0.45	7
19.85	8.38	177	530	2.3	0.21	8
19.66	8.36	158	530	1.2	0.11	9
19.38	8.33	133	530	1	0.09	10
18.99	8.31	101	534	0.9	0.08	11
18.78	8.29	77	537	0.8	0.07	12
18.36	8.19	46	555	0.8	0.08	12.7

LAKE ALMADEN (SITE 1) FIELD DATA (9/13/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
22.14	9.45	128	542	100.2	8.63	0
22.15	9.46	132	542	100.6	8.66	0
22.14	9.46	136	542	101	8.7	0.25
22.13	9.46	140	542	100.9	8.69	0.5
22.1	9.47	143	542	100.7	8.68	0.75
22.09	9.46	147	542	100.3	8.64	1
21.52	8.8	157	547	44.1	3.84	2
20.78	8.51	155	546	7.1	0.62	3
20.47	8.41	148	545	3.1	0.27	4
20.25	8.36	124	543	2	0.18	5
20.1	8.33	89	542	1.7	0.15	6
19.99	8.29	51	541	1.4	0.13	7
19.94	8.28	27	540	1.2	0.11	8
19.89	8.27	9	539	1.2	0.1	9
19.82	8.26	-4	539	1.1	0.1	10
19.73	8.23	-14	540	1	0.09	11
19.57	8.18	-23	544	0.9	0.08	12
19.32	8.04	-30	558	0.9	0.08	12.6

LAKE ALMADEN (SITE 2) FIELD DATA (8/17/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
23.47	9.98	153	507	98.4	8.26	0
23.52	9.99	154	507	99.7	8.36	0
23.04	9.95	158	509	95.1	8.05	0.25
22.66	9.87	161	511	85.2	7.27	0.5
22.67	9.84	164	512	80	6.82	0.75
22.29	9.51	171	524	59.8	5.14	1
21.34	8.74	186	535	13.5	1.18	2
20.87	8.57	183	539	3.3	0.29	3
20.78	8.5	164	540	1.7	0.15	4
20.74	8.46	151	540	1.3	0.12	5
20.72	8.43	148	540	1.1	0.1	6
20.71	8.41	148	540	1	0.08	7
20.69	8.4	147	540	0.8	0.07	8
20.67	8.38	136	542	0.7	0.06	9
20.5	8.3	120	552	0.7	0.06	10
19.8	8	28	666	0.7	0.06	10.5

LAKE ALMADEN (SITE 2) FIELD DATA (9/13/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
22.63	9.71	165	541	100.8	8.6	0
22.59	9.7	167	541	101.1	8.63	0
22.54	9.68	169	542	99	8.46	0.25
22.36	9.65	171	543	95.4	8.19	0.5
22.41	9.67	172	542	96.1	8.23	0.75
22.26	9.62	175	542	91.5	7.86	1
21.44	8.69	186	552	13.4	1.17	2
20.83	8.45	92	556	3.8	0.34	3
20.66	8.39	49	559	2	0.18	4
20.62	8.35	29	560	1.4	0.12	5
20.61	8.34	17	560	1.2	0.1	6
20.6	8.32	7	561	1.1	0.09	7
20.6	8.3	0	563	0.8	0.08	8
20.57	8.28	-7	564	0.8	0.07	9
20.39	8.14	-16	580	0.7	0.06	10
20.14	7.86	-25	667	0.7	0.06	10.4

LAKE ALMADEN (SITE 5) FIELD DATA (8/17/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
22.77	9.99	146	507	99.4	8.46	0
22.78	9.99	148	507	99.4	8.46	0
22.78	9.99	150	507	99.8	8.49	0.25
22.65	9.95	153	508	95.2	8.12	0.5
22.5	9.92	156	510	89.9	7.69	0.75
22.4	9.81	159	512	82.1	7.03	1
21.41	8.93	173	532	35.7	3.11	2
20.69	8.63	171	531	9.6	0.85	3
20.27	8.51	167	530	3.7	0.33	4
20.07	8.46	162	530	2.3	0.2	5
19.92	8.46	160	532	6.3	0.57	6
19.84	8.43	160	534	5.4	0.49	7
19.83	8.39	143	535	3.1	0.28	7.9

LAKE ALMADEN (SITE 5) FIELD DATA (9/13/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
22.11	9.55	152	541	100.4	8.65	0
22.11	9.55	155	540	100.8	8.68	0
22.11	9.54	159	541	100.7	8.68	0.25
22.11	9.54	163	541	100.5	8.66	0.5
22.11	9.54	167	541	100.2	8.64	0.75
22.1	9.51	170	541	98.9	8.52	1
21.47	8.7	180	549	28.6	2.49	2
20.73	8.49	176	547	5.5	0.49	3
20.48	8.41	168	545	2.7	0.24	4
20.28	8.35	144	543	2	0.18	5
20.14	8.32	103	542	1.6	0.14	6
20	8.28	63	544	1.4	0.12	7
19.87	8.2	36	549	1.3	0.11	8

LAKE ALMADEN INLET FIELD DATA (8/17/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
22.51	9.75	228	514	103.2	8.83	0
22.49	9.79	228	514	107	9.15	0
22.48	9.78	229	515	107	9.15	0.25
21.98	9.66	232	518	96.4	8.33	0.5
19.2	8.97	248	520	67.4	6.15	0.75
18.09	8.79	253	517	57.7	5.39	1

LAKE ALMADEN INLET FIELD DATA (9/13/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
22	9.54	331	540	109.3	9.43	0
21.97	9.56	330	539	110.4	9.54	0
21.86	9.5	331	542	105.4	9.13	0.25
20.58	9.17	338	532	89.7	7.96	0.5
18.9	8.71	346	530	75.5	6.93	0.75
18.87	8.66	345	530	72.3	6.64	1

LAKE ALMADEN OUTLET FIELD DATA (8/17/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
22.87	9.81	148	515	100.4	8.53	0
22.73	9.82	151	516	101.5	8.65	0
22.77	9.81	154	514	102.4	8.71	0.25
22.65	9.81	157	515	101.5	8.66	0.5
22.66	9.8	159	515	101	8.61	0.75
22.38	9.64	164	519	88.7	7.61	1
21.8	9.36	171	508	71.9	6.23	1.5
21.26	8.78	181	523	35.1	3.07	2
20.91	8.59	181	529	16.1	1.42	2.5
20.7	8.5	179	529	7.6	0.68	3
20.4	8.43	176	530	2.9	0.26	3.5
20.27	8.39	171	531	1.6	0.15	4
20.18	8.35	131	533	1.3	0.11	4.5
20.1	8.31	78	535	1.2	0.1	4.9

LAKE ALMADEN OUTLET FIELD DATA (9/13/11)

Temp [°C]	pH [Units]	ORP [mV]	SpCond [µS/cm]	DO% [Sat]	DO [mg/l]	Depth [meters]
22.1	9.31	144	544	101.6	8.75	0
22.07	9.3	147	544	103.2	8.9	0
22.11	9.35	149	544	105.7	9.11	0.25
22.09	9.32	153	544	105	9.05	0.5
22.09	9.3	156	544	102.7	8.85	0.75
22.05	9.11	161	545	85.8	7.4	1
21.66	8.8	165	539	51.4	4.47	1.5
21.31	8.54	165	538	12.5	1.09	2
21	8.47	163	529	9	0.8	2.5
20.7	8.35	153	536	3.4	0.3	3
20.59	8.3	137	541	1.8	0.16	3.5
20.48	8.28	121	544	1.6	0.14	4
20.36	8.2	89	545	1.4	0.12	4.5
20.31	8.17	66	547	1.2	0.11	4.8