

Water Science and Application 9

Groundwater Recharge in a Desert Environment:

The Southwestern United States

James F. Hogan
Fred M. Phillips
Bridget R. Scanlon
Editors

 American Geophysical Union
Washington, DC

Fundamental Concepts of Recharge in the Desert Southwest: A Regional Modeling Perspective

Alan L. Flint, Lorraine E. Flint, and Joseph A. Hevesi

U.S. Geological Survey, Sacramento, California

Joan B. Blainey

U.S. Geological Survey, Tucson, Arizona

Recharge in arid basins does not occur in all years or at all locations within a basin. In the desert Southwest potential evapotranspiration exceeds precipitation on an average annual basis and, in many basins, on an average monthly basis. Groundwater travel time from the surface to the water table and recharge to the water table vary temporally and spatially owing to variations in precipitation, air temperature, root zone and soil properties and thickness, faults and fractures, and hydrologic properties of geologic strata in the unsaturated zone. To highlight the fundamental concepts controlling recharge in the Southwest, and address the temporal and spatial variability of recharge, a basin characterization model was developed using a straightforward water balance approach to estimate potential recharge and runoff and allow for determination of the location of recharge within a basin. It provides a means for interbasin comparison of the mechanisms and processes that result in recharge and calculates the potential for recharge under current, wetter, and drier climates. Model estimates of recharge compare favorably with other methods estimating recharge in the Great Basin. Results indicate that net infiltration occurs in less than 5 percent of the area of a typical southwestern basin. Decadal-scale climatic cycles have substantially different influences over the extent of the Great Basin, with the southern portion receiving 220 percent higher recharge than the mean recharge during El Niño years in a positive phase of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, whereas the northern portion receives only 48 percent higher recharge. In addition, climatic influences result in groundwater travel times that are expected to vary on timescales of days to centuries, making decadal-scale climate cycles significant for understanding recharge in arid lands.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to develop a simple model for basin characterization that allows interbasin comparison of recharge mechanisms and the potential for recharge

Groundwater Recharge in a Desert Environment:
The Southwestern United States

Water Science and Application 9

This paper is not subject to U.S. copyright. Published in 2004 by
the American Geophysical Union.

10.1029/009WSA10

under current, wetter, and drier climates, and to highlight the fundamental concepts and mechanisms that control recharge in the deserts of the Southwestern United States (Southwest). The method developed allows analysis of climate change, as changes in precipitation and air temperature, to evaluate the potential for changes in groundwater recharge in the Great Basin and eventually in other areas in the Southwest. Without further refinements, this modeling approach primarily is intended to provide a means for hydrologically characterizing basins on a basin-wide or regional scale on the basis of fundamental concepts of recharge as they apply to southwestern desert environments. Estimates of recharge in basins of the Great Basin are presented for the purpose of illustrating the approach, evaluating relative proportions of recharge and runoff to describe the dominant mechanisms controlling recharge, and providing a comparison with other methods that have estimated recharge in the Great Basin. They are not relied on as accurate enough at this time to be used for assessment of water availability.

A basin characterization model (BCM) was developed for this study to determine the spatial and temporal variability of net infiltration (all terms are defined below), which is assumed to be equal to recharge because the model assumes steady state conditions and no lateral subsurface flow. The BCM uses a mathematical deterministic water-balance approach that includes the distribution of precipitation and the estimation of potential evapotranspiration, along with soil water storage and bedrock permeability. The BCM was used with available GIS data (digital elevation model, geology, soils, vegetation, precipitation, and air temperature maps), and GIS data that was developed for this study.

The BCM can be used to identify locations and climatic conditions that allow for excess water, quantifying the amount of water available either as runoff or as in-place recharge on a monthly basis, and allows inter-basin comparison of recharge mechanisms. The model does not distinguish between mountain front and stream channel recharge, which are referred to in this paper as runoff, nor does it explicitly define the percentage of runoff that becomes recharge. Because the accurate estimates of recharge cannot be calculated without further refinement to the BCM to estimate the partitioning of runoff, it calculates *potential* in-place recharge and *potential* runoff, and provides the distribution of both in a basin. These values can be combined using assumptions of the amount of runoff that results in recharge to estimate total potential recharge.

A simple calculation of travel time through the unsaturated zone can be estimated if steady state conditions are assumed and if unsaturated zone thickness and permeability

data are available [Flint *et al.*, 2000]. The BCM can also be used to evaluate the potential for recharge under current, wetter, and drier climates, and is used to evaluate the role of decadal-scale climate cycles (El Niño/La Niña and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation) on recharge at a pixel scale (generally 30–270 meters) across the Southwest.

1.1 Terms and Concepts

Because many terms related to infiltration and recharge often have different meanings to different researchers, the terms used in this paper are defined and are consistent with those in most current literature. Infiltration is the entry into the soil of water made available at the ground surface [Freeze and Cherry, 1979]. Net infiltration is the quantity of water that moves below the zone of surface evapotranspiration processes [Flint *et al.*, 2001]. Under steady state conditions, net infiltration is equal to recharge unless diverted to an area of flow from a spring and thus lost to evapotranspiration; even under this condition, one could argue that some recharge occurs, even if only to a small local or perched aquifer. Percolation (or drainage) is the process by which water moves downward through the unsaturated zone [Flint *et al.*, 2001]. Recharge is the entry into the saturated zone of water made available at the water table surface [Freeze and Cherry, 1979]. Discharge is the removal of water from the saturated zone across the water table surface [Freeze and Cherry, 1979].

Travel time in the unsaturated zone is the time it takes for water that has become net infiltration to recharge the water table (hours to millennia); it is controlled by net infiltration, the thickness of the unsaturated zone, and the effective porosity of subsurface flow paths [Flint *et al.*, 2000]. As climate changes, the travel time of infiltrating water through the unsaturated zone may vary; the spatial distribution of recharge also may vary. Recharge that occurs today is spatially variable owing to the thicknesses of soil and alluvium, the thickness of the unsaturated zone, and to the layering and properties of geologic and sediment strata. Recharge is temporally variable owing to changes in processes controlling net infiltration (primarily climate) for timescales of years to centuries.

Recharge is often discussed as dominant within one of the following basin locations: mountain block, diffuse, mountain front, stream channel, and playa lake. Mountain block recharge occurs directly into the underlying bedrock without runoff and is widely distributed in areas of higher mountainous terrain particularly where there is permeable bedrock. Diffuse recharge is areally distributed in alluvial valleys but away from the stream channels (similar to

Table 1. Total mean potential recharge (acre-feet/year) calculated for 258 basins in the Great Basin calculated using several methods of estimating recharge and potential in-place recharge and potential runoff calculated several ways using the basin characterization model.

Mean potential recharge, in acre-feet per year, by method												
Hydro-graphic area or subarea identifier*	Hydrographic area or subarea*	Maxey—Eakin method*	Chloride mass balance method*	Estimates using discharge measurements**	Water-balance model (Hevesi et al., 2003)	Water-balance model (Hevesi et al., 2002)	Basin Characterization Model					
							Mean year			Time series		
							Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for mean year	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for time series
142	Alkali Spring Valley	100			141	3,544	9	0	9	221	82	229
230	Amargosa Desert	1,500			2,139	8,129	146	236	169	1,938	2,567	2,195
151	Antelope Valley (Eureka and Nye)						4,880	1,087	4,988	4,060	1,682	4,228
57	Antelope Valley (Humboldt System)	11,000					2,091	2,289	2,320	1,848	2,988	2,147
93	Antelope Valley (Lemmon Valley)	300					1	947	95	1	1,308	131
186A	Antelope Valley (south)						1,193	486	1,242	977	624	1,039
186B	Antelope Valley (north)						3,574	1,202	3,694	2,897	1,341	3,031
186	Antelope Valley (north and south)	4,700		16,824			4,767	1,688	4,936	3,874	1,965	4,071
106	Antelope Valley (Walker System)	18,000					5,045	75,829	12,627	4,678	82,497	12,928
283	Beaver Valley						15,201	64,886	21,689	15,551	55,149	21,066
280	Beryl-Enterprise Area						25,804	44,431	30,247	21,678	52,721	26,950
137A	Big Smoky Valley (north)	12,000					2,544	2,628	2,807	3,686	3,742	4,060
215	Black Mountains Area	70					51	25	54	1,376	939	1,470
28	Black Rock Desert	14,000					3,963	18,836	5,847	6,055	30,586	9,113
275	Blue Creek Valley	14,000					2,279	59	2,285	3,051	138	3,065
61	Boulder Flat						140	907	231	439	1,569	596
15	Boulder Valley	2,000					5,044	6,228	5,667	4,090	6,382	4,729
75	Bradys Hot Springs Area	160					812	542	866	1,088	1,290	1,216
129	Buena Vista Valley						588	9,755	1,563	670	12,681	1,938
131	Buffalo Valley						284	7,885	1,072	361	8,078	1,169
178A	Butte Valley (north)		2,400				12,653	3,923	13,045	10,465	3,570	10,822
178B	Butte Valley (south)		1,200				21,499	7,413	22,240	17,657	6,261	18,284
178	Butte Valley (north and south)	19,000					34,152	11,336	35,285	28,122	9,831	29,105
272	Cache Valley						339,819	226,765	362,495	372,607	245,166	397,124
148	Cactus Flat	600			1,410	1,969	1,818	1,603	1,978	1,612	2,142	1,826
241	California Valley				775	1,361	13	532	66	41	1,744	216
218	California Wash	60					23	1	23	639	130	652
55	Carico Lake Valley	4,300					1,826	4,080	2,234	1,435	3,582	1,793
101A,B	Carson Desert (Packard and Lahontan Valleys)	1,300					752	1,412	893	1,821	2,218	2,043
105	Carson Valley	41,000					39,856	589,167	98,772	41,627	617,008	103,328
180	Cave Valley	14,000					9,350	9,135	10,264	8,479	9,009	9,380
282	Cedar City Valley						3,275	29,899	6,265	2,696	27,149	5,411
264	Cedar Valley						16,024	12,075	17,231	16,370	12,688	17,639
240	Chicago Valley				569	903	11	57	17	80	873	167
102	Churchill Valley	1,300					6,470	10,420	7,512	6,718	14,298	8,148
143	Clayton Valley	1,500			1,051	14,347	524	306	555	1,300	1,190	1,419
204	Clover Valley (Colorado System)						14,512	17,614	16,274	12,367	20,215	14,389

Table 1. (continued).

		Mean potential recharge, in acre-feet per year, by method										
		Basin Characterization Model										
		Mean year			Time series							
Hydro- graphic area or subarea identifier*	Hydrographic area or subarea*	Maxey— Eakin method*	Chloride mass balance method*	Estimates using discharge measure- ments**	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2003)	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2002)	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for mean year	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for time series
177	Clover Valley (Independence Valley System)	21,000		58,802			8,065	38,353	11,900	8,223	36,675	11,890
64	Clovers Area						2,250	5,458	2,796	2,493	6,088	3,102
171	Coal Valley	2,000			3,325		3,575	2,643	3,839	2,740	3,701	3,110
100	Cold Springs Valley						7	1,764	184	8	3,355	344
118	Columbus Salt Marsh Valley	700					633	420	675	983	1,207	1,104
2	Continental Lake Valley	11,000					643	4,364	1,079	1,233	7,889	2,022
126	Cowkick Valley						290	91	300	442	352	477
210	Coyote Spring Valley	2,600					5,037	1,467	5,184	5,659	2,924	5,951
229	Crater Flat	220			268	1,424	29	9	30	782	382	820
54	Crescent Valley						1,043	10,935	2,136	910	9,933	1,903
278	Curlew Valley	75,600					26,646	2,177	26,863	26,276	2,728	26,548
103A	Dayton Valley (Carson Plains)						5,522	14,372	6,959	7,090	19,847	9,074
103B	Dayton Valley (Stagecoach Valley)		320				932	990	1,031	1,018	1,357	1,154
103	Dayton Valley (Stagecoach Valley and Carson Plains)	7,900					6,454	15,362	7,991	8,108	21,204	10,228
243	Death Valley	8,000			16,891	60,997	4,960	11,712	6,131	11,755	28,056	14,560
253	Deep Creek Valley	17,000					9,743	25,765	12,319	9,004	23,970	11,401
182	Delamar Valley	1,000					6,627	11,366	7,764	5,308	10,958	6,404
31	Desert Valley	5,000					1,218	12,203	2,438	1,292	15,250	2,817
153	Diamond Valley	21,000	10,500				13,081	20,431	15,124	12,199	19,417	14,141
128	Dixie Valley	6,000					1,909	4,347	2,343	2,199	5,154	2,714
82	Dodge Flat	1,400					1,527	1,460	1,673	1,627	3,337	1,961
181	Dry Lake Valley	5,000					10,307	3,207	10,627	10,666	6,316	11,298
19	Dry Valley (Black Rock Desert System)	200					552	314	584	839	857	925
198	Dry Valley Colorado System)						2,065	1,278	2,192	1,555	2,603	1,815
16	Duck Lake Valley	9,000	8,900				16,185	11,988	17,384	16,060	20,458	18,106
259	Dugway-Government Creek Valley	7,000					4,489	17,112	6,200	3,714	14,735	5,187
104	Eagle Valley Carson System)	8,700					219	18,933	2,112	266	19,625	2,228
200	Eagle Valley Colorado System)						810	796	890	848	1,508	999
268	East Shore Area						3,530	98,590	13,389	4,993	101,225	15,116
109	East Walker Area	31,000					21,032	84,308	29,463	19,215	92,571	28,472
127	Eastgate Valley Area						1,032	1,319	1,164	1,194	1,707	1,364
133	Edwards Creek Valley	8,000					2,722	3,453	3,067	2,503	4,239	2,927
167	Eldorado Valley	1,100					1	112	12	933	1,384	1,072
49	Elko Segment						244	3,823	626	340	4,909	831
158A	Emigrant Valley (Groom Lake Valley)	3,200			5,739	12,910	2,279	1,409	2,420	3,655	4,574	4,112

Table 1. (continued).

		Mean potential recharge, in acre-feet per year, by method										
		Basin Characterization Model										
		Mean year					Time series					
Hydro- graphic area or subarea identifier*	Hydrographic area or subarea*	Maxey— Eakin method*	Chloride mass balance method*	Estimates using discharge measure- ments**	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2003)	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2002)	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for mean year	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for time series
158B	Emigrant Valley (Papoose Lake Valley)	4					2	7	3	151	359	187
124	Fairview Valley	500					124	163	140	265	521	317
76	Fernley Area	600					888	647	953	1,307	2,001	1,507
77	Fireball Valley	200					1,239	968	1,336	1,213	1,563	1,369
117	Fish Lake Valley	33,000	26,800				5,855	48,812	10,737	7,743	60,393	13,783
258	Fish Springs Flat	4,000					1,016	384	1,054	1,460	664	1,526
227A	Fortymile Canyon (Jackass Flat)	900			1,583	1,665	857	535	910	2,524	2,535	2,778
227B	Fortymile Canyon (Buckboard Mesa)	1,400			1,959	3,113	3,727	3,287	4,056	4,684	6,436	5,327
160	Frenchman Flat	100			1,903	5,683	537	396	576	4,299	2,207	4,520
122	Gabbs Valley	5,000	4,900				1,023	1,238	1,147	2,195	2,367	2,431
172	Garden Valley	10,000			3,323		16,542	14,325	17,974	13,866	16,939	15,559
120	Garfield Flat	300					1,371	1,257	1,497	1,382	2,265	1,609
216	Garnet Valley	400					288	60	294	989	109	1,000
147	Gold Flat	3,800			4,205	6,287	4,637	3,701	5,007	4,595	5,847	5,180
187	Goshute Valley	10,400		40,911			25,210	9,048	26,115	22,410	9,498	23,360
23	Granite Basin	400					1	1,535	154	1	1,599	160
78	Granite Springs Valley	3,500					5,044	22,631	7,307	5,046	25,213	7,567
138	Grass Valley	13,000					6,891	11,266	8,018	5,030	10,926	6,123
71	Grass Valley (Humboldt System)	12,000					410	13,387	1,749	502	15,453	2,048
279	Great Salt Lake						3	1,320	135	6	1,647	171
261B	Great Salt Lake Desert (east)	4,500					54	0	54	106	0	106
261A	Great Salt Lake Desert (west)	47,000					14,026	4,685	14,494	13,365	5,116	13,876
3	Gridley Lake Valley	4,500					933	1,666	1,099	2,588	5,981	3,186
251	Grouse Creek Valley	14,000					2,369	3,490	2,718	3,265	4,606	3,726
276	Hansel and North Rozel Flat	8,000					331	4	332	864	28	867
68	Hardscrabble Area	9,000					12,833	46,734	17,506	12,248	48,868	17,134
217	Hidden Valley (north)	400					188	6	188	566	57	571
166	Hidden Valley (south)				23	28	0	0	—	169	63	175
25	High Rock Lake Valley	13,000					13,762	8,367	14,599	16,559	16,145	18,173
156	Hot Creek Valley	7,000		5,756			4,512	1,805	4,692	5,380	4,034	5,783
24	Hualapai Flat	7,000					3,700	7,727	4,473	4,088	9,248	5,013
47	Huntington Valley						34,668	59,713	40,639	29,248	52,667	34,514
113	Huntoon Valley	800					1,226	1,012	1,327	1,440	2,439	1,683
72	Imlay Area	4,000					226	6,056	831	462	10,260	1,488
188	Independence Valley	9,300		50,065			22,907	8,347	23,742	20,525	8,863	21,411
161	Indian Springs Valley	10,000			4,591	18,978	6,912	3,904	7,302	9,966	7,901	10,756
135	Ione Valley	8,000					1,176	689	1,245	1,026	984	1,125
164A	Ivanpah Valley (north)				1,399	3,482	438	418	480	1,487	896	1,576
164B	Ivanpah Valley (south)				1,569	1,519	53	126	66	293	2,261	519
164	Ivanpah Valley (North and South)	1,500			2,968	5,001	491	545	546	1,779	3,158	2,095

Table 1. (continued).

		Mean potential recharge, in acre-feet per year, by method										
		Basin Characterization Model										
		Mean year					Time series					
Hydro- graphic area or subarea identifier*	Hydrographic area or subarea*	Maxey— Eakin method*	Chloride mass balance method*	Estimates using discharge measure- ments**	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2003)	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2002)	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for mean year	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for time series
174	Jakes Valley			38,203			10,761	2,131	10,974	8,082	2,280	8,310
165	Jean Lake Valley	100			73	217	0	28	3	167	276	195
132	Jersey Valley	800					557	955	652	677	1,366	813
206	Kane Springs Valley						4,579	8,416	5,421	5,262	10,659	6,328
157	Kawich Valley	3,500			3,688	6,563	3,788	3,008	4,089	3,454	5,143	3,968
66	Kelly Creek Area						3,730	5,497	4,279	3,408	6,654	4,073
30A	Kings River Valley (Rio King Subarea)						8,386	21,333	10,520	7,698	24,428	10,141
30B	Kings River Valley (Sodhouse Subarea)						26	23	28	109	62	116
30	Kings River Valley (Rio King and Sodhouse subareas)	15,000					8,412	21,357	10,547	7,808	24,490	10,257
139	Kobeh Valley						7,793	5,852	8,378	5,942	5,413	6,483
79	Kumiva Valley	1,000					36	11,208	1,157	31	10,742	1,105
183	Lake Valley	13,000					13,213	15,049	14,718	10,858	14,946	12,353
45	Lamoille Valley						20	62,875	6,308	21	69,928	7,014
212	Las Vegas Valley		28,000		15,147		28,072	21,349	30,207	33,697	28,483	36,545
285	Leamington Canyon						3,786	31,981	6,984	4,388	38,152	8,203
92A	Lemmon Valley (west)						8	3,787	386	9	5,521	561
92B	Lemmon Valley (east)						7	1,906	197	99	3,519	451
92	Lemmon Valley (east and west)	1,500					14	5,693	584	108	9,040	1,012
144	Lida Valley				610	11,335	50	6	50	406	118	418
150	Little Fish Lake Valley	11,000		9,628			3,501	2,996	3,801	3,010	3,131	3,324
67	Little Humboldt Valley	24,000					26,022	58,057	31,828	25,338	64,651	31,803
155A	Little Smoky Valley (north)						7,881	1,466	8,028	6,122	1,561	6,278
155B	Little Smoky Valley (central)						391	93	400	317	167	334
155C	Little Smoky Valley (south)						1,889	567	1,946	1,542	963	1,638
155	Little Smoky Valley (north, central and south)	5,400		12,681			10,161	2,126	10,374	7,981	2,692	8,250
9	Long Valley	6,000					5,908	5,164	6,424	5,913	7,486	6,662
175	Long Valley (Colorado System)	10,000		47,740			15,875	4,139	16,289	13,186	3,495	13,536
73A	Lovelock Valley (Oreana Subarea)						39	1,672	206	95	2,542	349
73B	Lovelock Valley (Upper and Lower Valley subareas)						1,732	2,826	2,015	2,290	5,810	2,871
73	Lovelock Valley (Oreana, and Upper and Lower Valley subareas)	3,200					1,771	4,498	2,220	2,385	8,352	3,220
242	Lower Amargosa Valley				767	1,475	17	26	20	590	1,420	732
205	Lower Meadow Valley Wash						10,883	8,004	11,683	18,126	19,659	20,092
220	Lower Moapa Valley	40					0	0	-	128	193	147
59	Lower Reese River Valley						354	5,804	935	445	5,995	1,044

Table 1. (continued).

		Mean potential recharge, in acre-feet per year, by method										
		Basin Characterization Model										
		Mean year			Time series							
Hydro- graphic area or subarea identifier*	Hydrographic area or subarea*	Maxey— Eakin method*	Chloride mass balance method*	Estimates using discharge measure- ments**	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2003)	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2002)	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for mean year	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for time series
51	Maggie Creek Area						695	8,759	1,571	1,748	10,529	2,801
273	Malad-Lower Bear River Area						81,639	43,703	86,010	84,159	44,066	88,566
52	Marys Creek Area						35	17	37	154	228	176
42	Marys River Area						19,014	36,806	22,694	18,977	43,651	23,342
108	Mason Valley	2,000					1,438	19,162	3,354	1,635	19,694	3,604
8	Massacre Lake Valley						1,086	247	1,110	2,613	1,829	2,796
225	Mercury Valley	250			359	2,256	75	243	99	751	1,165	867
163	Mesquite Valley	1,500	1,600		3,470	6,696	1,370	582	1,428	4,328	2,492	4,577
58	Middle Reese River Valley	7,000					1,065	1,119	1,177	1,045	1,274	1,173
284	Milford Area						1,509	6,091	2,118	1,734	6,919	2,426
140A	Monitor Valley (north)						8,536	15,375	10,074	6,981	12,882	8,269
140B	Monitor Valley (south)						13,827	22,150	16,042	10,260	17,665	12,026
136	Monte Cristo Valley	500					190	1,179	308	399	1,756	575
12	Mosquito Valley	700					6	1	6	185	106	196
26	Mud Meadows	8,000					3,439	3,346	3,774	4,590	4,711	5,061
219	Muddy River Springs Area						12	0	12	207	1	207
154	Newark Valley	17,500		49,092			16,721	17,077	18,428	13,852	15,380	15,390
44	North Fork Area						7,189	34,246	10,614	17,330	49,380	22,268
137B	Northern Big Smoky Valley	65,000					25,680	70,153	32,695	20,720	62,976	27,018
266	Northern Juab Valley						12,996	24,774	15,474	12,878	27,698	15,648
228	Oasis Valley	1,000			2,209	4,698	2,445	744	2,519	5,512	3,919	5,903
209	Pahranagat Valley	1,800			4,046		6,620	4,234	7,043	6,665	5,211	7,186
208	Pahroc Valley	2,200					4,275	1,564	4,432	4,531	3,015	4,832
162	Pahrump Valley				11,759	28,437	20,976	17,319	22,708	23,716	25,591	26,275
203	Panaca Valley						4,535	2,059	4,741	4,506	4,779	4,984
69	Paradise Valley	10,000					2,902	63,905	9,293	2,971	70,503	10,022
260B	Park Valley (east)						256	10,171	1,273	317	10,772	1,394
260A	Park Valley (west)						319	1,736	493	585	1,923	777
260	Park Valley (east and west)	24,000					575	11,907	1,765	902	12,696	2,171
281	Parowan Valley						6,718	24,701	9,188	5,368	24,572	7,825
202	Patterson Valley	8,000					6,201	4,427	6,643	6,046	7,132	6,759
286	Pavant Valley						20,068	56,338	25,701	19,957	64,934	26,450
170	Penoyer Valley	4,300	3,200		5,160		3,797	2,551	4,052	3,828	4,460	4,275
191	Pilot Creek Valley	2,400					2,239	2,778	2,517	2,871	3,187	3,189
252	Pilot Valley	3,400					613	2,543	867	837	2,551	1,092
29	Pine Forest Valley	10,000					5,493	15,310	7,024	5,452	23,193	7,771
255	Pine Valley (Great Salt Lake Desert System)	21,000					14,027	18,308	15,858	11,982	16,365	13,619
53	Pine Valley (Humboldt System)	46,000					16,331	27,297	19,060	13,026	23,031	15,330
130	Pleasant Valley (Dixie Valley System) ⁶	3,000					601	3,188	920	801	4,544	1,25

Table 1. (continued).

		Mean potential recharge, in acre-feet per year, by method										
						Basin Characterization Model						
						Mean year		Time series				
Hydro- graphic area or subarea identifier*	Hydrographic area or subarea*	Maxey— Eakin method*	Chloride mass balance method*	Estimates using discharge measure- ments**	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2003)	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2002)	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for mean year	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for time series
88	Pleasant Valley (Truckee System)	10,000					746 7,766	27,585 102	3,505 7,777	663 8,008	28,877 121	3,550 8,020
274	Pocatello Valley											
277	Promontory Mountains Area						1,888	490	1,937	3,373	954	3,468
65	Pumpnickel Valley						101	2,591	360	321	3,754	697
81	Pyramid Lake Valley	6,600					9,830	9,656	10,796	11,443	16,877	13,130
33A	Quinn River Valley (Orovada Subarea)						8,128	68,406	14,969	7,865	73,280	15,193
33B,C	Quinn River Valley (McDermitt and Oregon Canyon)						40,294	103,185	50,612	35,080	103,920	45,472
33	Quinn River Valley (Orovada, McDermitt, and Oregon Canyon subareas)	73,000					48,422	171,590	65,581	42,945	177,200	60,665
173A	Railroad Valley (south)		4,900		4,135		1,853	892	1,942	2,682	2,539	2,936
173B	Railroad Valley (north)		24,800	61,083			57,421	39,280	61,349	46,876	38,659	50,742
173	Railroad Valley (north and south)	52,000					59,274	40,172	63,291	49,558	41,199	53,678
141	Ralston Valley	5,000					3,708	3,683	4,076	4,028	5,410	4,568
123	Rawhide Flats	150					144	42	149	394	179	412
119	Rhodes Salt Marsh Valley ⁴	500					318	882	406	756	1,880	94
62	Rock Creek Valley						442	849	527	921	1,581	1,079
226	Rock Valley	30			352	532	0	0	—	324	110	335
199	Rose Valley						48	4	48	38	52	43
176	Ruby Valley	68,000		145,636			35,382	88,306	44,212	29,133	82,288	37,362
263	Rush Valley	34,000					33,806	42,371	38,043	31,493	40,184	35,511
267	Salt Lake Valley						28,193	182,454	46,439	29,827	184,549	48,282
22	San Emidio Desert	2,100					3,862	9,961	4,858	3,747	11,559	4,903
20	Sano Valley	4					37	2	37	87	54	93
146	Sarcobatus Flat	1,200			2,466	7,315	1,230	707	1,301	2,532	2,398	2,772
287	Sevier Desert						17,238	30,771	20,316	17,924	33,064	21,230
245	Shadow Valley				1,731	3,634	89	145	104	528	1,506	679
32	Silver State Valley	1,400					52	634	115	183	2,344	418
271	Sink Valley	1,000					99	0	99	154	5	154
270	Skull Valley						16,969	44,502	21,419	14,624	39,740	18,598
134	Smith Creek Valley	12,000					3,279	2,935	3,572	3,738	4,550	4,193
107	Smith Valley	17,000					11,313	87,974	20,111	10,359	94,692	19,828
21	Smoke Creek Desert	13,000					14,993	14,351	16,428	18,729	25,829	21,311
254	Snake Valley	100,000					80,079	126,490	92,728	69,738	122,176	81,955
121A,C	Soda Spring Valley (east and central)						242	1,483	390	598	4,188	1,017
121B	Soda Spring Valley (west)						257	871	344	367	1,108	478
121	Soda Spring Valley (east, central, and west)	700					499	2,354	735	965	5,297	1,494

Table 1. (continued).

		Mean potential recharge, in acre-feet per year, by method										
		Basin Characterization Model										
		Mean year			Time series							
Hydro- graphic area or subarea identifier*	Hydrographic area or subarea*	Maxey— Eakin method*	Chloride mass balance method*	Estimates using discharge measure- ments**	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2003)	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2002)	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for mean year	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for time series
46	South Fork Area						8	59,056	5,914	8	55,920	5,600
85	Spanish Springs Valley	600					695	474	743	991	1,685	1,159
201	Spring Valley	10,000					9,549	13,249	10,874	7,486	14,436	8,930
184	(Colorado System) Spring Valley (Great Salt Lake Desert System)	75,000	61,600	103,569			57,629	93,577	66,987	48,116	80,635	56,179
43	Starr Valley Area						2,905	84,762	11,381	2,986	82,405	11,226
179	Steptoe Valley	85,000		131,469			104,285	71,344	111,419	88,282	61,094	94,391
152	Stevens Basin						1,390	10	1,391	1,055	113	1,067
125	Stingaree Valley						9	13	10	90	73	97
149	Stone Cabin Valley	5,000					2,843	1,628	3,006	3,673	3,139	3,987
145	Stonewall Flat	100			1,241	3,393	65	6	65	540	110	551
27	Summit Lake Valley	4,200					1,000	1,072	1,107	1,248	2,204	1,469
86	Sun Valley	50					5,657	36,757	9,333	6,260	40,549	10,315
50	Susie Creek Area						178	1,684	346	525	2,907	816
7	Swan Lake Valley						514	248	539	2,697	1,688	2,866
114	Teels Marsh Valley	1,300					1,284	1,887	1,473	2,035	3,527	2,387
48	Tenmile Creek Area						3,608	17,122	5,320	2,954	16,702	4,624
189A	Thousand Springs Valley (Herrell Siding-Brush Creek subarea)						1,192	5,092	1,701	1,197	5,707	1,768
189B	Thousand Springs Valley (Toano-Rock Spring subarea)						2,206	4,322	2,638	3,505	5,960	4,101
189C	Thousand Springs Valley (Rocky Butte subarea)						1,728	0	1,728	3,160	74	3,167
189D	Thousand Springs Valley (Montello-Crittenden Creek subarea)						7,573	358	7,609	10,436	1,462	10,582
189	Thousand Springs Valley (Herrell Siding-Brush Creek, Toano-Rock Spring Rocky Butte and Montello-Crittenden Creek subareas)	12,000					12,699	9,772	13,676	18,299	13,202	19,619
168	Three Lakes Valley (north)	2,000			1,490	9,031	1,317	472	1,364	2,182	903	2,272
211	Three Lakes Valley (south)	6,000			1,298	7,335	2,725	1,773	2,903	3,631	1,981	3,830
169A	Tikapoo Valley (north)				3,971	13,767	3,028	947	3,123	3,756	2,050	3,961
169B	Tikapoo Valley (south)				2,295	10,819	1,230	263	1,256	2,419	581	2,477
169	Tikapoo Valley (north and south)	6,000			6,266	24,586						
185	Tippett Valley	6,900		12,389			9,364	3,534	9,717	7,367	2,918	7,659
137A	Tonopah Flat	12,000					2,544	2,628	2,807	3,686	3,742	4,060
262	Tooele Valley						23,941	24,445	26,386	23,885	23,766	26,262
83	Tracy Segment	6,000					9,768	6,750	10,443	10,613	14,424	12,056
87	Truckee Meadows	27,000					1,983	15,837	3,566	2,013	17,699	3,783

Table 1. (continued).

		Mean potential recharge, in acre-feet per year, by method										
						Basin Characterization Model						
						Mean year			Time series			
Hydro- graphic area or subarea identifier*	Hydrographic area or subarea*	Maxey— Eakin method*	Chloride mass balance method*	Estimates using discharge measure- ments**	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2003)	Water- balance model (Hevesi et al., 2002)	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for mean year	Potential in-place recharge	Potential runoff	Total potential recharge for time series
221	Tule Desert	2,100					1,319	1,512	1,470	4,126	3,456	4,472
257	Tule Valley	7,600					6,206	2,992	6,505	5,559	2,736	5,833
56	Upper Reese River Valley	37,000	30,000				13,529	30,683	16,598	12,137	29,699	15,107
265A	Utah Valley Area (Goshen Valley)						1,561	2,526	1,814	2,056	3,630	2,419
265C	Utah Valley Area (north)						42,897	76,850	50,582	45,816	78,973	53,714
265B	Utah Valley Area (south)						62,634	85,648	71,199	63,401	94,892	72,890
244	Valjean Valley				671	820	2	533	56	77	1,921	269
222	Virgin River Valley						16,014	23,837	18,398	29,392	30,078	32,400
4	Virgin Valley	7,000					615	615	676	2,377	1,561	2,533
256	Wah Wah Valley	7,000					5,869	1,886	6,057	5,186	2,319	5,418
110A	Walker Lake Valley (Schurz Subarea)						351	13,684	1,720	897	10,780	1,975
110B	Walker Lake Valley (Lake Subarea)						487	35,034	3,991	560	32,806	3,841
110C	Walker Lake Valley (Whiskey Flat-Hawthorne Subarea)						4,599	54,355	10,035	4,096	53,332	9,429
110	Walker Lake Valley	6,500					5,438	103,074	15,745	5,553	96,918	15,245
84	Warm Springs Area	6,000					3,446	7,044	4,150	3,738	12,722	5,010
269	West Shore Area	600					53	1	53	188	6	189
60	Whirlwind Valley						119	55	125	169	104	179
74	White Plains	3					13	0	13	212	80	220
207	White River Valley						33,443	14,818	34,925	29,192	15,673	30,759
63	Willow Creek Valley						2,629	5,052	3,134	4,189	6,954	4,885
80	Winnemucca Lake Valley	2,900					4,099	9,894	5,088	4,292	11,791	5,471
70	Winnemucca Segment						622	7,321	1,354	990	8,478	1,838
159	Yucca Flat	700			1,557	2,815	874	1,732	1,047	1,677	3,002	1,977
Total potential Great Basin recharge							2,406,022	4,828,227	2,888,844	2,428,874	5,239,825	2,952,856

*Harrill and Prudic (1998)

** Nichols (2000)

the basin boundaries primarily occur along the drainage divides, and the divides tend to have higher elevations (thus higher precipitation and lower air temperature) and thinner soils relative to the soils in the central part of each basin.

3.1 Evaluation of Recharge Processes

Results of the mean monthly calculations indicate that there is 2.41 million acre-feet/year of potential in-place recharge in the Great Basin and 4.83 million acre-feet/year

of potential runoff, or a total potential recharge of 7.24 million acre-feet/year. Results of the 34-year time series calculations indicate that there is slightly more recharge when water can be carried over between months: 2.43 million acre-feet/year of potential in-place recharge, and 5.24 million acre-feet/year of potential runoff, or a total potential recharge of 7.67 million acre-feet/year. Although the amount of recharge that occurs as a result of runoff is not known, based on analyses performed by David Prudic [U.S. Geological Survey, personal communication, 2001] and Hevesi et al. [2003], it was assumed that about 10 percent of