



Natural
Resources
Conservation
Service

Arizona

Basin Outlook Report

March 1, 2012



Issued by

David White
Chief
Natural Resources Conservation Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Released by

Keisha L. Tatem
State Conservationist
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Phoenix, Arizona

Basin Outlook Reports And Federal – State – Private Cooperative Snow Surveys

How forecasts are made

Most of the annual streamflow in Arizona originates as snowfall that has accumulated in the mountains during the winter and early spring. As the snowpack accumulates, hydrologists estimate the runoff that will occur when it melts. Measurements of snow water equivalent at selected manual snow courses and automated Snow Telemetry (SNOTEL) sites, along with precipitation and streamflow values, are used in statistical and simulation models to prepare runoff forecasts. These forecasts are coordinated between hydrologists in the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) the National Weather Service, and the Salt River Project.

Forecasts of any kind are not perfect. Streamflow forecast uncertainty arises from three primary sources: (1) uncertainty of future weather conditions, (2) uncertainty in the forecasting procedure, and (3) errors in the data. The forecast, therefore, must be interpreted not as a single value but rather as a range of values with specific probabilities of occurrence. The middle of the range is expressed by the 50% exceedance probability forecast, for which there is a 50% chance that the actual flow will be above, and a 50% chance that the actual flow will be below, this value. To describe the expected range around this 50% value, four other forecasts are provided, two smaller values (90% and 70% exceedance probability) and two larger values (30%, and 10% exceedance probability). For example, there is a 90% chance that the actual flow will be more than the 90% exceedance probability forecast.

The wider the spread among these values, the more uncertain the forecast. As the season progresses, forecasts become more accurate, primarily because a greater portion of the future weather conditions become known. This is reflected by a narrowing of the range around the 50% exceedance probability forecast. Users should take this uncertainty into consideration when making operational decisions by selecting forecasts corresponding to the level of risk they are willing to assume about the amount of water to be expected. If users anticipate receiving a lesser supply of water, or are concerned about having an adequate water supply, they may want to base their decisions on the 90% or 70% exceedance probability forecasts. On the other hand, if users anticipate receiving too much water, or are concerned about the threat of flooding, they may want to base their decisions on the 30% or 10% exceedance probability forecasts. Regardless of the forecast value users choose, they should be prepared to deal with either more or less water.



For more water supply and resource management information, contact:

Dino DeSimone
Water Supply Specialist
230 N. First Ave., Suite 509
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1706
Phone: (602) 280-8786
Email: dino.desimone@az.usda.gov

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in its programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs and marital or familial status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at 202-720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint, write the Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250, or call 1-800-245-6340 (voice) or (202) 720-1127 (TDD). USDA is an equal employment opportunity employer.

ARIZONA Basin Outlook Report as of March 1, 2012


SUMMARY

As of March 1, snowpack levels are well below normal in all basins. Precipitation for February was well below normal throughout the basins. The Salt and Verde River reservoir system stands at 66 percent of capacity, while San Carlos Reservoir is at 3 percent of capacity. The forecast continues to call for well below normal runoff in all of the basins for the spring runoff period.

SNOWPACK

Snow water equivalent levels are well below normal in all basins, ranging from a low of 47 percent of average in the Verde River Basin to a high of 75 percent of average in the San Francisco-Upper Gila River Basin. The statewide snowpack is also well below normal at 54 percent of average.

**Arizona
Snow Water Equivalent
as of March 1, 2012**




PRECIPITATION

Mountain data from NRCS SNOTEL sites and Cooperator precipitation gages show that precipitation for February was well below normal, ranging from 36 percent of average in the San Francisco-Upper Gila River Basin to 42 percent of average in the Little Colorado River Basin. Cumulative precipitation since October 1 is now below normal in all basins, with the Verde River Basin currently at only 72 percent of normal for the water year. Please refer to the precipitation bar graphs found in this report for more information on precipitation levels in the basins.

RESERVOIR STORAGE

As of March 1, the Salt and Verde River reservoir system stands at 66 percent of capacity. San Carlos Reservoir remains well below normal at only 3 percent of capacity.




Key storage volumes displayed in thousands of acre-feet (x1000):

<u>Reservoir</u>	<u>Current Storage</u>	<u>Last Year Storage</u>	<u>30-Year Average</u>	<u>Storage Capacity</u>
Salt River System	1458.0	1869.1	1239.7	2025.8
Verde River System	65.4	153.1	165.3	287.4
San Carlos Reservoir	24.3	113.6	461.4	875.0
Lyman Lake	9.6	18.0	15.4	30.0
Lake Havasu	563.0	566.6	552.4	619.0
Lake Mohave	1649.8	1699.0	1675.1	1810.0
Lake Mead	14907.0	11117.0	22122.0	26159.0
Lake Powell	15453.0	13235.0	18236.0	24322.0

STREAMFLOW



As of March 1, the forecast continues to call for well below normal streamflow for the spring runoff period, ranging from 27 percent of median at San Carlos Reservoir inflow to 40 percent of median in the Little Colorado River above Lyman Lake. The streamflow forecasts are based on several factors, including an exceptionally dry January-February, snowpacks well below normal, current streamflows well below normal, and an outlook for dry conditions to persist through the spring. Please refer to the basin forecast tables found in this report for more information regarding water supply forecasts.

Arizona Spring Streamflow Forecasts as of March 1, 2012



SALT RIVER BASIN as of March 1, 2012

Well below normal streamflow levels are forecast for the basin. In the Salt River, near Roosevelt, the forecast calls for 37% of median streamflow through May, while at Tonto Creek, the forecast calls for 31% of median streamflow through May. Snow survey measurements show the Salt snowpack to be at 63% of average.



SALT RIVER BASIN as of March 1, 2012

```

=====
                        SALT RIVER BASIN
                    Streamflow Forecasts - March 1, 2012
=====
Forecast Pt | <=== Drier === Future Conditions === Wetter ===> |
Forecast | ===== Chance of Exceeding * ===== |
Period | (1000AF) (1000AF) | (1000AF) (% MED.) | (1000AF) (1000AF) | (1000AF)
=====
Salt R nr Roosevelt (3)
MAR-MAY      46      75      100      37      130      186      270
MARCH              48      37
Tonto Ck ab Gun Ck nr Roosevelt (3)
MAR-MAY      0.4      3.3      8.0      31      15.7      34      26
MARCH              6.0      36

```

```

=====
* 90%, 70%, 50%, 30%, and 10% chances of exceeding are the probabilities that
the actual volume will exceed the volumes in the table.
The average and median are computed for the 1971-2000 base period.
(1) - The values listed under the 10% and 90% Chance of Exceeding are
      actually 5% and 95% exceedance levels.
(2) - The value is natural volume - actual volume may be affected by upstream
      water management.
(3) - Median value used in place of average.
=====

```

```

=====
                        SALT RIVER BASIN
                    Reservoir Storage (1000AF) End of February
=====
Reservoir | Usable Capacity | ***** Usable Storage ***** |
          |                 | This Year   Last Year   Average |
=====
SALT RIVER RES SYSTEM | 2025.8 | 1458.0 | 1869.1 | 1239.7 |
=====

```



```

=====
                        SALT RIVER BASIN
                    Watershed Snowpack Analysis - March 1, 2012
=====
Watershed | Number of Data Sites | This Year as Percent of Last Year | Average |
=====
SALT RIVER BASIN | 10 | 112 | 63 |
=====

```

VERDE RIVER BASIN as of March 1, 2012

Well below normal streamflow levels are forecast for the basin. In the Verde River, at Horseshoe Dam, the forecast calls for 31% of median streamflow through May. Snow survey measurements show the Verde snowpack to be at 47% of average.



VERDE RIVER BASIN as of March 1, 2012

```

=====
                                VERDE RIVER BASIN
                                Streamflow Forecasts - March 1, 2012
=====
Forecast Pt | <=== Drier === Future Conditions === Wetter ===> |
Forecast    | ===== Chance of Exceeding * ===== |
Period      | 90%    70%    | 50%    | 30%    10%    | 30 Yr Med
              |(1000AF) (1000AF)|(1000AF) (% MED.)|(1000AF) (1000AF)| (1000AF)
=====
Verde R bl Tangle Ck ab Horseshoe Dam (3
MAR-MAY     10.0    26    45    31    71    124    144
MARCH       20    40

```

```

=====
* 90%, 70%, 50%, 30%, and 10% chances of exceeding are the probabilities that
  the actual volume will exceed the volumes in the table.
The average and median are computed for the 1971-2000 base period.
(1) - The values listed under the 10% and 90% Chance of Exceeding are
      actually 5% and 95% exceedance levels.
(2) - The value is natural volume - actual volume may be affected by upstream
      water management.
(3) - Median value used in place of average.
=====

```

```

=====
                                VERDE RIVER BASIN
                                Reservoir Storage (1000AF) End of February
=====
Reservoir    Usable          ***** Usable Storage *****
              Capacity    This Year    Last Year    Average
=====
VERDE RIVER RES SYSTEM    287.4    65.4    153.1    165.3
=====

```



```

=====
                                VERDE RIVER BASIN
                                Watershed Snowpack Analysis - March 1, 2012
=====
Watershed    Number of          This Year as Percent of
              Data Sites    Last Year    Average
=====
VERDE RIVER BASIN    11    52    47
SAN FRANCISCO PEAKS    3    66    66
=====

```

SAN FRANCISCO-UPPER GILA RIVER BASIN as of March 1, 2012

Well below normal streamflow levels are forecast for the basin. In the San Francisco River, at Clifton, the forecast calls for 48% of median streamflow levels through May. In the Gila River, near Solomon, the forecast calls for 37% of median streamflow levels through May. At San Carlos Reservoir, inflow to the lake is forecast at 27% of median through May. Snow survey measurements show the snowpack for this basin to be at 75% of average.



SAN FRANCISCO - UPPER GILA RIVER BASIN as of March 1, 2012

```

=====
SAN FRANCISCO - UPPER GILA RIVER BASIN
Streamflow Forecasts - March 1, 2012
=====
Forecast Pt | <=== Drier === Future Conditions === Wetter ===> |
Forecast | ===== Chance of Exceeding * ===== |
Period | (1000AF) (1000AF) | (1000AF) (% MED.) | (1000AF) (1000AF) | (1000AF)
=====
Gila R at Gila (3)
MAR-MAY 9.2 14.5 19.0 56 24 34 34

Gila R bl Blue Ck nr Virden (3)
MAR-MAY 7.6 10.0 19.0 40 32 52 47

San Francisco R at Glenwood (3)
MAR-MAY 2.3 5.1 8.0 49 11.8 19.2 16.4

San Francisco R at Clifton (3)
MAR-MAY 8.0 12.0 20 48 32 49 42

Gila R nr Solomon (3)
MAR-MAY 15.0 22 39 37 76 131 105
MARCH 20 38

San Carlos Reservoir Inflow (2,3)
MAR-MAY 5.0 8.0 17.0 27 42 78 64
    
```

```

=====
* 90%, 70%, 50%, 30%, and 10% chances of exceeding are the probabilities that
the actual volume will exceed the volumes in the table.
The average and median are computed for the 1971-2000 base period.
(1) - The values listed under the 10% and 90% Chance of Exceeding are
actually 5% and 95% exceedance levels.
(2) - The value is natural volume - actual volume may be affected by upstream
water management.
(3) - Median value used in place of average.
=====
    
```

```



=====
SAN FRANCISCO - UPPER GILA RIVER BASIN
Reservoir Storage (1000AF) End of February
=====
Reservoir | Usable Capacity | ***** Usable Storage ***** |
| | This Year | Last Year | Average |
=====
SAN CARLOS | 875.0 | 24.3 | 113.6 | 461.4
=====
    
```

```

=====
SAN FRANCISCO - UPPER GILA RIVER BASIN
Watershed Snowpack Analysis - March 1, 2012
=====
Watershed | Number of Data Sites | This Year as Percent of Last Year | Average |
=====
SAN FRANCISCO - UPPER GILA R | 11 | 155 | 75
=====
    
```

LITTLE COLORADO RIVER BASIN as of March 1, 2012

Well below normal streamflow levels are forecast for the basin. In the Little Colorado River, at Lyman Lake, the forecast calls for 40% of median streamflow through June. At Blue Ridge (C.C. Cragin) Reservoir, inflow to the lake is forecast at 29% of median through May. Snowpacks along the southern headwaters of the Little Colorado River, and along the central Mogollon Rim, were measured at 60% and 48% of average, respectively.



LITTLE COLORADO RIVER BASIN as of March 1, 2012

```

=====
                        LITTLE COLORADO RIVER BASIN
                        Streamflow Forecasts - March 1, 2012
=====
Forecast Pt | <=== Drier === Future Conditions === Wetter ===> |
Forecast | ===== Chance of Exceeding * ===== |
Period | (1000AF) (1000AF) | (1000AF) (% MED.) | (1000AF) (1000AF) | (1000AF)
=====
Little Colorado R ab Lyman Lake (3)
MAR-JUN      1.00      1.62      2.50      40      3.60      5.90      6.30

Rio Nutria nr Ramah (3)
MAR-MAY      0.10      0.41      0.80      30      1.39      2.70      2.70

Ramah Reservoir Inflow (3)
MAR-MAY      0.00      0.20      0.50      34      1.33      2.60      1.49

Zuni River ab Black Rock Reservoir (3)
MAR-MAY      0.00      0.02      0.10      17      4.00      9.70      0.60

Blue Ridge Reservoir Inflow (3)
MAR-MAY      1.1       2.4       3.7       29      5.4       8.8       12.8

Lake Mary Reservoir Inflow (3)
MAR-MAY      0.80      1.09      1.70      42      2.50      4.10      4.10
=====

```

```

=====
* 90%, 70%, 50%, 30%, and 10% chances of exceeding are the probabilities that
the actual volume will exceed the volumes in the table.
The average and median are computed for the 1971-2000 base period.
(1) - The values listed under the 10% and 90% Chance of Exceeding are
actually 5% and 95% exceedance levels.
(2) - The value is natural volume - actual volume may be affected by upstream
water management.
(3) - Median value used in place of average.
=====

```

```

=====
                        LITTLE COLORADO RIVER BASIN
                        Reservoir Storage (1000AF) End of February
=====
Reservoir      Usable Capacity      ***** Usable Storage *****
                This Year      Last Year      Average
=====
LYMAN RESERVOIR      30.0      9.6      18.0      15.4
=====

```



```

=====
                        LITTLE COLORADO RIVER BASIN
                        Watershed Snowpack Analysis - March 1, 2012
=====
Watershed      Number of Data Sites      This Year as Percent of
                Last Year      Average
=====
LITTLE COLORADO - SOUTHERN H      10      86      60
CENTRAL MOGOLLON RIM      4      68      48
=====

```

CHUSKA MOUNTAINS as of March 1, 2012

Snow survey measurements conducted by staff of the Navajo Water Management Branch show the Chuska snowpack to be at 71% of average. Well below normal runoff is forecast for Captain Tom Wash, Wheatfields Creek, Bowl Canyon Creek, and Kinlichee Creek.



CHUSKA MOUNTAINS as of March 1, 2012

```

=====
                        CHUSKA MOUNTAINS
                    Streamflow Forecasts - March 1, 2012
=====
Forecast Pt | <=== Drier === Future Conditions === Wetter ===> |
Forecast | ===== Chance of Exceeding * ===== |
Period | (1000AF) (1000AF) | (1000AF) (% AVG.) | (1000AF) (1000AF) | (1000AF)
=====
Captain Tom Wash nr Two Gray Hills
MAR-MAY 0.15 0.72 1.50 53 2.70 5.50 2.83

Wheatfields Ck nr Wheatfields
MAR-MAY 0.93 1.25 1.50 52 1.79 2.30 2.90

Bowl Canyon Ck ab Asaayi Lake
MAR-MAY 0.29 0.46 0.60 60 0.77 1.08 1.00

Kinlichee Ck
MAR-MAY 0.27 0.52 0.75 44 1.04 1.59 1.70
=====

```

* 90%, 70%, 50%, 30%, and 10% chances of exceeding are the probabilities that the actual volume will exceed the volumes in the table.

The average is computed for the 1971-2000 base period.

- (1) - The values listed under the 10% and 90% Chance of Exceeding are actually 5% and 95% exceedance levels.
- (2) - The value is natural volume - actual volume may be affected by upstream water management.
- (3) - Median value used in place of average.



```

=====
                        CHUSKA MOUNTAINS
                    Watershed Snowpack Analysis - March 1, 2012
=====
Watershed | Number of | This Year as Percent of |
           | Data Sites | Last Year | Average
=====
CHUSKA MOUNTAINS | 7 | 86 | 71
DEFIANCE PLATEAU | 2 | 33 | 16
=====

```

NORTHWESTERN ARIZONA as of March 1, 2012

On the Colorado River, well below normal inflow to Lake Powell is forecast at 67% of the 30-year average for the forecast period April-July. At the Grand Canyon, measurements conducted by park rangers show the snowpack to be at 32% of average.



NORTHWESTERN ARIZONA as of March 1, 2012

```

=====
                                NORTHWESTERN ARIZONA
                                Streamflow Forecasts - March 1, 2012
=====
Forecast Pt | <=== Drier === Future Conditions === Wetter ===> |
Forecast     | ===== Chance of Exceeding * ===== |
Period       | (1000AF) (1000AF) | (1000AF) (% AVG.) | (1000AF) (1000AF) | (1000AF)
=====
Virgin R at Littlefield
APR-JUL      14.0   18.2    27     37     38     56     74

Lake Powell Inflow (2)
APR-JUL      3200   4160   5300   67    6580   8200   7930
=====

```

* 90%, 70%, 50%, 30%, and 10% chances of exceeding are the probabilities that the actual volume will exceed the volumes in the table.

The average is computed for the 1971-2000 base period.

- (1) - The values listed under the 10% and 90% Chance of Exceeding are actually 5% and 95% exceedance levels.
- (2) - The value is natural volume - actual volume may be affected by upstream water management.
- (3) - Median value used in place of average.

```

=====
                                NORTHWESTERN ARIZONA
                                Reservoir Storage (1000AF) End of February
=====
Reservoir      Usable Capacity      ***** Usable Storage *****
                | This Year | Last Year | Average
=====
LAKE HAVASU    619.0        563.0        566.6        552.4
LAKE MOHAVE    1810.0       1649.8       1699.0       1675.1
LAKE MEAD      26159.0     14907.0     11117.0     22122.0
LAKE POWELL    24322.0     15453.0     13235.0     18236.0
=====

```

```

=====
                                NORTHWESTERN ARIZONA
                                Watershed Snowpack Analysis - March 1, 2012
=====
Watershed      Number of Data Sites      This Year as Percent of
                | Last Year | Average
=====
GRAND CANYON   2                36                32
=====


```

S N O W S U R V E Y D A T A

MARCH 1, 2012

MAP NUM.	SNOW COURSE	ELEV.	DATE	SNOW DEPTH	WATER CONTENT	LAST YEAR	AVERAGE 71-00
1.	ARBABS FOREST (AK)	7680	2/27	2	.6	1.1	2.1
2.	BAKER BUTTE SNOTEL	7330	3/01	5	.9	3.0	5.9
3.	BAKER BUTTE #2	7700	2/28	24	7.6	9.2	12.3
4.	BAKER BUTTE SMT SNTL	7700	3/01	30	9.3	12.9	-
5.	BALDY SNOTEL	9220	3/01	17	6.0	5.3	8.0
6.	BEAVER HEAD	8000	2/29	4	1.0	.5	2.9
7.	BEAVER HEAD SNOTEL	7990	3/01	0	.3	1.2	3.0
8.	BEAVER SPRING	9220	2/29	28	6.8	8.4	9.7
9.	BEAVER SPRING SNOTEL	9200	3/01	18	7.2	6.0	-
10.	BRIGHT ANGEL	8400	2/29	24	4.2	10.3	10.9
11.	BUCK SPRING	7400	2/29	4	1.0	.9	3.8
12.	CHALENDER	7100	2/29	4	.7	2.5	3.3
13.	CHALENDER SNOTEL	7100	3/01	4	1.0	4.9	-
14.	CHEESE SPRINGS	8600	2/28	24	4.9	2.9	5.9
15.	CORONADO TRL SNOTEL	8400	3/01	0	.0	.6	3.3
16.	CORONADO TRAIL	8350	2/29	0	.0	.0	3.0
17.	FLUTED ROCK	7800	2/27	1	.3	1.6	3.5
18.	FORT APACHE	9160	2/28	32	7.8	5.4	7.9
19.	FORT VALLEY	7350	2/28	5	.6	1.6	2.6
20.	FORT VALLEY SNOTEL	7350	3/01	2	.5	2.2	-
21.	FRY SNOTEL	7220	3/01	17	5.8	9.1	6.8
22.	GRAND CANYON	7500	2/26	0	.0	1.3	2.4
23.	HANNAGAN MDWS SNOTEL	9020	3/01	35	10.3	7.6	11.7
24.	HAPPY JACK	7630	2/29	2	.6	5.2	4.8
25.	HAPPY JACK SNOTEL	7630	3/01	19	5.4	10.1	6.1
26.	HEBER SNOTEL	7640	3/01	1	1.1	4.0	5.0
27.	LAKE MARY	6930	2/28	4	.7	2.1	3.3
28.	MAVERICK FORK SNOTEL	9200	3/01	23	7.3	7.2	10.2
29.	MORMON MTN SNOTEL	7500	3/01	4	1.3	5.4	6.7
30.	MORMON MT. SUMMIT #2	8470	2/28	27	7.0	11.8	14.2
31.	MORMON MTN SUMMIT SN	8500	3/01	27	6.2	10.2	-
32.	NEWMAN PARK	6750	2/28	6	1.2	1.6	2.5
33.	NUTRIOSO	8500	2/29	3	.4	.0	1.8
34.	NUTRIOSO SNOTEL	8500	3/01	0	.2	.0	-
35.	PROMONTORY SNOTEL	7900	3/01	20	7.8	10.3	12.9
36.	SNOW BOWL #1 ALT.	10260	2/29	27	6.6	11.2	12.3
37.	SNOW BOWL #2	11000	2/29	38	9.6	13.6	17.2
38.	SNOWSLIDE CYN SNOTEL	9750	3/01	48	11.5	17.1	12.4
39.	TSAILE CANYON #1	8160	2/29	19	4.4	6.3	6.1
40.	TSAILE CANYON #3	8920	2/29	29	6.9	8.9	8.7
41.	WHITE HORSE SNOTEL	7180	3/01	1	1.0	4.3	5.3
42.	WILDCAT SNOTEL	7850	3/01	4	3.2	.6	4.4
43.	WILLIAMS SKI RUN	7720	2/29	14	3.7	10.8	8.9
44.	WORKMAN CREEK SNOTEL	6900	3/01	4	1.4	5.1	5.3

Arizona Snow Survey Data Sites



Legend

- SNOTEL (Snowpack Telemetry) Sites
- Snow Course Sites
- ◆ SNOTEL and Snow Course Sites
- Basin Boundaries

February 2010
 Data Sources: NRCS / ALRIS
 Projection: UTM Zone 12 Datum: NAD83
 For Further Information Contact:
 Arizona NRCS State Headquarters - (602) 280-8831
 230 N. 1st Ave., Suite 509, Phoenix, AZ 85003

