

Comprehensive Survey of Sedimentation in Lake Mead, 1948-49

By W. O. SMITH, C. P. VETTER, G. B. CUMMINGS, *and others*

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY PROFESSIONAL PAPER 295

Prepared in collaboration with the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation; U.S. Department of the Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, Bureau of Ships, Bureau of Ordnance, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Hydrographic Office, and Navy Electronics Laboratory; U.S. Department of Commerce, Coast and Geodetic Survey; University of California, Scripps Institution of Oceanography



UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON : 1960

FOREWORD

Reservoirs are becoming an increasingly prominent feature of the American landscape. Built for flood mitigation and to change a fluctuating river into a dependable source of water for irrigation, power, and other purposes, they are predestined, like natural lakes, to be destroyed sometime following their creation. Sedimentation sooner or later robs most lakes and reservoirs of their capacity to store water. The significance of sedimentation in the life of Lake Mead, the largest artificial reservoir in the world, was realized when the plan for the reservoir was conceived, and an aerial survey of the floor was made in 1935 before the reservoir filled with water. The survey provided a base for the study of future sedimentation.

A casual view of the magnificent expanse of Lake Mead in its desert environment gives no more than a hint of the complex actions and interactions within and near the lake that are critical in relation to the long-term service for which the lake was impounded. The reservoir impounds sediment, dissolved salts, and heat as well as water. Each of these has important effects on the usefulness of the reservoir. Accurate appraisal of the magnitude of the impounded items is the key to longtime successful reservoir management. Such appraisals take the form of budgets, showing the balance between income, outgo, and storage. The sediment budget affects the life of the reservoir, the salt budget affects the chemical quality and usefulness of the impounded water, and the heat budget affects evaporation and the water balance. This report, although centered about the sediment budget, treats the other items to some extent, but each in time will require

separate inquiry. The importance of evaporation already has led to a separate report on the heat budget. These problems relate to all reservoirs; but, because of the great size of Lake Mead, the importance and complexity of the problems there reach major proportions. The lake offers an opportunity to test and apply principles that can be derived from study of the sediment, salt, and heat balances. For these reasons the Bureau of Reclamation, the steward of the reservoir on behalf of the people of the country, asked the Geological Survey to lead a joint study by many scientists of the diverse and complicated aspects of Lake Mead. The resulting report is unique in its field because it represents a study by a diversified group of research scientists trained in several different fields of research, including oceanography, hydrology, and geology, working together on a common problem. Such pooling of talents promises to become more common in future hydrologic research because the results of this study have proved the synergistic value of collaboration.

The specific results of the study are food for speculation about future accumulations of sediment and the movement of salt. We have assurances that Lake Mead will not be filled with sediment for at least 350 years and that it will not become a salt lake. The wealth of information in this report undoubtedly will be useful in the operation, not only of Lake Mead, but of many other reservoirs already built or in prospect.

Carl G. Paulsen
Chief Hydraulic Engineer
February 1957

PREFACE

This report on the Lake Mead comprehensive survey of 1948-49 includes a planned collection of papers or chapters that cover fully the intensive field investigations in those years, in which several agencies participated. The technical direction of the comprehensive survey was by the U.S. Geological Survey, with general supervision by C. G. Paulsen, chief of the Water Resources Division, and R. W. Davenport, chief of the Technical Coordination Branch of that Division. W. B. Langbein, hydraulic engineer of the Technical Coordination Branch, contributed importantly to the initial conception of the comprehensive survey and advised in the general supervision. W. O. Smith, physicist of the Water Resources Division, as project chief for the Lake Mead survey was responsible for the overall direction of the program. C. P. Vetter, as Chief of the Office of River Control, Bureau of Reclamation, the contracting agency, approved the general scope of the investigations. He also assisted in the coordination of the field activities and served as principal consultant on reservoir engineering problems. G. B. Cummings, Chief of the Sonar Design Branch of the Bureau of Ships, was in charge of the activities of the Navy Department and served as principal consultant with respect to the echo-sounding and communication problems. Messrs. Smith, Vetter, and Cummings constituted a project staff representing the three agencies principally involved in the Lake Mead survey. These men had primary responsibility for setting the policy of the report, determining what chapters would be included and indicating their general scope; a large proportion of their time was occupied with the project throughout the period of the field investigations.

The project required the services of many consultants who advised in matters pertaining to their respective scientific specialties. Several of these men participated in the development of plans for the survey; most of them visited the area at various times during the survey to consult with members of the field staff. Several of the consultants have contributed technical reports, which appear in succeeding chapters. Consultants within the Geological Survey included: C. S. Howard, staff chemist, Quality of Water Branch, Water Resources Division; C. B. Hunt, chief (during the in-

vestigation), General Geology Branch, Geologic Division; H. V. Peterson, staff geologist, Technical Coordination Branch, Water Resources Division; R. M. Wilson, chief, Geodesy and Control Surveys Section, Topographic Division; K. O. Emery, also professor of geology, University of Southern California; and C. R. Longwell, also professor of geology, Yale University.

For the Bureau of Reclamation the following men advised on specific engineering problems: J. W. Stanley, of the Office of River Control; E. A. Moritz, director of Region III; L. R. Douglas, assistant director, and C. P. Christensen, director of power of the Boulder Canyon project.

Consultants for the Navy Department included: Gunnar Leifson, head, and M. R. Ullom, assistant head, of the Survey Branch, Hydrographic Office; Lt. W. R. Brooks, U.S.N.R., and C. E. Nicholson, engineer in the Research and Development Section, Bureau of Ordnance; E. C. LaFond and R. W. Dietz, of the Oceanography Section, and R. D. Russell, consultant on geophysics—all of the Navy Electronics Laboratory in San Diego, Calif.; and C. E. Mongan, Jr., then with the Sonar Design Division of the Bureau of Ships, and now physicist with the Edo Corporation.

Other consultants on the Lake Mead survey included E. J. Parkin, mathematician of the Division of Geodesy, for the Coast and Geodetic Survey; F. D. Sisler, research associate of the Microbiology Division, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California; W. C. Blaisdell, vice president of Bludworth Marine Division of National-Simplex-Bludworth, Inc.; R. P. Geddes, Jr., marine manager of Pacific Division, Bendix Aviation Corporation; and N. B. McLean, president of Edo Corporation.

In field operations of the Geological Survey at Boulder City, F. C. Ames, resident engineer, and his assistant, F. W. Kennon, were responsible for maintenance of vertical control, signaling at horizontal control points, drafting of control maps, layout of lines to be sounded, and plotting of the results of soundings. These men also computed the reservoir-area and capacity tables, using methods developed for the Lake Mead survey by J. L. Speert, geodetic engineer, Topo-

graphic Division. The third-order triangulation necessary for horizontal control was done by W. P. McIntosh and J. P. Minta, under the supervision of R. M. Wilson. The survey of the Lower Granite Gorge was made by F. W. O'Bannon, chief of party, under the supervision of L. C. Pampel. Investigations of the geologic changes since Hoover Dam was constructed were made by H. R. Gould, resident geologist, under the supervision of K. O. Emery. Studies of the sediments were made by Gould, partly at the University of Southern California. Irving Sherman assisted in the analyses of sediments in a laboratory set up in Hoover Dam. Chemical analyses to determine dissolved solids in the water were made in the Geological Survey laboratory at Salt Lake City under the direction of C. S. Howard.

Underwater soundings were conducted by Lt. C. C. McCall, Bureau of Ordnance, with a Navy crew of seven petty officers (Chief minemen: J. M. Dickison, J. D. M. Freitas, A. B. Holmes, H. E. Knudsen, G. B. Labagnara, C. D. Malone, and M. L. Perez) under the general supervision of Gunnar Leifson of the Hydrographic Office. Underwater photographic investigations were also made by Lt. McCall. D. W. Pritchard of the Navy Electronics Laboratory directed monthly cruises on the lake for salinity and thermal surveys. E. R. Anderson assumed active charge of these surveys when Mr. Pritchard became associated with the Chesapeake Bay Institute, and he prepared the report on physical limnology in collaboration with Mr. Pritchard.

Biological and biochemical studies of the sediment were made under the direction of F. D. Sisler of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. The changes in the earth's crust since Hoover Dam was constructed were determined on the basis of precise leveling by the Coast and Geodetic Survey in 1935 and releveling in 1940-41 and 1949-50, under the supervision of E. J.

Parkin. Analyses of these leveling data were made by C. R. Longwell.

Some of the papers presented herein rely to an important degree upon data obtained in other parts of the Colorado River basin. Included in this category are discussions of the geologic setting, by C. R. Longwell; the drainage basin tributary to Lake Mead, by H. E. Thomas; the water budget for Lake Mead, by W. B. Langbein; physical and chemical characteristics of the inflowing water, by C. S. Howard; life of the reservoir, by H. E. Thomas, H. R. Gould, and W. B. Langbein; and the sediment problem in reservoirs, by Thomas Maddock, Jr.

This report in advance form (Smith, Vetter, Cummings, and others, 1954), was made available to the public in 1954 by placing it in the open files of the Geological Survey and by reproduction by the Bureau of Reclamation, Boulder City, Nev., for distribution for official use and review by cooperating agencies and others concerned. H. E. Thomas, of the Geological Survey, did the final technical editing of this report both in its advance form and for the present publication. The original draft of the report was assembled by W. O. Smith. Base data obtained as part of this investigation, which will be of use for comparison with future surveys of Lake Mead but is too detailed for inclusion in this report, are contained in the Geological Survey open-file report "Supplemental Base Data for Lake Mead: Comprehensive Survey of 1948-49." This report was also reproduced by the Bureau of Reclamation, Boulder City, Nev., in very limited quantity for reference work. The maps showing the bottom of Lake Mead as determined by the survey were printed only as overlay sheets to the Soil Conservation Service maps of 1935. A summary of the conclusions of this investigation is given in Geological Survey Circular 346, "First Fourteen Years of Lake Mead" (Thomas, 1954).

CONTENTS

Summary of results, by W. O. Smith, C. P. Vetter, and G. B. Cummings.....	Page 1
---	-----------

PART 1. INTRODUCTION

	Page		Page
A. The Lake Mead problem, by C. P. Vetter.....	3	C. Geologic setting of Lake Mead—Continued	
Reference cited.....	5	Stratigraphy—Continued	
B. Organization of the work and equipment, by W. O. Smith.....	7	Middle and late Cenozoic rocks.....	15
Mapping the bottom of the reservoir.....	7	Muddy Creek formation.....	15
Determining the character of sediments.....	8	Hualpai formation.....	15
Measuring the salinity and thermal characteristics of the lake water.....	9	Chemehuevi formation.....	16
Precise leveling.....	9	Volcanic rocks and related intrusive bodies.....	17
Comments on operations.....	9	Structure of the bedrock.....	18
Communication facilities, by Lt. C. C. McCall, USN.....	10	Summary of geologic history.....	20
Reference cited.....	10	References cited.....	20
C. Geologic setting of Lake Mead, by C. R. Longwell.....	11	D. Drainage basin tributary to Lake Mead, by H. E. Thomas.....	21
Location and topography.....	11	Physiography.....	21
Stratigraphy.....	11	Geology.....	22
Precambrian rocks.....	11	Water.....	23
Paleozoic and Mesozoic rocks.....	13	Sediment.....	26
Cretaceous (?) and early Cenozoic (?) rocks.....	14	Suspended load.....	26
Overton fanglomerate.....	14	Bed load.....	28
Horse Spring formation.....	14	Live storage.....	29
		Dead storage.....	29
		References cited.....	30

PART 2. GEODETIC SURVEYS

	Page		Page
E. Precise leveling, by E. J. Parkin.....	31	F. Interpretation of the leveling data—Continued	
Adjustments.....	31	Possible causes of changes in level.....	35
Hoover Dam level net.....	32	Comparison between measured and predicted subsidence.....	37
F. Interpretation of the leveling data, by C. R. Longwell.....	33	Effect of subsidence upon reservoir capacity.....	37
Pertinent geologic features.....	33	References cited.....	38
Pattern of the changes in level.....	33		

PART 3. HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS

	Page		Page
G. Survey of the lake, by Gunnar Leifson.....	39	G. Survey of the lake—Continued	
Outline of procedures, by M. R. Ullom and F. C. Ames.....	40	Vertical control—Continued	
Horizontal control.....	40	Evaluation of discrepancies.....	56
Plotting of soundings.....	42	Selection of reference datum.....	57
Sounding procedures.....	43	Sounding operations, by Lt. C. C. McCall, USN.....	58
Horizontal control, by R. M. Wilson.....	44	Low-frequency depth-recording equipment, by W. C. Blaisdell.....	59
Program for triangulation.....	44	NJ-8 Depth-recording equipment.....	59
Description of operations.....	45	Recorder.....	59
Summary of results.....	45	Driver-rectifier or signal sender.....	62
Office computations.....	51	Transmitting and receiving transducers.....	62
Vertical control, by F. C. Ames.....	51	Motor-alternator set.....	63
Collection of water-stage records.....	52	NK-6 Portable depth-recording equipment.....	63
Gage installations.....	52	Recorder.....	63
Water-stage recorders.....	53	Submersible unit.....	66
Development of a common gage datum.....	53	High-frequency depth-recording equipment, by Robert P. Geddes, Jr. and Birt Blackman.....	66
Analysis of water-stage records.....	55	NGB-3 Depth-recording equipment.....	66
Seiches.....	55	Circuit analysis.....	67
Tides.....	56		
Wind effects.....	56		
Slope effects.....	56		

PART 3. HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS—Continued

	Page		Page
G. Survey of the lake—Continued		I. Reservoir storage—Continued	
Evaluation of the echo sounding, by G. B. Cummings and C. E. Mongan, Jr.	68	Computations, by J. L. Speert, F. C. Ames, and F. W. Kennon	84
Analysis of records	68	Original area and capacity computations	85
Summary of results, by F. C. Ames	69	Review and revision of the original compu- tations	85
Evidence of sediment accumulation	70	Area and capacity computations for 1948-49 survey	86
Evidence of slumping	70	Computation of sediment and auxiliary tables ..	87
Evidence of erosion	71	Tables, by F. C. Ames, F. W. Kennon, and W. B. Langbein	87, 93
References cited	71	Reference cited	88
H. Survey of Lower Granite Gorge, by L. C. Pampel ..	73	J. Water budget, W. B. Langbein	95
Outline of operations	73	Method of computing the budget	95
Total volume of sediment	76	Inflow	95
Distribution of sediment	78	Outflow	97
References cited	81	Reservoir storage	97
I. Reservoir storage	83	Statistical analyses	97
Significance of area, capacity, and sediment tables, by J. W. Stanley	83	Evaporation	98
Flood control	83	Transpiration	99
Irrigation and domestic use	84	Precipitation	99
Power generation	84	Evaluation of bank storage	99
		References cited	102

PART 4. WATER OF THE LAKE

	Page		Page
K. Character of the inflowing water, by C. S. Howard ..	103	L. Chemistry of the water—Continued	
Sources of inflow	103	Effect of reservoir storage upon water quality—Con. Stabilization of water quality by reservoir storage	124
Sediment carried by the inflowing water	103	References cited	124
Suspended load in the Colorado River	103	M. Circulation and evaporation, by E. R. Anderson and D. W. Pritchard	125
Particle sizes in suspended load	104	Circulation	125
Seasonal variations	106	Techniques for determining circulation	125
Correlation of analyses of deposited and suspended sediment	106	Tonguelike distributions	125
Suspended load from other sources	107	Wüst's core method	126
Temperature of the inflowing water	107	T-S relations	126
Dissolved solids in the inflowing water	108	Observational program	126
Seasonal variations	108	Analysis	127
Annual variations	108	Spring	128
Density currents	109	Summer	132
Initial evidence, 1935-36	109	Fall	134
Investigations, 1936-49	110	Winter	136
Record of density currents	111	Summary of the circulation patterns	139
References cited	113	Evaporation	141
L. Chemistry of the water, by C. S. Howard	115	Techniques for determining evaporation	141
Program of investigation	115	Energy budget	141
Dissolved solids in the lake water	115	Radiation from sun and sky	142
Seasonal variations	115	Reflected sun and sky radiation	142
Geographic variations	118	Effective back radiation	142
Variations with depth	119	Adected energy	142
Relation to temperature of the lake water	119	Energy storage	143
Effect of reservoir storage upon water quality	121	Bowen ratio	143
Comparison of chemical constituents in the inflowing and outflowing water	121	Summary	143
Concentration by evaporation	123	Calculation of rates of evaporation	143
Precipitation of dissolved constituents	123	Comparison with rates of pan evaporation	145
Solution of reservoir bed and bank materials	123	References cited	146

PART 5. SEDIMENTS

	Page		Page
N. Character of the accumulated sediment, by H. R. Gould.....	149	P. Amount of sediment—Continued.....	
Methods of investigation.....	149	Median particle size.....	197
Miscellaneous observations.....	152	Average chemical composition.....	197
Laboratory studies.....	152	Potential economic use.....	199
Water content and air-dry moisture content.....	152	Q. Turbidity currents, by H. R. Gould.....	201
Specific gravity of sediment particles.....	153	Relation to river discharge and lake stratification.....	202
Density, porosity, and specific weight.....	153	Overflows.....	202
Gas volume in place.....	154	Interflows.....	203
Particle size.....	154	Underflows.....	203
Distribution of sediment.....	156	Velocity, density, and thickness.....	204
Colorado delta.....	156	Amount of sediment and distance of travel.....	205
Virgin delta.....	157	Change in slope and width of the channel.....	206
Deposits from small tributaries.....	157	Size of suspended particles.....	206
Physiography of the deltas.....	158	Virgin River turbidity currents.....	206
Colorado delta.....	158	References cited.....	207
Topset beds.....	158	R. Erosion in the reservoir, by H. R. Gould.....	209
Foreset beds.....	164	Landslides.....	209
Bottomset beds.....	164	Wave-cut terraces.....	212
Virgin delta.....	165	Solution.....	212
Growth and structure of the deltas.....	166	Erosion of the delta surface.....	213
Colorado delta.....	166	References cited.....	213
Growth in February and March 1935.....	167	S. Sedimentation in relation to reservoir utilization, by H. R. Gould.....	215
Growth from April 1935 to March 1936.....	168	Sediment-storage capacity above the permanent spillway level.....	215
Growth from April 1936 to July 1937.....	168	Sediment compaction.....	217
Growth from July 1937 to December 1948.....	169	Pattern of sedimentation in the future.....	218
Structure in 1948.....	169	Complete filling.....	219
Virgin delta.....	172	Halfway point in reservoir filling.....	221
Physical properties.....	173	Filling to sills of lower outlet gates at Hoover Dam.....	223
Texture and stratification.....	173	Terminal slope and residual storage.....	224
Water content and porosity.....	177	Amount of erosion required for filling Lake Mead.....	228
Specific weight.....	178	References cited.....	229
Gas content.....	180	T. Life of the reservoir, by H. E. Thomas, H. R. Gould, and W. B. Langbein.....	231
Sediment temperature.....	181	Projection of observed rates of sediment accumulation.....	231
Chemical properties.....	183	“Normal” rate of sediment accumulation.....	232
Chemical analyses.....	183	Evaluation of existing records.....	232
Spectrographic analyses.....	184	Gaging of suspended sediment at Grand Canyon.....	232
Clay minerals.....	184	Ungaged increments of sediment.....	233
Calcium carbonate.....	184	Variations in rate of sediment inflow.....	234
Organic content.....	185	Variations in sediment load and runoff.....	234
References cited.....	186	Variations in relation of sediment to runoff.....	235
O. Bacteriology and biochemistry of the sediments, by F. D. Sisler.....	187	Variations resulting from water development.....	238
Physical and chemical character.....	187	Variations in rate of sediment outflow.....	240
Bacterial populations.....	188	Probable rates of sediment accumulation in the future.....	240
Total population.....	188	Miscellaneous changes in reservoir volume.....	241
Physiological groups.....	189	Downwarping of the reservoir floor.....	241
Biochemical oxygen demand.....	190	Dissolving of materials of the reservoir floor.....	243
Migration of bacteria.....	190	References cited.....	244
Effects of biochemical action.....	190	U. The sediment problem in reservoirs, by Thomas Maddock, Jr.....	245
Heating of sediments.....	190	References cited.....	248
Evolution of gas.....	191		
Compaction of sediments.....	192		
Summary and discussion.....	193		
References cited.....	193		
P. Amount of sediment, by H. R. Gould.....	195		
Volume.....	195		
Weight.....	195		
Rate of sedimentation.....	196		
Index.....			249

ILLUSTRATIONS

[Plates 1, 3, 4, 7, 12-14, 18-20, 24, and 26 are in pocket]

PLATE	1. Geologic maps of the Lake Mead area, Arizona-Nevada. <i>A</i> , The Lake Mead area; <i>B</i> , The reservoir floor.	Page	19
	2. Steeply dipping strata of Carboniferous age along Grand Bay, Lake Mead.....		19
	3. Hoover Dam level net, levelings of 1935, 1940-41, and 1949-50.		
	4. Map of Lake Mead area, showing approximate boundaries between exposed bedrock and alluviated basins, and profiles along lines of leveling.		
	5. <i>A</i> , Boulder Canyon and Virgin Basin, Lake Mead; <i>B</i> , Shore signal used during the Lake Mead survey.....		40
	6. Black Canyon and Boulder Basin of Lake Mead.....		47
	7. Map showing locations of gages used to establish water-stage elevations during the 1947-49 survey.		
	8. NJ-8 recorder, opened for inspection or servicing.....		60
	9. <i>A</i> , NJ-8 driver-rectifier, showing horizontally mounted strobotron tube; <i>B</i> , NJ-8 transducer, showing conical reflector hanging from case cover.....		61
	10. <i>A</i> , NK-6 recorder, showing carefully positioned spiral wire on drum; <i>B</i> , NK-6 submersible unit, carrying transmitting and receiving transducers.....		64
	11. <i>A</i> , NGB-3 depth recorder, inside view; <i>B</i> , NGB-3 depth recorder, showing recording unit.....		65
	12. Comparative river-bed data along profile line 79D-109D in Boulder Basin.		
	13. Annual profiles of sediment distribution along Colorado River channel through Lake Mead, 1937 to 1948.		
	14. Map of Lower Granite Gorge, Lake Mead.		
	15. <i>A</i> , The Tonto platform; <i>B</i> , Sounding of cross section at range 24.....		75
	16. Views of Lower Granite Gorge upstream from North Separation Canyon. <i>A</i> , In 1939; <i>B</i> , In October 1948.....		79
	17. Convergence of Colorado River and Lake Mead in Pierce Basin, November 1948.....		117
	18. Map showing average station locations for cruises during Lake Mead survey 1948-49.		
	19. Map showing coring and sampling positions in Lake Mead, 1947-49.		
	20. Map and sections showing sediment distribution in Lake Mead, 1947-49.		
	21. <i>A</i> , One of many tributaries sealed off by natural levee, behind which a narrow lake has formed; <i>B</i> , Upstream view of the 1948 terrace, in which the Colorado River has entrenched itself.....		160
	22. Closeup view of the 1948 terrace being cut back by the Colorado River in Pierce Basin.....		161
	23. Gas pits in the 1948 terrace near the delta front. <i>A</i> , General view; <i>B</i> , Closeup view of one of the large gas pits....		162
	24. Map of Pierce Basin, showing pre-Lake Mead topography, 1935, and topography of accumulated sediments, 1949.		
	25. <i>A</i> , View of The Temple, Ariz., in 1934; <i>B</i> , View in 1948, showing fresh landslide scars on the face of The Temple...		170
	26. Graphs showing relation between computed density of Colorado River water at Grand Canyon gaging station and arrival of turbid underflows at Hoover Dam.		
	27. Landslide on the north wall of Virgin Canyon near the mouth.....		208
	28. Prominent landslide on the east side of Gregg Basin near the mouth of Hualpai Wash.....		210
	29. <i>A</i> , Solution and terracing of gypsum reefs near the mouth of Detrital Wash; <i>B</i> , Solution cavities in siltstone and gypsum of the Muddy Creek formation in Las Vegas Bay.....		211
FIGURE	1. Map of Colorado River basin, showing location of Lake Mead.....		4
	2. Major physiographic features of the Lake Mead region.....		12
	3. Structural relations of principal bedrock units; profile along line A-B-C of plate 1.....		13
	4. Map of drainage basin tributary to Lake Mead, showing source areas of sediments as inferred from surface geology.....		24
	5. Streamflow entering Lake Mead during water year 1948.....		25
	6. Suspended sediment inflow to Lake Mead during water year 1948.....		27
	7. Sediment carried by the Colorado River in water years 1931-50.....		28
	8. Contours showing changes in altitude, 1935 to 1950.....		34
	9. Boulder Basin triangulation net, 1947-48.....		46
	10. Virgin Basin triangulation net, 1947-48.....		48
	11. Overton Arm triangulation net, 1947-48.....		49
	12. Triangulation net in the Virgin Canyon-Pierce Ferry area, 1947-48.....		50
	13. Variations of water stage at auxiliary gages and at Hoover Dam gage with respect to true lake elevations at Lake Mead.....		54
	14. Block diagrams illustrating electronic circuits and principle of echo sounding. <i>A</i> , Principle of echo sounding; <i>B</i> , Operation of echo sounder.....		67
	15. Typical cross sections in Lower Granite Gorge, 1935 and 1948-49.....		77
	16. Profiles of the thalweg of Lower Granite Gorge, 1935 and 1948-49.....		80
	17. Index map showing basins for which separate capacity and sediment tables have been prepared.....		88
	18. Stage and usable storage of Lake Mead, 1935 to 1948.....		96
	19. Relation between unmeasured inflow to Lake Mead and runoff of Virgin River at Littlefield, Ariz.....		98

	Page
FIGURE 20. Relation of net residual (bank storage) to annual change in reservoir contents.....	100
21. Comparison of reservoir capacity curve with gross storage curve computed from difference between inflow and outflow.....	101
22. Relation of annual runoff to sediment load at Grand Canyon.....	105
23. Discharge, temperature, dissolved solids, and suspended sediment records for Colorado River at Grand Canyon, October 1947 to February 1949.....	106
24. Periods of reported density currents and elevation of sediment surface at Hoover Dam, 1935 to 1950.....	112
25. Water temperature at the intake towers of Hoover Dam during four periods in 1948.....	119
26. Temperature and dissolved solids in Virgin and Boulder Canyons, 1948.....	120
27. Dissolved solids and discharge at the Grand Canyon and Willow Beach gaging stations on the Colorado River during the year ended September 30, 1935.....	122
28. Typical seasonal salinity distribution and circulation patterns in Lake Mead.....	129
29. Temperature and salinity data from selected stations on Lake Mead, spring and summer.....	130
30. Typical seasonal salinity distribution and indicated circulation in Overton Arm, Lake Mead.....	131
31. Secchi-disc readings at Lake Mead, cruise IV, May 25-31, 1948.....	132
32. Salinity distribution at surface of Lake Mead, cruise IV, May 25-31, 1948.....	133
33. Temperature distribution in Lake Mead at depth of 10 feet, cruise IV, May 25-31, 1948.....	134
34. Salinity distribution at surface of Lake Mead, cruise VII, August 22-26, 1948.....	135
35. Temperature distribution in Lake Mead at depth of 10 feet, cruise VII, August 22-26, 1948.....	136
36. Temperature and salinity data from selected stations on Lake Mead, fall and winter.....	137
37. Salinity distribution at surface of Lake Mead, cruise X, November 27-30, 1948.....	138
38. Temperature distribution in Lake Mead at depth of 10 feet, cruise X, November 27-30, 1948.....	139
39. Salinity distribution at surface of Lake Mead, cruise I, February 25-29, 1948.....	140
40. Temperature distribution in Lake Mead at depth of 10 feet, cruise I, February 25-29, 1948.....	141
41. Average monthly values of energy-budget parameters as computed for Lake Mead, 1948-49.....	144
42. Average monthly values of Q_e and Q_h	144
43. Comparison of evaporation as computed from energy budget with pan evaporation.....	146
44. Relation of core length to depth of penetration by gravity-core sampler.....	150
45. Typical cumulative size-frequency curve for silt and clay samples from the sediment accumulated in Lake Mead.....	156
46. Fathograms obtained by low-frequency echo-sounding equipment in Gregg, Virgin, and Boulder Basins.....	159
47. Longitudinal section through the Colorado delta, showing relation of bottomset beds to topset and foreset beds.....	169
48. Textural characteristics of the surficial deposits of the Colorado delta along the thalweg.....	174
49. Typical vertical sections of the bottomset beds of the Colorado delta, showing the variations in water content and median particle size.....	176
50. Specific weight of the sediment deposit in the Colorado delta along the thalweg.....	179
51. Relations of gas content, organic content, and temperature gradient in longitudinal section through the Colorado delta.....	181
52. Vertical distribution of temperature in the bottomset beds of the Colorado delta.....	182
53. Cumulative curves showing estimated average size distribution of the accumulated sediment in each of the eight selected lake areas.....	198
54. Cumulative curves showing the estimated average size distribution of the accumulated sediment in several of the lake areas combined.....	199
55. Distribution of density during underflow of November 1948 in vertical section at mile 301.9, in Virgin Canyon.....	205
56. Percentage distribution of sediment transported by turbidity currents in relation to distance from the east end of the lake, measured along the buried Colorado River channel.....	205
57. Diagrammatic representation of the surface of the sediment that would be accumulated in Lake Mead when the lake is filled to permanent spillway level.....	216
58. Water content and approximate specific weight of silt and clay, plotted as a function of depth.....	217
59. Curve showing the estimated sediment-storage capacity of Lake Mead when the accumulated sediment reaches the elevation of the permanent spillway crest at Hoover Dam.....	219
60. Cumulative curve showing the estimated weight of sediment, and of coarse and fine components, when the reservoir becomes filled with sediment.....	220
61. Hypothetical bottom topography of Lake Mead at its terminal stage.....	227
62. Monthly sediment load, discharge, and water temperature at Grand Canyon, 1935-49.....	236
63. Relation of monthly runoff to sediment load at Grand Canyon.....	237
64. Actuarial projections for Lake Mead, showing estimated dates when it will be completely filled with sediment.....	242
65. Weighted average salinity of inflowing and outflowing water of Lake Mead since 1935.....	243

TABLES

	Page
TABLE 1. Subsidence at points near lake shore with respect to Hoover Dam.....	38
2. Revisions of 1935 area and capacity tables.....	86
3. Area of Lake Mead as a function of elevation, 1948-49.....	89
4. Usable capacity as a function of elevation, 1948-49.....	90
5. Lake Mead reservoir volumes by basins, 1948-49.....	91
6. Sediment volumes in Lake Mead by basins, 1948-49.....	92
7. Comparative data showing areas, capacities, and sediment volumes as a function of elevation.....	93
8. Comparative summary, 1935 and 1948-49.....	93
9. Lake Mead water budget, 1935 to 1950.....	97
10. Annual runoff and suspended load of Colorado River near Grand Canyon, Ariz.....	103
11. Chemical analyses of water samples of inflow and outflow, and from various points and depths in Lake Mead..	108
12. Reported density currents in Lake Mead, and antecedent conditions at Grand Canyon, 1935 to 1949.....	111
13. Specific conductance of water at four points in Lake Mead, 1937 and 1938.....	115
14. Dissolved solids in surface samples from Lake Mead, 1948.....	116
15. Preliminary energy budget for Lake Mead.....	145
16. Monthly evaporation as determined from energy budget.....	145
17. Comparison of evaporation with other pertinent factors.....	145
18. Distribution of cores and samples from the sediment accumulated in Lake Mead.....	149
19. Penetration depths and core lengths obtained by gravity core sampler.....	151
20. Penetration depths and core lengths obtained by piston core sampler.....	151
21. Combined Udden and Wentworth size classification.....	155
22. Median particle diameters of samples from bottomset beds of Colorado delta, as determined by analyses in a dispersed medium and in untreated lake water.....	155
23. Chemical analyses of samples from the sediment deposits in Lake Mead.....	183
24. Characteristics of calcium carbonate and organic matter in selected samples from the Colorado delta.....	184
25. Characteristics of sediment between intake towers at Hoover Dam.....	187
26. Increase in temperature by bacterial action.....	191
27. Volume, weight, and particle size of sediment in individual basins, Lake Mead.....	196
28. Estimated average chemical composition of the sediment accumulated in the Colorado delta, 1935-48.....	198
29. Estimated weight, volume, and specific weight of the sediment in Lake Mead when filled under conditions assumed.....	221

COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY OF SEDIMENTATION IN LAKE MEAD, 1948-49

By W. O. SMITH, C. P. VETTER, G. B. CUMMINGS, and others

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

By W. O. SMITH, C. P. VETTER, and G. B. CUMMINGS

This report presents the results of studies of Lake Mead and its environs made in 1948-49. In the hydrographic survey of the lake, depths were measured by echo sounding. The equipment operating at 50 kilocycles gave a consistent indication of the top of the sediment, with error of less than 2 feet. The instruments operating at 14.25 kilocycles produced an echo from the sediment surface and, where the sediments were dominantly silt and clay of moderate to high water content, produced an echo from the bottom of the old river bed as well. In the Boulder Basin, complete penetration of some 140 feet of soft sediment was obtained.

Area and capacity tables, prepared on the basis of this hydrographic survey, show that the total capacity of the reservoir was reduced 4.9 percent during the first 14 years after Hoover Dam was completed, but that the usable capacity was reduced only 3.2 percent. Practically all this reduction was caused by accumulation of sediment in the reservoir. Studies of inflow and outflow indicate that the reservoir has a total storage capacity about 12 percent greater than that shown by the area-capacity table, because of "bank" storage (ground-water storage) in the bottom and sides of the reservoir. Thus the total capacity in 1949 was greater than the quantity shown by the original 1935 area and capacity table, even though large quantities of sediment had been deposited in the reservoir during the 14 years.

The sediment accumulated in Lake Mead has formed two deltas. One extends from Bridge Canyon to Hoover Dam along the thalweg of the Colorado River; the other, of much smaller size, extends along the inundated Virgin River channel. Most of the sediment brought into Lake Mead is supplied by the Colorado River and accumulates in its delta, which thickens progressively from Bridge Canyon to Pierce Basin, where it attains a maximum thickness of 270 feet. Topset beds make up the surface of this part of the delta. The foreset beds that make up the delta front in Pierce Basin dip sharply beneath the lake surface for a distance of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles, measured along the course of the submerged Colorado River channel. From the foot of the delta front to Hoover Dam the slope of the bottomset beds ranges from 9 feet per mile, between the delta front and the mouth of Iceberg Canyon, to less than 1 foot per mile, in the southern part of Boulder Basin. The bottomset beds in 1948 had a minimum thickness of 45 feet in the Temple Bar area, increasing progressively to 106 feet at the dam.

According to computations of the volume and weight of the accumulated sediment, about 2,000 million tons was deposited in the reservoir in 14 years; this is within 2 percent of the amount calculated from measurements of the suspended sedi-

ment carried by the inflowing rivers. It is estimated that the sediment capacity of the reservoir, when filled to the permanent spillway crest, is about 75,000 million tons. This quantity is 37 times as great as the amount which occupied 4.9 percent of the reservoir capacity in 1948-49. The prediction is based on estimates that the sediment-storage capacity is about 25 percent greater than the water-storage capacity, and that the mean specific weight of the sediment will ultimately be nearly 50 percent greater than in 1948-49, owing to compaction of the clay and silt. The sediment contributed by the Colorado River averages about 45 percent sand and 55 percent silt and clay. Practically all the clay and much of the silt has been transported by turbidity currents into the lowest parts of the reservoir.

The sediment level at the dam will reach the elevation of the lower outlet gates and the present dead-storage space will be filled when the total accumulation becomes about seven times as great as the amount brought into the lake from 1935 to 1948. The water-storage capacity below the permanent spillway crest will then be about 22 million acre-feet. This prediction is based on certain assumptions, of which an important one concerns reservoir operation. It is assumed that the average operating level will be at spillway level, 35 feet higher than at present, and on that assumption it is predicted that approximately 20 percent of the total sediment load will be deposited above the level of the permanent spillway crest. Lower average operating levels will reduce the proportion of sediment deposited in the upper part of the reservoir, extend the delta front downlake, reduce the area available for deposition of silt and clay, and result in a more rapid rise of the sediment level at the dam.

If the sediment carried by the river in the years 1926-50 represents the long-term average rate of accumulation in Lake Mead, it will be more than 4 centuries before the reservoir is filled with sediment to the level of the permanent spillway crest. The rate of sedimentation since the first year of Lake Mead (1935) has been about 20 percent lower than this 25-year average, and if that rate continues in the future, the life of the reservoir will be correspondingly greater. Construction of upstream reservoirs to capture some of the inflowing sediment, or transportation of sediment in the outflow through Hoover Dam, would also increase the life of the reservoir.

The total bacterial population in the sediment near the dam was found to exceed 1 million bacteria per gram at all depths, which is comparable with the bacterial population in raw sewage. Near the mud surface there is a minimum of 10 million bacteria per gram. By contrast, the water less than a foot above the sediment surface contained only 100 bacteria per gram. By comparison with marine and natural lake muds, the Lake Mead sediments are unique in containing a high bacterial population distributed uniformly throughout a deep and loosely packed layer. Laboratory tests indicate that the abundance

and activity of the microflora have contributed to the heating of the fresh sediment layer in Lake Mead, and also that they affect the hydrogen-ion concentration of the water in the sediment, which in turn influences the rate of sediment compaction.

In the first 12 years of Lake Mead, the dissolved mineral matter in the outflowing water was significantly greater than the average in the inflowing water, owing in part to solution of gypsum and rock salt from the bed of the reservoir. Currently the increased dissolved solids in the outflowing water can be accounted for almost entirely by evaporation from the reservoir, which is about 5 to 7 percent of the annual inflow. The water from Lake Mead is generally of better quality than the water that was diverted from the river for irrigation prior to regulation by Hoover Dam, because it represents an average of the poor water of low stages and the excellent water from melting snow. Since 1935 the concentration of dissolved solids in the inflow has ranged from 225 to 1,720 parts per million, but in the outflow from Lake Mead the concentration has ranged only from 621 to 824 ppm. The "alkali" problem of the areas downstream that are irrigated with the Colorado River water has been decreased to an appreciable extent because of this stabilization.

Oceanographic techniques were utilized to establish the general features of the circulation in Lake Mead. Analysis of the data collected during 12 monthly cruises on Lake Mead indicates a distinct and orderly cyclic progression in the distribution of properties and in the implied circulation, which can be related to the seasonal changes of weather and river inflow.

The changes in elevation measured by precise leveling since 1935 indicate that the weight of water and sediment in the reservoir has caused some subsidence, and that there has also been an extensive tilting subsidence involving the entire lake basin and extending tens of miles farther south. The amount of lowering of bench marks around the reservoir, calculated with respect to a bench mark at Cane Springs, Nev., has been

relatively small. Hoover Dam was lowered about 0.4 foot between 1935 and 1950, and bench marks along the shores of the Boulder and Virgin Basins of the lake (which have 60 percent of the reservoir storage capacity) have been lowered as much as 0.6 foot. On the other hand, bench marks near the Overton Arm and east of Virgin Canyon have not dropped as much as those near the dam. It is concluded that the differential subsidence has not changed the reservoir capacity appreciably.

Since 1941 there has been more subsidence at the dam than at any of the six locations—where the level net provides data as to elevations—near the shore of the reservoir. The leveling operation of 1941 was performed while the reservoir was filled nearly to capacity, and the differential rise at these six locations by 1950 may be an indication of elastic rebound with reduced load.

Lake Mead had a noteworthy predecessor in the geologic past. The Colorado River was dammed during the Pleistocene epoch, forming a lake that was deeper and more extensive than Lake Mead, in which there was delta deposition similar to that which has begun since the completion of Hoover Dam. The lower part of the Chemehuevi formation (deposited in that lake) consists chiefly of banded clay, presumably deposited as bottomset beds in a deep lake. This clay is thin in Iceberg Canyon and thicker downstream; extensive remnants occur near Davis Dam, about 60 miles below Hoover Dam. Sand overlies the clay, and composes most of the thickness of the formation in upstream areas. The upper part of the formation consists of river gravel and cobbles, presumably deposited after the lake was filled with fine sediment. Some of these gravels are about 300 feet above the high-water level of Lake Mead. The cobbles in the upper part of the Chemehuevi formation were transported by a larger and more powerful stream than the present Colorado River, which apparently carries nothing coarser than fine gravel into the deltaic fill in the Lower Granite Gorge.