GSA Hosts First Leadership Weekend, p.18

GSA TODAY

VOL. 18, No. 8 A PUBLICATION OF THE GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA AUGUST 2008



Is there enough sand?

Evaluating the fate of Grand Canyon sandbars

Inside:

Panel Seeks Input on GSA Position Statement Draft, p. 22

Overarching 2008 Joint Annual Meeting Themes, p. 30

GSA TODAY

VOLUME 18, NUMBER 8 ▲ AUGUST 2008

SCIENCE ARTICLE

4 **Is there enough sand? Evaluating the fate of Grand Canyon sandbars**
Scott A. Wright, John C. Schmidt, Theodore S. Melis, David J. Topping, and David M. Rubin

Cover: Matched views of the Colorado River downstream from Nankoweap Creek in Grand Canyon National Park, ~52.8 miles from Lees Ferry, Arizona, USA. Top: 18 Jan. 1890. Robert Brewster Stanton photographed this downstream view showing the large, typically nonvegetated fluvial sandbar deposits common in Grand Canyon prior to river regulation (R.B. Stanton 361, courtesy of the National Archives). Bottom: 5 Feb. 1991. Repeat view of Stanton's location shows sandbar loss and increased riparian vegetation below Glen Canyon Dam since it was closed in 1963 (USGS, Stake 1424b). See "Is there enough sand? Evaluating the fate of Grand Canyon sandbars" by S.A. Wright et al., p. 4–10.

10 **What is a DOI?**
12 **GeoHealth I:** Building Bridges across the Geological and Health Sciences
14 **International Year of Planet Earth 2008**
15 **2009 GSA Section Meeting Calendar**
17 **Geologic Past**—Water through the Hands of Time
18 **GSA Hosts First Leadership Weekend**
21 **GSA Awards 2008 Intel International Science and Engineering Fair Prize**
21 **2008 John C. Frye Memorial Award in Environmental Geology**
22 **Panel Seeks Input on GSA Position Statement**
24 **2007–2008 Congressional Science Fellow Report:** A Risky Proposition
26 **GSA Mentoring Programs:** A Win-Win Opportunity
28 **GSA Foundation Update**
29 **Check out the GSA Education and Outreach Program!**
30 **Overarching 2008 Joint Annual Meeting Themes**
31 **2008 Joint Annual Meeting**—Mentor Programs
31 **2008 Joint Annual Meeting**—Letter
32 **2008 Joint Annual Meeting**—Student Travel Grants
33 **2008 Joint Annual Meeting**—Guest Program
33 **2008 Joint Annual Meeting**—Child Care
34 **2008 Joint Annual Meeting**—Public Forum
35 **2008 Joint Annual Meeting**—Short Courses
41 **2008 Joint Annual Meeting**—Field Trips
43 **2008 Joint Annual Meeting**—Housing
43 **2008 Joint Annual Meeting**—Teacher Forum
44 **Classified Advertising**
46 **Journal Highlights**

Erratum: Two units in the July *GSA Today* science article (v. 18, no. 7, p. 4–11) are incorrect: (1) Baoshan was used when the subject was Baoxing, and (2) Longquan was used rather than Longchuan. Please make a note of these corrections.

planetearth® Earth Sciences for Society

GSA celebrates our three-year association with the International Year of Planet Earth.

GSA TODAY publishes news and information for more than 20,000 GSA members and subscribing libraries. *GSA TODAY* (ISSN 1052-5173 USPS 0456-530) is published 11 times per year, monthly, with a combined April/May issue, by The Geological Society of America®, Inc., with offices at 3300 Penrose Place, Boulder, Colorado. Mailing address: P.O. Box 9140, Boulder, CO 80301-9140, USA. Periodicals postage paid at Boulder, Colorado, and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to *GSA Today*, GSA Sales and Service, P.O. Box 9140, Boulder, CO 80301-9140. GSA provides this and other forums for the presentation of diverse opinions and positions by scientists worldwide, regardless of their race, citizenship, gender, religion, or political viewpoint. Opinions presented in this publication do not reflect official positions of the Society.

Copyright © 2008, The Geological Society of America (GSA). All rights reserved. Copyright not claimed on content prepared wholly by U.S. government employees within scope of their employment. Individual scientists are hereby granted permission, without fees or further requests to GSA, to use a single figure, a single table, and/or a brief paragraph of text in other subsequent works and to make unlimited photocopies of items in this journal for noncommercial use in classrooms to further education and science. For any other use, contact Permissions, GSA, P.O. Box 9140, Boulder, CO 80301-9140, USA, Fax +1-303-357-1073, editing@geosociety.org.

SUBSCRIPTIONS for 2008 calendar year: Society Members: *GSA Today* is provided as part of membership dues. Contact GSA Sales and Service at +1-888-443-4472, +1-303-357-1000, option 3, or gsaservice@geosociety.org for membership information. Nonmembers & Institutions: Free with paid subscription to both *GSA Bulletin* and *Geology*, otherwise US$60. Contact Subscription Services at +1-800-627-0629 or gsa@allenpress.com. Also available on an annual CD-ROM (with GSA's journals, GSA Data Repository, and an Electronic Retrospective Index to journal articles from 1972); US$99 to GSA Members, others call GSA Subscription Services for prices and details. Claims: For nonreceipt or for damaged copies, members contact GSA Sales and Service; all others contact Subscription Services. Claims are honored for one year; please allow sufficient delivery time for overseas copies, up to six months.

***GSA TODAY* STAFF:**
Executive Director and Publisher: John W. Hess
Science Editors: Stephen T. Johnston, University of Victoria, School of Earth & Ocean Sciences, Victoria, British Columbia V8W 3P6, Canada, stj@uvic.ca; and David E. Fastovsky, University of Rhode Island, Department of Geosciences, Woodward Hall, Rm. 317, Kingston, Rhode Island 02881, USA, defastov@uri.edu.
Managing Editor: Kristen E. Asmus, kasmus@geosociety.org
Graphics Production: Margo Y. Sajban

ADVERTISING:
Classifieds & Display: Ann Crawford, +1-800-472-1988, ext. 1053, +1-303-357-1053, Fax +1-303-357-1070; acrawford@geosociety.org

GSA ONLINE: www.geosociety.org

Printed in the USA using pure soy inks.

THE GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA®

FSC Mixed Sources
Product group from well-managed forests, controlled sources and recycled wood or fiber
www.fsc.org Cert no. SW-COC-002272
© 1996 Forest Stewardship Council

Is there enough sand?
Evaluating the fate of Grand Canyon sandbars

Scott A. Wright*, *U.S. Geological Survey, California Water Science Center, 6000 J Street, Sacramento, Calif., 95819, USA;* ***John C. Schmidt****, *Department of Watershed Sciences, Utah State University, Logan, Utah 84322, USA;* ***Theodore S. Melis****, ***David J. Topping****, *U.S. Geological Survey, Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center, 2255 N. Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, Ariz. 86001, USA;* ***David M. Rubin****, *U.S. Geological Survey, Pacific Science Center, 400 Natural Bridge Drive, Santa Cruz, Calif. 95060, USA.*

ABSTRACT

Large dams have the potential to dramatically alter the flow regime, geomorphology, and aquatic ecosystem of downstream river reaches. Development of flow release regimes in order to meet multiple objectives is a challenge facing dam operators, resource managers, and scientists. Herein, we review previous work and present new analyses related to the effects of Glen Canyon Dam on the downstream reach of the Colorado River in Marble and Grand Canyons. The dam traps the entire incoming sediment load in Lake Powell and modulates the hydrologic regime by, for example, eliminating spring snowmelt floods, resulting in changes in the geomorphology of the river downstream. The primary geomorphic impact has been the erosion of sandbars along the banks of the river. Recognition of this impact has led to many scientific studies and a variety of experimental operations of Glen Canyon Dam with the goal of rebuilding the eroding sandbars. These efforts have thus far been generally unsuccessful and the question remains as to whether or not the dam can be operated such that sandbars can be rebuilt and maintained over extended periods with the existing sediment supply. We attempt to answer this question by evaluating a dam operation that may be considered a "best-case scenario" for rebuilding and maintaining eroded sandbars. Our analysis suggests that this best-case scenario may indeed have viability for rebuilding sandbars, and that the initial rate at which sandbars could be rebuilt is comparable to the rate at which sandbars have been eroded since dam construction. The question remains open as to the viability of operations that deviate from the best-case scenario that we have defined.

INTRODUCTION

Large dams have the potential to profoundly transform downstream riverine hydrology, geomorphology, and ecosystem function (Nilsson et al., 2005; Collier et al., 2000; Williams and Wolman, 1984; Syvitski et al., 2005). Flood control and elimination of the upstream sediment supply perturb the downstream sediment balance (Grant et al. 2003; Schmidt and Wilcock, 2008). Immediately below a large dam, sediment deficit conditions exist because the transport capacity of the river exceeds the supply. In such a situation, fine sediment is evacuated from the channel, and the bed may become incised, potentially causing disconnection with the pre-dam floodplain and changing the distribution and availability of aquatic habitats. Sediment evacuation caused by deficit conditions has been described on many large rivers, including the Rio Grande below Elephant Butte Dam (Stevens, 1938), and the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam (Grams et al., 2007) and Hoover Dam (Borland and Miller, 1960). At some point farther downstream, sediment mass balance conditions may shift to surplus if there is sufficient resupply of sediment by tributaries. An extreme example of surplus is that of the Rio Grande near Presidio, Texas (Everitt, 1993). The location of the transition from deficit to surplus depends on the rate that downstream tributaries supply sediment as well as the flow regime released from the dam, which controls the transport capacity of the post-dam river. Understanding the relationship between downstream sediment supply and transport capacity is essential for resource management downstream from dams where aquatic habitat is linked to river morphology.

One notable effort to understand these relationships has been ongoing for several decades on the Colorado River in Glen and Grand Canyons downstream from Glen Canyon Dam (Fig. 1). The completion of Glen Canyon Dam in 1963 substantially reduced the downstream sediment supply by trapping in Lake Powell reservoir (Topping et al., 2000a, 2000b). In addition, flow regulation by the dam has eliminated the large annual snowmelt floods while increasing base flows (Topping et al., 2003); flow releases through the power plant also contain seasonal and daily cycles that follow electricity demand in the western U.S. (White et al., 2005). Environmental flow constraints were imposed on the dam's power plant operation after 1991 due to perceived effects on downstream physical, biological, and cultural resources (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1995, 1996). These "Record-of-Decision" (ROD) operations reduced the daily range and daily peaks of fluctuating flows, and subsequent experimental releases have included low steady flows and large simulated floods. However, more than four decades after construction of this large dam (the fourth highest in the United States) and after considerable scientific research and monitoring, scientists and river stakeholders continue to debate its impacts on downstream resources and how to reverse those environmental conditions that are deemed undesirable by society (Lovich and Melis, 2005; Melis et al., 2006).

One of the distinctive environmental attributes of the pre-dam river are sandbars that form in large eddies downstream of tributary debris fans (Schmidt, 1990; Schmidt and Rubin, 1995; Fig. 2) and floodplain-like channel-margin deposits.

*E-mails: sawright@usgs.gov; jschmidt@cnr.usu.edu; tmelis@usgs.gov; dtopping@usgs.gov; drubin@usgs.gov

GSA Today, v. 18, no. 8, doi: 10.1130/GSATG12A.1



Figure 1. Location map of the Colorado River between Lakes Powell and Mead in northern Arizona, USA. Marble Canyon is the reach of river between Lees Ferry and the confluence with the Little Colorado River.



Figure 2. Example of a recirculating eddy and sandbar formed around the flow reattachment point along the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam. Image on right reproduced from Webb et al. (2005).

These sandbars are considered valuable resources by stakeholders of the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program (www.usbr.gov/uc/rm/amp/index.html) for a variety of reasons: they are a fundamental element of the pre-dam riverscape within Grand Canyon National Park; they provide Park visitors, such as river runners and hikers, with recreational areas; they create zones of low-velocity aquatic habitat for juvenile native fish; they are the substrate for unique but limited riparian vegetation in an arid setting; and they are a source of sand for upslope wind-driven transport that may help protect archaeological resources.

Several attempts have been made at evaluating the post-dam sand budget; i.e., determining whether or not the amount of sand supplied by tributaries downstream of the dam exceeds the capacity of the regulated river to transport sand (see review in Wright et al., 2005). The numerous studies of the post-dam sand budget have come to conflicting results, but recent studies have concluded that the Colorado River between the dam and Phantom Ranch (Fig. 1) was evacuated of fine sediment from much of its bed and large parts of its eddies during the first three decades after dam closure and that erosion continues at a much slower rate today (Rubin et al., 2002; Schmidt et al., 2004; Wright et al., 2005; Webb et al., 2002). Because sandbars have continued to erode under ROD operations, the primary sediment-related question identified by scientists at a knowledge assessment workshop in July 2005 (Melis et al., 2006) was, "Is there a 'flow-only' operation that will rebuild and maintain sandbar habitats over decadal time scales?"

The goal of the analysis presented here is to evaluate what might be considered the "best-case flow-only scenario" for reversing the trend of sandbar erosion without sediment augmentation from sources in the upstream reservoir (Randle et al., 2007). Our analysis is conceptual but nevertheless reveals whether there is any reasonable expectation that a flow-only scenario can rebuild and maintain eroding sandbars in the post-dam era. If there is, then this analysis provides a basis for further analyses of other scenarios and sets a best-case expectation for the rate at which sandbars could be rebuilt. If not, then the analysis sets the stage for managers' value-based discussions related to costs and benefits associated with non-flow options such as sediment augmentation. The best-case flow-only scenario is relatively easy to evaluate with existing knowledge as compared to more complex scenarios, and this analysis helps to identify areas of uncertainty that require future research.

OPTIMAL DAM OPERATIONS FOR REBUILDING SANDBARS

For the analysis presented herein, flow releases from Glen Canyon Dam can be broken into two components: (1) short-duration (on a time scale of days) dam releases that are substantially higher than "normal" releases—herein referred to as "high flow events"; and (2) intervening, or "normal," operations for the remainder of the year. The intervening operations control the amount of sand that is retained, if any, in the reach during tributary flooding and the amount that is exported during periods of tributary quiescence. High flow events are required to transfer sand from the channel bed and low-elevation parts of sandbars, where sand is first deposited when a tributary brings sediment into the Colorado River, to higher-stage environments inundated only during floods, such as high-elevation parts of sandbars and other channel-margin deposits.

The "optimal" intervening dam operation is that which will result in the most tributary sand being available in the mainstem Colorado River for redistribution during high flow events. It is not difficult to specify this optimum operation because sediment transport theory dictates that a steady flow will transport less sand than an equivalent-volume fluctuating flow (e.g., ASCE, 1975). Thus, dam releases that vary seasonally and daily to meet electricity demand, such as approved by the ROD, are not optimal for retaining sand on the river bed prior to redistribution to higher elevations by high flow events. Higher sand transport rates during fluctuating flows as compared to steady flows were recognized in the 1995 Environmental Impact Statement (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1995). Thus, for a given annual volume release, the optimal dam operation for accumulating tributary sand inputs is a constant, steady flow over the entire year. The optimal annual release volume for accumulating tributary sand is the minimum volume stipulated by the various agreements that govern water delivery between the upper and lower Colorado River basins.

It is more difficult to specify the optimal frequency and hydrograph shape of short-duration high flow events, because these releases do not optimize overall sand storage. That is, high flow events have been called a "double-edged sword" by Rubin et al. (2002), because they necessarily export relatively large volumes of sand in order to transfer sand to high-elevation portions of sandbars. Thus, the optimal use of high flow events is such that they maximize storage of sand in "desirable" environments while attempting to minimize downstream export. Because we are currently unable to precisely define this optimal use, we assume an annual high flow event with a hydrograph shape that is dictated by the amount of sand that has accumulated in a given year. For example, in years with very low tributary inputs there might be no high flow event or one with a small peak of only a few hours' duration. Or, in a year with tributary inputs that are substantially above average, the high flow event may have a higher peak and longer duration. These details are not necessary for the analysis in the following section. Also, the timing of the annual high flow event is not important for our analysis so long as there is abundant sand available in the river channel below the dam from recent tributary floods.

EVALUATION OF THE OPTIMAL DAM OPERATIONS

Marble Canyon Sand Budget

We focus our analysis on Marble Canyon, the 100-km reach of the Colorado River situated between the confluences of the Paria River, the first major tributary below the dam, and Little Colorado River (Fig. 1), because this is the first reach downstream of the dam with a significant post-dam sand supply. A simple annual average sand budget for this reach is

$$\Delta M = M_{in} - M_{io} - M_{bf}, \quad (1)$$

where ΔM is the change in sand mass in the reach, M_{in} is the incoming mass of sand from the Paria River and other smaller

tributaries, M_{io} is the mass of sand exported during intervening operations, and M_{bf} is the mass exported during high flows. The mass of sand coming into the reach from upstream (Glen Canyon) is assumed to be zero because releases from the dam contain almost no sediment, and the 25-km-long reach from the dam to Lees Ferry is substantially depleted of sand (Grams et al., 2007). Since the tributary inputs will almost always occur during intervening operations, M_{in} and M_{io} can be combined into a term representing the change in storage during intervening operations:

$$\Delta M = \Delta M_{io} - M_{bf}, \quad (2)$$

where $\Delta M_{io} = M_{in} - M_{io}$. From (Eq. 2) it is apparent that in order for the overall storage in the reach to be positive, the export during high flow events must be less than the amount of sand that accumulates in the reach during intervening operations. It follows that if ΔM_{io} is negative, then no sand would be available, on average, for redistribution during high flows, and it would thus be impossible to rebuild and maintain sandbars. The first step, then, in evaluating the optimal dam operation is to estimate the potential sand accumulation during intervening operations (i.e., the sign and magnitude of ΔM_{io}).

Accumulation during Intervening Operations

The average annual sand supply from tributaries (M_{in}) is relatively well constrained. The Paria River is the primary sand supply to Marble Canyon (Fig. 1) and delivers ~1,500,000 metric tons of sand per year (t/yr) (Topping et al., 2000a). Smaller tributaries are estimated to supply ~290,000 t/yr to Marble Canyon (Webb et al., 2000), resulting in total tributary sand supply of ~1,800,000 yr. Pre-dam, ~23,000,000 yr of sand was supplied from the watershed upstream from the Paria River (Topping et al., 2000a), such that the post-dam sand supply to Marble Canyon is ~7%–8% of the pre-dam supply.

In order to estimate export during intervening operations, the year-round steady flow rate must be specified. This rate depends on the minimum annual release volume from the dam. In December 2007, the U.S. Secretary of the Interior signed a ROD that implemented interim guidelines for the coordinated operation of Lakes Powell and Mead (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2007a). These interim guidelines stipulate a minimum objective release volume of 10.2×10^9 m^3/yr (8.23 million acre-feet [MAF]) as well as operational tiers under which the annual release may be reduced to as low as 8.6×10^9 m^3 (7.0 MAF). However, the final environmental impact statement concludes that during the period 2008–2026, the probability of releases being below the minimum objective is ~10% (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2007b, figures 4.3-13, p. 4-43). Because of this relatively low probability and the uncertainty surrounding future hydrologic conditions in the basin (Barnett et al., 2008; Seager et al., 2007), we chose to evaluate the minimum objective release volume of 10.2×10^9 m^3 (8.23 MAF), which, averaged over the entire year, equates to a steady flow of 322 m^3/s. We also note that this has been the annual release volume since 2001 due to drought conditions and low reservoir levels.

The next step is to estimate the sand concentration at the steady 322 m^3/s water discharge. Several previous studies have attempted to define a relationship between water discharge and sand concentration, such as Randle and Pemberton (1987), upon which the ROD operation was based. Subsequent research, however, has shown that the relationship between suspended-sand concentration and water discharge is not constant in this reach of river; rather, substantial shifts occur due to changes in the upstream supply of sand (Topping et al., 1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2005, 2007; Rubin and Topping, 2001). These shifts make the estimation of sand concentration at a steady 322 m^3/s water discharge a more complicated affair than in rivers where discharge and sediment supply are more in equilibrium. That is, some assumptions regarding the state of sand supply must be made in order to estimate the sand concentration.

Figure 3 shows suspended-sand concentration versus water discharge as measured at two gages in Marble Canyon between August 1999 and January 2008, illustrating the wide range in sand concentration that can occur for a given water discharge. The 30-mile gage is located in middle Marble Canyon, and the 61-mile gage is located at the lower end of Marble Canyon (see Topping et al., 2006a, 2006b). At the 30-mile gage, sand concentrations for flows within ±5% of 322 m^3/s ranged from 9 to 104 mg/L, with median, mean, and standard deviation of 51, 51, and 31 mg/L, respectively. At the 61-mile gage, sand concentrations ranged from 11 to 150 mg/L, with median, mean, and standard deviation of 23, 34, and 29 mg/L, respectively. Figure 4 illustrates the effects of sand supply on sand concentration by plotting the concentrations contained in the box of Figure 3 along with the daily water discharge record for the Paria River (U.S. Geological Survey gage 09382000). During periods of little tributary activity, when the sand budget tends to be negative under ROD releases, such as 2001–2003 (Wright et al., 2005), the sand concentrations are lower. During periods



Figure 3. Suspended-sand concentration versus water discharge as measured in middle Marble Canyon (30-mile gage) and at the lower end of Marble Canyon (61-mile gage) for August 1999–January 2008. Bold rectangle encloses measurements made in the water discharge range of 322 m^3/s ±5%.



Figure 4. Paria River water discharge (top) and mainstem Colorado River sand concentrations for mainstem discharges in the 322 m^3/s ±5% range (bottom) for October 2000–April 2008. Sand concentrations increased during temporary sand accumulation in Marble Canyon following Paria floods in fall 2004, winter 2005, and fall 2006 and subsequently decreased as the tributary sand was exported from Marble Canyon.

of substantial tributary flooding and temporary accumulation of sand in Marble Canyon, such as fall 2004 (Topping et al., 2006b), winter 2005, and fall 2006 (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2008), concentrations are higher because sand supply is greater.

Because the steady 322 m^3/s operation is expected to transport substantially less sand than ROD operations, the sand supply should be greater on average such that sand concentrations under this operation would tend toward the high end of those measured during 1999–2008. Given this, our best estimate is based on the period from October 2006–January 2008, because tributary inputs were above average, dam releases were minimum annual volumes, and substantial accumulation of sand occurred in Marble Canyon (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2008). The median sand concentration measured during this period, based on both Marble Canyon gages, was 54 mg/L (Fig. 4), which when combined with steady 322 m^3/s yields an annual sand flux of ~500,000 t. This is the value we have used for M_{io} in subsequent calculations while acknowledging substantial uncertainty in the estimate due to the difficulty in projecting future sand supply conditions.

Redistribution during High Flow Events

Using these estimates for tributary inputs (1,800,000 t) and export during intervening operations (500,000 t), the potential accumulation in Marble Canyon, ΔM_{io}, is ~1,300,000 t. This is the mass of sand, on average, that would be available for redistribution during a high flow and is near the upper bound of the estimate for sand storage in upper Marble Canyon going into the November 2004 high flow (Topping et al., 2006a). In the pre-dam river, Topping et al. (2000a) estimated seasonal fine sediment accumulation in an average year of ~7,000,000 t, such that the potential accumulation during intervening dam operations described herein is ~20% of the estimated pre-dam seasonal accumulation. There would be substantial variation in the amount of sand accumulation from year to year owing to variability in tributary inputs, but we have chosen to focus on the average response instead of the variability because it provides more insight with respect to the long-term prospects for rebuilding and maintaining sandbars.

The degree to which sandbars can be rebuilt depends on how much of the sand that accumulates during intervening operations remains in sandbars following a high flow event. That is, what fraction of the accumulated sand is exported downstream, eventually to Lake Mead, versus deposited in sandbars? Topping et al. (2006b) estimated that ~10%–20% of the tributary sand that had accumulated in upper Marble Canyon was still in the reach following the 2004 high flow, presumably in sandbars. Though the 1996 high flow event resulted in an overall net loss of sediment from sandbars (Schmidt, 1999; Hazel et al., 2006), there was a gain in high-elevation volume ~20% of that was the losses from the low-elevation portions of sandbars and the channel. Hazel et al. (2006) estimated the potential active storage in sandbars in Marble Canyon to be ~13,000,000 t, or ~20% of the total pre-dam fine sediment load. Thus, it appears that a reasonable estimate for the fraction of sand transferred to sandbars during high flow events is ~10%–20% of the available supply. It follows, then, that ~200,000 t/yr of the 1,300,000 t/yr of potential sand accumulation could go toward building sandbars.

Comparison with Post-Dam Erosion Rates

Several existing data sets and previous analyses facilitate comparison of the potential annual accumulation in sandbars with the rate of sandbar erosion since dam closure. Using daily sediment records from gages near Lees Ferry and Phantom Ranch (Fig. 1), Rubin and Topping (2001) estimated that 16,000,000 t of fine sediment was eroded from this reach during high flow releases in April–June 1965. It is impossible to know precisely how much of this sediment came from sandbars versus the channel bed, but even a conservative estimate of 10% from sandbars yields 1,600,000 t of erosion during this three-month period, which is eight times our estimated potential annual accumulation. Schmidt et al. (2004) and Hazel et al. (2006) estimated the loss of fine sediment from sandbars from the pre-dam era through the 1990s to be ~6,000,000 t. Over the ~40 years since dam construction, this equates to an average annual erosion rate of ~150,000 t, which is in the same range as our estimated potential annual accumulation in sandbars (200,000 t). Thus, our analysis indicates that under the "best-case scenario" for hydrologic conditions and dam operations, sandbars could potentially be rebuilt, at least initially, at approximately the same rate as they have eroded since dam construction.

DISCUSSION

Though our analysis suggests potential annual sandbar accumulation at about the same rate as the post-dam erosion rate, we do not mean to imply that pre-dam conditions could be achieved in 40 years; this is almost certainly not the case. The cumulative rate of sandbar building depends on how much of the annual accumulation is maintained between high flow events, how the system changes as accumulation occurs over

time, and the frequency and magnitude of deviations in future annual release volumes from the minimum objective volume. Our analysis evaluates only the potential for accumulation in a given "average" year and does not address cumulative accumulation because there is too much uncertainty about how the system would evolve over multiple years, or even decades, under these operations. For example, we know that as accumulation occurs, sand export during intervening operations will increase, but we do not know by how much. Also, we have very little information on how stable the sandbars would be under steady flows. Finally, the probability that annual releases will exceed the minimum objective release in a given year is ~60% (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2007b, figure 4.3-13, p. 4–43) such that incremental gains in sandbar building made during periods of minimum objective releases would be subjected to higher flows more than half the time in the future.

The question remains open as to the viability of operations that deviate from the optimal conditions that we have defined, such as the current ROD operations that contain seasonal and daily variations in flow releases. One of the advantages of the operation we have defined is that it is simple enough that it can be evaluated relatively quickly with our existing knowledge. More complicated scenarios that include variability in upper basin hydrology, dam releases, and tributary sand supply become much more difficult to evaluate, particularly over extended periods, and require models that are as yet not available. Currently, all that we can say is that deviations from the optimal operation, such as annual volumes that exceed minimum objective releases and/or seasonal and daily flow variations, will either reduce the rate of sandbar building or lead to continued erosion instead of accumulation. That is, the sandbar rebuilding rate under the optimal operation can be considered an upper bound.

The ability to evaluate more complex operational scenarios will require future research, and one of the reasons for conducting the analysis presented here was to identify areas with the greatest uncertainty. Considerable research and monitoring has been conducted to define the magnitude of tributary inputs and the rate at which these inputs are exported from the system by ROD dam releases such that we feel these components of the analysis are relatively well constrained. The greatest uncertainty lies with our understanding of the processes of sandbar building during high flows and readjustment during subsequent flows. For example, our estimate for the transfer of sand from the channel to sandbars during high flows is made on the basis of only two experimental releases, conducted in 1996 and 2004 (data from a third experimental high flow test in March 2008 are still being collected and analyzed as of this writing). Also, significant uncertainty exists as to the rate at which recently deposited sandbars are eroded by subsequent flows, particularly under steady flows.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite extensive research and monitoring over the past several decades, the question of whether sandbars can be rebuilt and maintained in a sustainable manner along the Colorado River in Grand Canyon below Glen Canyon Dam has remained unanswered. Here, we have drawn from this extensive literature to conduct a relatively simple analysis of the potential for rebuilding sandbars under what might be considered a "best-case scenario" in terms of hydrologic conditions and dam operations. Our analysis suggests that this scenario may indeed have viability for rebuilding sandbars. We estimate a potential sandbar rebuilding rate of ~200,000 t/yr, which is comparable to the estimated average sandbar erosion rate since dam construction of ~150,000 t/yr. However, the similarity in these rates should not be used to infer that pre-dam conditions could be achieved in 40 years. Potential cumulative sandbar building would depend on how much of the annual accumulation is maintained between high flow events, how the system changes through time as accumulation occurs, and the frequency and magnitude of deviations in future annual release volumes from the minimum objective release. Deviations from our best-case scenario, such as seasonal variability in flow releases, daily flow fluctuations, or greater than minimum release volumes would either reduce the sandbar accumulation rate or result in continued erosion of sandbars.

REFERENCES CITED

ASCE, 1975, Sedimentation Engineering, Vanoni, V.A. ed.: ASCE Manuals and Reports on Engineering Practice, no. 54, 745 p.

Barnett, T.P., Pierce, D.W., Hidalgo, H.G., Bonfils, C., Santer, B.D., Das, T., Bala, G., Wood, A.W., Nozawa, T., Mirin, A.A., Cayan, D.R., and Dettinger, M.D., 2008, Human-induced changes in the hydrology of the western United States: Science, v. 319, p. 1080–1083, doi: 10.1126/science.1152538.

Borland, W.M., and Miller, C.R., 1960, Sediment problems of the lower Colorado River: Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers: Journal of the Hydraulics Division, v. 86, HY4, p. 61–87.

Collier, M., Webb, R.H., and Schmidt, J.C., 2000, Dams and Rivers, a primer on the downstream effects of dams: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1126, 94 p.

Everitt, B., 1993, Channel response to declining flow on the Rio Grande between Ft. Quitman and Presidio, Texas: Geomorphology, v. 6, p. 225–242, doi: 10.1016/0169-555X(93)90048-7.

Grams, P.E., Schmidt, J.C., and Topping, D.J., 2007, The rate and pattern of bed incision and bank adjustment on the Colorado River in Glen Canyon downstream from Glen Canyon Dam, 1956–2000: Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 119, no. 5–6, p. 556–575, doi: 10.1130/B25969.1.

Grant, G.E., Schmidt, J.C., and Lewis, S.L., 2003, A geological framework for interpreting downstream effects of dams on rivers, *in* O'Connor, J.E., and Grant, G.E., A Peculiar River, geology, geomorphology, and hydrology of the Deschutes River, Oregon: American Geophysical Union Water Science and Application 7, p. 203–219.

Hazel, J.E., Topping, D.J., Schmidt, J.C., and Kaplinski, M., 2006, Influence of a dam on fine-sediment storage in a canyon river: Journal of Geophysical Research, v. 111, p. F01025, doi: 10.1029/2004JF000193.

Lovich, J.E., and Melis, T.E., 2005, Lessons from 10 years of adaptive management in Grand Canyon, *in* Gloss, S.P., Lovich, J.E., and Melis, T.S., The state of the Colorado River ecosystem in Grand Canyon: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1282, p. 207–220.

Melis, T.S., Wright, S.A., Ralston, B.E., Fairley, H.C., Kennedy, T.A., Andersen, M.E., Coggins, L.G., Jr., and Korman, J., 2006, 2005 Knowledge Assessment of the Effects of Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River Ecosystem: An experimental planning support document: U.S. Geological Survey, 82 p.

Nilsson, C., Reidy, C.A., Dynesius, M., and Revenga, C., 2005, Fragmentation and flow regulation of the world's large river systems: Science, v. 308, p. 405–408, doi: 10.1126/science.1107887.

Randle, T.J., and Pemberton, E.L., 1987, Results and analysis of STARS modeling efforts of the Colorado River in Grand Canyon: Glen Canyon Environmental Studies Report, 41 p. plus 95 figures and 26 tables.

Randle, T.J., Lyons, J.K., Christensen, R.J., and Stephen, R.D., 2007, Colorado River ecosystem sediment augmentation appraisal engineering report: Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Sedimentation and River Hydraulics Group, Denver, Colorado, 71 p., http://www.gcmrc.gov/library/reports/physical/Fine_Sed/Randle2007.pdf (last accessed 12 May 2008).

Rubin, D.M., and Topping, D.J., 2001, Quantifying the relative importance of flow regulation and grain-size regulation of suspended-sediment transport (α), and tracking changes in bed-sediment grain size (β): Water Resources Research, v. 37, p. 133–146, doi: 10.1029/2000WR900250.

Rubin, D.M., Topping, D.J., Schmidt, J.C., Hazel, J., Kaplinski, M., and Melis, T.S., 2002, Recent sediment studies refute Glen Canyon Dam hypothesis: Eos (Transactions, American Geophysical Union), v. 83, no. 25, p. 273, 277–278, doi: 10.1029/2002EO000191.

Schmidt, J.C., 1990, Recirculating flow and sedimentation in the Colorado River in Grand Canyon, Arizona: The Journal of Geology, v. 98, p. 709–724.
Schmidt, J.C., 1999, Summary and synthesis of geomorphic studies conducted during the 1996 controlled flood in Grand Canyon, *in* Webb, R.H., Schmidt, J.C., Marzolf, G.R., and Valdez, R.A., eds., The controlled flood in Grand Canyon: Washington, D.C., American Geophysical Union, Geophysical Monograph Series, v. 110, p. 329–341
Schmidt, J.C., and Rubin, D.M., 1995, Regulated streamflow, fine-grained deposits, and effective discharge in canyons with abundant debris fans: Geophysical Monograph, v. 89, p. 177–194.
Schmidt, J.C., and Wilcock, P.R., 2008, Metrics for assessing the downstream effects of dams: Water Resources Research, v. 44, W04404, doi: 10.1029/2006WR005092
Schmidt, J.C., Topping, D.J., and Grams, P.E., 2004, System-wide changes in the distribution of fine-grained alluvium in the Colorado River corridor between Glen Canyon Dam and Bright Angel Creek, Arizona: Final Report to the Grand Canyon Monitoring Research Center, 107 p., http://www.gcmrc.gov/library/reports/physical/Fine_Sed/Schmidt2004.pdf (last accessed 12 May 2008).
Seager, R., Ting, M., Held, I., Kushnir, Y., Lu, J., Vecchi, G., Huang, H., Harnik, N., Leetmaa, A., Lau, N., Li, C., Velez, J., and Naik, N., 2007, Model projections of an imminent transition to a more arid climate in southwestern North America: Science, v. 316, p. 1181–1184, doi: 10.1126/science.1139601.
Stevens, J.C., 1938, The effect of silt-removal and flow-regulation on the regimen of Rio Grande and Colorado Rivers: Transactions, American Geophysical Union, v. 19, p. 653–659.
Syvitski, J.P.M., Vorosmarty, C.J., Kettner, A.J., and Green, P., 2005, Impact of humans on the flux of terrestrial sediment to the global coastal ocean: Science, v. 308, p. 376–380, doi: 10.1126/science.1109454.
Topping, D.J., Rubin, D.M., Nelson, J.M., Kinzel, P.J., III, and Bennett, J.P., 1999, Linkage between grain-size evolution and sediment depletion during Colorado River floods, *in* Webb, R.H., Schmidt, J.C., Marzolf, G.R., and Valdez, R.A., eds., The 1996 controlled flood in Grand Canyon: American Geophysical Union Geophysical Monograph 110, p. 71–98.
Topping, D.J., Rubin, D.M., and Vierra, L.E., Jr., 2000a, Colorado River sediment transport: Part 1: Natural sediment supply limitation and the influence of Glen Canyon Dam: Water Resources Research, v. 36, p. 515–542, doi: 10.1029/1999WR900285.
Topping, D.J., Rubin, D.M., Nelson, J.M., Kinzel, P.J., III, and Corson, I.C., 2000b, Colorado River sediment transport: Part 2: Systematic bed-elevation and grain-size effects of supply limitation: Water Resources Research, v. 36, p. 543–570, doi: 10.1029/1999WR900286.
Topping, D.J., Schmidt, J.C., and Vierra, L.E., Jr., 2003, Computation and Analysis of the Instantaneous-Discharge Record for the Colorado River at Lees Ferry, Arizona—May 8, 1921, through September 30, 2000: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1677, 118 p.
Topping, D.J., Rubin, D.M., and Schmidt, J.C., 2005, Regulation of sand transport in the Colorado River by changes in the surface grain size of eddy sandbars over multi-year timescales: Sedimentology, v. 52, p. 1133–1153, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3091.2005.00738.x.
Topping, D.J., Wright, S.A., Melis, T.S., and Rubin, D.M., 2006a, High-resolution monitoring of suspended-sediment concentration and grain size in the Colorado River using laser-diffraction instruments and a three-frequency acoustic system: Proceedings, 8th Federal Interagency Sedimentation Conference, April 2–6, 2006, Reno, Nevada, CD-ROM only, ISBN 0-9779007-1-1.
Topping, D.J., Rubin, D.M., Schmidt, J.C., Hazel, J.E., and Melis, T.S., Wright, S.A., and Kaplinski, M., 2006b, Comparison of sediment-transport and bar-response results from the 1996 and 2004 controlled flood experiments on the Colorado River in Grand Canyon: Proceedings, 8th Federal Interagency Sedimentation Conference, April 2–6, 2006, Reno, Nevada, CD-ROM only, ISBN 0-9779007-1-1.
Topping, D.J., Rubin, D.M., and Melis, T.S., 2007, Coupled changes in sand grain size and sand transport driven by changes in the upstream supply of sand in the Colorado River: Relative importance of changes in bed-sand grain size and bed-sand area: Sedimentary Geology, v. 202, no. 3, p. 538–561, doi: 10.1016/j.sedgeo.2007.03.016.
Webb, R.H., Griffiths, P.G., Melis, T.S., and Hartley, D.R., 2000. Sediment delivery by ungaged tributaries of the Colorado River in Grand Canyon, Arizona: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 00-4055, 67 p.
Webb, R.H., Melis, T.S., and Valdez, R.A., 2002, Observations of Environmental Change in Grand Canyon, Arizona: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 02-4080, 33 p.
Webb, R.H., Griffiths, P.G., Magirl, C.S., and Hanks, T.C., 2005, Debris flows in Grand Canyon and the rapids of the Colorado River, *in* Gloss, S.P., Lovich, J.E., and Melis, T.S., eds., The state of the Colorado River ecosystem in Grand Canyon: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1282, p. 139–152.
White, M.A., Schmidt, J.C., and Topping, D.T., 2005, Application of wavelet analysis for monitoring the hydrologic effects of dam operation: Glen Canyon Dam and the Colorado River at Lees Ferry, Arizona: River Research and Applications, v. 21, p. 551–565, doi: 10.1002/rra.827.
Williams, G.P., and Wolman, M.G., 1984, Downstream effects of dams on alluvial rivers: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1286, 83 p.
Wright, S.A., Melis, T.S., Topping, D.J., and Rubin, D.M., 2005, Influence of Glen Canyon Dam operations on Downstream Sand Resources of the Colorado River in Grand Canyon, *in* Gloss, S.P., Lovich, J.E., and Melis, T.S., eds., The state of the Colorado River ecosystem in Grand Canyon: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1282, p. 17–31.
U.S. Department of the Interior, 1995, Operation of Glen Canyon Dam final environmental impact statement: Salt Lake City, March 1995, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Region, 337 p. plus appendices.
U.S. Department of the Interior, 1996, Record of decision, operation of Glen Canyon Dam: Washington, D.C., October 1996, Office of the Secretary of Interior, 15 p., http://www.usbr.gov/uc/rm/amp/pdfs/sp_appndxG_ROD.pdf.
U.S. Department of the Interior, 2007a, Record of decision, Colorado River interim guidelines for lower basin shortages and the coordinated operations for Lake Powell and Lake Mead: Washington, D.C., December 2007, 59 p., http://www.usbr.gov/lc/region/programs/strategies/RecordofDecision.pdf.
U.S. Department of the Interior, 2007b, Final environmental impact statement, Colorado River interim guidelines for lower basin shortages and coordinated operations for Lake Powell and Lake Mead: Bureau of Reclamation Upper and Lower Colorado Regions, October 2007, http://www.usbr.gov/lc/region/programs/strategies/FEIS/index.html.
U.S. Department of the Interior, 2008, Final environmental assessment experimental releases from Glen Canyon Dam, Arizona, 2008 through 2012: Bureau of Reclamation Upper Colorado Region, February 2008, 60 p., http://www.usbr.gov/uc/envdocs/ea/gc/2008hfe/GCD-finalEA2-29-08.pdf.

Manuscript received 11 February 2008; accepted 28 April 2008. ❦

What is a DOI?

If you've published with GSA recently, you may have noticed we've added a code at the end of many of your references. This code is a digital object identifier ("doi" in print; officially "DOI") and signifies that the article you have cited has been digitized and can be accessed via the Web.

The DOI is your key to accessing more information about the article, including the abstract or full text, depending on the publisher.

The Web site for the DOI® System, which was developed by the International DOI Foundation, is www.doi.org. At the bottom of the home page, under "Resolve a DOI Name," type or paste a DOI number (just the number; don't include "doi:") into the search box, hit submit, and your browser will be directed to the original article (or, if the DOI is incorrect, to an error message or an unrelated article).

Try it out for February's *GSA Today* science article. The DOI is 10.1130/GSAT01802A.1. If you don't receive an article by J. Zalasiewicz et al. asking if we are now living in the "Anthropocene," please write to Kristen Asmus, *GSA Today* managing editor, kasmus@geosociety.org.

To learn more about doi numbers and the origin of the DOI® System, go to www.doi.org/about_the_doi.html.