


# **GROUND-WATER CONDITIONS IN UTAH**

**SPRING OF 2003**

**COOPERATIVE INVESTIGATIONS  
REPORT NO. 44**



**UTAH DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES • UTAH DIVISION OF WATER RIGHTS •  
U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY**

# GROUND-WATER CONDITIONS IN UTAH, SPRING OF 2003

By

C.B. Burden and others

U.S. Geological Survey

Prepared by the U.S. Geological Survey

in cooperation with the Utah Department of Natural Resources,

Division of Water Resources and

Division of Water Rights

Published by the

Utah Department of Natural Resources

Division of Water Resources

Cooperative Investigations Report Number 44

2003

# CONTENTS

Introduction .....	1
Utah's ground-water reservoirs .....	1
Summary of conditions .....	4
Major areas of ground-water development .....	7
Curlew Valley by M. Enright .....	7
Cache Valley by M.R. Danner.....	13
East Shore area by M.J. Fisher .....	18
Salt Lake Valley by P.L. Haraden.....	24
Tooele Valley by T.A. Kenney .....	32
Utah and Goshen Valleys by C.D. Wilkowske .....	38
Juab Valley by R.J. Eacret .....	46
Sevier Desert by Paul Downhour.....	52
Central Sevier Valley by B.A. Slaugh .....	60
Pahvant Valley by R.L. Swenson .....	66
Cedar Valley, Iron County by J.H. Howells .....	72
Parowan Valley by J.H. Howells .....	78
Escalante Valley	
Milford area by B.A. Slaugh .....	84
Beryl-Enterprise area by H.K. Christiansen .....	90
Central Virgin River area by H.K. Christiansen.....	96
Other areas by M.J. Fisher .....	102
References cited .....	120

## ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Map showing areas of ground-water development in Utah specifically referred to in this report .....	2
2. Map of location of wells in Curlew Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003.....	8
3. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in Curlew Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Grouse Creek, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells.....	9
4. Map of location of wells in Cache Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	14
5. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in Cache Valley to total annual discharge of the Logan River near Logan, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Logan, Utah State University, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (A-13-1)29bcd-1 .....	15
6. Map of location of wells in the East Shore area in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	19
7. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in the East Shore area to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Ogden Pioneer Powerhouse, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (B-4-2)27aba-1 .....	20
8. Map of location of wells in Salt Lake Valley in which the water level was measured during February 2003 .....	25

## ILLUSTRATIONS—Continued

9. Graphs showing estimated population of Salt Lake County, total annual withdrawal from wells, annual withdrawal for public supply, and average annual precipitation at Salt Lake City Weather Service Office (International Airport) .....	26
10. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells completed in the principal aquifer in Salt Lake Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton, and relation of water level in well (D-1-1)7abd-6 to concentration of chloride and dissolved solids in water from the well .....	27
11. Map of location of wells in Tooele Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	33
12. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in Tooele Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Tooele and to annual withdrawal from wells .....	34
13. Map of location of wells in Utah and Goshen Valleys in which the water level was measured during March 2003.....	39
14. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in Utah and Goshen Valleys to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton and Spanish Fork Powerhouse, to total annual withdrawal from wells, to annual withdrawal for public supply, to annual discharge of Spanish Fork at Castilla, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from three wells .....	40
15. Map of location of wells in Juab Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	47
16. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in Juab Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Nephi, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (D-13-1)7dbc-1 .....	48
17. Map of location of wells in the shallow artesian aquifer in part of the Sevier Desert in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	53
18. Map of location of wells in the deep artesian aquifer in part of the Sevier Desert in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	54
19. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in the Sevier Desert to annual discharge of the Sevier River near Juab, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Oak City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-15-4)18daa-1 .....	55
20. Map of location of wells in central Sevier Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	61
21. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in central Sevier Valley to annual discharge of the Sevier River at Hatch, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Richfield, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-23-2)15dcb-4.....	62
22. Map of location of wells in Pahvant Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	67
23. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in Pahvant Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Fillmore, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells .....	68
24. Map of location of wells in Cedar Valley, Iron County, in which the water level was measured during March 2003.....	73

## ILLUSTRATIONS—Continued

25. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in Cedar Valley, Iron County, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport, to annual discharge of Coal Creek near Cedar City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells .....	74
26. Map of location of wells in Parowan Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	79
27. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in Parowan Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-33-8)31ccc-1 .....	80
28. Map of location of wells in the Milford area in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	85
29. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in the Milford area to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Black Rock, to annual discharge of the Beaver River at Rocky Ford Dam, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-28-11)25dcd-1 .....	86
30. Map of location of wells in the Beryl-Enterprise area in which the water level was measured during March 2003.....	91
31. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in the Beryl-Enterprise area to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Modena, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-34-16)28dcc-2 .....	92
32. Map of location of wells in the central Virgin River area in which the water level was measured during February 2003.....	97
33. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in the central Virgin River area to annual discharge of the Virgin River at Virgin, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at St. George, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-41-17)17bdb-1 .....	98
34. Map of location of wells in Cedar Valley, Utah County, in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	103
35. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in Cedar Valley, Utah County, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Fairfield .....	104
36. Map of location of wells in Sanpete Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 .....	106
37. Graphs showing relation of water level in selected wells in Sanpete Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Manti .....	107
38. Graphs showing relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas.....	109

## TABLES

1. Areas of ground-water development in Utah specifically referred to in this report .....	3
2. Number of wells constructed and estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Utah .....	5
3. Total annual withdrawal of water from wells in significant areas of ground-water development in Utah, 1992-2001 .....	6

# CONVERSION FACTORS AND DATUMS

Multiply	By	To obtain
acre-foot	1,233	cubic meter
foot	0.3048	meter
gallon per minute	0.06308	liter per second
inch	25.4	millimeter
mile	1.609	kilometer
square mile	2.590	square kilometer

Vertical coordinate information is referenced to the National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD 1929). Horizontal coordinate information is referenced to the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 83).

Chemical concentration is reported only in metric units—milligrams per liter. For concentrations less than 7,000 milligrams per liter, the numerical value is about the same as for concentrations in parts per million.

## DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Acre-foot**—The quantity of water required to cover 1 acre to a depth of 1 foot; equal to 43,560 cubic feet or about 326,000 gallons or 1,233 cubic meters.

**Aquifer**—A geologic formation, group of formations, or part of a formation that contains sufficient saturated permeable material to yield substantial amounts of water to wells and springs.

**Artesian**—Describes a well in which the water level stands above the top of the aquifer tapped by the well (confined). A flowing artesian well is one in which the water level is above the land surface.

**Cumulative departure from average annual precipitation**—A graph of the departure or difference between the average annual precipitation and the value of precipitation for each year, plotted cumulatively. A cumulative plot is generated by adding the departure from average precipitation for the current year to the sum of departure values for all previous years in the period of record. A positive departure, or greater-than-average precipitation, for a year results in a graph segment trending upward; a negative departure results in a graph segment trending downward. A generally downward-trending graph for a period of years represents a period of generally less-than-average precipitation, which commonly causes and corresponds with declining water levels in wells. Likewise, a generally upward-trending graph for a period of years represents a period of greater-than-average precipitation, which commonly causes and corresponds with rising water levels in wells. However, increases or decreases in withdrawals of ground water from wells also affect water levels and can change or eliminate the correlation between water levels in wells and the graph of cumulative departure from average precipitation.

**Dissolved**—Material in a representative water sample that passes through a 0.45–micrometer membrane filter. This is a convenient operational definition used by Federal agencies that collect water data. Determinations of “dissolved” constituents are made on subsamples of the filtrate.

**Land-surface datum (lsd)**—A datum plane that is approximately at land surface at each ground-water observation well.

**Milligrams per liter**—A unit for expressing the concentration of chemical constituents in solution. Milligrams per liter represents the mass of solute per unit volume (liter) of water.

**Precipitation**—The total annual precipitation in inches for selected locations is computed from monthly total precipitation (rain, sleet, hail, snow, etc.). Data supplied by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Utah Climate Center. Data may be provisional and/or estimated when used to compute annual total and long-term average precipitation values.

**Specific conductance**—A measure of the ability of water to conduct an electrical current. It is expressed in microsiemens per centimeter at 25 degrees Celsius. Specific conductance is related to the type and concentration of ions in solution and can be used for approximating the dissolved-solids concentration of the water. Commonly, the concentration of dissolved solids (in milligrams per liter) is about 65 percent of the specific conductance (in microsiemens). This relation is not constant in water from one well or stream to another, and it may vary for the same source with changes in the composition of the water.

## WELL-NUMBERING SYSTEM

The well-numbering system used in Utah is based on the Bureau of Land Management's system of land subdivision. The well-numbering system is familiar to most water users in Utah, and the well number shows the location of the well by quadrant, township, range, section, and position within the section. Well numbers for most of the State are derived from the Salt Lake Base Line and the Salt Lake Meridian. Well numbers for wells located inside the area of the Uintah Base Line and Meridian are designated in the same manner as those based on the Salt Lake Base Line and Meridian, with the addition of the "U" preceding the parentheses. The numbering system is illustrated on the following page.

**R. 6 W.**




9.7 kilometers

## Sec. 8



1.6 kilometers

1



# **GROUND-WATER CONDITIONS IN UTAH, SPRING OF 2003**

By

**C.B. Burden and others**

**U.S. Geological Survey**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This is the fortieth in a series of annual reports that describe ground-water conditions in Utah. Reports in this series, published cooperatively by the U.S. Geological Survey and the Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Water Resources and Division of Water Rights, provide data to enable interested parties to maintain awareness of changing ground-water conditions.

This report, like the others in the series, contains information on well construction, ground-water withdrawal from wells, water-level changes, precipitation, streamflow, and chemical quality of water. Information on well construction included in this report refers only to wells constructed for new appropriations of ground water. Supplementary data are included in reports of this series only for those years or areas which are important to a discussion of changing ground-water conditions and for which applicable data are available.

This report includes individual discussions of selected significant areas of ground-water development in the State for calendar year 2002. Most of the reported data were collected by the U.S. Geological Survey in cooperation with the Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Water Rights and Division of Water Resources.

The following reports deal with ground water in the State and were printed by the U.S. Geological Survey or by cooperating agencies from May 2002 through April 2003:

Ground-water conditions in Utah, spring of 2002, by C.B. Burden, and others, Utah Division of Water Resources Cooperative Investigations Report No. 43, 120 p.

Selected hydrologic data for Cedar Valley, Iron County, southwestern Utah, 1930-2001, by J.H. Howells, J.L. Mason, and B.A. Slaugh, U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 01-419, 81 p.


Selected hydrologic data for the field demonstration of three permeable reactive barriers near Fry Canyon, Utah, 1996-2000, by C.D. Wilkowske, R.C. Rowland, and D.L. Naftz, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 01-361, 102 p.

## **UTAH'S GROUND-WATER RESERVOIRS**

Small amounts of ground water can be obtained from wells throughout most of Utah, but large amounts that are of suitable chemical quality for irrigation, public supply, or industrial use generally can be obtained only in specific areas. The areas of ground-water development discussed in this report are shown in figure 1 and listed in table 1. Relatively few wells outside of these areas yield large amounts of ground water of suitable chemical quality for the uses listed above, although some of the basins in western Utah and many areas in eastern Utah have not been explored sufficiently to determine their potential for ground-water development.

About 2 percent of the wells in Utah yield water from consolidated rock. Consolidated rocks that yield the most water are lava flows, such as basalt, which contain interconnected vesicular openings, fractures, or permeable weathered zones at the tops of flows; limestone, which contains fractures or other openings enlarged by solution; and sandstone, which contains open fractures. Most of the wells that penetrate consolidated rock are in the eastern and southern parts of the State in areas where water cannot be obtained readily from unconsolidated deposits.

About 98 percent of the wells in Utah yield water from unconsolidated deposits. These deposits may consist of boulders, gravel, sand, silt, or clay, or a mixture of some or all of these materials. The largest yields are obtained from coarse materials that are sorted into deposits of uniform grain size. Most wells that yield



**Figure 1.** Areas of ground-water development in Utah specifically referred to in this report.

**Table 1.** Areas of ground-water development in Utah specifically referred to in this report

[Do., ditto]

Number in figure 1	Area	Principal types of water-bearing rocks
1	Grouse Creek Valley	Unconsolidated.
2	Park Valley	Do.
3	Curlew Valley	Unconsolidated and consolidated.
4	Malad-lower Bear River Valley	Unconsolidated.
5	Cache Valley	Do.
6	Bear Lake Valley	Do.
7	Upper Bear River Valley	Do.
8	Ogden Valley	Do.
9	East Shore area	Do.
10	Salt Lake Valley	Do.
11	Park City area	Unconsolidated and consolidated.
12	Tooele Valley	Unconsolidated.
13	Rush Valley	Do.
14	Dugway area	Do.
	Skull Valley	Do.
	Old River Bed	Do.
15	Cedar Valley, Utah County	Do.
16	Utah and Goshen Valleys	Do.
17	Heber Valley	Do.
18	Duchesne River area	Unconsolidated and consolidated.
19	Vernal area	Do.
20	Sanpete Valley	Do.
21	Juab Valley	Unconsolidated.
22	Central Sevier Valley	Do.
23	Pahvant Valley	Unconsolidated and consolidated.
24	Sevier Desert	Unconsolidated.
25	Snake Valley	Do.
26	Milford area	Do.
27	Beaver Valley	Do.
28	Monticello area	Consolidated.
29	Spanish Valley	Unconsolidated and consolidated.
30	Blanding area	Consolidated.
31	Parowan Valley	Unconsolidated and consolidated.
32	Cedar Valley, Iron County	Unconsolidated.
33	Beryl-Enterprise area	Do.
34	Central Virgin River area	Unconsolidated and consolidated.
35	Upper Sevier Valleys	Unconsolidated.
36	Upper Fremont River Valley	Unconsolidated and consolidated.

water from unconsolidated deposits are in large inter-mountain basins that have been partly filled with rock material eroded from the adjacent mountains.

## **SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS**

The total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Utah during 2002 was about 947,000 acre-feet (table 2), which is about 64,000 acre-feet more than the total for 2001 and 108,000 acre-feet more than the 1992-2001 average annual withdrawal (table 3). The increase in withdrawals mostly resulted from increased irrigation. The total estimated withdrawal for irrigation was about 554,000 acre-feet (table 2), which is 101,000 acre-feet more than the value for 2001. Withdrawal for industrial use decreased about 12,000 acre-feet to about 58,000 acre-feet. Withdrawal for public supply was about 263,000 acre-feet (table 2), which is about 29,000 acre-feet less than the value for 2001. Withdrawal for domestic and stock use was about 70,000 acre-feet, which is about 3,000 acre-feet more than the value for 2001.

Ground-water withdrawal increased from 2001 to 2002 in 9 of the 16 areas of ground-water development discussed in this report (table 2). Withdrawal in

“other areas” increased about 17,000 acre-feet (fig. 1). The 2002 withdrawal was more than the average annual withdrawals for 1992-2001 in 11 of the 16 areas (tables 2 and 3).

The amount of water withdrawn from wells is related to demand and availability of water from other sources, which, in turn, are partly related to local climatic conditions. Precipitation during calendar year 2002 at all 28 weather stations included in this report (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2002), was less than the long-term average. The average decrease in precipitation from average in 2002 was about 4.2 inches. The greatest decrease in precipitation from average was 10.0 inches at Silver Lake Brighton.

A total of 760 wells were constructed for new appropriations of ground water in 2002, as determined by the Utah Division of Water Rights (table 2). This is five more wells than was reported for 2001. In 2002, 87 large-diameter wells (12 inches or more) were constructed for new appropriations of ground water (table 2). These are principally for withdrawal of water for public supply, irrigation, and industrial use.

**Table 2.** Number of wells constructed and estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Utah

Estimated withdrawal from wells—2001 total: From Burden, and others (2002, table 2).

Area	Number in figure 1	Number of wells <sup>1</sup> constructed in 2002		Estimated withdrawal from wells (acre-feet)					
		Total	Diameter of 12 inches or more	2002				2001 Total (rounded)	
				Irrigation	Industry <sup>1</sup>	Public supply <sup>1</sup>	Domestic and stock		Total (rounded)
Curlew Valley	3	2	0	31,600	0	200	100	32,000	36,000
Cache Valley	5	40	0	14,500	5,000	11,100	2,000	33,000	32,000
East Shore area	9	6	5	14,000	3,000	27,300	5,000	49,000	57,000
Salt Lake Valley	10	10	2	1,000	<sup>2</sup> 12,000	84,400	27,000	124,000	151,000
Tooele Valley	12	56	2	<sup>3</sup> 12,100	630	7,100	1,000	21,000	21,000
Utah and Goshen Valleys	16	49	11	47,600	3,200	62,700	19,600	133,000	128,000
Juab Valley	21	4	1	28,400	0	<sup>4</sup> 370	400	29,000	29,000
Sevier Desert	24	13	6	28,200	4,900	1,400	1,200	36,000	19,000
Central Sevier Valley	22	27	0	7,500	80	2,500	900	11,000	12,000
Pahvant Valley	23	6	2	87,300	0	940	300	89,000	80,000
Cedar Valley, Iron County	32	23	9	32,600	130	6,800	2,000	42,000	32,000
Parowan Valley	31	7	5	<sup>5</sup> 37,900	0	500	200	39,000	22,000
Escalante Valley									
Milford area	26	3	1	42,500	<sup>6</sup> 8,200	780	160	52,000	42,000
Beryl-Enterprise area	33	17	4	96,300	<sup>7</sup> 1,800	630	520	99,000	81,000
Central Virgin River area	34	13	6	5,800	100	18,600	2,200	27,000	27,000
Other areas <sup>8,9</sup>		484	33	66,700	<sup>10</sup> 19,200	38,100	7,800	131,000	114,000
Total (rounded)		760	87	554,000	58,000	263,000	70,000	947,000	883,000

<sup>1</sup> Data provided by Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Water Rights.

<sup>2</sup> Includes some use for air conditioning, about 1,200 acre-feet. About 70 percent was injected back into the aquifer.

<sup>3</sup> Includes some domestic and stock use.

<sup>4</sup> Previously included some springs.

<sup>5</sup> Includes some stock use.

<sup>6</sup> Withdrawal for geothermal power generation was injected back into the aquifer.

<sup>7</sup> Includes 1,440 acre-feet used for heating greenhouses. About 95 percent was injected back into the aquifer.

<sup>8</sup> Withdrawal totals are estimated minimum. See "Other areas" section of this report for withdrawal estimates for other areas.

<sup>9</sup> Includes withdrawals for upper Sevier Valley and upper Fremont River Valley that were included with central Sevier Valley in reports prior to number 31 of this series.

<sup>10</sup> Includes some withdrawal for geothermal power generation, about 290 acre-feet, of which about 90 percent was injected back into the aquifer.

**Table 3.** Total annual withdrawal of water from wells in significant areas of ground-water development in Utah, 1992-2001

[From previous reports of this series]

Area	Number in figure 1	Thousands of acre-feet										1992-2001 average (rounded)
		1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Curlew Valley	3	44	35	41	31	39	36	29	29	41	36	36
Cache Valley	5	36	23	31	23	24	25	26	24	30	32	27
East Shore area	9	59	56	60	53	57	62	56	61	60	57	58
Salt Lake Valley	10	138	116	142	120	138	123	122	126	145	151	132
Tooele Valley	12	30	22	31	26	23	25	<sup>1</sup> 19	21	24	21	24
Utah and Goshen Valleys	16	141	89	114	77	99	96	86	<sup>1</sup> 110	132	128	107
Juab Valley	21	29	20	26	13	19	15	12	14	27	29	20
Sevier Desert	24	33	31	37	18	17	17	12	12	15	19	21
Central Sevier Valley <sup>2</sup>	22	19	19	20	20	21	20	20	20	13	12	18
Pahvant Valley	23	86	87	93	69	83	67	66	76	80	80	79
Cedar Valley, Iron County	32	34	33	34	31	35	34	36	32	<sup>1</sup> 35	32	34
Parowan Valley	31	31	28	30	24	29	25	28	<sup>1</sup> 26	30	22	27
Escalante Valley												
Milford area	26	42	50	61	48	52	52	41	41	49	42	48
Beryl-Enterprise area	33	72	78	86	70	92	81	74	79	84	81	80
Central Virgin River area	34	14	13	14	15	17	18	20	<sup>1</sup> 18	<sup>1</sup> 26	27	18
Other areas		120	94	113	97	113	107	99	106	<sup>1</sup> 135	114	110
Total		928	794	933	735	858	803	<sup>1</sup> 746	<sup>1</sup> 795	<sup>1</sup> 926	883	839

<sup>1</sup> Revised.<sup>2</sup> Prior to 1991, included upper Sevier and upper Fremont River Valleys.

# MAJOR AREAS OF GROUND-WATER DEVELOPMENT

## CURLEW VALLEY

By M. Enright

The Curlew Valley drainage basin extends across the Utah-Idaho State line between latitudes 40°41' and 42°30' north and longitudes 112°30' and 113°20' west, and covers about 1,200 square miles. The valley is bounded on the west, north, and east by mountains that range in altitude from about 6,500 to nearly 10,000 feet and is open to the south, where it drains into Great Salt Lake.

The Utah part of Curlew Valley (Utah subbasin) covers about 550 square miles. It is an arid to semiarid, largely uninhabited area, with a community center at Snowville. Average annual precipitation in the Utah subbasin is less than 8 inches on part of the valley floor and reaches a maximum that exceeds 35 inches on one of the highest mountain peaks.

The principal source of water in the Utah subbasin is ground water. The ground-water reservoir is primarily composed of confined aquifers in alluvial and lacustrine deposits and volcanic rocks. These formations yield several hundred to several thousand gallons of water per minute to individual large-diameter irrigation wells west of Snowville and near Kelton.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Curlew Valley in 2002 was about 32,000 acre-feet, which is 4,000 acre-feet less than reported for 2001 and

4,000 acre-feet less than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). The decrease resulted from less water withdrawn for irrigation.

The location of wells in Curlew Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 2. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Grouse Creek, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells is shown in figure 3.

Water levels in Curlew Valley have generally declined from March 1999 to March 2003. These recent declines probably resulted from a general decrease in precipitation and streamflow during the last 3 years. Water levels in the area generally rose from 1982 to 1987, a period of greater-than-average precipitation, then declined from 1987 to 1997, and generally rose again from 1997 to 1999.

Precipitation at Grouse Creek in 2002 was about 10.3 inches, which is about 0.3 inch less than in 2001 and about 0.9 inch less than the average annual precipitation for 1959-2002.

The concentrations of dissolved solids in water from well (B-14-9)5bbb-1, west of Snowville, and well (B-12-11)4bcc-1, north of Kelton, generally have increased since 1972. These increases may be a result of recharge from unconsumed irrigation water in which dissolved solids are concentrated by evaporation.




Figure 2. Location of wells in Curlew Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003.







Figure 3. Relation of water level in selected wells in Curlew Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Grouse Creek, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells.




Figure 3. Relation of water level in selected wells in Curlew Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Grouse Creek, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells—Continued





Figure 3. Relation of water level in selected wells in Curlew Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Grouse Creek, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells—Continued




Figure 3. Relation of water level in selected wells in Curlew Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Grouse Creek, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells—Continued

## CACHE VALLEY

By M.R. Danner

Cache Valley, as referred to in this report, covers about 450 square miles in Utah. Ground water occurs in unconsolidated deposits in the valley, under both water-table and artesian conditions. Recharge to the ground-water system occurs principally at the margins of the valley, and ground water moves toward the center of the valley and toward a point of discharge near Cache Junction.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Cache Valley in 2002 was about 33,000 acre-feet, which is about 1,000 acre-feet more than was reported for 2001 and 6,000 acre-feet more than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). The increase in withdrawals mostly resulted from increased irrigation.

The location of wells in Cache Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 4. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to total annual discharge of the Logan River near Logan, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Logan, Utah State Universi-

ty, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (A-13-1)29bcd-1 is shown in figure 5. Water levels generally rose from 2002 to 2003 in the southern part of the valley, and generally declined in the northern part. Water levels throughout the valley generally declined from March 1999 to March 2002. From about 1935 to about 1983 water levels fluctuated with no apparent trend. Levels generally declined from 1985 to 1993, and generally rose from 1993 to 1999.

Total discharge of the Logan River (combined flow from the Logan River above State Dam, near Logan, and Logan, Hyde Park, and Smithfield Canal at Head, near Logan) during 2002 was about 109,900 acre-feet, which is 900 acre-feet more than the revised 2001 total of 109,000 acre-feet and 71,800 acre-feet less than the 1941-2002 average annual discharge.

Precipitation at Logan, Utah State University, was about 14.4 inches in 2002. This is about 0.3 inch more than for 2001 and about 4.2 inches less than the average annual precipitation for 1941-2002. The concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (A-13-1)29bcd-1 fluctuated during 1970-2002 with no apparent trend.

## EXPLANATION




Figure 4. Location of wells in Cache Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003.




Figure 5. Relation of water level in selected wells in Cache Valley to total annual discharge of the Logan River near Logan, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Logan, Utah State University, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (A-13-1)29bcd-1








Figure 5. Relation of water level in selected wells in Cache Valley to total annual discharge of the Logan River near Logan, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Logan, Utah State University, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (A-13-1)29bcd-1—Continued.



<sup>1</sup> Combined flow from Logan River above State Dam, near Logan, and Logan, Hyde Park, and Smithfield Canal at Head, near Logan.

Figure 5. Relation of water level in selected wells in Cache Valley to total annual discharge of the Logan River near Logan, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Logan, Utah State University, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (A-13-1)29bcd-1 —Continued

## EAST SHORE AREA

By M.J. Fisher

The East Shore area is in north-central Utah between the Wasatch Range and Great Salt Lake. Ground water occurs in unconsolidated deposits under both water-table and artesian conditions, but most of the water withdrawn by wells is from the artesian aquifers. Water enters the artesian aquifers along the east edge of the Weber Delta and also in the Bountiful area and generally moves westward toward Great Salt Lake.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in the East Shore area in 2002 was about 49,000 acre-feet, which is 8,000 acre-feet less than was reported for 2001 and is 9,000 acre-feet less than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). The decrease in withdrawals mostly resulted from decreased withdrawals for public supply and irrigation. Withdrawal for public supply was about 3,400 acre-feet less than in 2001. Withdrawal for irrigation was about 3,800 acre-feet less than in 2001.

The location of wells in the East Shore area in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 6. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Ogden Pioneer Powerhouse, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (B-4-2)27aba-1 is shown in figure 7.

Water levels generally declined from 1999-2003 throughout the area. Declines probably resulted from less recharge during the recent drought (1999-2002) and greater-than-average total withdrawals from 1999 to 2001 (table 3). Water levels generally declined in most of the East Shore area from the mid-1950s to 2003, although some wells in the southern part of the area indicated a general rise or no change.

Precipitation at the Ogden Pioneer Powerhouse in 2002 was about 16.4 inches, which is about 5.3 inches less than the average annual precipitation for 1937-2002, and about 0.4 inch less than in 2001.




Figure 6. Location of wells in the East Shore area in which the water level was measured during March 2003.




Figure 7. Relation of water level in selected wells in the East Shore area to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Ogden Pioneer Powerhouse, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (B-4-2)27aba-1.







Figure 7. Relation of water level in selected wells in the East Shore area to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Ogden Pioneer Powerhouse, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (B-4-2)27aba-1—Continued.







Figure 7. Relation of water level in selected wells in the East Shore area to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Ogden Pioneer Powerhouse, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (B-4-2)27aba-1—Continued




Figure 7. Relation of water level in selected wells in the East Shore area to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Ogden Pioneer Powerhouse, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (B-4-2)27aba-1—Continued

## SALT LAKE VALLEY

By P.L. Haraden

Salt Lake Valley covers about 400 square miles in the lowlands of Salt Lake County. Ground water occurs in unconsolidated deposits in the valley under water-table and artesian conditions. Recharge to the aquifers occurs in the area of the mountains that borders the valley. In the southern two-thirds of the western half of the valley, ground water moves from the base of the Oquirrh Mountains eastward toward the Jordan River. In the northern one-third of the western half of the valley, the direction of movement is mostly toward Great Salt Lake. In the eastern half of the valley, ground water moves westward from the base of the Wasatch Range toward the Jordan River. The Jordan River drains both surface water and ground water from the valley.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Salt Lake Valley in 2002 was about 124,000 acre-feet, which is 27,000 acre-feet less than in 2001 and about 8,000 acre-feet less than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). Withdrawal for public supply was about 84,400 acre-feet, which is 21,200 acre-feet less than was reported in 2001. Withdrawal for industrial use was about 12,000 acre-feet, which is 7,700 acre-feet less than was reported for 2001.

The location of wells in Salt Lake Valley in which the water level was measured during February 2003 is shown in figure 8. Estimated population of Salt Lake

County, total annual withdrawal from wells, annual withdrawal for public supply, and average annual precipitation at Salt Lake City Weather Service Office (WSO) (International Airport) are shown in figure 9. Precipitation at Salt Lake City WSO during 2002 was about 10.3 inches, about 4.7 inches less than in 2001 and about 4.9 inches less than the average annual precipitation for 1931-2002.

The relation of the water level in selected observation wells completed in the principal aquifer to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton, and the relation of the water level in well (D-1-1)7abd-6 to concentration of chloride and dissolved solids in water from the well are shown in figure 10. Precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton was 32.6 inches in 2002, which is about 6.0 inches less than in 2001 and about 10.0 inches less than the average annual precipitation for 1931-2002.


Water levels generally declined from February 1999 to February 2003 in most of the observation wells in the principal aquifer of the Salt Lake Valley. The water level in most of the observation wells was highest during 1985-87, which corresponds to a period of much-greater-than-average precipitation during 1982-86. Levels have generally declined since 1987, although some rises occurred from 1994 to 1999.

## EXPLANATION

 Approximate boundary of basin-fill deposits

● Observation well

3 ● Observation well with corresponding hydrograph—Number refers to hydrograph in figure 10



**Figure 8.** Location of wells in Salt Lake Valley in which the water level was measured during February 2003.




Figure 9. Estimated population of Salt Lake County, total annual withdrawal from wells, annual withdrawal for public supply, and average annual precipitation at Salt Lake City Weather Service Office (International Airport).




Figure 10. Relation of water level in selected wells completed in the principal aquifer in Salt Lake Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton, and the relation of the water level in well (D-1-1)7abd-6 to concentration of chloride and dissolved solids in water from the well.




Figure 10. Relation of water level in selected wells completed in the principal aquifer in Salt Lake Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton, and the relation of the water level in well (D-1-1)7abd-6 to concentration of chloride and dissolved solids in water from the well—Continued.






Figure 10. Relation of water level in selected wells completed in the principal aquifer in Salt Lake Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton, and the relation of the water level in well (D-1-1)7abd-6 to concentration of chloride and dissolved solids in water from the well—Continued.






Figure 10. Relation of water level in selected wells completed in the principal aquifer in Salt Lake Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton, and the relation of the water level in well (D-1-1)7abd-6 to concentration of chloride and dissolved solids in water from the well—Continued.



13

Figure 10. Relation of water level in selected wells completed in the principal aquifer in Salt Lake Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton, and the relation of the water level in well (D-1-1)7abd-6 to concentration of chloride and dissolved solids in water from the well—Continued.

## TOOELE VALLEY

By T.A. Kenney

Tooele Valley is between the Stansbury Mountains and Oquirrh Mountains and extends from Great Salt Lake to a low ridge called South Mountain. The total area of the valley is about 250 square miles.

Ground water occurs in the unconsolidated deposits in Tooele Valley under both water-table and artesian conditions, but nearly all the water withdrawn by wells is from artesian aquifers.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Tooele Valley in 2002 was about 21,000 acre-feet, which is the same as in 2001 and 3,000 acre-feet less than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). Withdrawal for irrigation was about 12,100 acre-feet, which is 600 acre-feet less than the

withdrawal for 2001. Withdrawal for public supply was about 7,100 acre-feet, which is 200 acre-feet more than the withdrawal for 2001.

The location of wells in Tooele Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 11. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Tooele and to annual withdrawal from wells is shown in figure 12. Precipitation during 2002 at Tooele was about 12.7 inches, which is about 4.7 inches less than in 2001 and about 5.1 inches less than the average annual precipitation for 1936-2002.

Water levels in wells in Tooele Valley generally declined from March 2000 to March 2003. The decline in water levels is probably the result of less-than-average precipitation.




Figure 11. Location of wells in Tooele Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003.







Figure 12. Relation of water level in selected wells in Tooele Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Tooele and to annual withdrawal from wells.




5



6



7



8

Figure 12. Relation of water level in selected wells in Tooele Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Tooele and to annual withdrawal from wells—Continued.






Figure 12. Relation of water level in selected wells in Tooele Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Tooele and to annual withdrawal from wells—Continued.




Figure 12. Relation of water level in selected wells in Tooele Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Tooele and to annual withdrawal from wells—Continued.

## UTAH AND GOSHEN VALLEYS

By C.D. Wilkowske

Northern Utah Valley is the part of Utah Valley that is north of Provo Bay. Ground water occurs in unconsolidated basin-fill deposits in the valley. The principal ground-water recharge area for the basin fill is in the eastern part of the valley, along the base of the Wasatch Range.

Southern Utah Valley is the part of Utah Valley south of Provo and bounded by the Wasatch Range, West Mountain, and the northern extension of Long Ridge. Goshen Valley is south of the latitude of Provo and is bounded by West Mountain, Long Ridge, and the East Tintic Mountains. Ground water in Utah and Goshen Valleys occurs in the alluvium under both water-table and artesian conditions, but most wells discharge from artesian aquifers.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Utah and Goshen Valleys in 2002 was about 133,000 acre-feet, which is 5,000 acre-feet more than the value for 2001, and 26,000 acre-feet more than the average annual withdrawal for the period 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). Ground water withdrawal in northern Utah Valley was about 86,200 acre-feet, which is 2,400 acre-feet more than the value for 2001; withdrawal in southern Utah Valley was about 35,600 acre-feet, which is 3,400 acre-feet more than in 2001; withdrawal in Goshen Valley was about 11,400 acre-feet, which is 400 acre-feet less than in 2001. The overall increase in withdrawals was mostly a result of increased irrigation.

Water levels in Goshen Valley and in the northern and southern parts of Utah Valley generally rose in the early 1980s. The rise corresponds to a period of greater-than-average precipitation and recharge from surface

water. Water levels generally declined from 1985 to 1993 in Utah Valley and generally rose from 1993 to 1998. This rise resulted from greater-than-average precipitation during this period.

Water levels generally declined throughout Utah Valley from March 1999 to March 2003. Water levels in some wells reached their lowest level for their period of record dating back to 1935. Water levels in Goshen Valley also have continued to decline. This trend generally started in 1992. The decline in water levels is the result of another year of less-than-average precipitation combined with continued large withdrawals from wells for public supply and irrigation.

The location of wells in Utah and Goshen Valleys in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 13. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton and Spanish Fork Powerhouse, to total annual withdrawal from wells, to annual withdrawal for public supply, to annual discharge of Spanish Fork at Castilla, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from three wells, is shown in figure 14. Discharge of Spanish Fork at Castilla in 2002 was 147,900 acre-feet, which is 19,600 acre-feet less than the 1933-2002 annual average. Precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton in 2002 was about 32.6 inches, which is about 10.0 inches less than the 1931-2002 annual average and about 6.0 inches less than 2001. Precipitation at Spanish Fork Powerhouse in 2002 was about 13.8 inches, which is about 5.7 inches less than the 1937-2002 annual average and about 2.2 inches less than in 2001.




Figure 13. Location of wells in Utah and Goshen Valleys in which the water level was measured March spring 2003.







Figure 14. Relation of water level in selected wells in Utah and Goshen Valleys to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton and Spanish Fork Powerhouse, to total annual withdrawal from wells, to annual withdrawal for public supply, to annual discharge of Spanish Fork at Castilla, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from three wells.




5



6




7




8


Figure 14. Relation of water level in selected wells in Utah and Goshen Valleys to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton and Spanish Fork Powerhouse, to total annual withdrawal from wells, to annual withdrawal for public supply, to annual discharge of Spanish Fork at Castilla, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from three wells—Continued.




9



10



11



12

Figure 14. Relation of water level in selected wells in Utah and Goshen Valleys to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton and Spanish Fork Powerhouse, to total annual withdrawal from wells, to annual withdrawal for public supply, to annual discharge of Spanish Fork at Castilla, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from three wells—Continued.






Figure 14. Relation of water level in selected wells in Utah and Goshen Valleys to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton and Spanish Fork Powerhouse, to total annual withdrawal from wells, to annual withdrawal for public supply, to annual discharge of Spanish Fork at Castilla, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from three wells—Continued.




Figure 14. Relation of water level in selected wells in Utah and Goshen Valleys to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton and Spanish Fork Powerhouse, to total annual withdrawal from wells, to annual withdrawal for public supply, to annual discharge of Spanish Fork at Castilla, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from three wells—Continued.




Figure 14. Relation of water level in selected wells in Utah and Goshen Valleys to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Silver Lake near Brighton and Spanish Fork Powerhouse, to total annual withdrawal from wells, to annual withdrawal for public supply, to annual discharge of Spanish Fork at Castilla, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from three wells—Continued.

## JUAB VALLEY

By R.J. Eacret

Juab Valley, which is about 30 miles long and averages about 4 miles wide, is in central Utah along the west side of the Wasatch Range and the San Pitch Mountains. The valley drains near both its northern and southern ends—in northern Juab Valley via Currant Creek into Utah Lake, and in southern Juab Valley via Chicken Creek into the Sevier River. The northern and southern parts of Juab Valley are separated topographically by Levan Ridge, a gentle rise near the midpoint of the valley floor.

Ground water in Juab Valley occurs in the unconsolidated basin-fill deposits. Most of the recharge to the ground-water reservoir occurs on the eastern side of the valley along the Wasatch Range and the San Pitch Mountains. Ground water moves to the lower part of the valley and to eventual discharge points at the northern and southern ends of the valley. The ground-water divide between the northern and southern parts of Juab Valley is near Levan Ridge.

Ground water occurs in the basin-fill deposits under both water-table and artesian conditions; artesian conditions are prevalent in the lower part of the valley. The greatest depths to water are along the eastern margin of the valley, where permeable alluvial fans extend from the mountains into the valley.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Juab Valley in 2002 was about 29,000 acre-feet, which is the same amount reported for 2001 and 9,000 acre-feet more than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3).

Water levels from March 1999 to March 2003 generally declined in most of Juab Valley. The decline in water levels probably resulted from continued large withdrawals and less-than-average precipitation during the irrigation season. Water levels in March generally rose from 1978 to their highest level in 1985. This rise corresponds to a period of greater-than-average precipitation during 1978-86. Water levels have generally declined since 1986, although there was a general rise from 1993 to 1999.

The location of wells in Juab Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 15. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Nephi, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (D-13-1)7dbc-1 is shown in figure 16.

Precipitation at Nephi during 2002 was about 11.3 inches, which is about 3.2 inches less than the average annual precipitation for 1935-2002, and about 0.1 inch more than in 2001. The concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (D-13-1)7dbc-1 fluctuated during 1964-2002 with a slight upward trend.




Figure 15. Location of wells in Juab Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003.




Figure 16. Relation of water level in selected wells in Juab Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Nephi, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (D-13-1)7dbc-1.







Figure 16. Relation of water level in selected wells in Juab Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Nephi, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (D-13-1)7dbc-1—Continued.





Figure 16. Relation of water level in selected wells in Juab Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Nephi, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (D-13-1)7dbc-1—Continued.




Figure 16. Relation of water level in selected wells in Juab Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Nephi, to annual withdrawals from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (D-13-1)7dbc-1—Continued.

## SEVIER DESERT

By Paul Downhour

The part of the Sevier Desert described here covers about 2,000 square miles. It is principally the broad, gently sloping area between about Townships 12 South and 19 South, and Ranges 3 West and 11 West. Ground water occurs in the Sevier Desert in unconsolidated deposits under water-table and artesian conditions. Most of the ground water is discharged from wells completed in either of two artesian aquifers—the shallow or deep artesian aquifer.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in the Sevier Desert in 2002 was about 36,000 acre-feet, which is 17,000 acre-feet more than in 2001 and about 15,000 acre-feet more than the 1992-2001 average annual withdrawal (tables 2 and 3). The increase in total withdrawal from 2001 was mostly a result of increased withdrawal for irrigation.

The location of wells in the Sevier Desert in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figures 17 and 18. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to annual discharge of the Sevier River near Juab, to cumulative departure

from average annual precipitation at Oak City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-15-4)18daa-1 is shown in figure 19. Water levels in both the shallow and deep aquifers in the Sevier Desert generally rose from 1980 to 1987, which corresponds to a period of greater-than-average precipitation and less-than-average withdrawal. Water levels in both aquifers began declining during 1987-90 and continued to decline until 1995. Levels generally rose or remained stable from about 1995 to 1999. Rises during this period probably resulted from decreased withdrawal, greater-than-average precipitation, and more available surface water for irrigation. Water levels generally declined from March 1999 to March 2003, probably as a result of decreased surface-water supplies and increased withdrawal from wells.

Discharge of the Sevier River near Juab in 2002 was 106,300 acre-feet, 32,500 acre-feet less than the revised total of 138,800 acre-feet in 2001 and 77,100 acre-feet less than the long-term average (1935-2002). Precipitation at Oak City was about 11.4 inches in 2002, about 1.6 inches less than the 1935-2002 average annual precipitation and about 2.8 inches more than in 2001.





Figure 17. Location of wells in the shallow artesian aquifer part of the Sevier Desert in which the water level was measured during March 2003.



### EXPLANATION




-  Approximate boundary of basin-fill deposits
-  Observation well
-  Observation well with corresponding hydrograph—Number with letter D refers to deep artesian aquifer hydrograph in figure 19

Figure 18. Location of wells in the deep artesian aquifer part of the Sevier Desert in which the water level was measured during March 2003.




Figure 19. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Sevier Desert to annual discharge of the Sevier River near Juab, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Oak City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-15-4)18daa-1.




Figure 19. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Sevier Desert to annual discharge of the Sevier River near Juab, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Oak City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-15-4)18daa-1—Continued.




Figure 19. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Sevier Desert to annual discharge of the Sevier River near Juab, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Oak City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-15-4)18daa-1—Continued.




Figure 19. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Sevier Desert to annual discharge of the Sevier River near Juab, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Oak City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-15-4)18daa-1—Continued.




Figure 19. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Sevier Desert to annual discharge of the Sevier River near Juab, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Oak City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-15-4)18daa-1—Continued.

## CENTRAL SEVIER VALLEY

By B.A. Slauch

The central Sevier Valley is in south-central Utah, surrounded by the Sevier and Wasatch Plateaus to the east and the Tushar Mountains, Valley Mountains, and Pahvant Range to the west. Altitude ranges from 5,100 feet on the valley floor at the north end of the valley near Gunnison to about 12,000 feet in the Tushar Mountains.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in the central Sevier Valley in 2002 was about 11,000 acre-feet, which is 1,000 acre-feet less than reported for 2001, and 7,000 acre-feet less than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). The decrease was mostly a result of decreased withdrawals for public supply.

The location of wells in the central Sevier Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 20. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to annual discharge of the Sevier River at Hatch, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Richfield, to annu-

al withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-23-2)15dcb-4 is shown in figure 21.

Water levels generally declined from March 1999 to March 2003 in the central Sevier Valley. Hydrographs for selected wells show that March water levels generally rose from about 1978 to 1985 and declined from 1985 to about 1993. Since 1993, water levels have fluctuated depending on the amount and timing of precipitation and the potential for recharge from snowmelt runoff.

Discharge of the Sevier River at Hatch in 2002 was about 28,500 acre-feet. This is about 41,000 acre-feet less than the 69,500 acre-feet for 2001 and about 49,700 acre-feet less than the 1940-2002 average annual discharge.

Precipitation at Richfield was about 6.5 inches in 2002, which is about 1.6 inches less than the 1950-2002 average annual precipitation and about 0.3 inch less than in 2001. Concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-23-2)15dcb-4 decreased from about 600 milligrams per liter to about 400 milligrams per liter during 1987-95, which was about the concentration during 1955-59. The concentration of dissolved solids for 2002 was about 444 milligrams per liter.




Figure 20. Location of wells in central Sevier Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003.







Figure 21. Relation of water level in selected wells in central Sevier Valley to annual discharge of the Sevier River at Hatch, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Richfield, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-23-2)15dcb-4.




5



6



7



8

Figure 21. Relation of water level in selected wells in central Sevier Valley to annual discharge of the Sevier River at Hatch, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Richfield, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-23-2)15dcb-4—Continued.





Figure 21. Relation of water level in selected wells in central Sevier Valley to annual discharge of the Sevier River at Hatch, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Richfield, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-23-2)15dcb-4—Continued.




Figure 21. Relation of water level in selected wells in central Sevier Valley to annual discharge of the Sevier River at Hatch, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Richfield, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-23-2)15dcb-4—Continued.

## PAHVANT VALLEY

By R.L. Swenson

Pahvant Valley, in southeast Millard County, extends from the vicinity of McCornick on the north to Kanosh on the south, from the Pahvant Range and Canyon Mountains on the east and northeast to a low basalt ridge on the west. The area of the valley is about 300 square miles, and water drains to the valley from about 500 square miles of the mountainous terrain. There is surface-water drainage from the southern part of the valley, south of the southern edge of Township 20 South. North of this line, the surface is an undulating plain covered with sand dunes from which there is little or no surface drainage.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Pahvant Valley in 2002 was about 89,000 acre-feet, which is about 9,000 acre-feet more than was reported in 2001 and 10,000 acre-feet more than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). Withdrawal for irrigation in 2002 was about 87,300 acre-feet, which is 8,600 acre-feet more than was reported in 2001.

The location of wells in Pahvant Valley in which water levels were measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 22. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Fillmore, to annual

withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells is shown in figure 23.

Water levels generally declined in Pahvant Valley from March 2000 to March 2003. The declines are probably a result of decreased recharge from less-than-average precipitation and continued large withdrawals for irrigation. Water levels generally declined from the early 1950s until 1982 as a result of generally less-than-average precipitation and increased withdrawals. Water levels generally rose from 1982 to 1985, and were generally higher than in the early 1950s. The 1982-85 rises were caused by greater-than-average precipitation and decreased withdrawals for irrigation. Levels generally have declined since 1985 because of continued large withdrawals for irrigation.

Precipitation at Fillmore during 2002 was about 10.4 inches, which is about 4.7 inches less than the average annual precipitation for 1931-2002 and about 3.6 inches less than in 2001. The concentration of dissolved solids in water from wells near Flowell and west of Kanosh is shown in figure 23. The concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-21-5)7cdd-3, northwest of Flowell, has shown little change since 1983. The concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-23-6)8abd-1, west of Kanosh, generally has increased since the late 1950s.




Figure 22. Location of wells in Pahvant Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003.




Figure 23. Relation of water level in selected wells in Pahvant Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Fillmore, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells.







Figure 23. Relation of water level in selected wells in Pahvant Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Fillmore, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells—Continued.




9



10



11



12

Figure 23. Relation of water level in selected wells in Pahvant Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Fillmore, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells—Continued




Figure 23. Relation of water level in selected wells in Pahvant Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Fillmore, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids from selected wells—Continued.

## **CEDAR VALLEY, IRON COUNTY**

By J.H. Howells

Cedar Valley is in eastern Iron County, southwestern Utah. The valley covers about 170 square miles, from about Townships 34 South to 37 South and Ranges 10 West to 12 West. Ground water in Cedar Valley occurs in unconsolidated deposits, mostly under water-table conditions. The principal source of recharge to aquifers is water from Coal Creek, which seeps directly from the stream channel into the ground after being diverted for irrigation.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Cedar Valley in 2002 was about 42,000 acre-feet, which is 10,000 acre-feet more than the value for 2001 and 8,000 acre-feet more than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3).

The location of wells in Cedar Valley, Iron County, in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 24. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport, to annual discharge of Coal Creek near Cedar City, to annual with-

drawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells is shown in figure 25.

Ground-water levels generally declined from March 1999 to March 2003 in most of Cedar Valley. Water-level declines probably resulted from continued large withdrawals for irrigation and public supply and less-than-average streamflow and precipitation. Wells in the northern part of Cedar Valley show that water levels generally declined through 1992 and rose slightly from 1993-99. Water levels in the central and southern parts of the valley generally rose in the 1980s and generally have declined since 1989.

Precipitation at Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport in 2002 was about 5.2 inches, which is about 4.5 inches less than the revised level for 2001 and about 5.5 inches less than the average annual precipitation for 1951-2002. The discharge of Coal Creek was about 7,200 acre-feet in 2002, which is 16,000 acre-feet less than the revised total of 23,200 acre-feet for 2001, and 16,700 acre-feet less than the average annual discharge for 1936, 1939-2002. The concentrations of dissolved solids in water from wells (C-35-11)31dbd-1, (C-37-12)23acb-1, and (C-37-12)23abd-1 ranged between 300 and 600 milligrams per liter.




Figure 24. Location of wells in Cedar Valley, Iron County, in which the water level was measured during March 2003.




Figure 25. Relation of water level in selected wells in Cedar Valley, Iron County, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at the Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport, to annual discharge of Coal Creek near Cedar City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells




Figure 25. Relation of water level in selected wells in Cedar Valley, Iron County, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at the Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport, to annual discharge of Coal Creek near Cedar City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells—Continued




Figure 25. Relation of water level in selected wells in Cedar Valley, Iron County, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at the Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport, to annual discharge of Coal Creek near Cedar City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells—Continued




Figure 25. Relation of water level in selected wells in Cedar Valley, Iron County, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at the Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport, to annual discharge of Coal Creek near Cedar City, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from selected wells—Continued

## PAROWAN VALLEY

By J.H. Howells

Parowan Valley is in northern Iron County, southwestern Utah. The valley covers about 160 square miles, between about Townships 32 South and 34 South and Ranges 7 West and 10 West. Ground water occurs in unconsolidated deposits under both water-table and artesian conditions.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in Parowan Valley in 2002 was about 39,000 acre-feet, which is about 17,000 acre-feet more than was reported for 2001 and 12,000 acre-feet more than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3).

The location of wells in Parowan Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 26. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Cedar City Federal

Aviation Administration Airport, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-33-8)31ccc-1 is shown in figure 27.

Water levels generally declined from March 1999 to March 2003 in Parowan Valley. Declines probably resulted from decreased recharge resulting from less-than-average precipitation. Water levels in Parowan Valley generally have declined since 1950, although rises occurred during 1973-74, 1983-85, and 1996-99. The rises were probably the result of greater-than-average precipitation during those periods.

Precipitation at Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport in 2002 was about 5.2 inches, which is about 5.5 inches less than the average annual precipitation for 1951-2002 and about 4.5 inches less than the revised value for 2001. The concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-33-8)31ccc-1 has shown little change since 1976 (fig. 27).

## EXPLANATION

Approximate boundary of basin-fill deposits

● Observation well

3● Observation well with corresponding hydrograph—Number refers to hydrograph in figure 27




Figure 26. Location of wells in Parowan Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003.




Figure 27. Relation of water level in selected wells in Parowan Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-33-8)31ccc-1.




Figure 27. Relation of water level in selected wells in Parowan Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-33-8)31ccc-1—Continued.





Figure 27 Relation of water level in selected wells in Parowan Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-33-8)31ccc-1—Continued




Figure 27. Relation of water level in selected wells in Parowan Valley to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Cedar City Federal Aviation Administration Airport, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-33-8)31ccc-1—Continued

## ESCALANTE VALLEY

### Milford Area

By B.A. Slauch

The Milford area is in southwest Utah in parts of Millard, Beaver, and Iron Counties, between about Townships 24 South and 31 South and Ranges 9 West and 14 West.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in the Milford area of the Escalante Valley in 2002 was about 52,000 acre-feet, which is 10,000 acre-feet more than was reported for 2001 and 4,000 acre-feet more than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). The increase in withdrawals was mostly the result of increased irrigation.

The location of wells measured in the Milford area during March 2003 is shown in figure 28. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Black Rock, to annual discharge of the Beaver

River at Rocky Ford Dam, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-28-11)25dcd-1 is shown in figure 29.

Water levels from March 2000 to March 2003 generally declined in most of the Milford area as a result of less-than-average precipitation. Water levels generally have declined since the early 1950s in the south-central Milford area in response to the long-term effects of ground-water withdrawals. Water-level rises during 1983-85 resulted from greater-than-average precipitation during 1982-85 and increased recharge from record flow in the Beaver River during 1983-84.

Precipitation at Black Rock in 2002 was about 4.8 inches, about 1.9 inches less than in 2001 and about 4.2 inches less than the 1952-2002 average annual precipitation.

Discharge of the Beaver River in 2002 was about 11,200 acre-feet, which is 17,500 acre-feet less than the 1931-35, 1938-2002 average annual discharge. From 1950 to 1983, the concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-28-11)25dcd-1 increased from about 500 to almost 2,000 milligrams per liter. Since 1983, concentrations have decreased to about 643 milligrams per liter in 2002.




Figure 28. Location of wells in the Milford area in which the water level was measured during March 2003.







Figure 29. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Milford area to cumulative departure at Black Rock, to annual discharge of the Beaver River at Rocky Ford Dam, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentrations of dissolved solids in water from well (C-28-11)25dcd-1.




Figure 29. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Milford area to cumulative departure at Black Rock, to annual discharge of the Beaver River at Rocky Ford Dam, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentrations of dissolved solids in water from well (C-28-11)25dcd-1—Continued.




Figure 29. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Milford area to cumulative departure at Black Rock, to annual discharge of the Beaver River at Rocky Ford Dam, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentrations of dissolved solids in water from well (C-28-11)25dcd-1—Continued.




Figure 29. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Milford area to cumulative departure at Black Rock, to annual discharge of the Beaver River at Rocky Ford Dam, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentrations of dissolved solids in water from well (C-28-11)25dcd-1—Continued.

## ESCALANTE VALLEY

### Beryl-Enterprise Area

By H.K. Christiansen

The Beryl-Enterprise area covers about 800 square miles in the southern end of Escalante Valley between about Townships 31 South and 37 South and Ranges 12 West and 18 West.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in the Beryl-Enterprise area in 2002 was about 99,000 acre-feet, which is 18,000 acre-feet more than in 2001 and 19,000 acre-feet more than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). The increase was mostly the result of increased withdrawals for irrigation.

The location of wells in the Beryl-Enterprise area in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 30. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells to cumulative depar-

ture from average annual precipitation at Modena, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-34-16)28dcc-2 is shown in figure 31.

Water levels generally declined from March 2002 to March 2003 in the Beryl-Enterprise area. Water levels have declined steadily and consistently since 1950, showing basically no recovery during periods of above average precipitation. The declines are a result of continued large withdrawals for irrigation since 1950. A decline of about 110 feet since 1948 is shown in well (C-36-16)29daa-1, about 5 miles northeast of Enterprise.

Precipitation at Modena in 2002 was about 3.6 inches, which is about 6.7 inches less than the average annual precipitation for 1936-2002 and about 5.4 inches less than in 2001. Concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-34-16)28dcc-2 has increased from about 460 milligrams per liter in 1967 to about 680 milligrams per liter in 2002.




Figure 30. Location of wells in the Beryl-Enterprise area in which the water level was measured during March 2003.




Figure 31. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Beryl-Enterprise area to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Modena, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-34-16)28dcc-2.










Figure 31. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Beryl-Enterprise area to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Modena, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-34-16)28dcc-2—Continued.



9



10



11

Figure 31. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Beryl-Enterprise area to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Modena, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-34-16)28dcc-2—Continued.




Figure 31. Relation of water level in selected wells in the Beryl-Enterprise area to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at Modena, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-34-16)28dcc-2—Continued.

## CENTRAL VIRGIN RIVER AREA

By H.K. Christiansen

The central Virgin River area is between the south end of the Pine Valley Mountains and the Hurricane Cliffs to the east and the Beaver Dam Mountains to the southwest. Major ground-water development includes water from valley-fill aquifers that is used primarily for irrigation and water from consolidated rock and valley fill that is used primarily for public supply. Most of the wells measured are near the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers.

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in the central Virgin River area in 2002 was about 27,000 acre-feet, which is the same as in 2001 and 9,000 acre-feet more than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). Withdrawal for irrigation increased by about 1,700 acre-feet from 2001 to 2002. Withdrawal for industry in 2002 increased by about 90 acre-feet from 2001. Withdrawal for public supply was 2,100 acre-feet less than the 2001 amount. Withdrawal for domestic and stock use was about 100 acre-feet more than in 2001.

The location of wells in the central Virgin River area in which the water level was measured during February 2003 is shown in figure 32. The relation of the

water level in selected observation wells to annual discharge of the Virgin River at Virgin, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at St. George, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-41-17)17bdb-1 is shown in figure 33.

Water levels from February 2002 to February 2003 in the central Virgin River area generally declined in the Santa Clara River drainage and most of the Virgin River drainage. Water levels in the Fort Pearce Wash area have generally declined since the mid-1980s. The declines are probably the result of increased withdrawals for irrigation.

Discharge of the Virgin River at Virgin in 2002 was about 65,000 acre-feet, which is 30,200 acre-feet less than the revised value of 95,200 acre-feet for 2001 and about 67,800 acre-feet less than the long-term average for 1931-70, 1979-2002. Precipitation at St. George in 2002 was about 3.1 inches, which is about 4.8 inches less than the average annual precipitation for 1947-2002 and about 3.3 inches less than in 2001. The concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-41-17)17bdb-1 indicates moderate fluctuation but little overall change since 1966.




Figure 32. Location of wells in the central Virgin River area in which the water level was measured during March 2003.




Figure 33. Relation of water level in selected wells in the central Virgin River area to annual discharge of the Virgin River at Virgin, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at St. George, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-41-17)17bdb-1.






Figure 33. Relation of water level in selected wells in the central Virgin River area to annual discharge of the Virgin River at Virgin, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at St. George, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-41-17)17bdb-1—Continued.





Figure 33. Relation of water level in selected wells in the central Virgin River area to annual discharge of the Virgin River at Virgin, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at St. George, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-41-17)17bdb-1—Continued.




Figure 33. Relation of water level in selected wells in the central Virgin River area to annual discharge of the Virgin River at Virgin, to cumulative departure from the average annual precipitation at St. George, to annual withdrawal from wells, and to concentration of dissolved solids in water from well (C-41-17)17bdb-1—Continued

## OTHER AREAS

By M.J. Fisher

Total estimated withdrawal of water from wells in the areas of Utah listed below in 2002 was about 131,000 acre-feet, which is 17,000 acre-feet more than the estimate for 2001 and 21,000 acre-feet more than the average annual withdrawal for 1992-2001 (tables 2 and 3). In the areas listed below, withdrawal in 2002 was the same as or more than in 2001 except in the Grouse Creek and Ogden Valleys. The increase in withdrawal resulted from increased irrigation, industrial, and public supply use.

The location of wells in Cedar Valley, Utah County, in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 34. The relation of the water level in observation wells in Cedar Valley, Utah County, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Fairfield is shown in figure 35.

Water levels in the selected wells in Cedar Valley generally rose during the 1970s. Water levels rose sharply from the early to mid-1980s as a result of greater-than-average precipitation, but generally have declined since the mid-1980s because of continued withdrawal and less precipitation. Water levels declined in most of the wells from March 2002 to March

2003. The declines probably resulted from increased withdrawals for irrigation and public supply, and less-than-average precipitation.

The location of wells in Sanpete Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003 is shown in figure 36. The relation of the water level in selected observation wells in Sanpete Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Manti is shown in figure 37.

Water levels in many of the selected wells in Sanpete County rose from the late 1970s to the mid-1980s as a result of greater-than-average precipitation, and have varied since the mid-1980s, but overall have declined. Water levels declined in most of the wells from March 1999 to March 2003. The declines probably resulted from increased withdrawal for irrigation and less-than-average precipitation.

The relation of the water level in wells in the remaining selected areas of Utah (see accompanying table) to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas is shown in figure 38. Water levels generally declined in most of the selected observation wells from March 1999 to March 2003. The declines probably resulted from increased withdrawals for public supply and industry, and less-than-average precipitation. Water-level rises in some of the areas from 2002 to 2003 probably resulted from greater-than-average precipitation and (or) increased local recharge from surface water.

Number in figure 1	Area	Estimated withdrawal (acre-feet)					2001 total (rounded)
		2002				2002 total (rounded)	
		Irrigation	Industrial	Public supply	Domestic and stock		
1	Grouse Creek Valley	2,000	0	0	20	2,000	2,800
2	Park Valley	2,500	0	0	10	2,500	2,500
4	Malad-lower Bear River Valley	3,800	850	4,900	200	9,800	8,600
8	Ogden Valley	0	0	10,900	20	10,900	11,100
13	Rush Valley	5,200	180	270	30	5,700	4,600
14	Dugway area, Skull Valley, and Old River Bed	3,200	3,400	1,600	10	8,200	8,100
15	Cedar Valley, Utah County	3,300	0	1,900	40	5,200	3,800
20	Sanpete Valley	7,500	520	660	4,000	12,700	10,500
25	Snake Valley	14,400	0	70	50	14,500	10,300
27	Beaver Valley	11,700	20	570	420	12,700	6,000
	Remainder of State	13,100	14,200	17,200	2,500	47,000	45,200
Total (rounded)		66,700	19,200	38,100	7,300	131,000	114,000




Figure 34. Location of wells in Cedar Valley, Utah County, in which the water level was measured during March 2003.







Figure 35. Relation of water level in selected wells in Cedar Valley, Utah County, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Fairfield.



4

Figure 35. Relation of water level in selected wells in Cedar Valley, Utah County, to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Fairfield—Continued.




Figure 36. Location of wells in Sanpete Valley in which the water level was measured during March 2003.




Figure 37. Relation of water level in selected wells in Sanpete Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Manti.




Figure 37. Relation of water level in selected wells in Sanpete Valley to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at Manti—Continued.




Figure 38. Relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas.




Figure 38. Relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas—Continued.




Figure 38. Relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas—Continued.




Figure 38. Relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas—Continued.




Figure 38. Relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas—Continued.




Figure 38. Relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas—Continued.




Figure 38. Relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas—Continued.




Figure 38. Relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas—Continued.




Figure 38. Relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas—Continued.




Figure 38. Relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas—Continued.




Figure 38. Relation of water level in wells in selected areas of Utah to cumulative departure from average annual precipitation at sites in or near those areas—Continued.

## REFERENCES CITED

- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2002, Climatological data, Utah: Asheville, N.C., National Climatic Data Center, v. 104, no. 1-12 [variously paged].
- Burden, C.B., and others, 2002, Ground-water conditions in Utah, Spring of 2001: Utah Division of Water Resources Cooperative Investigations Report No. 43, 120 p.