

Obegi, Doug

From: Hilts, Derek <derek_hilts@fws.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 2:08 PM
To: Obegi, Doug
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] CALSIM modeling questions
Attachments: Oroville_Storages_4DO.xlsx

Doug,
Sorry for the delay. I was tied up with something else. Here are the Oroville September storages.
Derek

Derek Hilts M.S., P.E.
US Fish and Wildlife Service
650 Capitol Mall Room 8-300
Sacramento, California 95814
Work desk phone 916.930.5633

On Fri, Mar 29, 2019 at 9:09 AM Obegi, Doug <dobegi@nrdc.org> wrote:

Thanks Derek. The Bureau's EA on the COA Addendum increased EOS Shasta storage in critical years by around 100TAF, so that could account for a portion of the change (and also the adverse effect on Oroville storage you note), along with the changes to the Sacramento River Settlement Contract deliveries to use historic levels rather than full contract amounts.

Are there other years you saw where Oroville storage drops to or nearly to dead pool, or just 1977? The BA only includes exceedance tables of storage, not the year by year results, so I haven't been able to see more detailed results.

One other thing that I don't really understand looking at the model results again this morning: the critically dry EOS storage levels for Oroville under the COS scenario (750TAF) don't match up with the probability of exceedance results for Oroville EOS storage under the COS scenario (90% exceedance is 951 TAF). If critically dry years are 15% of years, shouldn't these numbers be much closer, and the 90% exceedance level be lower than the CD level?? (Appendix D at page 116) The same is true for Shasta storage, where the 90% exceedance EOS storage under COS is more than 400TAF higher than the critically dry year EOS storage levels (1,673 vs 1,225).