

MEMORANDUM

To: Tom Stokely and Mike Deas
From: Greg Kamman
Date: May 22, 1998
Subject: Carryover Storage Analysis
Simulated (1928-1934) Period

Recently, we discussed various methods to simulate an intense drought period as part of the carryover storage analysis. As you are aware, we decided to simulate a series of representative water year-types similar to those experienced during the 1928-1934 drought. The progression of year-types experienced over this period are listed in the second column of the attached tables.

As a first step in completing these simulations, I prepared a series of water budgets that represent the change in storage of Trinity Lake from one year to the next during the 1928-1934 progression of year-types and according to Trinity Division operations¹ associated with each proposed flow alternative. As indicated in column three of these tables, there is a net annual decrease in Trinity Lake storage during dry and critically dry year-types. These values are based on PROSIM output of our representative dry and critically dry year-types (1990 and 1977, respectively). The amount of these annual decreases are quite variable between proposed flow alternatives. The tables also indicate if and when the Lake would go dry under a suite of carryover storage scenarios. For example, when starting with 1250K ac-ft of storage under the No Action alternative, Trinity Lake would go dry after the third year of this representative drought. Only when carryover storage is greater than approximately 1750K ac-ft would there be enough water to last through the entire 7 year period. Even then, the remaining storage may not provide enough cool-water pool to meet downstream temperature objectives.

The Flow Study and 40% Inflow alternatives appear to be the only alternatives which would provide sufficient water over the entire drought period to maintain desired operations. The Flow Study alternative maintains the greatest reservoir storage volumes over this period. Given the poor performance of the 40% Inflow alternative during our previous simulations, we will likely only need to simulate droughts using a couple Flow Study alternative scenarios (maybe 1000K and 1500K ac-ft carryover storage scenarios). At this point, I doubt that there is much reason to try any of the No Action alternative simulations, but we can discuss this in the near future.

¹ It is quite likely that operations would change during drought periods. However, we do not have the knowledge or expertise to define what such changes. Thus, this analysis uses operations consistent with the earlier PROSIM simulations and evaluations.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Year	Water Yr-type	An. delta Storage (ac-ft)	750K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1000K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1250K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1500K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1750K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	2000K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)
1928	normal	136,160	886,160	1,136,160	1,386,160	1,636,160	1,886,160	2,136,160
1929	crit. dry	-701,980	184,180	434,180	684,180	934,180	1,184,180	1,434,180
1930	dry	-104,220	79,960	329,960	579,960	829,960	1,079,960	1,329,960
1931	crit. dry	-701,980	-622,020	-372,020	-122,020	127,980	377,980	627,980
1932	dry	-104,220	-726,240	-476,240	-226,240	23,760	273,760	523,760
1933	dry	-104,220	-830,460	-580,460	-330,460	-80,460	169,540	419,540
1934	dry	-104,220	-934,680	-684,680	-434,680	-184,680	65,320	315,320

FLOW STUDY ALTERNATIVE

Year	Water Yr-type	An. delta Storage (ac-ft)	750K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1000K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1250K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1500K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1750K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	2000K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)
1928	normal	-23,515	886,160	1,136,160	1,386,160	1,636,160	1,886,160	2,136,160
1929	crit. dry	-340,823	545,337	795,337	1,045,337	1,295,337	1,545,337	1,795,337
1930	dry	-17,460	527,877	777,877	1,027,877	1,277,877	1,527,877	1,777,877
1931	crit. dry	-340,823	187,054	437,054	687,054	937,054	1,187,054	1,437,054
1932	dry	-17,460	169,594	419,594	669,594	919,594	1,169,594	1,419,594
1933	dry	-17,460	152,134	402,134	652,134	902,134	1,152,134	1,402,134
1934	dry	-17,460	134,674	384,674	634,674	884,674	1,134,674	1,384,674

40% INFLOW ALTERNATIVE

Year	Water Yr-type	An. delta Storage (ac-ft)	750K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1000K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1250K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1500K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1750K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	2000K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)
1928	normal	207,760	886,160	1,136,160	1,386,160	1,636,160	1,886,160	2,136,160
1929	crit. dry	-363,915	522,245	772,245	1,022,245	1,272,245	1,522,245	1,772,245
1930	dry	-89,732	432,513	682,513	932,513	1,182,513	1,432,513	1,682,513
1931	crit. dry	-363,915	68,598	318,598	568,598	818,598	1,068,598	1,318,598
1932	dry	-89,732	-21,134	228,866	478,866	728,866	978,866	1,228,866
1933	dry	-89,732	-110,866	139,134	389,134	639,134	889,134	1,139,134
1934	dry	-89,732	-200,598	49,402	299,402	549,402	799,402	1,049,402

MAXIMUM FLOW ALTERNATIVE

Year	Water Yr-type	An. delta Storage (ac-ft)	750K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1000K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1250K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1500K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	1750K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)	2000K Cum. Storage (ac-ft)
1928	normal	960	886,160	1,136,160	1,386,160	1,636,160	1,886,160	2,136,160
1929	crit. dry	-343,179	542,981	792,981	1,042,981	1,292,981	1,542,981	1,792,981
1930	dry	-343,610	199,371	449,371	699,371	949,371	1,199,371	1,449,371
1931	crit. dry	-343,179	-143,808	106,192	356,192	606,192	856,192	1,106,192
1932	dry	-343,610	-487,418	-237,418	12,582	262,582	512,582	762,582
1933	dry	-343,610	-831,028	-581,028	-331,028	-81,028	168,972	418,972
1934	dry	-343,610	-1,174,638	-924,638	-674,638	-424,638	-174,638	75,362