

To: syaeger@exec
From: Stein Buer <sbuer@water.ca.gov>
Subject: Sites-Colusa
Cc: mcowin@exec, samson@water.ca.gov
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Sites yield: A while back you asked me to look into the results displayed by Ben Everett in Table 1 of his July 18 Memo, "Water Supply Accomplishment Analyses for Red Bank and Thomes-Newville Projects". Mark followed up with questions to Ben Everett, but did not feel that he received a satisfactory understanding. He then conducted his own analysis, using CALFED spreadsheets modified to include the local runoff components and to allow modeling of Shasta enlargement. His results suggest that Thomes-Newville yields are somewhat higher than Sites-Colusa but the difference is not dramatic. Mark's numbers:

| | 71-year average | Critical Period |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Avg. | | |
| Thomes-Neville | 291 | 213 |
| Sites-Colusa | 277 | 170 |
| Shasta Enlargement | 298 | 348 |

These results are based on a uniform assumption of 3 maf additional storage and build on the new set of DWRSIM runs. They assume that the Sacramento River Flow Event Target must be met. The modeling assumptions would need to be carefully discussed and evaluated before using these results. You will note that Shasta CP yield is larger than 71 yr average, the reverse of the other two reservoirs. Mark told me that this is because Shasta was able to capture a big slug of inflow at the beginning of the CP; the other reservoirs, being conveyance limited, could not capture much of it. Stein