

---

**From:** Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 8, 2019 2:40 PM  
**To:** Garwin Yip; Evan Sawyer - NOAA Affiliate  
**Subject:** Shasta Winter-Spring Minimum Flows

Something to ponder re: subject line project component.

We have the following table,

**Table 2.5.2-4. Example of Keswick Dam Release Schedule for Various End of September Storages (from Table 4-9 in the ROC on LTO BA).**

<b>Keswick Release (cfs)</b>	<b>Shasta End of September Storage</b>
3,250	≤ 2.2 MAF
4,000	≤ 2.8 MAF
4,500	≤ 3.2 MAF
5,000	> 3.2 MAF

We have text that states: "The greatest risk posed by these operations would occur when December flows are less than 3,250 cfs. For the PA, CalSimII modeling indicates that December flows of 3250 cfs have an exceedance probability of 30 percent."

Garwin noted that "Table indicates that "these operations" (if referring to the PA) won't be less than 3,250 cfs." Rosalie noted this too.

I note back that I agree in theory, but modeling results indicate otherwise based on cited App D Table 15-2, which is exceedance tables for KWK flows by month. And in that table, flows are less than 3250 cfs 30% of the time.

Garwin, does that satisfy you? If we state that and cite to the app D table, and maybe state that we do see that probability and therefore can't (yet again) count on the "stated" operations?