From: Hilts, Derek <derek\_hilts@fws.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 4:24 PM
To: Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal

**Subject:** Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: ROC on LTO Stanislaus info by yeartype

Hi Barb,

Responses to your questions -

1. Yes, Column G of the "Conv\_Flags" worksheet is what you should use for 60-20-20 yeartypes at the Early Long Term climate. Those yeartypes match what was input into CalSimII for both the COS and PA runs.

HOWEVER, heretofore I was using a timeseries of 60-20-20 ELT yeartypes that classified 1933, 2002 and 2003 as DRY, DRY rather than CRT, CRT, BN, respectively. The person who generated the yeartype-based values in Table 37-3 must have also used DRY, DRY, DRY despite Column G on "Conv\_Flags" because when you use DRY, DRY, DRY for those three water years you get the values AND the yeartype percentages shown in Table 37-3.

- I don't understand your terminology.
- 3. I'm sorry that I used a different convention for numbering the wateryear types. I could have easily used the other way. There is no convention unless you want to be consistent with CalSimII code in which case 1=WET...5=CRT. Sorry again for any confusion/loss of time.
- 4. Yes, I agree, except for row 15. I would say a change "MAY be" rather than "MUST be"
- 5. I don't see anything inaccurate. And while it is interesting intellectually, I think the bottom line is most important, which you address in Cells S60-S66.
- 6. I think you've summarized it as clearly as mud can get. The thing that nags at me is that the NMI seems like a more direct, self-correcting parameter than 60-20-20. In any given year, the 60-20-20 could have a monster month that makes the yeartype an imperfect predictor of available water supply whereas the NMI seems like a less imperfect predictor (it's imperfection being limited to inaccuracies only in the spring/early summer months). Hope that makes sense.

Good luck! 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 Tue, Mar 26, 2019 at 8:57 AM Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal < barbara.byrne@noaa.gov > wrote:

Derek -- Please see some Stanislaus-related questions below. Our effects analysis is due Thursday, so feedback by COB today (at least on questions 1-3, which I think are quick) would be much appreciated.

Attached are: Excel workbook (see "Yeartypes" tab) and Table 37-3 from Modeling Appendix.

## Part 1:

In the chain forwarded below, you code yeartype as Wet=5 to Critical=1. I pulled the 60-20-20 yeartype from the CALSIM "trend reporting" workbook (Column G of the "Conv\_Flags" tab) and it seems to code yeartype as Wet=1 to Critical=5 (see, for example, 2001 and 2002. In the real world, those were Dry; in the ELT Q5 scenario they are listed as 5's. My interpretation is that they are Critical in the Calsim climate change scenario.)

- 1. Is it correct that I should pull the 60-20-20 yeartypes from Column G of the "Conv\_Flags" tab of the trend reporting workbook? If not, where can I find that info?
  - --Hmmm... I just looked at Table 37-3 in Attachment 3-2 of Appendix D (Flow below Goodwin, COS and PA comparison), and their 60-20-20 yeartypes percentages are listed as: Wet (23%), AN (24%), BN (10%),Dry (16%) and Critical (27%). The numbers I get in my excel sheet ("Yeartypes" tab in the attached, see cells Q29-Q34) are the same in some cases (green highlight) but different in others (yellow highlight): Wet (23%), AN (24%), BN (11%),Dry (12%) and Critical (29%). Pretty close, but I'm concerned about the discrepancy -- any ideas why that might be?
- 2. Is it correct that I should "sync" up your NMI summary with the 60-20-20 by recoding one or the other (I recoded yours)?
- 3. Is your coding (Wet=5 to Critical=1) the more conventional ordering? If so, why does the darn trend reporting workbook reverse it (or have I misunderstood)?

## Part II:

If you have time, I'd appreciate your eyes on the "Yeartypes" tab in the attached (added a tab to what you sent over), particularly:

- 4. (Rows 6-15) Do you agree with the assumptions/interpretations stated in these rows?
- 5. (Summary tables and general conclusions in Columns M-S) Do you see anything inaccurate in my summaries or conclusions? Any insights to add?
- 6. (Cells S60-S66 and Table 37-3 from Attachment 3-2 of Appendix D) Any suggestions on these conclusions in particular? I would welcome your take on the mechanisms behind the different or similar flows in Table 37-3, bottom panel.

## Barb

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Hilts, Derek** < <u>derek\_hilts@fws.gov</u>>

Date: Fri, Mar 1, 2019 at 4:06 PM

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: ROC on LTO Stanislaus info by yeartype

To: Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal < barbara.byrne@noaa.gov >

Just in case storage isn't enough to mull over, I've added Goodwin flows to the workbook. See attached - AFTER the weekend! :)

Derek Hilts M.S., P.E. US Fish and Wildlife Service 650 Capitol Mall Room 8-300

On Fri, Mar 1, 2019 at 1:31 PM Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal < <u>barbara.byrne@noaa.gov</u>> wrote: Responses embedded below, in blue.

On Fri, Mar 1, 2019 at 12:48 PM Hilts, Derek < derek hilts@fws.gov wrote: Hi Barb,

As you may know, the results in Appendix D Attch 3-1 Tables 7.1, 7.2 & 7.3, although arrayed as Jan - Dec, actually are displaying Oct, Nov, & Dec values based on the previous water year type (which I think is good). For example, the value for NM storage in Oct 1976 is used in the calculation of Wet Yeartype average because WY75 was a wet year. (WY76 winds up being a critically dry year). I thought this was the case, but wasn't sure -- meant to ask you so thanks for flagging this!

I will use this same approach to tabulate NM storages on a NMI-based yeartype basis. The problem of course with tabulating water year type-based averages using NMI bins is that each run may have its own set of W, AN, BN, DRY, CRT years. Below is a table of the three runs' NMI yeartypes (WET=5, ..., CRT=1)

1947 2 3 1 1948 2 3 1 1949 2 2 1

1950 2 2 1

1951 3 4 1

1952 5 5 2

1953 4 4 1

1954 3 3 1

1955 2 2 1

1956 4 4 1

1957 3 3 1

1958 4 4 1

1959 3 3 1

1960 2 2 1

1961 1 2 1

1962 1 2 1

1963 2 2 1

1964 1 2 1

1965 3 3 1

1966 2 2 1

1967 4 4 2

1968 3 3 1

1969 5 5 2

1970 4 4 1

1971 3 4 1

1972 3 3 1

1973 3 4 1

1974 3 4 1

1975 3 4 1 1976 2 3 1

1977 1 2 1

1978 2 3 1

1979 3 3 1 1980 4 4 1

1981 2 3 1

1982 5 5 2

1983 5 5 3

1984 4 4 1

1985 3 3 1

1986 5 5 2

1987 3 3 1

1988 1 2 1

1989 1 2 1

1990 1 1 1

1991 1 1 1

1992 1 1 1

1993 1 1 1

1994 1 1 1

1995 3 3 2

1996 4 4 1

1997 4 4 2

1998 5 5 2

1999 4 4 1

2000 4 4 1 2001 2 3 1 2002 2 3 1 2003 2 3 1

Do you want me to tabulate each run's NM storage averages based on <u>its own</u> NMI yeartypes? I need to think about this -- don't want to ask for everything and not use it. Will check in Mon or Tuesday!

The above all applies to tabulating Stan flows below Goodwin (Appendix D Attch 3-2 Tables 37.1, 37.2 & 37.3) as well. I need to think about this -- don't want to ask for everything and not use it. Will check in Mon or Tuesday!

For Appendix D Attch 3-4, do you want me to re-do all five sets of temperature tables or is there a particular location of interest? I need to think about this -- don't want to ask for everything and not use it. Will check in Mon or Tuesday!

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

--

## **Barb Byrne**

Fish Biologist
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
Office: 916-930-5612
barbara.byrne@noaa.gov
California Central Valley Office
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814



Find us online

www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov



--

Barb Byrne

Fish Biologist NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region

U.S. Department of Commerce

Office: 916-930-5612 <u>barbara.byrne@noaa.gov</u> California Central Valley Office 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100 Sacramento, CA 95814



Find us online

www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov

