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Scott Valley Management Scenario Results
Summary Table

| Scenario Type | Scenario ID | Scenario Depletion Reversal, Sep-Nov '91-'18 (TAF) | Relative Depletion Reversal, Sep-Nov '91-'18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enhanced Recharge | MAR (Managed Aquifer Recharge) in Jan-Mar | 13 | 10\% |
|  | ILR (In-Lieu Recharge) in the early growing season | 12 | 9\% |
|  | MAR + ILR | 25 | 19\% |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Expanded MAR + ILR (assumed max infiltration rate of } \\ & 0.019 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{d} \text { ) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 60 | 44\% |
| Diversion Limits | All surface water diversions limited at low FJ flows | 51 | 38\% |
|  | MAR + ILR, with all surface water diversions limited at low FJ flows | 77 | 57\% |
| Crop change | 80\% Irrigation demand | 82 | 61\% |
|  | 90\% Irrigation demand | 40 | 29\% |
| Irrigation Efficiency | Improve irrigation efficiency by 0.1 | 5.8 | 4\% |
|  | Improve irrigation efficiency by 0.2 | 16 | 12\% |
|  | Reduce irrigation efficiency by 0.1 | -3.2 | -2\% |
| Irrigation schedule change | Alfalfa irrigation schedule - July 10 end date | 117 | 86\% |
|  | Alfalfa irrigation schedule - Aug 01 end date | 82 | 60\% |
|  | Aug 01 end date, dry years only ('91, '92, '94, '01, '09, '13, '14, '18) | 19 | 14\% |
|  | Alfalfa irrigation schedule - Aug 15 end date | 45 | 33\% |
|  | Aug 15 end date, dry years only ('91, '92, '94, '01, '09, '13, '14, '18) | 9 | 7\% |
| Attribution adjudicated area impacts | Natural Vegetation Outside Adjudicated area (NVOA) | 171 | 126\% |
|  | Natural Vegetation, on Groundwater- or Mixed-source fields, Outside Adjudicated area (NV-GWM-OA) | 136 | 100\% |
|  | Natural Vegetation Inside Adjudicated area (NVIA) | 126 | 93\% |
|  | Natural Vegetation, on Groundwater- or Mixed-source fields, Inside Adjudicated area (NV-GWM-IA) | 116 | 85\% |
|  | Natural Vegetation (NV) | 287 | 212\% |
|  | Natural Vegetation on all Groundwater- or Mixed-source fields (NV-GWM) | 233 | 171\% |
| Reservoir | 9 TAF Reservoir, 30 cfs release, Shackleford | 46 | 34\% |
|  | 9 TAF Reservoir, 30 cfs release, Etna | 65 | 48\% |
|  | 9 TAF Reservoir, 30 cfs release, French | 78 | 58\% |
|  | 9 TAF Reservoir, 30 cfs release, S. Fork | 35 | 26\% |
| 100\% reliable reservoir | 29 TAF Reservoir, 100\% reliability 30 cfs release | 72 | 53\% |
|  | 134 TAF Reservoir, 100\% reliability 60 cfs release | 250 | 184\% |

## Summary of scenarios

- Supply-side scenarios
- Enhanced Recharge
- Reservoirs
- Attribution
- Impact of pumping inside and outside adjudicated zone
- Demand-side scenarios
- Crop change
- Irrigation efficiency
- Irrigation schedule change
- Range of depletion reversal: 4\% - 114\%
- Not including Attribution scenarios


## Explanatory Material

The following information is intended to help a reader understand the scenario results plots and interpret them in the context of setting the surface water SMC for the Scott Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan.

## Acronyms:

UR - Undesirable Result

- Informed by Sustainability Goal, but must be tied to metric(s)

MT - Minimum (or Maximum) Threshold.

- The MT is the boundary beyond which a UR occurs.
- Note: MT and UR definitions are linked.

MO - Measurable Objective

- Ideal operating range

SMC - Sustainable Management Criteria (includes URs, MO and MTs)

PMAs - Projects and Management Actions

## Quantifying the SMC

Streamflow Depletion is quantified as:

- the difference in flow at the Fort Jones Gauge...
- over the model period of 19912018...
- between the Basecase (estimated historical) conditions and a management scenario.



## Quantifying the SMC

Total Streamflow Depletion* is quantified as:

- the difference in flow at the Fort Jones Gauge...
- over the model period of 19912018...
- between the Basecase (estimated historical/current) conditions and the No Pumping** Reference case.
* Due to pumping in SGMA wells
** Also referred to as "Natural Vegetation on GW and Mixedsource fields Outside the Adjudicated Zone", or NV-GWM-OA
*Note: Areas not proportional due to log-y axis


Total Depletion, 2010
Total Depletion, 2017

## Quantifying the SMC

Depletion Reversal is quantified for each scenario as the difference between the Basecase (simulated historical \& current) conditions and the relevant scenario (for example, MAR+ILR).
*Note: Areas not proportional due to log-y axis


MAR+ILR Depletion Reversal, 2010 MAR+ILR Depletion Reversal, 2017

MAR+ILR Depletion Reversal, 2014

## Total Depletion: no-pumping reference case maps





Basecase Landuse

> Native Vegetation on GW and Mixed Water Source Fields Outside Adjudication

## Quantifying Depletion Reversal



$$
\text { Sept. } 1 \text { - Nov. } 30
$$


Depletion Reversal

To calculate relative depletion reversal, sum the darker areas for each year and divide by the sum of the lighter areas in the Sept-Nov window.

## Relative Depletion

 Reversal for MAR+ILR: 19\%of Total Depletion, Sept.-Nov. for 1991-2018.

## Setting the SMC - Minimum Threshold (MT)

- The MT selected will define the "significant and unreasonable" undesirable result.
- The MT will be set as the amount of stream depletion reversal achieved by the minimum required PMA (expressed as \% of depletion reversed relative to the No-Pumping Reference Case).
- The PMA(s) selected to define the MT should be realistic, feasible, and fair.


# How to read and interpret graphs of scenario results 

All flows and flow changes plotted are for the Fort Jones Gauge location

## Change in flow, scenario

 minus basecase - 28 years, averaged monthly
## Flow Change Results

Threshold-passing or "reconnection" date distribution graphs


## Threshold-passing or "reconnection" date distribution graphs

Intermediate years - river
flow rose above the
threshold Sept. 15 - Nov. 1

Early years river passed this threshold on or before Sept. 15, or never fell below it


Late years river flow rose above the threshold after Nov 1

## Threshold-passing or "reconnection" date distribution graphs

How to read this graph: From 1991-2018, the FJ gauge measured flow >20 cfs on or before Oct. 1 in $\sim 63 \%$ of years.


First day with flow >= 20 cfs
Notes on model performance:
The discrepancies
between the observed and simulated basecase distributions are another reason to think of scenario results as "relative change" rather than a prediction of future conditions.
years); in the observed record it's 13 years.

## Threshold-passing or "reconnection" date distribution graphs

MAR+ILR: Generates a gain of $\sim 7$ days in higher-flow dais intermediate and some late years


## Scenario descriptions and visual references

Land Use / Crop Type: Basecase


Native Vegetation Outside Adjudication

"NVOA"

Native Vegetation on GW and Mixed Water Source Fields Outside Adjudication

"NV-GWM-OA"

## MAR (Managed Aquifer Recharge)

- 1,390 acres
- Surface water applied to orange and yellow fields, Jan-Mar.
- Water delivered through SVID Ditch



## ILR (In-Lieu Recharge)

- 5,490 acres
- Operator applies surface water to yellow and red fields instead of pumping groundwater in the early growing season, as long as surface water is available.
- Water delivered through SVID Ditch



## MAR+ILR

-6,250 combined acres

- Both MAR (January-March) and ILR (early growing season) practices used.



## MAR+ILR expanded, $0.019 \mathrm{~m} /$ day, diversion limits

 on MAR- 16,450 combined acres
- In this expanded scenario, MAR and ILR irrigation practices were assumed to be practicable on all fields with a surface water irrigation source.
- MAR surface water diversions limited on days with FJ flow near or below the CDFW recommended instream flows.
- Current known range of infiltration capacities is $0.003-0.035 \mathrm{~m} /$ day. In fields with unknown infiltration capacities, $0.019 \mathrm{~m} /$ day infiltration rate is assumed.



## Irrigation demand change

- Two scenarios in which an unspecified crop change results in:
- 90\%
- 80\%
of the historical irrigation demand on all cultivated acres (a 10\% or 20 reduction in ET on irrigated fields).



## Irrigation efficiency scenarios

- Three scenarios:
- Improve by $10 \%$
- Improve by 20\%
- Reduced (worsen) by $10 \%$
- These scenarios assume an unspecified change in irrigation equipment that results in either an increase or decrease in irrigation efficiency on all irrigated fields.

```
irr_eff_improve_0.1
irr_eff_improve_0.2
irr_eff_worse_0.1
```


## Alfalfa irrigation schedule change

- Three scenarios, in which irrigation on all alfalfa fields ceases, in all water years, on:
- July 10
- August 1
- August 15
- Would presumably involve an incentive or compensation program (a back-of-the-envelope estimate of the value of the $3^{\text {rd }}$ cutting of alfalfa is approximately $\$ 7.5$ million).

alf_irr_stop_jul10
alf_irr_stop_aug01
alf_irr_stop_aug15


## Alfalfa irrigation schedule change, dry years only

- Two scenarios, in which irrigation on all alfalfa fields ceases, in dry water years only, on:
- August 1
- August 15
- Dry water years in this simulation: '91, '92, '94, '01, '09, '13, '14, '18.
- Would presumably involve an incentive or compensation program (a back-of-the-envelope estimate of the value of the $3^{\text {rd }}$ cutting of alfalfa is approximately $\$ 7.5$ million).
alf_irr_stop_aug01_dry_yrs_only
alf_irr_stop_aug15_dry_yrs_only


## Turn off all irrigation outside adjudicated area

- 23,070 acres of cultivated crops converted to native vegetation.



## Turn off pumping outside adjudicated area

- 11,630 acres of cultivated crops converted to native vegetation.



## Turn off all irrigation inside adjudicated area

- 10,980 acres of cultivated crops converted to native vegetation.



## Turn off pumping inside adjudicated area

- 9,900 acres of cultivated crops converted to native vegetation.



## Turn off all irrigation in Scott Valley

- 34,040 acres of cultivated crops converted to native vegetation.



## Turn off all pumping in Scott Valley

- 21,530 acres of cultivated crops converted to native vegetation.



## Reservoir, 30 cfs dry season release, Shackleford

- Alters the flow of Shackleford creek to simulate a 9 TAF reservoir storing and releasing flow.
- Holds all water except 30 cfs back in the wet season (Dec. 1-Mar. 31), until the reservoir is full.
- Allows water to pass through during the growing season (Apr. 1-June 31), but retains water in storage.
- Releases 30 cfs in the dry season (July 1-Nov. 30), unless the reservoir runs dry.



## Reservoir, 30 cfs dry season release, Etna Creek

- Alters the flow of Etna creek to simulate a 9 TAF reservoir storing and releasing flow.
- Holds all water except 30 cfs back in the wet season (Dec. 1-Mar. 31), until the reservoir is full.
- Allows water to pass through during the growing season (Apr. 1-June 31), but retains water in storage.
- Releases 30 cfs in the dry season (July 1 -Nov. 30), unless the reservoir runs dry.



## Reservoir, 30 cfs dry season release, French Creek

- Alters the flow of French creek to simulate a 9 TAF reservoir storing and releasing flow.
- Holds all water except 30 cfs back in the wet season (Dec. 1-Mar. 31), until the reservoir is full.
- Allows water to pass through during the growing season (Apr. 1-June 31), but retains water in storage.
- Releases 30 cfs in the dry season (July 1 -Nov. 30), unless the reservoir runs dry.



## Reservoir, 30 cfs dry season release, South Fork

- Alters the flow of South Fork to simulate a 9 TAF reservoir storing and releasing flow.
- Holds all water except 30 cfs back in the wet season (Dec. 1-Mar. 31), until the reservoir is full.
- Allows water to pass through during the growing season (Apr. 1-June 31), but retains water in storage.
- Releases 30 cfs in the dry season (July 1 -Nov. 30), unless the reservoir runs dry.



## Large reservoir, 100\% reliable 30 cfs dry season release, Etna Creek

- Alters the flow of Etna creek to simulate a 29 TAF reservoir storing and releasing flow.
- Holds all water except 30 cfs back in the wet season (Dec. 1-Mar. 31), until the reservoir is full.
- Allows water to pass through during the growing season (Apr. 1-June 31), but retains water in storage.
- Releases 30 cfs in every dry season (July $1-\mathrm{Nov}$. 30 ). This reservoir does not rum dry during the 1991-2018 period.



## Very large reservoir, 100\% reliable 60 cfs dry season release, Etna Creek

- Alters the flow of Etna creek to simulate a 134 TAF reservoir storing and releasing flow.
- Holds all water except 30 cfs back in the wet season (Dec. 1-Mar. 31), until the reservoir is full.
- Allows water to pass through during the growing season (Apr. 1-June 31), but retains water in storage.
- Releases 60 cfs in every dry season (July 1-Nov. 30). This reservoir does not run dry during the 1991-2018 period.



## Flow change results (Fort Jones Gauge)

Changes in the simulated flow at the Fort Jones USGS flow gauge (number 11519500) are an indicator of the effect of a project or management action (PMA) on the Scott River stream system. Interpretation details are below; see explanatory plots at the beginning of this appendix for more information.

- Upper left plot: Black dots show the average change in flow (scenario minus basecase) in each month (e.g., all Januaries averaged over the 28 -year model period). Whiskers indicate the standard deviation of flow values for each month. Blue areas show that on average, the scenario flow in those months is higher than the historical basecase, indicating that the project or management action would have increased flow in that month. Red areas indicate months with lower flow under the specified scenario.
- Upper right plot: Red, yellow and blue dots and lines indicate the monthly average change in flow in three example water years: 2014 (Dry), 2010 (Average), and 2017 (Wet). Some dots may be missing for some months - this indicates they are beyond the bounds of the figure axes. These example years are included to show deviations from average system behavior due to water year type and year-to-year variability.
- Lower left plot: Black dots show the monthly streamflow (averaged over the 28 year model period) in the historical basecase simulation. Whiskers show the standard deviation of those monthly flows. This is included for reference and is the same on every page of this appendix.
- Lower right plot: Dashed lines indicate the monthly hydrograph in the basecase (in dotted lines) and in the specified scenario (in solid lines) for the three example water years specified above. Shading has been added to each plot to indicate "Total Depletion" used to define the SMC.

Total Depletion is defined as the difference in simulated Fort Jones flow between the basecase and the No-Pumping Reference Case, in which pumping is turned off outside the adjudicated zone and a reversion to natural vegetation is assumed on all fields serviced by groundwater or mixed groundwater-surface water sources. The No-Pumping Reference Case has also been referred to with these names: "No Pumping Outside Adjudicated Zone" or "Natural Vegetation, Groundwater and Mixed-source fields, Outside Adjudicated Zone [NV-GWM-OA]".
In all graphs, the Total Depletion is indicated by the shaded area. The top of the shaded area is the unmarked hydrograph for the No-Pumping Reference case. The bottom of the shaded area, marked by the dashed line, is the hydrograph of the Basecase. Hydrographs for the scenarios are shown with solid lines. The relative position of the solid line within the shaded area shows how much a PMA can increase streamflow (reverse stream depletion) relative to the Basecase (dashed line) and relative to the Total Depletion (shaded area).

FLOW CHANGE RESULTS (FORT JONES GAUGE)
MAR (Managed Aquifer Recharge)





ILR (In-Lieu Recharge)









Expanded MAR and ILR, assumed infiltration rate of $0.019 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{d}$


Limited surface diversions at low flows





FLOW CHANGE RESULTS (FORT JONES GAUGE)
MAR and ILR with limited surface diversions at low flows

$80 \%$ of Historical Irrigation Demand





90\% of Historical Irrigation Demand





Improve Irrigation Efficiency by $10 \%$





Improve Irrigation Efficiency by 20\%





Reduce Irrigation Efficiency by $10 \%$





Alfalfa Irrigation Stops July 10





Alfalfa Irrigation Stops Aug. 01





Alfalfa Irrigation Stops Aug. 01, dry years only





Alfalfa Irrigation Stops Aug. 15





Alfalfa Irrigation Stops Aug. 15, dry years only





FLOW CHANGE RESULTS (FORT JONES GAUGE)
Irrigation Curtailed Starting June 01




FLOW CHANGE RESULTS (FORT JONES GAUGE)
Irrigation Curtailed Starting June 15





Irrigation Curtailed Starting July 01





Irrigation Curtailed Starting July 15





Irrigation Curtailed Starting Aug. 01





Irrigation Curtailed Starting Aug. 15





No Irrigation, Both Zones


No Pumping, Both Zones


FLOW CHANGE RESULTS (FORT JONES GAUGE)
No Irrigation Outside Adjudicated Zone


FLOW CHANGE RESULTS (FORT JONES GAUGE)
No Pumping Outside Adjudicated Zone


No Irrigation Inside Adjudicated Zone





No Pumping Inside Adjudicated Zone





No Irrigation, Both Zones, ET Check 0.6 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.





No Irrigation, Both Zones, ET Check 0.6 NV kc, 10 m ext.d.





No Irrigation, Both Zones, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 10 m ext.d.


No Irrigation, Both Zones, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.





No Pumping, Both Zones, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.


No Irrigation Outside Adjudicated Zone, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.


No Pumping Outside Adjudicated Zone, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.


No Irrigation Inside Adjudicated Zone, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.


No Pumping Inside Adjudicated Zone, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.


9 TAF Reservoir, Shackleford Creek





9 TAF Reservoir, Etna Creek





9 TAF Reservoir, French Creek





9 TAF Reservoir, South Fork





Reservoir, Etna Creek, 100\% dry season 30 cfs release


Reservoir, Etna Creek, 100\% dry season 60 cfs release


## Rising flows in the fall ("reconnection" date distribution)

In the late summer and early fall, the Scott River can be dry, or running so low as to be impassable for spawning salmon. In these years, the "reconnection date" of the river is an important metric of ecosystem services: did the river become passable for salmon early enough in the spawning season?

These results show the distribution of threshold-crossing dates of flow at the Fort Jones Gauge, or the first date in the fall season on which the flow exceeded a threshold. This threshold-crossing metric is assumed to be a proxy for reconnection dates. Multiple thresholds are depicted (10, 20,30 and 40 cfs ) to indicate uncertainty in the exact threshold of "reconnection" of different parts of the lower Scott River stream system.

In general, scenarios in which more water years rise above the threshold earlier indicate more favorable hydrologic conditions (or, more dots on the left side of the plots is better). See explanatory graphs at the beginning of this appendix for more information.

## Observed and Simulated Historical FJ Flow



Recharge Scenarios


## Tributary Diversion Limits at Low FLows



Irrigation Demand


## Irrigation Efficiency



## Alfalfa Irrigation Schedule



## Irrigation Curtailment Dates



## Nat. Vegetation Land Use, 0.6 kc, ET from GW in DZ only



## Natural Vegetation Land Use (1.0 kc, 4.5m)

Threshold: 10 cfs


First day with flow $>=10 \mathrm{cfs}$
Threshold: $\mathbf{3 0}$ cfs


First day with flow $>=30$ cfs

Threshold: 20 cfs


First day with flow $>=20 \mathrm{cfs}$
Threshold: 40 cfs


First day with flow $>=40$ cfs

## Nat. Vegetation Land Use; k_c, ext. depth check



First day with flow >= 10 cfs
Threshold: $\mathbf{3 0}$ cfs


First day with flow >= 30 cfs

Threshold: 20 cfs


First day with flow >= 20 cfs
Threshold: 40 cfs


First day with flow $>=40$ cfs

## Small Reservoir



First day with flow >= 10 cfs
Threshold: $\mathbf{3 0}$ cfs


First day with flow $>=30$ cfs

Threshold: 20 cfs


First day with flow >= 20 cfs
Threshold: 40 cfs


First day with flow $>=40$ cfs

## 100\% Reliable Reservoir (30 or 60 cfs release)



First day with flow >= 10 cfs
Threshold: $\mathbf{3 0}$ cfs


First day with flow $>=30$ cfs

Threshold: 20 cfs


First day with flow >= 20 cfs


First day with flow $>=40$ cfs

## Declining flows in the summer ("disconnection" date distribution)

Over the course of the late spring and summer, the Scott River decreases gradually from snowmelt-influenced high flows to summer baseflow. Earlier decline in summer flows is believed to correspond to poorer habitat conditions for juvenile salmonids.

In particular, the "disconnection date" of the river is an important metric of ecosystem services: was the river flow high enough for long enough to allow juvenile salmonids to migrate out of the watershed towards the ocean?

These results show the distribution of threshold-crossing dates of flow at the Fort Jones Gauge, or the first date in the summer season on which the flow fell below a threshold. This thresholdcrossing metric is assumed to be a proxy for disconnection dates. Multiple thresholds are depicted ( $10,20,30$ and 40 cfs ) to indicate uncertainty in the exact threshold of "disconnection" of different parts of the lower Scott River stream system.
In general, scenarios in which more water years fall below the threshold later indicate more favorable hydrologic conditions (or, more dots on the right side of the plots is better). See explanatory graphs at the beginning of this appendix for more information.

## Observed and Simulated Historical FJ Flow



Recharge Scenarios


## Tributary Diversion Limits at Low FLows



## Irrigation Demand



## Irrigation Efficiency



## Alfalfa Irrigation Schedule



## Irrigation Curtailment Dates



Nat. Vegetation Land Use, 0.6 kc, ET from GW in DZ only


Natural Vegetation Land Use (1.0 kc, 4.5m)


First day with flow <= 10 cfs
Threshold: $\mathbf{3 0}$ cfs


First day with flow <= 30 cfs

Threshold: 20 cfs


First day with flow <= 20 cfs
Threshold: $\mathbf{4 0}$ cfs


First day with flow <= 40 cfs

## Nat. Vegetation Land Use; k_c, ext. depth check



## Small Reservoir



First day with flow <= 30 cfs


First day with flow <= 20 cfs
Threshold: 40 cfs


First day with flow <= 40 cfs

## 100\% Reliable Reservoir (30 or 60 cfs release)



## Percentile Flows and Flow Regime Comparison

The goal of these plots is to 1) visualize the variability in Fort Jones flow in each model scenario, and 2) compare the flow to two proscribed flow regimes.

- Brown dots and line: The brown dots indicate the median flow recorded on all days falling in a given month in the 28 -year model period (e.g., the median flow of all days of all the Januaries 1991-2018). That means that flow exceeds this brown line on approximately $50 \%$ of days in a given scenario.
- Gray shading: The dark gray shading captures the area from the 25 th to the 75 th percentiles of flow in a given month, and the light gray shading encompasses the 5th to the 95th percentiles. This means that that flow in a given scenario falls within the dark gray area on $50 \%$, and within the light gray area on $90 \%$, of days.
- Blue lines: The light blue line shows the flow regime published in the 2017 California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) report "Interim Instream Flow Criteria for the Protection of Fishery Resources in the Scott River Watershed, Siskiyou County". The dark blue line shows the flow regime for the United States Forest Service (USFS) water right as quantified in the Scott River Adjudication of 1980 (Decree No. 30662).

At the bottom of each plot, a note indicates the percentage of days in the critical low flow window (Sept. 1-Nov. 30, for all water years 1991-2018) on which each threshold was met.

## Historical observed Fort Jones Flow



Observed FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Basecase (simulated historical)



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## MAR (Managed Aquifer Recharge)



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## ILR (In-Lieu Recharge)



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## MAR and ILR



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Expanded MAR and ILR, assumed infiltration rate of $0.019 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{d}$



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Limited surface diversions at low flows



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

MAR and ILR with limited surface diversions at low flows


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## 80\% of Historical Irrigation Demand



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## 90\% of Historical Irrigation Demand



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Improve Irrigation Efficiency by 10\%



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Improve Irrigation Efficiency by 20\%



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Reduce Irrigation Efficiency by 10\%



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Alfalfa Irrigation Stops July 10



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Alfalfa Irrigation Stops Aug. 01



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

Alfalfa Irrigation Stops Aug. 01, dry years only


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Alfalfa Irrigation Stops Aug. 15



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

Alfalfa Irrigation Stops Aug. 15, dry years only


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Irrigation Curtailed Starting June 01



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Irrigation Curtailed Starting June 15



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Irrigation Curtailed Starting July 01



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## Irrigation Curtailed Starting July 15



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

Irrigation Curtailed Starting Aug. 01


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

Irrigation Curtailed Starting Aug. 15


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Irrigation, Both Zones


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Pumping, Both Zones


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Irrigation Outside Adjudicated Zone


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Pumping Outside Adjudicated Zone


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Irrigation Inside Adjudicated Zone


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## No Pumping Inside Adjudicated Zone



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## No Irrigation, Both Zones, ET Check 0.6 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Irrigation, Both Zones, ET Check 0.6 NV kc, 10 m ext.d.


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Irrigation, Both Zones, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 10m ext.d.


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## No Irrigation, Both Zones, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Pumping, Both Zones, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Irrigation Outside Adjudicated Zone, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Pumping Outside Adjudicated Zone, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Irrigation Inside Adjudicated Zone, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

No Pumping Inside Adjudicated Zone, ET Check 1.0 NV kc, 4.5m ext.d.


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## 9 TAF Reservoir, Shackleford Creek



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## 9 TAF Reservoir, Etna Creek



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## 9 TAF Reservoir, French Creek



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

## 9 TAF Reservoir, South Fork



Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

Reservoir, Etna Creek, 100\% dry season 30 cfs release


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

Reservoir, Etna Creek, 100\% dry season 60 cfs release


Simulated FJ Flow, 1991-2018

