Performance Measures Scorecard for Sites Reservoir Potential Beneficiaries (non-economic measures)

	DCR 2015 without	DCR 2015	DCR 2015 Reservoir mi withou	with Project inus DCR 2015 it Project	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2030	WSIP 2030 Reservoir mir withou	with Project nus WSIP 2030 t Project	WSIP 2070 without	WSIP 2070	WSIP 2070 Reservoir min withou	with Project nus WSIP 2070 It Project
	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference
			ę	Sites Facilit	ies - Opera	ations						
Conveyance Capacity												
Diversions to Sites Reservoir from the Sacramento R 1641, CVPIA 3406(b)(2), 2008 FWS BiOps and 2009 restricted by Sacramento River bypass criteria at Rec provide)	iver at Red Blu MFS BiOps Bluff, Hamilto	ff (TCC), at Har requirements ar n City, Wilkens	milton City (GC re met, SWP a Slough and Fi	C) and at the I Inticle 21 deman reeport and res	New Delevan I nds are satisifi trictions assoc	Pipeline can occ ied and other ex ciated with prote	cur in any mon cess Delta flov cting fish outm	h; diversions o. v diversions (Fl ligration related	f excess Delta RWP, LV, FVE I pulse flows (7	 Iows are only etc) are satisi days once a n 	allowed once s ified; diversion nonth when flo	SWRCB D- s are w conditions
Sites Reservoir Fill from Sacramento River												
Diversions (OP-04)								ļ				
Annual (TAF/yr)								ļ				
Full Simulation Period					0	552	552	N/A	0	588	588	N/A
Dry					0	578	578	N/A	0	551	551	N/A
Critical					0	281	281	N/A	0	236	236	N/A
Storage Capacity		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·										· · · · ·
Sites Resevoir storage fills during excess flow events Supply, Water Quality and Ecosystem Enhancement	throughout the	e winter and spr	ring and drains	; during peak re	ease periods	throughout the	summer and fa	all to achieve th	ie benefits ass	ociated with the	ə primary objec	ctives of Water
Sites Reservoir												
End-of-Month Storage (OP-09)								ļ				
May (TAF)								ļ				
Full Simulation Period					0	1,459	1,459	N/A	0	1,390	1,390	N/A
Dry					0	1,309	1,309	N/A	0	1,276	1,276	N/A
Critical					0	810	810	N/A	0	637	637	N/A
September (TAF)								ļ				
Full Simulation Period					0	1,093	1,093	N/A	0	1,013	1,013	N/A
Dry					0	845	845	N/A	0	862	862	N/A
Critical					0	464	464	N/A	0	332	332	N/A

	DCR 2015 without	DCR 2015 Re without DCR 2015 Project with Project —		with Project nus DCR 2015 t Project	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2030 Reservoir min without	with Project us WSIP 2030 Project	WSIP 2070 without	WSIP 2070 with Project	WSIP 2070 Reservoir min without	with Project us WSIP 2070 Project
	Project		Difference	Relative Difference	Project		Difference	Relative Difference	Project		Difference	Relative Difference
			Prin	narv Obiect	ive - Water	VlaguZ						
SWP Contractors												
State Water Project (SWP) water supply reliability												
SWP Contractors												
Deliveries (WS-SWP)												
Annual (TAF/yr)												
Full Simulation Period					2,573	2,573	0	0.0%	2,398	2,398	0	0.0%
Dry					1,881	1,881	0	0.0%	1,737	1,737	0	0.0%
Critical					1,105	1,105	0	0.0%	861	861	0	0.0%
SWP SOD M&I Service Contractors												
Allocations (WS-SWP)												
Annual (fraction)												
Full Simulation Period					0.62	0.62	0.00	0.0%	0.57	0.57	0.00	0.0%
Dry					0.44	0.44	0.00	0.0%	0.40	0.40	0.00	0.0%
Critical					0.25	0.25	0.00	0.0%	0.20	0.20	0.00	0.0%
REF. Level 4 Water Supply for Wildlife Refuges	S											
Refuge level 4 water supply needs; replacement of pu	rchases of Nor	rth-of-the-Delta	(3.35 TAF/yr r	max) and South	of-the-Delta (101.09 TAF/Yr	max) water to	supplement ret	fuges supplies	up to level 4 c	riteria (CVPIA)	
Federal Wildlife Refuges												
Level 4 Water Supplies from Sites (WS-CVP)												
Annual (TAF/yr)												
Full Simulation Period					0	35	35	N/A	0	31	31	N/A
Dry					0	21	21	N/A	0	16	16	N/A
Critical					0	1	1	N/A	0	1	1	N/A
CVP Contractors												
Central Valley Project (CVP) water supply reliability												
CVP Ag and M&I Service, Settlement, and Exchange Cont	ractors											
Deliveries (WS-CVP)												
Annual (TAF/yr)												
Full Simulation Period					4,286	4,280	-6	-0.1%	3,914	3,916	2	0.1%
Dry					3,855	3,863	8	0.2%	3,683	3,657	-25	-0.7%
Critical					3,385	3,412	27	0.8%	3,135	3,161	26	0.8%
CVP SOD Ag Service Contractors												
Allocations (WS-CVP)												
Annual (fraction)												
Full Simulation Period					0.44	0.44	0.00	-0.6%	0.29	0.29	0.00	0.4%
Dry					0.23	0.23	0.01	2.8%	0.16	0.16	-0.01	-4.0%
Critical					0.11	0.12	0.00	1.7%	0.04	0.04	0.00	1.5%
Sites deliveries to Sacramento Valley Participa	ants											
Deliveries from Sites Reservoir to project participants	nanta (TCCA CC		the of Column on	d Western Canal	W(D)							
Delivery (W/S-NDS)	pants (TCCA, GC	ID, KD 108, COUI	ity of Colusa, and	u western Canar	WD)							
					0	120	129	N/A	0	155	155	N/A
Dry	-				0	129	186	N/A	0	100	190	N/A
Critical	-				0	165	165	N/A	0	143	143	N/A
Sites deliveries to South of Delta Sites Project Participant	s				0	105	100	13/73	0	140		
Delivery (WS-NDS)	l											
Annual (TAF/yr)												
Full Simulation Period					0	99	99	N/A	0	112	112	N/A
Dry					0	223	223	N/A	0	295	295	N/A
Critical					0	213	213	N/A	0	155	155	N/A

	DCR 2015 DCR 2015 with Project WSIP 2030 WSIP 2030 without DCR 2015 without Project WSIP 2030 without Project with Project Reservoir minus DCR 2015 WSIP 2030 WSIP 2030	WSIP 2030 Reservoir mir without	with Project nus WSIP 2030 : Project	WSIP 2070 without	WSIP 2070	WSIP 2070 with Project Reservoir minus WSIP 2070 without Project						
	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference
		Primary Ob	iective - Ed	cosvstem E	Inhanceme	ent Account	(EEA) Acti	ons				
EEA-1. Shasta Lake Cold Water Pool												
Improve the reliability of coldwater pool storage in Sha operationally translate into the increase of Shasta Res	asta Reservoir servoir May ste	to increase the brage levels, an	U.S. Bureau o d increased co	of Reclamation'	s operational f storage, with	lexibility to prov particular emph	ide suitable wa asis on Below	iter temperature Normal, Dry an	es in the Sacra nd Critical wate	amento River. 1 er year types.	This action wou	ld
Trinity Lake												
End-of-Month Storage (SW-01)												
May (TAF)												
Full Simulation Period					1,826	1,827	1	0.1%	1,689	1,693	5	0.3%
Dry					1,636	1,626	-11	-0.6%	1,453	1,471	17	1.2%
Critical					1,201	1,217	16	1.3%	1,016	1,024	9	0.9%
September (TAF)												
Full Simulation Period					1,320	1,312	-8	-0.6%	1,152	1,149	-3	-0.3%
Dry					1,104	1,093	-11	-1.0%	903	913	10	1.1%
Critical					800	807	7	0.9%	627	673	47	7.5%
Shasta Lake												
End-of-Month Storage (SW-07)												
May (TAF)												
Full Simulation Period					3,950	4,009	59	1.5%	3,681	3,761	80	2.2%
Dry					3,663	3,765	101	2.8%	3,386	3,478	92	2.7%
Critical					2,787	2,953	166	6.0%	2,157	2,428	271	12.6%
September (TAF)												
Full Simulation Period					2,544	2,627	83	3.3%	2,262	2,321	59	2.6%
Dry					2,457	2,514	57	2.3%	2,167	2,224	56	2.6%
Critical					1,515	1,696	181	12.0%	971	1,219	247	25.5%

	DCR 2015 without	LCR 2015 CCR 2015 Re without DCR 2015 Project with Project ——		with Project nus DCR 2015 t Project	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2030	WSIP 2030 Reservoir min without	with Project us WSIP 2030 Project	WSIP 2070 without	WSIP 2070 with Project -	WSIP 2070 Reservoir min without	with Project nus WSIP 2070 Project
	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference
EEA-2. Sacramento River Flows for Temperatu	ure Control											
Provide releases from Shasta Dam of appropriate was salmonids in the Sacramento River between Keswick Normal, Dry and Critical water year types.	ter temperature Dam and Red	es, and subseques, and subseques, Bluff Diversion	uently from Kes Dam, with part	swick Dam, to i ticular emphasi	maintain mean is on the month	daily water ten ns of highest po	nperatures yea otential water te	r-round at leve emperature-rela	ls suitable for a ated impacts (i.	all species and e., July throug	lifestages of ar h November) d	nadromous Turing Below
Trinity River below Lewiston												
Monthly Temperature (SQ-33)												
Jul-Sep (Deg-F)												
Full Simulation Period					51.1	51.1	0.0	-0.1%	51.9	51.8	-0.2	-0.3%
Dry Critical					51.5 53.8	51.7 53.5	0.2 -0.2	0.3% -0.4%	52.7 55.4	52.4 54.8	-0.2 -0.5	-0.4% -1.0%
Clear Creek at Igo												
Monthly Temperature (SQ-37)												
Jul-Sep (Deg-F)												
Full Simulation Period					54.8	54.7	-0.1	-0.2%	55.7	55.7	0.1	0.1%
Dry					55.0	54.9	-0.1	-0.2%	56.0	56.1	0.0	0.1%
Critical					56.6	56.5	-0.1	-0.2%	58.1	57.9	-0.3	-0.4%
Sacramento River at Bonnyview Monthly Temperature (SQ-03)												
Full Simulation Period					53 F	53 F	0.0	0.0%	51 9	51 2	-0.5	-0.8%
Drv					54.3	54 1	-0.1	-0.3%	55.1	54.5	-0.5	-0.9%
Critical					56.5	55.9	-0.6	-1.1%	60.5	58.6	-1.8	-3.0%
Sacramento River at Balls Ferry Monthly Temperature (SQ-04)												
Jul-Sep (Deg-F)												
Full Simulation Period					55.2	55.2	-0.1	-0.1%	56.5	56.0	-0.5	-0.9%
Dry					56.0	55.7	-0.2	-0.4%	56.9	56.3	-0.6	-1.0%
Critical					58.1	57.5	-0.6	-1.1%	61.9	60.2	-1.7	-2.7%
Sacramento River at Jellys Ferry Monthly Temperature (SQ-05) Jul-Sep (Deq-F)												
Full Simulation Period					56.6	56.5	-0.1	-0.1%	57.9	57.4	-0.5	-0.9%
Dry					57.3	57.0	-0.3	-0.5%	58.4	57.7	-0.6	-1.1%
Critical					59.4	58.8	-0.6	-1.0%	63.0	61.5	-1.5	-2.5%
Sacramento River at Bend Bridge												
Jul-Sep (Deg-F)												
Full Simulation Period					57.6	57.6	-0.1	-0.2%	59.0	58.5	-0.5	-0.9%
Dry					58.5	58.1	-0.3	-0.6%	59.5	58.8	-0.7	-1.1%
Critical					60.3	59.7	-0.6	-1.0%	63.8	62.4	-1.4	-2.3%
Chinook Salmon Production												
Sacramento River Winter Run Chinook Salmon	Р	L	А	С	E	н	0	L	D	E	R	
Annual Production (AQ-01)												
Annual Production												
Critical												
Sacramento River Spring Run Chinook Salmon Annual Production (AQ-02)	P	L	A	С	E	Н	0	L	D	E	R	
Annual Production Full Simulation Period												
Dry												
Critical												-
Sacramento River Fall Run Chinook Salmon	Р	L	А	С	E	н	0	L	D	E	R	
Full Simulation Period	_											
Dry												
Critical				-								
Sacramento River Late-Fall Run Chinook Salmon	Р	L	А	С	E	Н	0	L	D	E	R	
Annual Production (AQ-04)												
Annual Production Full Simulation Period												
Drv	-											
Critical												

	DCR 2015 without	DCR 2015	DCR 2015 v Reservoir mir without	vith Project nus DCR 2015 Project	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2030	WSIP 2030 v Reservoir min without	with Project us WSIP 2030 Project	WSIP 2070 without	WSIP 2070	WSIP 2070 v Reservoir min without	vith Project us WSIP 2070 Project
	Project	with roject	Difference	Relative Difference	Project	with roject	Difference	Relative Difference	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference
EEA-3. Folsom Lake Cold Water Pool												
crease the availability of coldwater pool storage in Folsom Reservoir, by increasing May storage and coldwater pool storage, to allow the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation additional operational flexibility to provide suitable water imperatures in the lower American River. This action would utilize additional coldwater pool storage by providing releases from Folsom Dam (and subsequently from Nimbus Dam) to maintain mean daily water temperatures at avels suitable for juvenile steelhead over-summer rearing and fall-run Chinook salmon spawning in the lower American River from May through November during all water year types.												
Folsom Lake												
End-of-Month Storage (SW-24)												
May (TAF)												
Full Simulation Period					769	764	-4	-0.5%	679	677	-2	-0.3%
Dry					699	692	-8	-1.1%	601	607	6	1.0%
Critical					476	473	-3	-0.6%	407	401	-5	-1.3%
September (TAF)												
Full Simulation Period					428	447	19	4.5%	377	396	19	5.2%
Dry					371	410	38	10.4%	349	373	24	6.7%
Critical					293	289	-4	-1.4%	235	246	11	4.8%
American River at Watt Ave												
Monthly Temperature (SQ-19)												
Jul-Sep (Deg-F)												
Full Simulation Period					70.6	69.9	-0.6	-0.9%	71.9	71.2	-0.7	-0.9%
Dry					70.7	70.5	-0.2	-0.4%	72.2	71.9	-0.3	-0.4%
Critical					73.6	73.1	-0.5	-0.7%	75.6	74.7	-0.9	-1.2%
EEA-4. Stabilize American River Flows												
Stabilize flows in the lower American River to minimize increases to 4,000 cfs with subsequent reduction to < meet Delta objectives and demands, particularly from .	e dewatering of 4,000 cfs) of ju January throug	fall-run Chino Ivenile anadroi gh August, to re	ok salmon redd mous salmonids educe flow fluct	s (i.e., October s, particularly fr uation and wat	through Marc rom October th er temperature	h) and steelhea rough June. R e-related impac	ad redds (i.e., J Reduce the relia tts to fall-run Ch	anuary throug nce upon Fols inook salmon	h May), and re om Reservoir a and steelhead	duce isolation e as a "real-time, in the lower An	events (specific first response f nerican River.	ally, flow facility" to
N/A - Reporting Metrics require dai	ly timestep mo	deling of flow o	operations to de	emonstrate hov	/ flexibility in si	torage operatio	ons supports sta	bilization of flo	ws throughout	t late Fall throug	gh Spring.	
EEA-5. Yolo Bypass Flow Improvement												
Increase flows in the Yolo Bypass by 400 cfs in Augus	t, September,	and October to	promote food	production for	Delta Smelt							
Yolo Bypass Flow												
Increase in Volume (SW-31)												
Aug-Oct (TAF)												
Full Simulation Period					24	64	40	163.2%	20	58	38	188.3%
Dry					60	100	40	66.4%	37	59	22	58.4%
Critical					13	18	5	33.5%	9	22	13	150.4%

	DCR 2015 without	DCR 2015	DCR 2015 Reservoir mit without	with Project nus DCR 2015 t Project	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2030	WSIP 2030 Reservoir mir without	with Project nus WSIP 2030 t Project	WSIP 2070 without WSIP 20 Breiset with Proj	WSIP 2070	WSIP 2070 with Project Reservoir minus WSIP 2070 without Project	
	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference	Project	with Project	Difference	Relative Difference
EEA-6. Lake Oroville Cold Water Pool												
Improve the reliability of coldwater pool storage in Orc the lower Feather River from May through November steelhead and spring-run Chinook salmon over-summ isolation of anadromous salmonids.	ville Reservoir during all wate er rearing, anc	r to improve wa er year types. (Ii I fall-run Chinoc	ter temperature mprove storage ok salmon spav	e suitability for j e conditions for wning in the low	juvenile steelh ::) Provide rele ver Feather Ri	ead and spring- ases from Orov ver. Stabilize flo	run Chinook s rille Dam to ma ws in the lowe	almon over-sun intain mean da r Feather River	nmer rearing, ily water temp to minimize re	and fall-run Chi eratures at leve edd dewatering	nook salmon s _i ils suitable for j , juvenile stran	pawning in juvenile ding and
Lake Oroville												
End-of-Month Storage (SW-18)												
May (TAF)												
Full Simulation Period					2,760	2,786	26	0.9%	2,620	2,651	31	1.2%
Dry					2,294	2,332	38	1.7%	2,167	2,206	39	1.8%
Critical					1,527	1,611	83	5.5%	1,507	1,618	111	7.4%
September (TAF)												
Full Simulation Period					1,469	1,528	59	4.0%	1,287	1,383	96	7.4%
Dry					1,146	1,195	49	4.3%	1,140	1,147	7	0.6%
Critical					901	924	23	2.6%	903	979	76	8.4%
EEA-7. Stabilize Sacramento River Fall Flows												
Stabilize flows in the Sacramento River between Kesv October through March), particularly during fall month.	vick Dam and s s. (avoid abrup	the Red Bluff D ot changes; ope	iversion Dam to eration limited to	o minimize dew o not greatly in	vatering of fall- npact cold wate	run Chinook sa er pool operatio	Imon redds (fo ns in D and C	r the spawning years)	and embryo ir	ncubation lifesta	ige periods ext	ending from
Sacramento River below Keswick												
Monthly Flow (SW-10)												
Dec-Feb (cfs)												
Full Simulation Period					9,028	9,256	228	2.5%	9,459	9,617	157	1.7%
Below Normal					4,711	4,889	177	3.8%	5,479	5,693	214	3.9%
Dry					3,969	4,442	474	11.9%	3,736	3,964	228	6.1%
Critical					3,532	3,679	147	4.2%	3,531	3,810	279	7.9%

E

E

	DCR 2015 without	DCR 2015	DCR 2015 Reservoir mi withou	with Project inus DCR 2015 it Project	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2030	WSIP 2030 Reservoir mir withou	with Project nus WSIP 2030 t Project	WSIP 2070 without	WSIP 2070	WSIP 2070 Reservoir mir withou	with Project nus WSIP 2070 t Project
	Project		Difference	Relative Difference	Project	With Project	Difference	Relative Difference	Project	With Project	Difference	Relative Difference
EEA-8. Sacramento River Diversion Reduction	at Red Bluf	f and Hamilto	on City									
Canal), and by providing supplemental flows (at Delew smelt, Sacramento splittail, starry flounder, and Crang food availability	/an). This actio	n will provide n m) by reducing	nultiple benefits entrainment, p	s to riverine and	d estuarine ha	bitats, and to ar	nadromous fish reasing habitat	availability, incr	re-dependent	species (e.g., o xivity, and impr	lelta smelt, spli	ttail, longfin transport and
Glenn Colusa Canal, Hamilton City Intake												
Diversions (OP-02a)									ł			
Jun-Aug volume above diversion rate of 2000 cfs (TAF	/season)								ł			
Full Simulation Period					114	84	-30	-26.2%	114	87	-27	-24.0%
Dry					123	69	-54	-44.0%	123	75	-48	-38.9%
Critical					76	53	-23	-30.3%	76	51	-24	-32.0%
Tehama Colusa Canal, Red Bluff Intake and Glenn Colusa	Canal, Hamilton	City Intake							l l			
Diversions (OP-01a and 02a)									ł			
Jun-Aug volume (TAF/season)									ł			
Full Simulation Period					584	524	-59	-10.2%	545	504	-41	-7.6%
Dry					543	473	-70	-12.9%	527	476	-51	-9.7%
Critical					460	405	-55	-11.9%	433	371	-62	-14.2%
			Secondary	Objective	- Additiona	Water Sur	pply					
ADD. Additonal Water Supply							• •					
Provide additional surface storage across the Sacram	iento Valley wa	ater resources s	system									
Trinity Lake, Shasta Lake, Lake Oroville and Folsom Lake	and Sites Reser	voir	-						l			
Total Combined End-of-Month Storage (SW-01, 07, 18, 24	4 and OP-09)								ł			
May (TAF)									ł			
Full Simulation Period					9,304	10,845	1,541	16.6%	8,670	10,173	1,503	17.3%
Dry					8.293	9.723	1,430	17.2%	7.607	9.037	1,430	18.8%
Critical					5.991	7.063	1,072	17.9%	5.087	6.109	1,022	20.1%
September (TAF)					-,	- 1			-,	-,		
Full Simulation Period					5 761	7 007	1,246	21.6%	5 077	6 262	1,185	23.3%
Drv					5.078	6 057	978	19.3%	4 560	5 519	959	21.0%
Critical					3,509	4,179	670	19.1%	2,736	3,449	713	26.1%

TCC Intake at Red Bluff and GCC Intake at Hamilton City, Volume of Diversion

Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type

		June through August	
	Volur	ne of Diversion (TAF/S	eason)
	DCR 2015 without	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2070 withou
Alternative:	Project	Project	Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 With Project	WSIP 2070 With Project
	Long-terr	n	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		2,396	2,260
Alternative		2,154	2,003
Difference		-242	-257
Percent Difference ³		-10.1%	-11.4%
	Water Year Ty	pes²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison		2,531	2,340
Alternative		2,423	2,166
Difference		-108	-175
Percent Difference		-4.3%	-7.5%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison		2,519	2,318
Alternative		2,353	2,270
Difference		-166	-48
Percent Difference		-6.6%	-2.1%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison		2,429	2,294
Alternative		2,304	2,169
Difference		-125	-125
Percent Difference		-5.2%	-5.4%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison		2,346	2,277
Alternative		2,001	1,893
Difference		-345	-384
Percent Difference		-14.7%	-16.9%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison		2,010	1,965
Alternative		1,387	1,406
Difference		-623	-559
Percent Difference		-31.0%	-28.4%



3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Glenn Colusa Canal Intake at Hamilton City, Volume of Diversion in Excess of 2000 cfs

Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type

0	· · ·	June through August	
	Volume of Diver	sion in Excess of 2000	cfs (TAF/Season)
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 withou Project
VS.	VS.	vs.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-ter	m	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		2,099	2,106
Alternative		1,879	1,819
Difference		-221	-288
Percent Difference ³		-10.5%	-13.7%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison		2,090	2,088
Alternative		2,066	1,910
Difference		-24	-178
Percent Difference		-1.2%	-8.5%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison		2,105	2,116
Alternative		1,952	2,001
Difference		-153	-115
Percent Difference		-7.3%	-5.4%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison		2,162	2,190
Alternative		2,006	2,005
Difference		-156	-185
Percent Difference		-7.2%	-8.5%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison		2,203	2,198
Alternative		1,879	1,789
Difference		-325	-409
Percent Difference		-14.7%	-18.6%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison		1,886	1,893
Alternative		1,238	1,299
Difference		-649	-594
Percent Difference		-34 4%	-31.4%



3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Funks Reservoir to Sites Reservoir, Annual Diversion to Fill Storage

	Annual	Diversion to Fill Storage	ge (TAF)
	DCR 2015 without	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2070 withou
Alternative:	Project	Project	Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-terr	n	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		0	0
Alternative		552	588
Difference		552	588
Percent Difference ³			
	Water Year Ty	pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	672	715
Difference	0	672	715
Percent Difference			
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	572	717
Difference	0	572	717
Percent Difference			
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	528	607
Difference	0	528	607
Percent Difference			
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	578	551
Difference	0	578	551
Percent Difference			
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	281	236
Difference	0	281	236
Percent Difference			



	Sites Reservoir, End of	Month Storage	
Long-te	erm Average and Average	ge by Water Year Type	
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-ter	m	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		0	0
Alternative		1,459	1,390
Difference		1,459	1,390
Percent Difference3			
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	1,730	1,710
Difference	0	1,730	1,710
Percent Difference			
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	1,680	1,622
Difference	0	1,680	1,622
Percent Difference			
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	1,504	1,423
Difference	0	1,504	1,423
Percent Difference			
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	1,309	1,276
Difference	0	1,309	1,276
Percent Difference			
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	810	637
Difference	0	810	637
Percent Difference			



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

	Sites Reservoir, End of	Month Storage	
Long-te	erm Average and Average	ge by Water Year Type	
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-ter	m	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		0	0
Alternative		1,093	1,013
Difference		1,093	1,013
Percent Difference3			
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	1,552	1,436
Difference	0	1,552	1,436
Percent Difference			
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	1,200	1,107
Difference	0	1,200	1,107
Percent Difference			
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	1,019	948
Difference	0	1,019	948
Percent Difference			
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	845	862
Difference	0	845	862
Percent Difference			
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	0	0
Alternative	0	464	332
Difference	0	464	332
Percent Difference			



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

	X2, Monthly Po	sition	
Long-te	erm Average and Averag	e by Water Year Type	
	July through Augus	st Average	
	Monthly Positio	n (KM)	
	DCR 2015 without	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2070 without
Alternative:	Project	Project	Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 With Project	WSIP 2030 With Project	WSIP 20/0 With Project
	Long-terr	n	TOJECT
Full Simulation Period ¹	Long ton		
Basis of Comparison		87	88
Alternative		87	87
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference ³		0.0%	-0.4%
	Water Year Tv	pes ²	0.470
Net			
Basis of Comparison		84	85
Alternative		84	84
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference		0.0%	-0.2%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison		84	84
Alternative		84	84
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference		-0.1%	-0.5%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison		86	87
Alternative		86	86
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference		0.0%	-0.3%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison		90	91
Alternative		90	90
Difference		0	-1
Percent Difference		0.0%	-0.7%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison		93	93
Alternative		92	93
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference		0.0%	-0.5%



Sacramento River at Bo	nnyview Bridge, July thi	rough September Avera	age Temperature
Long-t	erm Average and Average	ge by Water Year Type	
	July throug	h September Average	Temperature
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-ter	m	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		54	55
Alternative		54	54
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference ³		0.0%	-0.8%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	52	53
Alternative	0	53	53
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.5%	-0.1%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	53	53
Alternative	0	53	53
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.2%	0.1%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	53	54
Alternative	0	53	54
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.1%	-0.8%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	54	55
Alternative	0	54	55
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		-0.3%	-0.9%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	57	60
Alternative	0	56	59
Difference	0	-1	-2
Percent Difference		-1.1%	-3.0%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Sacramento River at	Balls Ferry, July throug	h September Average	Temperature
Long-t	erm Average and Average	ge by Water Year Type	
	July throug	h September Average	Temperature
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-ter	m	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		55	56
Alternative		55	56
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference3		-0.1%	-0.9%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	54	55
Alternative	0	54	55
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.4%	-0.1%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	54	55
Alternative	0	54	55
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.3%	0.1%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	55	56
Alternative	0	55	56
Difference	0	0	-1
Percent Difference		0.0%	-1.0%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	56	57
Alternative	0	56	56
Difference	0	0	-1
Percent Difference		-0.4%	-1.0%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	58	62
Alternative	0	57	60
Difference	0	-1	-2
Percent Difference		-1.1%	-2.7%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Sacramento River at	Jellys Ferry, July throug	gh September Average	Temperature
Long-t	erm Average and Average	ge by Water Year Type	
	July throug	h September Average	Temperature
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-ter	m	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		57	58
Alternative		57	57
Difference		0	-1
Percent Difference3		-0.1%	-0.9%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	55	56
Alternative	0	56	56
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.3%	-0.2%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	55	56
Alternative	0	56	56
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.3%	0.1%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	56	58
Alternative	0	56	57
Difference	0	0	-1
Percent Difference		-0.1%	-1.2%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	57	58
Alternative	0	57	58
Difference	0	0	-1
Percent Difference		-0.5%	-1.1%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	59	63
Alternative	0	59	61
Difference	0	-1	-2
Percent Difference		-1.0%	-2.5%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Sacramento River at	Bend Bridge, July throu	gh September Average	e Temperature
Long-t	erm Average and Averag	je by Water Year Type	
	July throug	h September Average	Temperature
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-terr	n	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		58	59
Alternative		58	58
Difference		0	-1
Percent Difference3		-0.2%	-0.9%
	Water Year Ty	rpes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	56	57
Alternative	0	57	57
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.3%	-0.3%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	56	57
Alternative	0	57	57
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.4%	0.1%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	57	59
Alternative	0	57	58
Difference	0	0	-1
Percent Difference		-0.1%	-1.2%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	58	59
Alternative	0	58	59
Difference	0	0	-1
Percent Difference		-0.6%	-1.1%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	60	64
Alternative	0	60	62
Difference	0	-1	-1
Percent Difference		-1.0%	-2.3%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

American River at W	latt Avenue, July throug	h September Average	Temperature
Long-t	erm Average and Average	je by Water Year Type	
	July throu	ugh September Monthl	y Average
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-terr	n	
Full Simulation Period ¹	-		
Basis of Comparison		71	72
Alternative		70	71
Difference		-1	-1
Percent Difference3		-0.9%	-0.9%
	Water Year Ty	rpes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison		70	71
Alternative		69	70
Difference		-1	-1
Percent Difference		-1.4%	-1.2%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison		70	71
Alternative		69	70
Difference		-1	-1
Percent Difference		-0.7%	-1.0%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison		70	71
Alternative		70	71
Difference		-1	-1
Percent Difference		-1.0%	-0.9%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison		71	72
Alternative		70	72
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference		-0.4%	-0.4%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison		74	76
Alternative		73	75
Difference		0	-1
Percent Difference		-0.7%	-1.2%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

	Clifton Court Forebay,	Monthly EC	
Long-	term Average and Averag	e by Water Year Type	
	August Through October		
	N	Ionthly EC (UMHOS/CM	Л)
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-terr	n	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		378	384
Alternative		379	382
Difference		1	-2
Percent Difference3		0.2%	-0.5%
	Water Year Ty	pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison		260	261
Alternative		260	261
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference		0.1%	0.0%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison		336	329
Alternative		336	329
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference		0.1%	0.0%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison		382	382
Alternative		382	379
Difference		0	-3
Percent Difference		0.0%	-0.8%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison		464	467
Alternative		466	465
Difference		3	-3
Percent Difference		0.5%	-0.6%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison		543	563
Alternative		545	558
Difference		2	-5
Percent Difference		0.3%	-0.8%



3 Relative difference of the monthly average

`	A	ugust Through Octob	er
	Ň	Nonthly EC (UMHOS/CN	/)
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-terr	n	
ull Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		403	410
Alternative		403	411
Difference		1	1
Percent Difference3		0.2%	0.2%
	Water Year Ty	pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison		274	285
Alternative		274	285
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference		0.1%	0.1%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison		364	368
Alternative		364	368
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference		0.1%	0.0%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison		410	412
Alternative		410	412
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison		505	497
Alternative		506	499
Difference		1	2
Percent Difference		0.3%	0.5%
Iritical			
Basis of Comparison		563	574
Alternative		566	574
Difference		3	1
Percent Difference		0.6%	0.1%



3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Trinity River below Le	ewiston Dam, July throu	gh September Average	e Temperature
Long-t	erm Average and Averag	ge by Water Year Type	
	July throug	h September Average	Temperature
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-terr	m	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		51	52
Alternative		51	52
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference3		-0.1%	-0.3%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	50	50
Alternative	0	50	50
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		-0.3%	0.0%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	50	51
Alternative	0	50	51
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.0%	-0.5%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	51	51
Alternative	0	51	51
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	52	53
Alternative	0	52	52
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		0.3%	-0.4%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	54	55
Alternative	0	54	55
Difference	0	0	-1
Percent Difference		-0.4%	-1.0%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Clear Creek at Igo, July through September Average Temperature Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type

	July throug	h September Average	Femperature
	DCR 2015 without	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2070 without
Alternative:	Project	Project	Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-terr	m	,
Full Simulation Period ¹	0		
Basis of Comparison		55	56
Alternative		55	56
Difference		0	0
Percent Difference3		-0.2%	0.1%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	54	55
Alternative	0	54	55
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		-0.2%	0.7%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	54	55
Alternative	0	54	55
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		-0.2%	-0.4%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	55	55
Alternative	0	54	55
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		-0.2%	0.4%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	55	56
Alternative	0	55	56
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		-0.2%	0.1%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	57	58
Alternative	0	57	58
Difference	0	0	0
Percent Difference		-0.2%	-0.4%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Trinity Lake, End of Month Storage						
Long-t	Long-term Average and Average by water rear type					
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project			
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.			
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project			
	Long-ter	m				
Full Simulation Period ¹						
Basis of Comparison		1,826	1,689			
Alternative		1,827	1,693			
Difference		1	5			
Percent Difference ³		0.1%	0.3%			
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²				
Wet						
Basis of Comparison	0	2,167	2,058			
Alternative	0	2,172	2,056			
Difference	0	5	-3			
Percent Difference		0.2%	-0.1%			
Above Normal						
Basis of Comparison	0	2,057	1,968			
Alternative	0	2,067	1,975			
Difference	0	9	8			
Percent Difference		0.5%	0.4%			
Below Normal						
Basis of Comparison	0	1,781	1,697			
Alternative	0	1,770	1,691			
Difference	0	-11	-7			
Percent Difference		-0.6%	-0.4%			
Dry						
Basis of Comparison	0	1,636	1,453			
Alternative	0	1,626	1,471			
Difference	0	-11	17			
Percent Difference		-0.6%	1.2%			
Critical						
Basis of Comparison	0	1,201	1,016			
Alternative	0	1,217	1,024			
Difference	0	16	9			
Percent Difference		1.3%	0.9%			



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Trinity Lake, End of Month Storage			
Long-te	erm Average and Average	ge by Water Year Type	
Alternative: vs.	DCR 2015 without Project VS.	WSIP 2030 without Project vs.	WSIP 2070 without Project vs.
Basis of Comparison.	Project	Project	Project
	Long-terr	m	,
Full Simulation Period ¹	Ť		
Basis of Comparison		1,320	1,152
Alternative		1,312	1,149
Difference		-8	-3
Percent Difference ³		-0.6%	-0.3%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	1,626	1,456
Alternative	0	1,608	1,434
Difference	0	-18	-22
Percent Difference		-1.1%	-1.5%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	1,511	1,420
Alternative	0	1,527	1,395
Difference	0	16	-25
Percent Difference		1.0%	-1.8%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	1,306	1,181
Alternative	0	1,289	1,170
Difference	0	-17	-11
Percent Difference		-1.3%	-0.9%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	1,104	903
Alternative	0	1,093	913
Difference	0	-11	10
Percent Difference		-1.0%	1.1%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	800	627
Alternative	0	807	673
Difference	0	7	47
Percent Difference		0.9%	7.5%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Trinity Lake, Shasta Lake, Lake Oroville, Folsom Lake and Sites Reservoir, End of Month Storage

Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type				
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project	
vs. Basis of Comparison:	vs. DCR 2015 with Project	vs. WSIP 2030 with Project	vs. WSIP 2070 with Project	
	Long-ter	m	-	
Full Simulation Period ¹				
Basis of Comparison		9,304	8,670	
Alternative		10,845	10,173	
Difference		1,541	1,503	
Percent Difference3		16.6%	17.3%	
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²		
Wet				
Basis of Comparison	0	10,835	10,353	
Alternative	0	12,585	12,070	
Difference	0	1,750	1,718	
Percent Difference		16.1%	16.6%	
Above Normal				
Basis of Comparison	0	10,537	10,173	
Alternative	0	12,266	11,815	
Difference	0	1,729	1,642	
Percent Difference		16.4%	16.1%	
Below Normal				
Basis of Comparison	0	9,474	8,974	
Alternative	0	11,011	10,488	
Difference	0	1,538	1,514	
Percent Difference		16.2%	16.9%	
Dry				
Basis of Comparison	0	8,293	7,607	
Alternative	0	9,723	9,037	
Difference	0	1,430	1,430	
Percent Difference		17.2%	18.8%	
Critical				
Basis of Comparison	0	5,991	5,087	
Alternative	0	7,063	6,109	
Difference	0	1,072	1,022	
Percent Difference		17.9%	20.1%	



1 Based on the 82-year simulation period

2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

May

Trinity Lake, Shasta Lake, Lake Oroville, Folsom Lake and Sites Reservoir, End of Month Storage

Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type				
	DCR 2015 without	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2070 without	
Alternative:	Project	Project	Project	
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.	
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 20/0 with Project	
	Lona-ter	m	Troject	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		5,761	5,077	
Alternative		7,007	6,262	
Difference		1.246	1.185	
Percent Difference3		21.6%	23.3%	
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²		
Wet				
Basis of Comparison	0	6,910	6,019	
Alternative	0	8,505	7,541	
Difference	0	1,596	1,522	
Percent Difference		23.1%	25.3%	
Above Normal				
Basis of Comparison	0	6,424	5,917	
Alternative	0	7,931	7,299	
Difference	0	1,507	1,381	
Percent Difference		23.5%	23.3%	
Below Normal				
Basis of Comparison	0	5,837	5,440	
Alternative	0	7,042	6,565	
Difference	0	1,205	1,125	
Percent Difference		20.6%	20.7%	
Dry				
Basis of Comparison	0	5,078	4,560	
Alternative	0	6,057	5,519	
Difference	0	978	959	
Percent Difference		19.3%	21.0%	
Critical				
Basis of Comparison	0	3,509	2,736	
Alternative	0	4,179	3,449	
Difference	0	670	713	
Percent Difference		19.1%	26.1%	



1 Based on the 82-year simulation period

2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Shasta Lake, End of Month Storage				
Long-t	Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type			
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project	
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.	
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project	
	Long-ter	m		
Full Simulation Period ¹				
Basis of Comparison		3,950	3,681	
Alternative		4,009	3,761	
Difference		59	80	
Percent Difference3		1.5%	2.2%	
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²		
Wet				
Basis of Comparison	0	4,387	4,228	
Alternative	0	4,405	4,242	
Difference	0	18	14	
Percent Difference		0.4%	0.3%	
Above Normal				
Basis of Comparison	0	4,322	4,271	
Alternative	0	4,359	4,289	
Difference	0	37	18	
Percent Difference		0.9%	0.4%	
Below Normal				
Basis of Comparison	0	4,133	3,949	
Alternative	0	4,155	4,018	
Difference	0	22	69	
Percent Difference		0.5%	1.8%	
Dry				
Basis of Comparison	0	3,663	3,386	
Alternative	0	3,765	3,478	
Difference	0	101	92	
Percent Difference		2.8%	2.7%	
Critical				
Basis of Comparison	0	2,787	2,157	
Alternative	0	2,953	2,428	
Difference	0	166	271	
Percent Difference		6.0%	12.6%	



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Shasta Lake, End of Month Storage					
Long-t	Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type				
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project		
vs. Basis of Comparison:	vs. DCR 2015 with Project	vs. WSIP 2030 with Project	vs. WSIP 2070 with Project		
	Long-terr	m			
Full Simulation Period ¹	-				
Basis of Comparison		2,544	2,262		
Alternative		2,627	2,321		
Difference		83	59		
Percent Difference3		3.3%	2.6%		
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²			
Wet					
Basis of Comparison	0	2,837	2,552		
Alternative	0	2,855	2,544		
Difference	0	18	-8		
Percent Difference		0.6%	-0.3%		
Above Normal					
Basis of Comparison	0	2,758	2,686		
Alternative	0	2,940	2,789		
Difference	0	182	104		
Percent Difference		6.6%	3.9%		
Below Normal					
Basis of Comparison	0	2,771	2,658		
Alternative	0	2,836	2,646		
Difference	0	65	-13		
Percent Difference		2.3%	-0.5%		
Dry					
Basis of Comparison	0	2,457	2,167		
Alternative	0	2,514	2,224		
Difference	0	57	56		
Percent Difference		2.3%	2.6%		
Critical					
Basis of Comparison	0	1,515	971		
Alternative	0	1,696	1,219		
Difference	0	181	247		
Percent Difference		12.0%	25.5%		



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Sacramento River below Keswick Reservoir, Average Flow, Dec-Feb

	Av	erage Flow, Dec-Feb (C	FS)
	DCR 2015 without	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2070 withou
Alternative:	Project	Project	Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-terr	n	Troject
Full Simulation Period ¹	5.0		
Basis of Comparison		9,028	9,459
Alternative		9,256	9,617
Difference		228	157
Percent Difference ³		2.5%	1.7%
	Water Year Ty	rpes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	17,411	18,072
Alternative	0	17,654	18,114
Difference	0	242	43
Percent Difference		1.4%	0.2%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	9,921	10,680
Alternative	0	9,943	10,779
Difference	0	22	99
Percent Difference		0.2%	0.9%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	4,711	5,479
Alternative	0	4,889	5,693
Difference	0	177	214
Percent Difference		3.8%	3.9%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	3,969	3,736
Alternative	0	4,442	3,964
Difference	0	474	228
Percent Difference		11.9%	6.1%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	3,532	3,531
Alternative	0	3,679	3,810
Difference	0	147	279
Percent Difference		4.2%	7.9%

-WSIP 2030 with Project 35,000 30,000 25,000 Dec-Feb (CFS) 20,000 - California Production Average Flow, 15,000 10,000 5,000 0 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100% Exceedance Probability

Sacramento River below Keswick Reservoir, Average Flow, Dec-Feb

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Lake Oroville, End of Month Storage			
Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type			
Alternative: vs. Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 without Project vs. DCR 2015 with	WSIP 2030 without Project vs. WSIP 2030 with	WSIP 2070 without Project vs. WSIP 2070 with
	Project	Project	Project
	Long-ter	m	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		2,760	2,620
Alternative		2,786	2,651
Difference		26	31
Percent Difference3		0.9%	1.2%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	3,383	3,258
Alternative	0	3,381	3,258
Difference	0	-1	0
Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	3,313	3,166
Alternative	0	3,318	3,165
Difference	0	6	-1
Percent Difference		0.2%	0.0%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	2,764	2,609
Alternative	0	2,792	2,644
Difference	0	28	35
Percent Difference		1.0%	1.3%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	2,294	2,167
Alternative	0	2,332	2,206
Difference	0	38	39
Percent Difference		1.7%	1.8%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	1,527	1,507
Alternative	0	1,611	1,618
Difference	0	83	111
Percent Difference		5.5%	7.4%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Lake Oroville, End of Month Storage			
Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type			
Alternative: vs.	DCR 2015 without Project vs.	WSIP 2030 without Project vs.	WSIP 2070 without Project vs.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-ter	m	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		1,469	1,287
Alternative		1,528	1,383
Difference		59	96
Percent Difference3		4.0%	7.4%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	1,938	1,585
Alternative	0	1,974	1,695
Difference	0	36	110
Percent Difference		1.8%	6.9%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	1,697	1,392
Alternative	0	1,778	1,549
Difference	0	81	157
Percent Difference		4.8%	11.3%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	1,323	1,184
Alternative	0	1,435	1,353
Difference	0	112	170
Percent Difference		8.4%	14.3%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	1,146	1,140
Alternative	0	1,195	1,147
Difference	0	49	7
Percent Difference		4.3%	0.6%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	901	903
Alternative	0	924	979
Difference	0	23	76
Percent Difference		2.6%	8.4%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Folsom Lake, End of Month Storage Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type			
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS. Decis of Comparison	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	Project	Project	Project
	Long-ter	m	,
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		769	679
Alternative		764	677
Difference		-4	-2
Percent Difference ³		-0.5%	-0.3%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	898	808
Alternative	0	896	805
Difference	0	-2	-3
Percent Difference		-0.2%	-0.4%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	844	768
Alternative	0	841	764
Difference	0	-3	-4
Percent Difference		-0.4%	-0.6%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	796	719
Alternative	0	790	713
Difference	0	-6	-6
Percent Difference		-0.7%	-0.9%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	699	601
Alternative	0	692	607
Difference	0	-8	6
Percent Difference		-1.1%	1.0%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	476	407
Alternative	0	473	401
Difference	0	-3	-5
Percent Difference		-0.6%	-1.3%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Folsom Lake, End of Month Storage			
Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type			
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
vs. Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	vs. WSIP 2030 with Project	vs. WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-ter	m	
Full Simulation Period ¹	-		
Basis of Comparison		428	377
Alternative		447	396
Difference		19	19
Percent Difference3		4.5%	5.2%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	508	425
Alternative	0	516	431
Difference	0	9	6
Percent Difference		1.7%	1.5%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	459	420
Alternative	0	487	459
Difference	0	28	39
Percent Difference		6.2%	9.3%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	437	417
Alternative	0	464	448
Difference	0	27	31
Percent Difference		6.1%	7.4%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	371	349
Alternative	0	410	373
Difference	0	38	24
Percent Difference		10.4%	6.7%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	293	235
Alternative	0	289	246
Difference	0	-4	11
Percent Difference		-1.4%	4.8%



2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Yolo Bypass, Volume, Aug-Oct Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type

	VOIUME, AUG-UCL (TAF)			
Alternative:	Project	Project	Project	
VS.	vs.	VS.	vs.	
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project	
	Long-terr	n		
ull Simulation Period ¹				
Basis of Comparison	0	24	20	
Alternative	0	64	58	
Difference	0	40	38	
Percent Difference3				
	Water Year Ty	pes ²		
Vet				
Basis of Comparison	0	20	19	
Iternative	0	65	76	
Difference	0	46	57	
Percent Difference				
bove Normal				
asis of Comparison	0	13	16	
Iternative	0	72	56	
Difference	0	58	40	
Percent Difference				
3elow Normal				
Basis of Comparison	0	14	10	
Alternative	0	57	55	
Difference	0	43	45	
Percent Difference				
Dry				
asis of Comparison	0	60	37	
Iternative	0	100	59	
Difference	0	40	22	
Percent Difference		66.4%	58.4%	
Critical				
asis of Comparison	0	13	9	
Iternative	0	18	22	
lifference	0	5	13	
ercent Difference		33.5%		

Yolo Bypass, Volume, Aug-Oct -WSIP 2030 with Project 1,000 900 800 700 600 500 400 300 200 100 *********************** -0 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100% Exceedance Probability

3 Relative difference of the monthly average

1 Based on the 82-year simulation period

Volume, Aug-Oct (TAF)

Sacramento/San Joaquin River Delta, Delta Outflow, Seasonal - May-Dec Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type

	DCR 2015 without	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2070 without
Alternative:	Project	Project	Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with	WSIP 2030 with	WSIP 2070 with
	Project	Project	Project
	Long-terr	n	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		45,268	47,876
Alternative		46,488	48,858
Difference		1,221	982
Percent Difference ³		2.7%	2.1%
	Water Year Ty	rpes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison	0	59,723	59,858
Alternative	0	59,936	60,115
Difference	0	214	257
Percent Difference		0.4%	0.4%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	59,917	63,973
Alternative	0	61,099	64,846
Difference	0	1,182	874
Percent Difference		2.0%	1.4%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison	0	30,669	36,025
Alternative	0	33,007	38,649
Difference	0	2,337	2,624
Percent Difference		7.6%	7.3%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison	0	40,898	39,615
Alternative	0	43,289	39,772
Difference	0	2,391	156
Percent Difference		5.8%	0.4%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison	0	27,011	33,765
Alternative	0	27,225	36,013
Difference	0	214	2,248
Percent Difference		0.8%	6.7%



3 Relative difference of the monthly average

CVP AG and M&I Service and Settlement Contract Deliveries Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type

	A	nnual Deliveries (TAF/	(1)
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	VS.
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
	Long-ter	m	
Full Simulation Period ¹	•		
Basis of Comparison		4,286	3,914
Alternative		4,280	3,916
Difference		-6	2
Percent Difference3		-0.1%	0.1%
	Water Year Ty	/pes ²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison		4,908	4,423
Alternative		4,897	4,434
Difference		-11	11
Percent Difference		-0.2%	0.3%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison		4,234	3,753
Alternative		4,217	3,743
Difference		-17	-10
Percent Difference		-0.4%	-0.3%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison		4,197	3,808
Alternative		4,168	3,823
Difference		-28	15
Percent Difference		-0.7%	0.4%
Dry			
- Basis of Comparison		3,855	3,683
Alternative		3,863	3,657
Difference		8	-25
Percent Difference		0.2%	-0.7%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison		3,385	3,135
Alternative		3,412	3,161
Difference		27	26
Percent Difference		0.8%	0.8%

2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999) 3 Relative difference of the monthly average



CVP SOD Ag Allocation				
Long-t	erm Average and Average	ge by Water Year Type		
	A	nnual Allocation (fraction	on)	
Altornativo	DCR 2015 without	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 2070 without	
Allel Halive:	FIOJECI	FIOJECI	FIDJECI	
Basis of Comparison:	vs. DCR 2015 with Project	VS. WSIP 2030 with Project	vs. WSIP 2070 with Project	
-	Long-ter	m		
Full Simulation Period ¹				
Basis of Comparison		0.44	0.29	
Alternative		0.44	0.29	
Difference		0.00	0.00	
Percent Difference3		-0.6%	0.4%	
	Water Year T	ypes ²		
Wet				
Basis of Comparison		0.71	0.51	
Alternative		0.71	0.51	
Difference		0.00	0.01	
Percent Difference		-0.3%	1.1%	
Above Normal				
Basis of Comparison		0.52	0.34	
Alternative		0.51	0.34	
Difference		-0.01	0.00	
Percent Difference		-1.9%	-0.9%	
Below Normal				
Basis of Comparison		0.39	0.23	
Alternative		0.37	0.23	
Difference		-0.01	0.01	
Percent Difference		-2.8%	3.5%	
Dry				
Basis of Comparison		0.23	0.16	
Alternative		0.23	0.16	
Difference		0.01	-0.01	
Percent Difference		2.8%	-4.0%	
Critical				
Basis of Comparison		0.11	0.04	
Alternative		0.12	0.04	
Difference		0.00	0.00	
Percent Difference		1 7%	1.5%	

2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)



3 Relative difference of the monthly average

CVP Refuge Level 4 Deliveries from Sites Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type

	DCR 2015 without	WSIP 2030 without	WSIP 2070 without
Alternative:	Project	Project	VSIP 2070 Without Project vs. WSIP 2070 with Project
VS.	VS.	VS.	
Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	
	Long-terr	n	
Full Simulation Period ¹			
Basis of Comparison		0	0
Alternative		35	31
Difference		35	31
Percent Difference3			
	Water Year Ty	pes ²	
Vet			
Basis of Comparison		0	0
Alternative		53	51
Difference		53	51
Percent Difference			
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison		0	0
Alternative		43	37
Difference		43	37
Percent Difference			
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison		0	0
Alternative		38	34
Difference		38	34
Percent Difference			
Dry			
Basis of Comparison		0	0
Alternative		21	16
Difference		21	16
Percent Difference			
Critical			
Basis of Comparison		0	0
Alternative		1	1
Difference		1	1
Percent Difference			



3 Relative difference of the monthly average

Annual Deliveries (TAF/Yr) DCR 2015 without WSIP 2030 without WSIP 2070 without Project VS. VS. VS. VS. Basis of Comparison: DCR 2015 with Project WSIP 2030 with WSIP 2070 with Project WSIP 2070 without Project Full Simulation Period ¹ Easis of Comparison 2,573 2,398 Ifference 2,573 2,398 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference ³ 0,0% 0.0% Wet 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Parcent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Maternative 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Parcent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Alternative 2,813 2,691 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison <th colspan="4">SWP Contract Deliveries Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type</th>	SWP Contract Deliveries Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type			
Annual Deliveries (TAF/W) DCR 2015 without WSIP 2030 without WSIP 2070 without Alternative: Project Project Project VS. VS. VS. VS. Basis of Comparison: DCR 2015 with Project WSIP 2030 with WSIP 2070 with Project WSIP 2070 with Project Iternative: Using 2000 with Project Project Project Iternative: 2,573 2,398 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference ¹ 2,573 2,398 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Wet 3,500 3,391 Basis of Comparison 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparis				
DCR 2015 without WSIP 2030 without WSIP 2070 without Project Project Project Project VS. VS. VS. VS. VS. Basis of Comparison: DCR 2015 with Project WSIP 2030 with Project WSIP 2070 with Project Full Simulation Period ¹ Easis of Comparison 2,573 2,398 Difference 0 0 0 Parcen Difference ³ 0,0% 0.0% Wet 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Parcent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Alternative 2,813 2,691 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Difference		A	nnual Deliveries (TAF/	Yr)
No. Project Project Project Basis of Comparison: DCR 2015 with Project WSIP 2030 with Project WSIP 2070 with Project Full Simulation Period ¹ Basis of Comparison 2,573 2,398 Alternative 2,573 2,398 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference ³ 0,0% 0.0% Wet Basis of Comparison 3,500 3,391 Alternative 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Parcent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Alternative 2,813 2,691 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Alternative 0 <t< th=""><th>Altornativo</th><th>DCR 2015 without Project</th><th>WSIP 2030 without Project</th><th>WSIP 20/0 without Project</th></t<>	Altornativo	DCR 2015 without Project	WSIP 2030 without Project	WSIP 20/0 without Project
Basis of Comparison: DCR 2015 with Project WSIP 2030 with Project WSIP 2010 with Project Full Simulation Period ¹ Basis of Comparison 2,573 2,398 Alternative 2,573 2,398 Alternative 2,573 2,398 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference ³ 0,0% 0.0% Wet Basis of Comparison 3,500 3,391 Alternative 0 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% 0 Met Basis of Comparison 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Difference 0 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% 0 Reasis of Comparison 2,579	VS	Ne	ve	ve
Long-term Full Simulation Period ¹ Basis of Comparison 2,573 2,398 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference ³ 0,0% 0.0% Water Year Types ² Wet 3,500 3,391 Alternative 3,500 3,391 Alternative 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Above Normal 2,813 2,691 Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Difference<	Basis of Comparison:	DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 with Project
Full Simulation Period ¹ Basis of Comparison 2,573 2,398 Alternalive 2,573 2,398 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference ¹ 0,0% 0.0% Water Year Types ² Wet 3,500 3,391 Alternative 3,500 3,391 Alternative 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Alternative 2,813 2,691 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Below Normal 2,579 2,414 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Dry 2,579 2,414 Difference 0,0% 0.0% <t< td=""><td></td><td>Long-ter</td><td>m</td><td></td></t<>		Long-ter	m	
Basis of Comparison 2,573 2,398 Alternative 2,573 2,398 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference ¹ 0,0% 0.0% Wet Basis of Comparison 3,500 3,391 Alternative 0,0% 0.0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Above Normal 2,813 2,691 Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Alternative 0,0% 0,0% Bowe Normal 2,579 2,414 Difference 0,0% 0,0% Below Normal 2,579 2,414 Difference 0,0% 0,0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Difference 0,0% 0,0% Differ	Full Simulation Period ¹			
Alternative 2,573 2,398 Difference 0 0 Parcen Difference ³ 0,0% 0,0% Water Year Types ² 0,0% 0,0% Water Year Types ² 3,500 3,391 Alternative 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Porcent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Above Normal 2,813 2,691 Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Alternative 0 0 Parcent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Parcent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Parcent Difference <td< td=""><td>Basis of Comparison</td><td></td><td>2,573</td><td>2,398</td></td<>	Basis of Comparison		2,573	2,398
Difference 0 0 Percent Difference ³ 0.0% 0.0% Water Year Types ² Wet 3,500 3,391 Alternative 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Above Normal Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Difference 0 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% 0 Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% 0 Relow Normal Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Difference 0,0% 0.0% 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% 0 Difference <td>Alternative</td> <td></td> <td>2,573</td> <td>2,398</td>	Alternative		2,573	2,398
Percent Difference* 0.0% 0.0% Water Year Types* Wet <t< td=""><td>Difference</td><td></td><td>0</td><td>0</td></t<>	Difference		0	0
Water Year Types ² Wet Basis of Comparison 3,500 3,391 Alternative 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Above Normal Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Miternative 2,813 2,691 1 Difference 0 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% 0 Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Difference 0 0 Parcent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Dry Basis of Comparison 1,881 1,737 Alternative 0 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% 0 Difference 0	Percent Difference ³		0.0%	0.0%
Wet Basis of Comparison 3,500 3,391 Alternative 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Above Normal 2,813 2,691 Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Ilfference 0,0% 0,0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Alternative 0,0% 0,0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Difference 0,0% 0,0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Difference 0,0% 0,0% Comparison		Water Year T	ypes ²	
Basis of Comparison 3,500 3,391 Alternative 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Above Normal 2,813 2,691 Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Alternative 0,0% 0,0% Difference 0,0% 0,0% Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Alternative 0,0% 0,0% Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Difference 0,0% 0,0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Dry 1,881 1,737 Alternative 1,881 1,737 Difference 0,0% 0,0% Percent Difference 0,0%	Wet			
Alternative 3,500 3,391 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Above Normal Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Alternative 2,813 2,691 Alternative 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Below Normal Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Alternative 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Difference 0,0% 0.0% Procent Difference 1,881 1,737 Alternative 1,881 1,737 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Critical 1,105 861 Basis of Comparison	Basis of Comparison		3,500	3,391
Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0% Above Normal 2,813 2,691 Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Alternative 2,813 2,691 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Below Normal 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Difference 0,0% 0.0% Difference 0,0% 0.0% Difference 1,881 1,737 Alternative 1,881 1,737 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Critical 1,105 861 <td>Alternative</td> <td></td> <td>3,500</td> <td>3,391</td>	Alternative		3,500	3,391
Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0% Above Normal	Difference		0	0
Above Normal Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Alternalive 2,813 2,691 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Difference 0,0% 0.0% Parcent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Dry 1,881 1,737 Basis of Comparison 1,881 1,737 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Critical 1,105 861 Alternative 1,105 861 Difference 0,0 0 Percent Difference 0	Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%
Basis of Comparison 2,813 2,691 Alternative 2,813 2,691 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Below Normal 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Difference 0,0% 0,0% Dry 1,881 1,737 Alternative 1,881 1,737 Alternative 0,0% 0.0% Difference 0,0% 0.0% Crutical 1,105 861 Alternative 1,105 861 Alternative 1,105 861 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 1,00 861	Above Normal			
Alternative 2,813 2,691 Difference 0 0 Parcent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Below Normal 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Difference 0 0 Parcent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Procent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Dry 1,881 1,737 Alternative 1,881 1,737 Alternative 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Critical 1,181 1,737 Difference 0,0% 0.0% Critical 0,0% 0.0% Basis of Comparison 1,105 861 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0 0 <td< td=""><td>Basis of Comparison</td><td></td><td>2,813</td><td>2,691</td></td<>	Basis of Comparison		2,813	2,691
Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0% Below Normal 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Dry 1,881 1,737 Alternative 1,881 1,737 Alternative 0,0% 0.0% Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Critical 1,105 861 Basis of Comparison 1,105 861 Difference 0,0% 0,0% Critical 1,105 861 Difference 0,0 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0%	Alternative		2,813	2,691
Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0% Below Normal	Difference		0	0
Below Normal Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Alternalive 2,579 2,414 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Dry Basis of Comparison 1,881 1,737 Alternative 1,881 1,737 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Cirtual 1,105 861 Alternative 1,105 861 Alternative 0,0% 0,0% Cirtual 1,105 861 Difference 0 0 Cirtual 1,005 861 Difference 0 0	Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%
Basis of Comparison 2,579 2,414 Alternative 2,579 2,414 Difference 2,579 2,414 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Dry Basis of Comparison 1,881 1,737 Alternative 1,881 1,737 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Critical Basis of Comparison 1,105 8661 Alternative 1,05 8661 Difference Difference 0 0 O Percent Difference 1,105 8661 Difference	Below Normal			
Alternative 2,679 2,414 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0,0% Dry 1,881 1,737 Alternative 1,881 1,737 Alternative 1,881 1,737 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Critical 1,105 861 Alternative 1,105 861 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 1,05 861 Difference 0,0% 0,0%	Basis of Comparison		2,579	2,414
Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0% Dry 1.881 1.737 Alternative 1.881 1.737 Alternative 1.881 1.737 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0% Critical 1.105 861 Baiss of Comparison 1.105 861 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0%	Alternative		2,579	2,414
Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0% Dry	Difference		0	0
Dry	Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%
Basis of Comparison 1,881 1,737 Alternative 1,881 1,737 Difference 1,881 1,737 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Critical Basis of Comparison 1,105 861 Alternative 1,105 861 Difference Difference 0 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0%	Dry			
Alternative 1,881 1,737 Difference 0 0 Parcent Difference 0,0% 0.0% Critical 1,105 861 Alternative 1,105 861 Alternative 1,105 861 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0%	Basis of Comparison		1,881	1,737
Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0% Critical 1,105 861 Alternative 1,105 861 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0	Alternative		1,881	1,737
Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0% Critical 1,105 861 Basis of Comparison 1,105 861 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0,0% 0.0%	Difference		0	0
Critical 1,105 861 Basis of Comparison 1,105 861 Alternative 1,105 861 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0%	Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%
Basis of Comparison 1,105 861 Alternative 1,105 861 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0%	Critical			
Alternative 1,105 861 Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0%	Basis of Comparison		1,105	861
Difference 0 0 Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0%	Alternative		1,105	861
Percent Difference 0.0% 0.0%	Difference		0	0
	Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%





SWP SOD M&I Allocation
Long-term Average and Average by Water Year Type

	Ar		
Alternative:	DCR 2015 without Project vs. DCR 2015 with Project	WSIP 2030 without Project vs. WSIP 2030 with Project	WSIP 2070 without Project vs. WSIP 2070 with Project
VS.			
Basis of Comparison:			
	Long-terr	n	
Full Simulation Period ¹	-		
Basis of Comparison		0.62	0.57
Alternative		0.62	0.57
Difference		0.00	0.00
Percent Difference ³		0.0%	0.0%
	Water Year Ty	pes²	
Wet			
Basis of Comparison		0.86	0.81
Alternative		0.86	0.81
Difference		0.00	0.00
Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%
Above Normal			
Basis of Comparison		0.68	0.65
Alternative		0.68	0.65
Difference		0.00	0.00
Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%
Below Normal			
Basis of Comparison		0.60	0.57
Alternative		0.60	0.57
Difference		0.00	0.00
Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%
Dry			
Basis of Comparison		0.44	0.40
Alternative		0.44	0.40
Difference		0.00	0.00
Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%
Critical			
Basis of Comparison		0.25	0.20
Alternative		0.25	0.20
Difference		0.00	0.00
Percent Difference		0.0%	0.0%

2 As defined by the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index Water Year Hydrologic Classification (SWRCB D-1641, 1999)



3 Relative difference of the monthly average