
Foreword

This is the 32nd annual progress report of the California Department of Water Resources' San Francisco Bay-Delta Evaluation Program, which is carried out by the Delta Modeling Section. This report is submitted annually by the section to the California State Water Resources Control Board pursuant to its Water Right Decision 1485, Term 9, which is still active pursuant to its Water Right Decision 1641, Term 8.

This report documents progress in the development and enhancement of the Bay-Delta Office's Delta Modeling Section's computer models and reports the latest findings of studies conducted as part of the program. This report was compiled under the direction of Tara Smith, program manager for the Bay-Delta Evaluation Program.

Online versions of previous annual progress reports are available at:
<http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/modeling/deltamodeling/annualreports.cfm>.

For more information contact:

Tara Smith

tara@water.ca.gov

(916) 653-9885

Report Contents

Preface	xv
Acronyms and Abbreviations	xvii
Metric Conversion Table	xviii
1 Improvements to DSM2-Qual Part 1	1-1
1.1 Summary.....	1-1
1.2 Advection and Parcel Recombination.....	1-1
1.3 Dispersion Changes.....	1-3
1.3.1 <i>Discretization Issue</i>	1-3
1.3.2 <i>Proposed Scheme</i>	1-5
1.3.3 <i>Estimating the Dispersion Coefficient (DC)</i>	1-6
1.4 Tests Using DSM2 Historical Setup	1-7
1.5 Conclusions	1-7
1.6 References	1-8
Figures	
Figure 1-1 New parcel formed by inflow over a single time step.....	1-1
Figure 1-2 Parcel recombination strategy example	1-2
Figure 1-3 Explanation of mixing between parcels	1-2
Figure 1-4 Previous model result at Collinsville.....	1-9
Figure 1-5 Previous model result at Jersey Point	1-9
Figure 1-6 Previous model advection only result at Collinsville	1-10
Figure 1-7 Previous model advection only result at Collinsville (zoom in)	1-10
Figure 1-8 New model, advection-only at Collinsville, convergence at 15, 5, 3, 1 min time steps	1-11
Figure 1-9 New model, advection-only at Collinsville, convergence at 5, 3, 1 min time steps.....	1-11
Figure 1-10 New model, advection-only at Jersey Pt., convergence at 15, 5, 3, 1 min time steps	1-12
Figure 1-11 New model, advection-only at Jersey Pt., convergence of 5, 3, 1 minute time steps.....	1-12
Figure 1-12 New model, advection-only at Collinsville (parcel size sensitivity test, dt=5 min)	1-13
Figure 1-13 Result with previous dispersion model after advection fix at Collinsville	1-13
Figure 1-14 New model, result at Collinsville (time step sensitivity test, parcel size 500 ft)	1-14
Figure 1-15 New model, result at Jersey Point (time step sensitivity test, parcel size 500 ft).....	1-14
Figure 1-16 New model, result at Bacon Island (time step sensitivity test, parcel size 500 ft).....	1-15
Figure 1-17 New model, result at Clifton Court (time step sensitivity test, parcel size 500 ft)	1-15
Figure 1-18 New model, result at Collinsville (parcel size sensitivity test, time step=5min)	1-16
Figure 1-19 New model, result at Jersey Point (parcel size sensitivity test, time step=5min).....	1-16
Figure 1-20 New model, result at Bacon Island (parcel size sensitivity test, time step=5min).....	1-17
Figure 1-21 New model, result at Clifton Court (parcel size sensitivity test, time step=5min)	1-17
Figure 1-22 Comparison of previous (red line) and new (green) model results with field data (blue dots) at Collinsville.....	1-18

Figure 1-23 Comparison of previous (red line) and new (green) model results with field data (blue dots) at Jersey Point 1-18

2 Improvements to DSM2-Qual: Part 2 2-1

2.1 Introduction 2-1

2.2 Testing Scenarios and Result Analysis 2-1

 2.2.1 *Test 1: Compare With the Old Solver* 2-1

 2.2.2 *Test 2: Test Minimum Dispersion Velocity (0.01 ft/s)* 2-1

 2.2.3 *Test 3: Test Cold Start*..... 2-2

2.3 Conclusions 2-2

2.4 References 2-2

Appendix 2-A 2-3

Appendix 2-B 2-4

Appendix 2-C 2-9

Figures

Figure 2-1 Delta Cross Channel (instantaneous, MDV=0 and 0.01) 2-5

Figure 2-2 Delta Cross Channel (monthly average, MDV=0 and 0.01)..... 2-5

Figure 2-3 Montezuma Slough (instantaneous, MDV=0 and 0.01)..... 2-6

Figure 2-4 Montezuma Slough (monthly average, MDV=0 and 0.01) 2-6

Figure 2-5 Montezuma Slough (monthly average, MDV=0 and 0.1) 2-7

Figure 2-6 Montezuma Slough (monthly average, MDV=0 and 0.001) 2-7

Figure 2-7 Old River at Tracy Road (instantaneous, ammonia)..... 2-8

Figure 2-8 Old River at Tracy Road (monthly average, ammonia) 2-8

Figure 2-9 Mallard Island cold vs. warm start, algae..... 2-9

Figure 2-10 Mallard Island cold vs. warm start, phosphate..... 2-10

Figure 2-11 Clifton Court cold vs. warm start, algae 2-10

Table

Table 2-1 Summary of maximum monthly percent difference..... 2-3

3 DSM2 Dissolved Organic Carbon Boundary Condition Improvement..... 3-1

3.1 Summary 3-1

3.2 Methods 3-1

 3.2.1 *Sites* 3-1

 3.2.2 *Sample Collection and Analysis* 3-2

 3.2.3 *Comparisons*..... 3-2

3.3 Results 3-4

3.4 Discussion 3-9

3.5 Conclusions 3-10

3.6 References 3-10

Figures

Figure 3-1 Sampled Delta boundary stations 3-2
 Figure 3-2 Shag Slough DOC, Sacramento River DOC, Yolo Bypass flow, and rainfall 3-5
 Figure 3-3 DOC in the Sacramento River at Hood and Shag Slough, December 2008—March 2010..... 3-5
 Figure 3-4 Mokelumne River DOC, Cosumnes River flow, and rainfall..... 3-6
 Figure 3-5 Mokelumne River DOC > 4 mg/L and high flow boundary conditions..... 3-7
 Figure 3-6 Mokelumne River DOC < 4 mg/L and low flow boundary conditions 3-7
 Figure 3-7 Calaveras River DOC, Mormon Slough flow, and rainfall..... 3-8

Tables

Table 3-1 Water Data Library station numbers and the corresponding DSM2 geometry by location 3-2
 Table 3-2 Statistics for DOC concentrations (mg/L) at boundary locations, Dec 2008—Mar 2010..... 3-4

4 South Delta Temporary Barriers Hydrodynamic Modeling 4-1

4.1 Summary 4-1
 4.2 2008 Delta Boundary conditions 4-1
 4.3 2008 Delta consumptive use..... 4-2
 4.4 South Delta Structures 4-2
 4.5 Delta Downstream Stage at Martinez..... 4-3
 4.6 Delta Cross Channel Operation..... 4-3
 4.7 Validation of DSM2 Simulation of Historical 2008 Delta Hydrodynamics 4-3
 4.8 Effect of Temporary Barriers Installation and Operation on South Delta Hydrodynamics 4-16
 4.9 Discussion 4-17

Figures

Figure 4-1 Daily average historical inflow from the Sacramento River, 2008 4-1
 Figure 4-2 Daily average historical inflow from the Yolo Bypass, 2008 4-1
 Figure 4-3 Daily average historical inflow from the San Joaquin River, 2008..... 4-2
 Figure 4-4 Daily average historical pumping at Banks and Jones pumping plants, 2008 4-2
 Figure 4-5 Locations where DSM2-simulated and measured stages and flows are presented, 2008..... 4-4
 Figure 4-6 Comparison of DSM2-simulated and observed daily stage, 2008..... 4-5
 Figure 4-7 Comparison of DSM2-simulated and measured daily flow, 2008..... 4-11
 Figure 4-8 Locations where simulated Delta stages and flows for analysis of 2008 conditions are presented 4-17
 Figure 4-9 Distribution of DSM2-simulated stages for historical 2008 with and without temporary barriers installed 4-19
 Figure 4-10 Distribution of DSM2-simulated flows for historical 2008 conditions with and without temporary barriers installed 4-23
 Figure 4-11 Simulated period-average flow and minimum stage for 2008 conditions with historical barrier configuration and no-barriers condition 4-27

Tables

Table 4-1 Historical South Delta Temporary Barriers installation and removal, 2008..... 4-3
 Table 4-2 Characteristics of time intervals for presentation of simulation results, 2008 4-16

5 Adaptive Mesh, Embedded Boundary Model for Flood Modeling 5-1

5.1 Summary 5-1
 5.2 Introduction 5-1
 5.3 Governing Equations..... 5-1
 5.4 Solution Algorithm 5-3
 5.4.1 Adaptive Mesh Refinement 5-4
 5.4.2 Embedded boundaries..... 5-5
 5.4.3 Godunov algorithm 5-5
 5.5 Wet/Dry Front Capture 5-6
 5.6 Model Verification 5-7
 5.6.1 Dam Break on a Dry Bottom 5-8
 5.6.2 Dam Break on a Wet Bottom 5-9
 5.6.3 Dam Break on a Dry Bottom with Friction 5-10
 5.7 Applications and Challenges 5-10
 5.8 Acknowledgements..... 5-11
 5.9 References 5-11

Figures

Figure 5-1 A multiblock adaptive mesh hierarchy with a refinement factor of 2 between levels 5-4
 Figure 5-2 Decomposition of a patch of cells into regular, irregular, and covered cells 5-5
 Figure 5-3 Two depictions of flooding 5-6
 Figure 5-4 AMR resolving a flood along a reach of the Sacramento River 5-7
 Figure 5-5 Water depth (left) and velocity (right) after dam break at time 50.78 seconds..... 5-8
 Figure 5-6 Water depth (left) and velocity (right) after dam break at time 50.52 seconds..... 5-9
 Figure 5-7 Water depth (left) and velocity (right) after dam break at time 50.88 seconds..... 5-10

6 Using Software Quality and Algorithm Testing to Verify a One-Dimensional Transport Model 6-1

6.1 Introduction 6-1
 6.2 1-D Transport Model..... 6-1
 6.3 Testing Requirements 6-2
 6.4 Testing Principles 6-2
 6.4.1 Software Testing Principles 6-3
 6.4.2 Numerical verification and algorithmic testing..... 6-4
 6.5 Algorithm Test Suite Description 6-6
 6.6 Architecture and Implementation 6-7

6.7 Challenges and Issues with Tests 6-8

6.8 Conclusions 6-9

6.9 Acknowledgments..... 6-10

6.10 References 6-10

Figures

Figure 6-1 Relationship between software testing components and algorithmic testing..... 6-3

Figure 6-2 Transport algorithm testing with incremental complexity 6-7

7 Turbidity Modeling with DSM2 7-1

7.1 Introduction 7-1

7.2 Turbidity Modeling with DSM2 7-1

7.3 Boundary Conditions 7-2

7.4 2010 Wet Season Calibration..... 7-2

7.5 Discussion of Model limitations..... 7-3

7.6 Summary 7-5

7.7 Acknowledgments..... 7-5

7.8 References 7-5

Figures

Figure 7-1 CDEC turbidity stations 7-6

Figure 7-2 Calibrated settling rate values 7-7

Figure 7-3 Turbidity comparison, Sacramento River at Rio Vista (15 minute interval)..... 7-8

Figure 7-4 Daily-averaged turbidity comparison, Sacramento River at Rio Vista..... 7-8

Figure 7-5 Regression analysis of daily averaged values, Sacramento River at Rio Vista 7-9

Figure 7-6 Turbidity comparison, Sacramento River at Decker Island (15 minute interval)..... 7-9

Figure 7-7 Daily-averaged turbidity comparison, Sacramento River at Decker Island..... 7-10

Figure 7-8 Regression analysis of modeled result and field data, Sacramento River at Decker Island..... 7-10

Figure 7-9 Turbidity comparison at Jersey Point 7-11

Figure 7-10 Daily-averaged turbidity comparison at Jersey Point..... 7-11

Figure 7-11 Regression analysis of modeled result and field data at Jersey Point..... 7-12

Figure 7-12 Turbidity comparison at Old River Bacon Island..... 7-12

Figure 7-13 Daily-averaged turbidity comparison at Old River Bacon Island 7-13

Figure 7-14 Regression analysis of modeled result and field data at Old River Bacon Island 7-13

Figure 7-15 Turbidity comparison, Sacramento River at Prisoners Point 7-14

Figure 7-16 Daily-averaged turbidity comparison, Sacramento River at Prisoners Point..... 7-14

Figure 7-17 Regression analysis of modeled result and field data at Prisoners Point..... 7-15

Figure 7-18 Turbidity comparison, Sacramento River at Holland Cut..... 7-15

Figure 7-19 Daily-averaged turbidity comparison at Holland Cut 7-16

Figure 7-20 Turbidity comparison at Victoria Canal..... 7-16

Figure 7-21 Daily-averaged turbidity comparison at Victoria Canal..... 7-17

Figure 7-22 Compare turbidity spikes at Jersey Point with rainfall and wind data 7-17

Figure 7-23 Compare turbidity spikes at Bacon Island with rainfall and wind data 7-18

Figure 7-24 Compare turbidity spikes at Holland Cut with rainfall and wind data 7-18

Figure 7-25 Turbidity comparison at San Joaquin River Garwood 7-19

Figure 7-26 Daily-averaged turbidity comparison at San Joaquin River Garwood..... 7-19

Figure 7-27 Turbidity comparison at Grant Line Canal 7-20

Figure 7-28 Daily-averaged turbidity comparison at Grant Line Canal 7-20

Figure 7-29 Flow at San Joaquin River Mossdale (RSAN087) and Brandt Bridge (RSAN072) 7-21

Figure 7-30 Velocity at San Joaquin River Mossdale and Brandt Bridge 7-21

Figure 7-31 Settling rate sensitivity test result at Decker Island 7-22

Figure 7-32 Settling rate sensitivity test result at Prisoners Point..... 7-22

Figure 7-33 Settling rate sensitivity test result at Holland Cut 7-23

Figure 7-34 Settling rate sensitivity test result at False River 7-23

Figure 7-35 Settling rate sensitivity test result at Victoria Canal 7-24

Figure 7-36 Settling rate sensitivity test result at Rough and Ready Island 7-24

Figure 7-37 Settling rate sensitivity test result at Grant Line Canal 7-25

Figure 7-38 Daily-averaged turbidity comparison at Mallard..... 7-25

Figure 7-39 Adjusted turbidity comparison at Mallard..... 7-26

Figure 7-40 Daily-averaged turbidity comparison at Antioch..... 7-26

Figure 7-41 Adjusted turbidity comparison at Antioch..... 7-27

Figure 7-42 Adjusted turbidity comparison at Prisoners Point 7-27

Figure 7-43 Adjusted turbidity comparison at Holland Cut 7-28

Figure 7-44 Adjusted turbidity comparison at Victoria Canal..... 7-28

Table

Table 7-1 Turbidity sources 7-4

8 DSM2 Grid Map Tool 8-1

8.1 Introduction 8-1

8.2 Geographical Information 8-1

8.3 Design..... 8-2

8.4 Implementation Details 8-2

8.5 Storage Format 8-3

8.6 User Interface Overview 8-4

 8.6.1 Login 8-4

 8.6.2 Upload 8-5

 8.6.3 Viewing the Grid..... 8-5

 8.6.4 Viewing Channel Information..... 8-8

 8.6.5 GIS Tools 8-9

 8.6.6 Managing Studies..... 8-9

 8.6.7 Editing Mode 8-10

 8.6.8 Editing Nodes 8-10

8.6.9 *Editing Channels*..... 8-10

8.6.10 *Editing Reservoirs*..... 8-14

8.6.11 *Editing Gates* 8-14

8.7 Conclusion..... 8-14

8.8 References 8-15

Figures

Figure 8-1 Data flow for DSM2 grid map 8-2

Figure 8-2 Sample grid 8-4

Figure 8-3 Example log in page..... 8-4

Figure 8-4 Example study upload..... 8-5

Figure 8-5 Example grid elements: reservoirs 8-6

Figure 8-6 Example grid elements: gates..... 8-6

Figure 8-7 Example base maps..... 8-7

Figure 8-8 Example channel display..... 8-8

Figure 8-9 GIS tools 8-9

Figure 8-10 Example study inputs 8-9

Figure 8-11 Node editing 8-10

Figure 8-12 Flow line editing 8-11

Figure 8-13 Edit Channel Cross section..... 8-11

Figure 8-14 Edit Channel Cross section (detail)..... 8-12

Figure 8-15 Edit Channel Cross section (profile points) 8-12

Figure 8-16 Edit Channel Cross section (elevation profile) 8-13

Figure 8-17 Edit Channel Cross section (generate or clear)..... 8-13

Figure 8-18 Editing reservoirs..... 8-14

Table

Table 8-1 GIS data format..... 8-3

9 DOC Validation with DSM2 9-1

9.1 Summary 9-1

9.2 Background 9-1

9.3 Study Methodology..... 9-1

9.4 Study Results..... 9-8

9.5 Conclusions 9-8

9.6 References 9-9

Figures

Figure 9-1 Assumed DOC for Delta inflows for simulation of historical conditions 9-3

Figure 9-2 DOC assumed for agricultural drainage by Delta region..... 9-5

Figure 9-3 Example of daily range and daily average DOC in DSM2-simulated conditions..... 9-6

Figure 9-4 Locations DSM2-simulated daily DOC compared to measured DOC..... 9-7

Figure 9-5 DSM2-simulated daily DOC and measured DOC, July 1990–1994 9-10
 Figure 9-6 DSM2-simulated daily DOC and measured DOC, 1995–1998 9-18
 Figure 9-7 DSM2-simulated daily DOC and measured DOC, 1999–2002 9-20
 Figure 9-8 DSM2-simulated daily DOC and measured DOC, 2003–2006 9-22
 Figure 9-9 DSM2-simulated daily DOC and measured DOC, 2007–2010 9-24
 Figure 9-10 DSM2-simulated daily DOC fingerprint and measured DOC, 1991–1994 9-26

10 DSM2 Comparison Report Tool 10-1
 10.1 Introduction..... 10-1
 10.2 Development Framework..... 10-1
 10.3 Tool Demonstration: Input Comparison Tool..... 10-2
 10.4 Tool Demonstration: DSS Comparison Tool 10-4
 10.4.1 Configuration File Preparation 10-5
 10.4.2 DSM2 Planning Study 10-9
 10.4.3 DSM2 Model Calibration 10-11
 10.5 Conclusions..... 10-13
 10.6 References..... 10-13

Figures

Figure 10-1 Working diagrams for input comparison report tool and output comparison report tool 10-2
 Figure 10-2 Input comparison report tool GUI 10-2
 Figure 10-3 Input comparison report..... 10-3
 Figure 10-4 Highlighted differences from reservoir in example input comparison report..... 10-3
 Figure 10-5 Extended reservoir table in example input comparison report 10-4
 Figure 10-6 Input comparison example for non-unique lookup names 10-4
 Figure 10-7 Example to execute output comparison tool 10-4
 Figure 10-8 Sample configuration file for output comparison tool..... 10-7
 Figure 10-9 Time series plot example for 5 comparison modes 10-8
 Figure 10-10 DSM2 output comparison report for planning studies..... 10-10
 Figure 10-11 A demonstration for displaying percentage root mean square differences on
 Google Map..... 10-10
 Figure 10-12 Time series plot (1) daily average time series (2) monthly average time series (3) difference
 for daily time series (4) overlaid water year type on daily average time series..... 10-11
 Figure 10-13 Percentage root mean square error for turbidity comparison (COMPARE_MODE 5)..... 10-12
 Figure 10-14 Time series plot example for turbidity comparison (COMPARE_MODE 5) 10-12

Table

Table 10-1 Files required for each comparison mode 10-8