

[Editor's Note: The following report is an electronic reproduction of the 13th annual progress report to the State Water Resources Control Board. The format of this chapter is different than the original report. The page numbers listed in this table of contents still reflect the page numbers from the original document.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1-1
2	TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF MODELS.....	2-1
2.1	Developments and Enhancements of DWRDSM	2-1
2.2	Investigations of Other Models	2-5
3	COMPARISON OF FISCHER 7E AND DWRDSM.....	3-1
3.1	Improvements to the Code.....	3-1
3.2	Addition of Agriculture Drainage Module.....	3-1
3.3	New Geometry	3-2
3.4	Benefits of the Improvements	3-2
4	VERIFICATION	4-1
4.1	Long Term Historic Simulations.....	4-1
4.2	May 1988 Verification.....	4-3
5	DEVELOPMENT OF DATABASE	5-1
5.1	Procurement of Observed Data from Various Sources	5-1
5.2	Assemblage of Acquired Data	5-2
6	DELTA GRAPHICAL SER INTERFACE (DGUI)	6-1
7	SAMPLE STUDIES WITH DWRDSM	7-1
7.1	Article VII Hydrodynamics and Transport Modeling	7-1
7.2	Steady State Flow and Quality Simulations Supporting the South Delta Water Management Program	7-9
8	FLOOD MODELING USING THE DWOPER / NETWORK MODEL.....	8-1
8.1	Running the Model on the Sun Microcomputer.....	8-1
8.2	The Future of North Delta Flood Modeling.....	8-2
9	TRICHALOMETHANE FORMATION POTENTIAL MODELING	9-1
9.1	Publications	9-1
9.2	Bromine Distribution Factors: Modified Formulation	9-2
9.3	Correlating THMFP Data with SDS-THM Data	9-6
9.4	Overall Model Framework	9-14

TABLES

Table 3.1:	Agricultural Drainage	3-4
Table 3.2:	Flow Split Comparison Hydrologies, FDM-DSM.....	3-4
Table 3.3:	Delta Flow Split Data	3-4
Table 3.4:	USGS ADCP Moving Boat System Float Data, Average Hydrologies from DAYFLOW	3-4
Table 4.1:	Input for Long Term Historical Simulations.....	4-4
Table 4.2:	Flow Splits.....	4-9
Table 7.1:	South Delta Barrier Operation Schedule for Article II Hydrodynamic Modeling.....	7-1
Table 7.2:	Operation Study Year-Type and 57-Year Average Flows	7-4
Table 7.3:	57-Year Average Dry Year May Hydrology: 1922-1978	7-6
Table 7.4:	Barrier Operation Alternatives.....	7-15
Table 9.1:	Model Verification	9-36

FIGURES

Figure 3.1:	DWRDSM, Flow Comparison, Base Case vs Lumped Ag	3-5
Figure 3.2:	DWRDSM, Base Case Salinity	3-5
Figure 3.3:	DWRDSM, Lumped Ag Salinity	3-6
Figure 3.4:	DSM vs. FDM Flow Areas Below MLLW, NF Mokelumne River	3-6
Figure 3.5:	DSM vs. FDM Flow Areas Below MLLW, SF Mokelumne River	3-7
Figure 3.6:	DSM vs. FDM Flow Areas Below MLLW, Old River	3-7
Figure 3.7:	Location of Delta Flow Split Analysis Sites.....	3-8
Figure 3.8:	Delta Cross-Transfer Flow Split.....	3-8
Figure 3.9:	North Fork vs. South Fork Mokelumne River, Flow Split in cfs, DSM vs. FDM.....	3-9
Figure 3.10:	Old River vs. Middle River, Residual Flow Split in cfs, DSM vs. FDM	3-9
Figure 3.11:	Old River vs. Middle River Flow, USGS ADCP Moving Boat System and DSM Simulation (19-yr mean tide).....	3-10
Figure 3.12:	Computed vs. Observed Monthly Average TDS, Ranked Plot for CCC.....	3-10
Figure 3.13:	Computed vs. Observed Monthly Average TDS, Ranked Plot for Union Island	3-11
Figure 3.14:	Computed vs. Observed Monthly Average TDS, Ranked Plot for DMC	3-11
Figure 4.1:	Representative Graphs used in DWRSAL Verification.....	4-5
Figure 4.2:	Representative Graph for Sensitivity Testing	4-6
Figure 4.3:	Representative Graphs for Sensitivity Testing with Agricultural Return Module	4-7
Figure 4.4:	Example of 20 Year Run Results to TDS Calculations.....	4-8
Figure 4.5:	Flow Split Between Old River and Middle River – Nov. 1991 Verification.....	4-9
Figure 4.6:	Flow Split Between Sacramento and Georgiana Slough – Nov. 1991 Verification	4-9
Figure 6.1:	Menu Diagram, Flowchart of DGUI Menu System	6-2
Figure 6.2:	Delta Base Map.....	6-3
Figure 6.3:	Delta Map, Stations Shown.....	6-3
Figure 6.4:	Time Series Plot, Sac Flow and CCC EC.....	6-4
Figure 6.5:	Time Series Plot, Zoom from Plot in Figure 6.4.....	6-5
Figure 7.1:	Residual Flows Study 1 (Base Condition)	7-13
Figure 7.2:	Residual Flows Study 2 (South Delta Barriers)	7-13

Figure 7.3:	Residual Flows Study 3 (South Delta Facilities).....	7-13
Figure 7.4:	Time Fate of Tracer Mass, Sacramento River @ I St., Trace Release	7-14
Figure 7.5:	Sample Barriers	7-15
Figure 7.6:	State Water Project Forebay Alternatives.....	7-16
Figure 9.1:	Bromine Distribution Factor Sum	9-17
Figure 9.2:	Bromine Distribution Factors: MWQI THMFP Data	9-18
Figure 9.3:	Bromine Distribution Factors: Amy et al. (1987) Data	9-19
Figure 9.4:	Bromine Distribution Factors: MWD's SDS-THM Data.....	9-20
Figure 9.5:	Correlation Objectives.....	9-21
Figure 9.6:	DWR Monitoring Stations in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta	9-22
Figure 9.7:	MWD Monitoring Stations	9-23
Figure 9.8:	Correlation Framework	9-24
Figure 9.9:	Total THM Formation: 24-Hr. vs. 3-Hr. SDS Data	9-25
Figure 9.10:	Bromine Incorporation Factor: 24-Hr. SDS Data	9-26
Figure 9.11:	24-Hr. SDS Conc. Transformed from 3-Hr. SDS Data: Predicted vs. Obs.....	9-27
Figure 9.12:	Total THM Formation: 24-Hr. SDS vs. THMFP Data.....	9-28
Figure 9.13:	Model Deviation vs. SDS Precursor Removal Fraction	9-29
Figure 9.14:	Total THM Formation: 24-Hr. SDS vs. THMFP* Data	9-30
Figure 9.15:	24-Hr. SDS Conc. Transformed from THMFP* Data: Predicted vs. Obs.	9-31
Figure 9.16:	THMFP Incremental Analysis: Base vs. Plan Conditions	9-32
Figure 9.17:	24-Hr. SDS Incremental Analysis: Base vs. Plan Conditions	9-33
Figure 9.18:	Comparison on THMFP and SDS Incremental Analyses	9-34
Figure 9.19:	Overall Model Framework.....	9-35