

Modeling Scenarios Updated 4/16/19		Russian River & Lake Mendocino Alternatives		
		Current Operations	Lake Mendocino FIRO (Hybrid) with Fish Flow EIR Operations	Raise Coyote Valley Dam+++
Potter Valley Project Alternatives	Current Operations	Baseline: Existing Climate (n=1)		
		Baseline FC: Future Climate (n=4)		
	PVP Revised Operations+		Scenario 4: Existing Climate (n=1)	
	Run-of-the-River ++		Scenario 2: Existing Climate (n=1)	
			Scenario 2FC: Future Climate (n=4)	
PVP Decommission	Scenario 1: Existing Climate (n=1)	Scenario 3: Existing Climate (n=1)	Scenario 5: Preliminary analysis with Existing Climate	

GREEN boxes are scenarios that are run using existing (historic) climate conditions (1911-2017). Green boxes (scenarios) will be compared with each other, but cannot be compared to future

ORANGE boxes are scenarios that are run using 4 future climate models, and are run into the future (50 years) rather than historical. At this point, the only comparison will be Scenario 2FC with the Baseline FC (No other scenarios will have climate change modeled other than Baseline and Scenario 2)

+ PVP Revised Operations Assumptions: reduce minimum flows on the East Fork Russian River; modify Eel River flows below Cape Horn Dam during late fall and late spring shoulder season; modify E-5 condition to allow for additional tunnel diversions during Scott Dam spill events improve cold water pool availability in Lake Pillsbury.

++ Run-of-the-River Assumptions: Remove Scott Dam; continue Van Arsdale diversions with a maximum PVP diversion of 170 cfs or 240 cfs; achieve unmet Potter Valley Irrigation District (PVID) demands (up to 15,320 ac-ft) via pumpback from Lake Mendocino.

+++ A preliminary analysis of needed storage to avoid draining the reservoir during series of drought years, assuming historic Lake Mendocino inflow (with no PVP diversions), Fish Flow EIR demands from Lake Mendocino, and no Lake Mendocino flood control reserve space.