Hi,

I've been reviewing the files for the Calfirm TCmodel run, and there seems to be a major problem.

There's two NRUNDATA files in the ".../drafteis" directory, "calfirm.in" dated 6-5-95 and "calfirm.in.2" dated 6-1-95. The latter seems to incorporate the latest decisions on the California Assured Storage Alternative: 50,000 AF max storage and the lower (current) mimimum instream flows. However, the former (12,000 AF max storage and DFG suggested minimum instream flows) seems to have been used as input to the Calfirm TCmodel run. The only part of the former (6-5-95) file I believe should have been used is the "instream flow targets" for the reservoirs in California, since instream flows are still an objective in the alternative albeit without those minimums suggested by DFG (but this wasn't discussed when we were last formulating the Calfirm alternative).

Below is a comparision showing the differences between the two NRUNDATA files. Maybe I'm missing something here as I don't know much about how the runs were made. But I think you should take a look at this.

John Sarna   jsarna@water.ca.gov

```
40 VALUES OF "KALT" WITH I3 SPACING
both:  0  2  2  0  1  0  1  0  1  1  0  0  1  0  1  0  0  0  1  0
6-5:   0  0  1  1  0  1  0  2  0  0  1  1  1  1  1  0  0  0  0  1
6-1:   0  0  1  1  0  1  0  3  0  0  1  1  1  1  1  0  0  0  0  1
                      ^
                      2 is mandatory
                      3 is targeted


40 VALUES OF "KAL2" WITH I3 SPACING      x
both:  0  0  1  0  0  0  2  1  0  0  0  0  0  1  0  0  1  1  0  0
6-5:   0  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  0  0  2  0  2  1  0  1  1  0  0  0
6-1:   0  0  0  1  0  0  0  1  0  0  2  0  2  0  0  0  1  0  0  0


20 VALUES OF "KAL3" WITH I3 SPACING
6-5:   0  0  1  0  1  0  1  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0
6-1:   2  0  1  0  1  0  1  1  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0


CALIFORNIA RESERVOIR STORAGE LIMITS
6-5:   0      0      1.5     0       0      12.0      0     12.
6-1:   0      0      5.0     0       0      60.0      0     60.0


INSTREAM FLOW TARGETS
6-5:   75     75     75     75     75     75     75     75     75     75
            75     75 INS 1
6-1:   50     50     50     50     50     50     70     70     70     70
            70     70 INS 1,2
```

```
6-5:   15    15    15    15    10    10    30    30    30    30
           10    10 INS 2
6-1     3     3     3     3     3     3     3     3     3     3
               3     3 INS 2,2


6-5:   15    15    15    15    10    10    30    30    30    30
           10    10 INS 3
6-1:    5     5     5     5     5     5     5     5     5     5
               5     5 INS 3,2


6-5:   10    10    10    10    10    10    10    10    10    10
           10    10 INS 4
6-1:    2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2
               2     2 INS 4,2


6-5:   40    40    40    40    40    40    40    40    40    40
           30    30 INS 5
6-1:   30    30    30    30    30    30    30    30    30    30
           30    30 INS 5,2


6-5:  100   100   100   100   100   100   200   200   200   200
          200   200 INS 6
6-1:    0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0
               0     0 INS 6,2


6-5:  100   100   100   100   100   100   100   100   100   100
          100   100 INS 7
6-1:    0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0
               0     0 INS 7,2


6-5:  250   250   250   250   250   250   250   250   250   250
          250   250 INS 8
6-1:    0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0
               0     0 INS 8,2


6-5:   30    30    30    30    30    30    40    40    40    40
           30    30 INS 9
6-1:    0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0
               0     0 INS 9,2


     MINIMUM FLOW IN INFLOW TO PYRAMID LAKE
6-5:  240   240   240   240   240   240   240   320   480   415
          400   280
6-1:    0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0
               0     0
```