

Table 2. Spill Volume Analysis Summary

Author	Report Title	Years Analyzed	Simulation	Data Set
FPC	Volume Changes with Use of Tailrace Monitors	Low - Moderate water years: 2003, 2005, 2007 High water year: 2006	Base Scenario: Actual Spill Scenario B: Spill that would have occurred if all projects spilled to the 120% cap Scenario C: Spill that would have occurred in that year if all projects spilled to the 120% cap Scenario D: Spill that would have occurred in that year if all projects spilled to the 120% cap	Empirical data set for each year and an excel spreadsheet was used to estimated changes in spill volumes. [pg 2, document (303)] Involuntary spill was removed from all scenarios. One spill cap per project was used for all scenarios. Scenario A and B used actual spill operations of that year. Scenario C used some spill operations included in litigation. Scenario D removed of all spill operations.
USACE	Report on the SYSTDG Modeling for AMT: With and without 115 percent TDG standard	Low water year: 2007 Moderate water year: 2002 High water year:1999	Hourly average of spill volume and spill cap with and without the 115% TDG Forebay Limit for each project and each year.	SYSTDG Hourly time-step model was used; the flow assumptions from each year and 2008 FCRPS BiOp spill operations. [pg 10, document (710)]. Hourly spill caps that would reach the 115% or 120% were used for all three years.
BPA	HYDSIM Use in Analysis of Removing 115 percent TDG Forebay Gauge Requirements BPA Report to the Adaptive Management Team	70 years, averaged (1929 - 1999)	70-year average spill with and without the 115% TDG Forebay Limit for each project.	HYDSIM Monthly time-step model was used; USACE hourly calculated spill caps averaged into monthly spill cap using the 2008 FCRPS BiOp spill operations, applied to 70 years of historical runoff data to generate monthly average flow and spill volumes at each dam. Overgeneration spill included. [pg 10, document (710)]

The bold words were added by the Corps.