



Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way, CGB-170
Sacramento, Calif. 95825-1898

Initial 2025 Restoration Allocation & Default Flow Schedule January 22, 2025

Summary

The initial Restoration Allocation is based on an Unimpaired Runoff Forecast at the 75% probability of exceedance of 727 TAF. This results in a Dry water year type. This value for the runoff forecast was arrived at by blending the DWR and NWS forecasts with a 10/90 ratio, respectively, and adjusting for observed runoff to date. Accordingly, 168.055 TAF is allocated to the Restoration Program as measured at Gravelly Ford. The Restoration Administrator is asked to return a recommendation on or before February 3, 2025.

Overview

The following transmits the initial 2025 Restoration Allocation and Default Flow Schedule to the Restoration Administrator for the San Joaquin River Restoration Program (SJRRP), consistent with the January 2020 (version 2.1) Restoration Flow Guidelines (Guidelines or RFG). This Restoration Allocation and Default Flow Schedule provides the following:

- Forecasted water year Unimpaired Runoff: the estimated annual flows that would occur absent regulation on the river. This value is also known as the “Natural River,” “Unimpaired Runoff,” “Unimpaired Inflow,” or “Full Natural Flow,” and is utilized to identify the water year type.
- Hydrograph Volumes: the annual allocation hydrograph based on water year Unimpaired Runoff, utilizing Method 3.1 with the Gamma Pathway (RFG-Appendix C, Figure C3) agreed to by the Parties in December 2008.
- Default Flow Schedule: the schedule of Restoration Flows in the absence of a recommendation from the Restoration Administrator.
- Additional Allocations: the hypothetical Restoration Allocations that would result from 10%, 50%, 75%, and 90% probability of exceedance (often shortened as “% exceedance”) of the Unimpaired Runoff forecast.
- Unreleased Restoration Flows: the amount of Restoration Flows not released due to channel capacity constraints, or without delaying completion of Phase 1 improvements.

- Flow targets at Gravelly Ford: the flows at the head of Reach 2, and estimated scheduled releases from Friant Dam adjusted for the assumed Holding Contract demands and losses in Exhibit B.
- Restoration Budget: the volumes for the annual allocation, spring flexible flow, base flow, riparian recruitment, and fall flexible flow.
- Remaining Flow Volume: the volume of Restoration Flows released, the remaining volume available, and associated limitations and flexibility.
- Operational Constraints: the flow release limitations based on downstream channel capacity, regulatory, or legal constraints.

Consistent with Paragraph 18 of the Settlement, the Restoration Administrator shall make recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior concerning the manner in which the hydrographs shall be implemented. As described in the Guidelines, the Restoration Administrator is requested to recommend a flow schedule showing the use of the entire annual allocation during the upcoming Restoration Year or otherwise identify Unreleased Restoration Flows and categorize recommended flows by account. If a recommendation is not provided by the Restoration Administrator, the Capacity Constrained Default Flow Schedule (Table 6b) or the most recently approved schedule will be implemented. The Restoration Administrator is asked to return a recommendation on or before February 3.

Forecasted Unimpaired Runoff

Unimpaired Runoff represents the natural water production of a river basin, unaltered by upstream diversions, storage, or by export or import of water to or from other watersheds (a.k.a. “Unimpaired Inflow” or “Natural River” or “Full Natural Flow”). It is calculated for the period of a water year. The forecast of the Unimpaired Runoff determines the volume of Restoration Flows available for the Restoration Year (i.e. the Restoration Allocation) (see Table 1).

Information for forecasting the Unimpaired Runoff includes:

- Observation of Unimpaired Runoff into Millerton Lake to support the water supply allocation ¹;
- The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Bulletin 120 latest update for San Joaquin River inflow to Millerton Lake Unimpaired Flow, and/or the most current DWR Bulletin Water Supply Index (WSI) ³;
- The National Weather Service (NWS) Ensemble Streamflow Prediction (ESP) Water Supply Forecast for the San Joaquin River at Millerton Lake ⁵;
- Other forecast models, ground-based observations, remotely-sensed observations, hydrologic models, analysis of historic patterns, and short-term weather forecasts as appropriate.

Table 1 shows the water year 2025 (October 1, 2024 to September 30, 2025) observed accumulated and forecasted water year Unimpaired Runoff into Millerton Lake. This table also includes the published DWR forecast, the DWR forecast adjusted for an expected runoff for the current month, the NWS forecast with and without a 7-day smoothing function applied to remove the day-to-day variance, and the NWS forecast with 7-day smoothing and adjustment for

the expected runoff for the current month (Reclamation adjusts the DWR and NWS values by replacing the forecasted runoff for the current month with Reclamation’s own estimate of runoff for the current month, which increases accuracy by incorporating the latest data and local knowledge). Figure 1a plots DWR and NWS forecast values over the entire water year, while Figure 1b shows the most recent period in detail.

The DWR Water Supply Index (WSI) forecast for January 1 (issued January 9) was adjusted by Reclamation to better align with observed runoff conditions to date and projections for the remainder of the month (becoming the “Runoff Adjusted DWR values”). Daily NWS forecast values were also adjusted by Reclamation for expected runoff for the remainder of the month. The NWS forecast considers the modeled future weather over the next 15 days whereas the DWR WSI forecast does not account for current trends to the same degree.

Table 1 — San Joaquin River Water Year Actuals and Forecasts at Millerton Lake, in Thousands of Acre-Feet (TAF)

	Forecast Probability of Exceedance				
	90%	75%	50%	25%	10%
Accumulated Unimpaired Runoff ("Natural River") January 20, 2025 ¹	86.1				
Accumulated Unimpaired Runoff as percent of normal ²	46%				
DWR, January 1, 2025 ³ (Published Value)	795	955	1,170	1,850	2,610
DWR, January 1, 2025 ⁴ (Runoff Adjusted)	796	947	1,147	1,780	2,480
NWS, January 21, 2025 ⁵ (Published Daily Value)	441	653	970	1,570	2,080
Smoothed NWS, January 21, 2025 ⁶ (7-day Smoothing)	488	703	1,053	1,602	2,146
NWS, May 16, 2025 ⁴ (Smoothed and Runoff Adjusted)	487	703	1,054	1,603	2,146

¹ <http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/vungvari/milfln.pdf>

² Based on average accumulation of Unimpaired Runoff totaling 1830 TAF.

³ B120: <https://cdec.water.ca.gov/snow/bulletin120/index.html>. April-July runoffs are converted to Water Year equivalents in this table.

⁴ The adjusted data has been updated with the actual Unimpaired Runoff through the current date and projected out for the remainder of the month.

⁵ <https://www.cnrfc.noaa.gov/ensembleProduct.php?id=FRAC1&prodID=9>

⁶ The NWS smoothed data uses a 7-day triangular weighted moving average, where the most recent day (n) is given greater weight than each previous forecast day (n-1, 2, 3, etc.); this reduces noise stemming from ESP model input. The following formula is used: $((Forecast_n * 1) + (Forecast_{n-1} * 0.857) + (Forecast_{n-2} * 0.714) + (Forecast_{n-3} * 0.571) + (Forecast_{n-4} * 0.429) + (Forecast_{n-5} * 0.286) + (Forecast_{n-6} * 0.143)) / 4$

⁷ Values at the 75% exceedance and 25% exceedance are interpolated.




Figure 1a — Plot of 2025 Water Year forecasts. This includes both NWS Ensemble Streamflow Prediction Forecasts and DWR Forecasts at the 90%, 75%, 50%, 25%, and 10% exceedances.




Figure 1b — Detail plot of most recent forecasts. Also shown are Reclamation’s “hybrid” forecast with open circles. Percent Probability of Exceedances are shown here as shaded bands.

Thus far, the 2025 water year has featured a strong gradient in precipitation from north to south. Figure 2 shows this strong “dipole” with drier than normal conditions south of Interstate 80. While November precipitation in the San Joaquin watershed was above normal, all other months have been below normal. January has been exceedingly dry, and we are expecting to close the month with near-record lack of precipitation, second only to January 2022 which received zero precipitation.




Figure 2 — California Water Year Precipitation as a percent of average. A strong gradient from north to south has developed as few storms have swept across lower latitudes.

Snowpack has largely melted below 7,000’ as evidenced by modeling and automated snow pillows. Despite the precipitation falling to around 46% of normal, snowpack at elevations above 9,000’ is somewhat higher, around 60% to 70% of normal. What modest precipitation that has been received has been biased toward higher elevations; higher elevation snowpack tends to improve runoff.

Another factor this water year will be favorable antecedent conditions. With last water year being near-normal and the previous water year being extremely wet, soil moisture content is more likely to be near-normal. Evidence of this includes a fairly strong Natural River (Unimpaired Inflow to Millerton) despite the well-below-normal precipitation.




Figure 3 — Mammoth Pass Snow Pillow trace. Snow Water Equivalent (SWE), plotted here as purple line against historic probabilities at one of the many snow pillows has only recently fallen below median values. A handful of snow courses measured on January 1 verify this high elevation bias in the snowpack.

At this point in the water year, some snowpack monitoring tools are still coming online. The first Airborne Snow Observatory (ASO) survey is planned for January 30. About that time the first M3Works iSnobal model state will be issued. We also anticipate receiving the first University of Colorado at Boulder Real-time Snow Water Equivalent (SWE) modeling product in the coming weeks. Finally, most San Joaquin watershed snow courses will be measured on or before February 1. Until more of these snowpack tools are available, Reclamation is interpreting the snow volume conservatively. An inventory of modeled or remotely measured SWE volumes are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 — Total snowpack volume (TAF of Snow Water Equivalent) depicted by models and remote sensing, and a consensus estimate for January 21, 2025.

	Snowpack Model SWE Volumes (TAF)						
	NWS CNRFC (Snow-17)	NOHRSC (SNODAS)	CU Boulder (Real-time SWE)	DWR iSnobal	M3W iSnobal	ASO Inc. (Aerial Snow Survey)	Reclamation Consensus
January 21, 2025	352	382	N/A	383	N/A	N/A	374

⁸ CU Boulder "Real-time SWE" model has not yet been issued.

⁹ The "iSnobal" model for the San Joaquin is produced by M3Works under a contract with ASO. The first model run with ASO assimilation is pending.

¹⁰ First ASO survey is planned for January 30, 2025.

Another factor in evaluating runoff forecasts is the current dry trend. Forecasts which do not incorporate the likelihood of dry conditions over the next 15 days should be adjusted since seasonal norms are far wetter than the expected conditions. Weather models are estimating less than 0.2” of cumulative precipitation (known as QPF) over the next 15 or 16 days. Both deterministic and ensemble predictions show similar results, indicating high confidence in this forecast. The US Climate Prediction Center is calling for a probable return to seasonal normal conditions the second week in February.

Should precipitation trends remain well below average through mid-February, then the next Restoration Allocation, scheduled to be issued February 10 – 18, would very likely fall to a Critical-High year type and result in a smaller volume of Restoration Flows.




Figure 4 — GFS and ECMWF Weather Model Predictions. Forecasted cumulative precipitation (QPF) is less than 0.2” for the San Joaquin watershed. The GFS (or American) model is on the left, the ECMWF (or European) model is on the right. Other weather models, including Artificial Intelligence versions of the American and European models, are showing remarkably good agreement.

Combining Forecasts

Staff from the South-Central California Area Office of Reclamation and the SJRRP jointly track and evaluate the accuracy of runoff forecasts on a regular basis. Based on the age of these forecasts, the short-term and long-term weather forecasts, the climatological outlook, observed Unimpaired Runoff, and other available information, a hybrid forecast is generated. The weighting of the different components is regularly evaluated and selected using the best available information and professional judgment. **For the current allocation, the DWR “runoff adjusted” and NWS “smoothed and runoff adjusted” forecasts are combined with a 10/90 blending, respectively (i.e. 10% DWR, 90% NWS) (Table 3). Reclamation has not applied any offsets to this forecast.** The selection of this blending ratio is based on the long-term performance of the forecasts, the age of the forecasts, and other data. Offsets are only applied when there is sufficient evidence to depart from the DWR and NWS forecast ranges. This blending leans heavily toward the NWS forecast since that forecast incorporates the expected dry conditions over the next 15 days. A very small weighting is placed on the DWR forecast, which is higher than the NWS forecast, especially at the 90% and 75% exceedance. The justification for a small amount of DWR weighting is the evidence of higher-than-expected SWE at elevations above 9,000’, which is a feature that would not normally be captured in the NWS forecast.

Reclamation’s preliminary runs of its water budget model indicate that NWS forecasts are within the range of probable runoff efficiency values with the possible exception of 90% and minimum trace (i.e. 98%) exceedance which may not be adequately capturing the favorable antecedent conditions. Until the first ASO data is received, Reclamation will place very little weight on its water budget model. However, this model is nonetheless useful for exploring precipitation and runoff efficiency scenarios. For example, in the 2022 water year, the watershed received 6.0” of precipitation after the extraordinarily dry January. If water year 2025 received the same amount of precipitation after February 1, then the total runoff is predicted to be about 550 TAF — a “Critical-High” water year type.

Table 3 — Current Blending and Hybrid Unimpaired Runoff Forecasts (TAF)

	Forecast Probability of Exceedance Using Blending				
	90%	75%	50%	25%	10%
Blending Ratio (DWR/NWS)	10/90 No Offset				
Hybrid Unimpaired Runoff Forecast (TAF)	518	727	1,063	1,620	2,180

Restoration Allocation

As per the Guidelines, the **75% probability of exceedance** forecast is used for the allocation under current hydrologic conditions to set the Restoration Flow Allocation. Table 4 below, from the Guidelines version 2.1, depicts the progression of forecast exceedances used to set the Restoration Allocation.

Table 4 — Guidance on Percent Probability of Exceedance Forecast to Use for Allocation.
The final allocation issuance is made in May or June as per the Guidelines.

	Value (TAF)	Date of Forecast Used for the Allocation					
		January	February	March	April	May	June
If the 50% forecast is:	Above 2200	50	50	50	50	50	—
	1600 to 2200	75	75	50	50	50	—
	900 to 1599	75	75	75	50	50	—
	500 to 899	90	90	75	50	50	50
	Below 500	90	90	90	90	75	50

Applying the forecast blending (and sometimes offsets) determined by Reclamation and using the 75% probability of exceedance forecast dictated by the Guidelines, Reclamation calculates an **Unimpaired Runoff hybrid forecast of 727 Thousand Acre-Foot (TAF) and a Dry Water Year Type. This provides a Restoration Allocation of 168.055 TAF as measured at Gravelly Ford (GRF).** Combined with Holding Contracts on the San Joaquin River, **this results in a Friant Dam release of approximately 285.000 TAF (Table 5).** Other hypothetical allocations are presented in Table 5 as grayed values and indicate the range of probable forecasts and the resulting Restoration Allocations.

Table 5 — SJRRP Water Year Type and Allocation for 2025 Restoration Year Shown with Other Hypothetical Values in Gray

	Forecast Probability of Exceedance using proposed blending				
	90%	75%	50%	25%	10%
Hybrid Unimpaired Runoff Forecast (TAF)	518	727	1,063	1,620	2,180
Water Year Type	Critical-High	Dry	Normal-Dry	Normal-Wet	Normal-Wet
Restoration Allocation at GRF (TAF)	70.919	168.055	231.259	307.171	385.624
Friant Dam Flow Releases (TAF)	187.785	285.000	348.204	424.116	502.569

Unreleased Restoration Flow Pricing

The first allocation issued after March 21 will set the price for 2025 Tier 2 Unreleased Restoration Flows (URFs) which may be made available to Friant Contractors. Tier 1 URF pricing is independent of hydrology and fixed at \$25.00 per acre-foot.

Contractual Obligation Considerations

Consistent with Section 10004(j) of the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act, the Settlement and the Settlement Act do not modify the rights and obligations of the United States under the Purchase Contract between Miller and Lux and the United States (Purchase Contract) and the Second Amended Exchange Contract between the United States, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation and Central California Irrigation District (CCID), San Luis Canal Company (SLCC), Firebaugh Canal Water District (FCWD), and Columbia Canal Company (CCC). These four districts are collectively known as the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors (SJREC). Reclamation's obligations in the Purchase Contract and Exchange Contract remain unchanged by this allocation, which is consistent with Condition 17 of Reclamation's 2013 Water Rights Order addressing Restoration Flows.

Hydrologic conditions in Northern California, where the SJREC water supply is typically generated, are trending at or above average. 2025 will be a "Non-Shasta Critical" allocation for the San Joaquin River Exchange Contract. Federal storage in San Luis Reservoir is at 63% of full storage, or about 106% of normal to date. Additional precipitation and continued Delta pumping are necessary to fully meet the Exchange Contract supply needs in 2025, though the likelihood for additional supply being drawn from Millerton Lake to meet the Exchange Contract is very low at this time.

Default Flow Schedule

The Default Flow Schedule, derived from Exhibit B in the Settlement, identifies how Reclamation will schedule the Restoration Allocation for the current Water Year Type and Unimpaired Runoff volume absent a recommendation from the Restoration Administrator. The Guidelines provide detail on how a Default Flow Schedule is parsed from the allocation volume. This approved method of distributing water throughout the year is referred to as “Method 3.1” with the “gamma pathway.”

Exhibit B Method 3.1 Default Flow Schedules

Table 6a shows the Basic Default Flow Schedule flows and corresponding Restoration Allocation volumes for the entire year absent channel capacity and seepage constraints, including total releases from Friant Dam and Restoration Flow releases in excess of Holding Contracts. Volume is distributed as various flow rates across the year as per the methods explained in the Guidelines.

Table 6b shows the Capacity Constrained Default Flow Schedule volumes with all expected operational constraints, primarily controlled by seepage limitations in Reach 4A. Any volume within the Spring Flexible Flow Account and Fall Flexible Flow Account that cannot be released on the default schedule is shifted to other times during the Flexible Flow Period with available capacity as per the Guidelines. This Capacity Constrained Default Flow Schedule depicted in Table 6b will be implemented in the absence of a specific recommendation by the Restoration Administrator. Table 6b uses Exhibit B losses; actual losses are greater in most cases. **With these known constraints, a Restoration Flow volume of 0 TAF is generated that cannot be scheduled for release without shifting outside of the flexible flow periods (which would require a Water Supply Test). This volume would become Unreleased Restoration Flows (URFs) under the Capacity Constrained Default Flow Schedule.** Note that this estimate is based on the newly set Reach 4A channel capacity of 500 cfs which was unavailable to SJRRP for most of the 2024 Spring Flexible Flow period. This is an estimated volume of water, actual URF volumes will depend on several factors including the Restoration Administrator Recommendation, flow schedule to-date, recapture of Restoration Flows at Mendota Pool, any Friant Dam releases made for the Exchange Contract, real-time assessments of groundwater constraints, and in-river construction projects.

Table 6a — Basic Default Flow Schedule

Flow Period	Flow (cfs)				Volume (TAF)	
	Friant Dam Release	Holding Contracts ¹¹	Flow Target at GRF	Restoration Flow at GRF	Friant Dam Release	Restoration Flow at GRF
Mar 1 – Mar 15	500	130	375	370	14.876	11.008
Mar 16 – Mar 31	1500	130	1375	1370	47.603	43.478
Apr 1 – Apr 15	350	150	205	200	10.413	5.950
Apr 16 – Apr 30	350	150	205	200	10.413	5.950
May 1 – May 28	350	190	165	160	19.438	8.886
May 29 – Jun 30	270	190	85	80	17.688	5.252
July 1 – July 29	260	230	35	30	14.955	1.726
Jul 30 – Aug 31	260	230	35	30	17.018	1.964
Sep 1 – Sep 30	350	210	145	140	20.826	8.331
Oct 1 – Oct 31	350	160	195	190	21.521	11.683
Nov 1 – Nov 6	700	130	575	570	8.331	6.783
Nov 7 – Nov 10	700	130	575	570	5.554	4.522
Nov 11 – Nov 30	350	120	235	230	13.884	9.124
Dec 1 – Dec 31	350	120	235	230	21.521	14.142
Jan 1 – Jan 31	350	100	255	250	21.521	15.372
Feb 1 – Feb 29	350	100	255	250	19.438	13.884
Totals					285.000	168.055

Table 6b — Capacity Constrained Default Flow Schedule

Flow Period	Flow (cfs)				Volume (TAF)		
	Friant Dam Release	Holding Contracts ¹¹	Flow Target at GRF	Restoration Flow at GRF	Friant Dam Release	Restoration Flow at GRF	Unreleased Restoration Flow ¹²
Mar 1 – Mar 15	537	130	412	407	15.967	12.099	-1.091
Mar 16 – Mar 31	725	130	600	595	23.008	18.883	24.595
Apr 1 – Apr 15	745	150	600	595	22.165	17.702	-11.752
Apr 16 – Apr 30	745	150	600	595	22.165	17.702	-11.752
May 1 – May 28	350	190	165	160	19.438	8.886	0.000
May 29 – Jun 30	270	190	85	80	17.688	5.252	0.000
July 1 – July 29	260	230	35	30	14.955	1.726	0.000
Jul 30 – Aug 31	260	230	35	30	17.018	1.964	0.000
Sep 1 – Sep 30	350	210	145	140	20.826	8.331	0.000
Oct 1 – Oct 31	350	160	195	190	21.521	11.683	0.000
Nov 1 – Nov 6	700	130	575	570	8.331	6.783	0.000
Nov 7 – Nov 10	700	130	575	570	5.554	4.522	0.000
Nov 11 – Nov 30	350	120	235	230	13.884	9.124	0.000
Dec 1 – Dec 31	350	120	235	230	21.521	14.142	0.000
Jan 1 – Jan 31	350	100	255	250	21.521	15.372	0.000
Feb 1 – Feb 29	350	100	255	250	19.438	13.884	0.000
Totals					285.000	168.055	0.000

¹¹ In recent years, Holding Contract demands have been higher than assumed under Exhibit B of the Settlement, in which case, flows at Friant are increased to achieve the Gravelly Ford Flow Target.

¹² This estimate of URF volume is based on the most constraining reach, with Spring Flexible Flows redistributed March 1 through May 28 as necessary and Fall Flexible Flows redistributed Sept 3 through December 28 as necessary up to channel capacity constraints. Constrained values are based on actual losses, not Exhibit B losses. Actual URF volume will depend on the Restoration Administrator's recommendations.

Exhibit B Restoration Flow Budget

Table 7 shows the components of the annual water budget for February 1, 2025, through February 28, 2026 (i.e. the Restoration Year including the spring flexible flow period). The Continuity Flow Account, Spring Flexible Flow Account, Riparian Recruitment Flow Account, and Fall Flexible Flow Account reflect the Exhibit B hydrograph for the current Restoration Allocation. The expected 116.945 TAF for Holding Contracts is shown. The volume for each flow account may change with subsequent Restoration Allocations.

Table 7 — Restoration Budget with Flow Accounts

Period	Holding Contract Demand (TAF)	Restoration Flow Accounts (TAF)			
		Continuity Flow Account	Spring Flexible Flow Account	Riparian Recruitment Flow Account	Fall Flexible Flow Account
Feb 1 – Feb 28	–	0	40.959	–	–
Mar 1 – Apr 30	16.919	25.428		–	–
May 1 – May 28	10.552	8.886		0	–
May 29 – Jul 29	25.666	6.977	–		–
Jul 30 – Aug 31	15.055	1.964	–	–	–
Sep 1 – Sep 30	12.496	8.331	–	–	6.942
Oct 1 – Nov 30	17.177	25.170	–	–	
Dec 1 – Dec 31	7.379	14.142	–	–	
Jan 1 – Feb 28	11.702	29.256	–	–	–
	116.945 ¹³	120.154	40.959	0	6.942
		168.055 (Base Flow Volume)			
		285.000 (approximate Friant Release Volume) ¹³			

¹³ Since the early 2000s, Holding Contract demands have been higher than assumed under Exhibit B of the Settlement, in which case, flows at Friant are increased to achieve the Gravelly Ford Flow Target.

Remaining Flow Volumes

The amount of water remaining for scheduling is the volume of flows released from Friant Dam in excess of releases required to meet Holding Contract demands, less past releases. Table 8 tracks these balances among the four flow accounts. Tracking these four flow accounts is necessary for application of the Water Supply Test. The released-to-date volumes are derived from quality-assurance/quality-control (QA/QC) daily average data when available, and partly from provisional data posted to CDEC, and thus may have future adjustments. Such adjustments may also affect the remaining flow volume.

There are currently no active URF Exchange agreements that would allow water returns in the coming Restoration Year, though new agreements can be developed.

Table 8 — Estimated Restoration Flow Volume Remaining and Released to Date

Flow Account		Yearly Allocation (TAF)	Released to River to Date ¹⁵ (TAF)	Released as URFs to Date ¹⁵ (TAF)	Remaining Flow Volume (TAF)
Base Flows	Continuity Flow Account (Mar 1 – Feb 28)	120.154	0	0	120.154
	Spring Flexible Flows (Feb 1 – May 28)	40.959	0	0	40.959
	Riparian Recruitment Flows (May 1 – Jul 29)	0	0	0	0
	Fall Flexible Flows (Sep 3 – Dec 28)	6.942	0	0	6.942
Buffer Flows ¹⁴		—	0	0	—
Unreleased Restoration Flows (Returned Exchanges)		—	0	—	0
Purchased Water		—	0	—	0
Totals:			0	0	168.055

¹⁴ Buffer Flow volumes are based on actual releases, and are not an allocated volume per se.

¹⁵ These are “Base Flow” releases through 1/20/2025

Available URF Exchange Returns

There are currently no active URF Exchange agreements that would allow returns in the upcoming Restoration Year. SJRRP is scoping the possible extension of two agreements shown in Table 9 below.

Table 9 — Volume available from URF Exchange Returns

Exchange Partner	Period of Return ¹⁶	Minimum Required Return (TAF)	Maximum Annual Return (TAF)	Notes
FID	Mar-Sep	— ^{16, 17}	Up to 2.624 TAF	Exchange expires February 2025, potential for renegotiation.
OCID	Mar-Sep	— ^{16, 17}	Up to 3.000 depending on hydrology	Exchange expires February 2025, potential for renegotiation.

¹⁶ If minimum volume of water is not taken, unused water is purchased by District

¹⁷ Unless otherwise by mutual agreement or modification of agreement

URF Exchange Commitments

Reclamation has previously developed URF agreements which may require commitments of water when URFs are made available.

Table 10 — Volume Committed to URF Exchanges in 2025

Exchange Partner	Exchange Terms	Notes
DEID	1.800 TAF net URF (1.895 gross URF)	This is a “reverse” exchange — SJRRP was provided water in 2023 with exchanged URF to be provided in first subsequent Dry or Normal-Dry year. URF must be Tier 2 and schedulable across summer.

Operational Constraints

Operating criteria, such as channel conveyance capacity, ramping rate constraints, scheduled maintenance or construction, reservoir storage, contractual obligations, and downstream seepage concerns, may restrict the release of Restoration Flows. Table 11 summarizes known 2025 Restoration Year operational constraints.

Table 11 — Summary of Operational Constraints

Type of Constraint	Period	Flow Limitation
Levee Stability	Currently in effect	1,210 cfs in Reach 2B
	Currently in effect	2,600 cfs in Middle Eastside Bypass
	Currently in effect	2,350 cfs in Reach 5
Seepage Limitation	Currently in effect	Reach 4A: Approx. 500 cfs @ SDP ¹⁸
USFWS Biological Opinion	Until consultation for “Phase 2”	1,660 cfs of Restoration Flows released at Friant Dam
Construction — Arroyo Canal Fish Screen and Sack Dam Fish Passage ¹⁹	September–October 2025	Approximately 150 cfs — Pending the contract award and dewatering plan
	November–December 2025	Approximately 200 cfs — Pending the contract award and dewatering plan
	January–February 2026	Approximately 220 cfs — Pending the contract award and dewatering plan

¹⁸ A seepage easement was signed on April 26, 2024 increasing the seepage limitation to the current estimate of 500 cfs at SDP.

¹⁹ The approximate values indicated here were developed in consultation with the Restoration Administrator who further engaged with implementing agencies with expertise in fisheries (i.e. NMFS, USFWS, and CDFW). Flow limitations will be finalized when the construction contract is awarded and the contractor’s dewatering plan approved. Flow limitations will be consistent with Paragraph 11 of the Settlement.

The 2025 Channel Capacity Report identifies a maximum flow in Reach 2B of 1,210 cfs due to levee stability constraints. This results in a maximum release from Friant Dam between 1,460 cfs and 1,590 cfs depending on the time of year. The 2025 Channel Capacity Report also identifies a maximum flow in the Middle Eastside Bypass of 2,600 cfs, which was increased from the 2022 Channel Capacity Report value of 1,070 cfs due to the completion of the DWR Reach O levee improvements project and the removal of two weirs within the Eastside Bypass.

2025 Allocation History

The Restoration Allocation is adjusted multiple times between the date of the initial allocation and the final allocation; issuances will generally take place on a monthly schedule but may also be issued based on rapidly changing hydrologic conditions. The Restoration Administrator is responsible for contingency planning and managing releases to stay within the current allocation to the extent possible, in accordance with the Guidelines. Table 12 summarizes the full allocation history for this Restoration Year.

Table 12 — Allocation History

Allocation Type	Issue Date	Forecast Blending Applied	Unimpaired Runoff Forecast (at forecast exceedance)	Year Type	Restoration Allocation at Gravelly Ford	Restoration Flows and URFs Released
Initial	January 22, 2025	10/90	727 TAF (@ 75%)	Dry	168.055 TAF	0 TAF (through 1/21/2025)

Appendix A: Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Glossary

AEWSD	Arvin–Edison Water Storage District
af	Acre-feet
ASO	Airborne Snow Observatory
B120	DWR Bulletin #120 which forecasts water supply
CCC	Columbia Canal Company
CCID	Central California Irrigation District
CDEC	California Data Exchange Center
cfs	Cubic feet per second
CVP	Central Valley Project
DEID	Delano–Earlimart Irrigation District
Delta	Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
ESP	Ensemble Streamflow Prediction
Exhibit B	Exhibit B of the Settlement depicting Default Hydrograph
FCWD	Firebaugh Canal Water District
GRF	Gravelly Ford Flow Gauge
FID	Fresno Irrigation District
Guidelines	Restoration Flow Guidelines
NWS	National Weather Service
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control (i.e. finalized)
OCID	Orange Cove Irrigation District
Reclamation	U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
Restoration Year	the cycle of Restoration Flows, March 1 through February 28/29
RFG	Restoration Flow Guidelines
RWA	SJRRP Reclaimed Water Account
Secretary	U.S. Secretary of the Interior
Settlement	Stipulation of Settlement in NRDC, et al., v. Kirk Rodgers, et al.
SJREC	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors
SJRRP	San Joaquin River Restoration Program
SLCC	San Luis Canal Company
SMP	Seepage Management Plan
SWE	Snow Water Equivalent
TAF	thousand acre–feet
URF	Unreleased Restoration Flows
WSI	DWR Water Supply Index
WY	Water year, October 1 through September 30

Appendix B: Previous Year (2023) Flow Accounting

Table B — Restoration Flow Accounting and Unreleased Restoration Flows, and Holding Contracts, for the period February 2023 through February 2024. Flood management releases to San Joaquin River occurred January 5 – February 5, 2023 and March 8 – July 26, 2023. No releases for the Exchange Contract occurred during this Restoration Year. The final Restoration Allocation was 557.038 TAF. URF Sales and Exchanges removed from the Allocation totaled 373.849 TAF. Additionally, Unreleased Restoration Flow exchange returns of 10.167 TAF were released to the San Joaquin River, and 0 TAF of Buffer Flows. A total of 4.245 TAF was advanced into February 2023. The Restoration Allocation had a year-end balance of -0.002 TAF.

Flow Period	Gravelly Ford 5 cfs requirement (TAF)	Other flows passing GRF (TAF)	URF sold or exch	Released Restoration Flow Volumes (TAF)							
				Continuity Flow	Spring Flexible Flow	Fall Flexible Flow	Riparian Recruitment Flow	Buffer Flow	Flexible Buffer Flow	URF returned	
Feb 1 – Feb 28	–	–	–	–	4.245	–	–	–	–	–	
Mar 1 – Mar 31	9.219 ^{A1}	297.134	165.263	13.527	9.531	–	–	0	–	0	
Apr 1 – Apr 30	45.663 ^{A1}	458.132	0	11.901	11.008	–	–	0	–	0	
May 1 – May 31	47.324 ^{A1}	439.371	81.054	9.838	11.941	–	4.600	0	0	0	
Jun 1 – Jun 30	51.285 ^{A1}	320.110	96.000	9.521	–	–		0		0	
Jul 1 – Jul 31	48.532 ^{A1}	154.540	29.732	7.379	–	–	–	0	0	0	
Aug 1 – Aug 31	8.541	1.327	0	9.481	–	–	–	0	–	2.826	
Sep 1 – Sep 30	11.153	0	0	8.331	–	0.754	–	0	–	3.868	
Oct 1 – Oct 31	10.986	0	0	10.342	–	0	–	0	0	2.499	
Nov 1 – Nov 30	11.173	0	1.895	8.933	–	4.079	–	0		0	
Dec 1 – Dec 31	9.773	0	0	10.072	–	0	–	0	–	0.974	
Jan 1 – Jan 31	10.130	0.101	0	15.681	–	–	–	0	–	0	
Feb 1 – Feb 29	8.838	0	0	21.933	–	–	–	0	–	0	
	272.616^{A1}	1,670.715	373.944	136.939	36.725	4.833	4.600	0	0	10.167	
183.096 (allocated Restoration Flows)					0 (all Buffer Flows)						
183.096 (Restoration Flows affecting Friant water supply)											
193.263 (Restoration Flows released to river)											
557.040 (Restoration Allocation used)											
				2,072.656 (Friant Dam releases — excludes removed URFs, Restoration Flows advanced into February, and excludes contributions from tributary inflows)							

^{A1} Calculations of the 5 cfs requirement are sensitive to gauge error at GRF or imprecision in Friant Dam release. The values for March through July are likely erroneously high and should instead be considered "Other Flows Passing GRF."

Appendix C: History of Millerton Unimpaired Runoff

Table C — Water Year Totals in Thousand Acre-Foot

Water Year ^{A2}	Unimpaired Runoff ^{A3}	SJRRP Water Year Type ^{A4}	Water Year ^{A2}	Unimpaired Runoff ^{A3}	SJRRP Water Year Type ^{A4}	Water Year ^{A2}	Unimpaired Runoff ^{A3}	SJRRP Water Year Type ^{A4}	Water Year ^{A2}	Unimpaired Runoff ^{A3}	SJRRP Water Year Type ^{A4}
1901	3,227.9	Wet	1933	1,111.4	Normal-Dry	1965	2,271.191	Normal-Wet	1997	2,817.670	Wet
1902	1,704.0	Normal-Wet	1934	691.5	Dry	1966	1,298.792	Normal-Dry	1998	3,160.759	Wet
1903	1,727.0	Normal-Wet	1935	1,923.2	Normal-Wet	1967	3,233.097	Wet	1999	1,527.040	Normal-Wet
1904	2,062.0	Normal-Wet	1936	1,853.3	Normal-Wet	1968	861.894	Dry	2000	1,735.653	Normal-Wet
1905	1,795.4	Normal-Wet	1937	2,208.0	Normal-Wet	1969	4,040.864	Wet	2001	1,065.318	Normal-Dry
1906	4,367.8	Wet	1938	3,688.4	Wet	1970	1,445.837	Normal-Dry	2002	1,171.457	Normal-Dry
1907	3,113.9	Wet	1939	920.8	Dry	1971	1,416.812	Normal-Dry	2003	1,449.954	Normal-Dry
1908	1,163.4	Normal-Dry	1940	1,880.6	Normal-Wet	1972	1,039.249	Normal-Dry	2004	1,130.823	Normal-Dry
1909	2,900.7	Wet	1941	2,652.5	Wet	1973	2,047.585	Normal-Wet	2005	2,826.872	Wet
1910	2,041.5	Normal-Wet	1942	2,254.0	Normal-Wet	1974	2,190.308	Normal-Wet	2006	3,180.816	Wet
1911	3,586.0	Wet	1943	2,053.7	Normal-Wet	1975	1,795.922	Normal-Wet	2007	684.333	Dry
1912	1,043.9	Normal-Dry	1944	1,265.4	Normal-Dry	1976	629.234	Critical-High	2008	1,116.790	Normal-Dry
1913	879.4	Dry	1945	2,134.633	Normal-Wet	1977	361.253	Critical-Low	2009	1,455.379	Normal-Wet
1914	2,883.4	Wet	1946	1,727.115	Normal-Wet	1978	3,402.805	Wet	2010	2,028.706	Normal-Wet
1915	1,966.3	Normal-Wet	1947	1,121.564	Normal-Dry	1979	1,829.988	Normal-Wet	2011	3,304.824	Wet
1916	2,760.5	Wet	1948	1,201.390	Normal-Dry	1980	2,973.169	Wet	2012	831.582	Dry
1917	1,936.2	Normal-Wet	1949	1,167.008	Normal-Dry	1981	1,067.757	Normal-Dry	2013	856.626	Dry
1918	1,466.8	Normal-Wet	1950	1,317.457	Normal-Dry	1982	3,317.171	Wet	2014	509.579	Critical-High
1919	1,297.5	Normal-Dry	1951	1,827.254	Normal-Wet	1983	4,643.090	Wet	2015	327.410	Critical-Low
1920	1,322.5	Normal-Dry	1952	2,840.854	Wet	1984	2,042.750	Normal-Wet	2016	1,300.612	Normal-Dry
1921	1,604.4	Normal-Wet	1953	1,226.830	Normal-Dry	1985	1,135.975	Normal-Dry	2017	4,395.400	Wet
1922	2,355.1	Normal-Wet	1954	1,313.993	Normal-Dry	1986	3,031.600	Wet	2018	1,348.980	Normal-Dry
1923	1,654.3	Normal-Wet	1955	1,161.161	Normal-Dry	1987	756.853	Dry	2019	2,734.772	Wet
1924	444.1	Critical-High	1956	2,959.812	Wet	1988	862.124	Dry	2020	886.025	Dry
1925	1,438.7	Normal-Dry	1957	1,326.573	Normal-Dry	1989	939.168	Normal-Dry	2021	521.853	Critical-High
1926	1,161.4	Normal-Dry	1958	2,631.392	Wet	1990	742.824	Dry	2022	1,059.492	Normal-Dry
1927	2,001.3	Normal-Wet	1959	949.456	Normal-Dry	1991	1,027.209	Normal-Dry	2023	4,506.923	Wet
1928	1,153.7	Normal-Dry	1960	826.021	Dry	1992	807.759	Dry	2024	1,757.111	Normal-Wet
1929	862.4	Dry	1961	647.428	Critical-High	1993	2,672.322	Wet			
1930	859.1	Dry	1962	1,924.066	Normal-Wet	1994	824.097	Dry			
1931	480.2	Critical-High	1963	1,945.266	Normal-Wet	1995	3,876.370	Wet			
1932	2,047.4	Normal-Wet	1964	922.351	Dry	1996	2,200.707	Normal-Wet			

^{A2} Water year is from Oct 1 through Sept 30, for example the 2010 water year began Oct 1, 2009. Unimpaired Runoff is based on Reclamation calculations, and hypothetical water year types are shown here; actual Restoration water year types are based on the final allocation, which may sometimes differ slightly from the calculated water year total.

^{A3} Also known as "Natural River" or "Unimpaired Runoff into Millerton" – This is the total runoff that would flow into Millerton Lake if there were no dams or diversions upstream. There was a lower level of precision prior to 1945. Friant Dam uses 1.9835 conversion from cfs to AF.

^{A4} The six SJRRP Water Year Types are based on Unimpaired Runoff and are not updated as climatology changes as per the Settlement. Critical-Low= <400 TAF, Critical-High=400-669.999 TAF, Dry= 670-929.999 TAF, Normal-Dry 930-1449.999, Normal-Wet 1450-2500, Wet>2500.

Appendix D: Final Restoration Allocations and Errors

Table D1 — History of Restoration Allocations

Year	Type	Date of Final Allocation Issuance ^{A6}	Unimpaired Runoff Forecast in Final Allocation (TAF)	Final Restoration Allocation (TAF)	Observed Unimpaired Runoff on Sep. 30 (TAF)	Unimpaired Runoff Forecast Error	Allocation Error
2009	Interim Flows			261.5	1,455.379	—	—
2010	Interim Flows			98.2	2,028.706	—	—
2011	Interim Flows			152.4	3,304.824	—	—
2012	Interim Flows			183	831.582	—	—
2013	Interim Flows			65.5	856.626	—	—
2014	Restoration Flows	Mar 3	518	0 ^{A5}	509.579	+8.421 (+1.6%)	0 ^{A5}
2015	Restoration Flows	Sep 28	327	0	327.410	-0.410 (-0.1%)	0
2016	Restoration Flows	Sep 30	1,300.986	263.295	1,300.986	0 (0%)	0
2017	Restoration Flows	Jul 10	4,444	556.542	4,395.400	+48.600 (+1.1%)	0
2018	Restoration Flows	May 22	1,427	280.258	1,348.979	+78.021 (+5.8%)	+10.503
2019	Restoration Flows	May 20	2,690	556.542	2,734.772	-44.772 (-1.6%)	0
2020	Restoration Flows	June 19	880	202.197	886.025	-6.025 (-0.7%)	-1.345
2021	Restoration Flows	June 25	529	70.919	521.853	+7.147 (+1.4%)	0
2022	Restoration Flows	May 13	1,072	232.470	1,059.492	+12.508 (+1.2%)	+1.684
2023	Restoration Flows	May 18	4,664	557.038	4,506.923	+157.077 (+3.5%)	0
2024	Restoration Flows	May 17	1,776	329.026	1,757.111	+18.889 (+1.1%)	+2.646

^{A5} No water was provided under this Critical-High designation due to necessity for Friant Dam to release flows for the Exchange Contract.

^{A6} In 2018 with the completion of Version 2.0 of the Restoration Flows Guidelines, the date of final Restoration Allocation issuance was advanced from September 30 to May (or June under dry hydrologic conditions).

Table D2 — History of Restoration Flow Releases

Year	Year Type	Final Restoration Allocation (TAF)	URFs Removed from Allocation (TAF)	URF Exchange Returns (TAF)	Buffer Flows Utilized (TAF)	Restoration Flows Passing Gravelly Ford (TAF) ^{A7}	Restoration Allocation Utilization (TAF)	Release Error (TAF)
2014	Critical-High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015	Critical-Low	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	Normal-Dry	263.295	<i>pending</i>	<i>pending</i>	<i>pending</i>	<i>pending</i>	<i>pending</i>	<i>pending</i>
2017	Wet	556.542	367.458	0	0	<i>pending</i>	<i>pending</i>	<i>pending</i>
2018	Normal-Dry	280.258	124.791	2.129	0	157.596	280.258	0
2019	Wet	556.542	365.760	0	0	190.666	556.426	+0.116
2020	Dry	202.197	63.502	0.487	0.605	139.517	201.927	-0.270
2021	Critical-High	70.919	0	10.425	0.902	82.247	70.919	0
2022	Normal-Dry	232.470	101.076	3.500	0	135.094	232.670	+0.200
2023	Wet	557.038	373.944	10.167	0	193.263	557.040	+0.002
2024	Normal-Wet	329.026	150.473	8.700	4.447	<i>pending</i>	<i>pending</i>	<i>pending</i>

^{A7} Restoration Flows passing Gravelly Ford includes flood flows which were accounted for as meeting the Restoration Flow Schedule at Gravelly Ford.

Appendix E: Unreleased Restoration Flow History

Table E1 — URF Distributions (TAF)

Restoration Year	Gross Volume of URF Sales to Class 1	Gross Volume of URF Sales to Class 2	Net Volume of URF Sales to Class 1	Net Volume of URF Sales to Class 2	Gross Volume of URF put into Exchanges	Net Volume of URF put into Exchanges	Gross Volume of URFs spilled	Gross Total URF
2013	—	—	—	—	12.694	12.694	—	12.694
2014	11.219	—	11.219	—	—	—	0.206	11.425
2015	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0
2016	70.860	56.959	67.317	54.111	18.947	18.000	—	146.766
2017	5.474	364.967	5.200	346.716	2.491	2.366	—	372.932
2018	65.249	40.000	61.986	38.000	19.543	18.565	—	124.792
2019	—	326.954	—	310.607	16.298	15.482	22.509	365.761
2020	43.500	—	41.325	—	20.002	19.697	—	63.502
2021	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0
2022	75.178	—	71.419	—	26.951	25.603	—	102.128
2023	—	372.048	—	353.446	—	—	—	372.049
2024	—	150.474	—	142.950	—	—	—	150.474
Total	271.480	1,311.402	258.48	1,245.83	116.926	112.407	22.715	1,722.523

Table E2 — Expected URF Revenue for the Restoration Fund

Restoration Year	Revenue Expected from URF Sales	Revenue Expected from URF Exchanges	Total Expected URF Revenue
2013	—	—	—
2014	\$3,470,650	—	\$3,470,650
2015	—	—	—
2016	\$9,686,790	—	\$9,686,790
2017	\$6,990,680	—	\$6,990,680
2018	\$6,123,858	\$494,504	\$6,618,362
2019	\$6,393,286	\$306,680	\$6,699,966
2020	\$8,922,481	\$1,251,630	\$10,174,111
2021	—	\$525,000	\$525,000
2022	\$13,488,907	\$1,909,267	\$15,398,173
2023	\$8,129,258	—	\$8,129,258
2024	\$3,287,850	\$188,870	\$3,476,720
Total	\$66,493,760	\$4,675,951	\$71,169,710

Table E3 — URF Exchanges Returned to the Program (TAF)

Restoration Year	Volume Returned	Notes
2013	—	—
2014	11.425	From 2013 URF Exchange with FID, used for 2014 sales
2015	—	—
2016	—	—
2017	5.474	Returned from San Luis Reservoir, 5.200 net URF sold
2018	2.129	Returned from 2018 DEID exchange
2019	9.000	Returned to SLR from 2019 AEWS and LTRID exchange, transferred to CVO for San Luis Unit supply
2020	0.487	Returned from FID from 2019 exchange
2021	10.425	Returned from multi-party 2020 exchange
2022	3.500	From 2016 URF Exchange with AEWS
2023	10.167	3.500 AEWS, 2.000 FID, 4.667 OCID
2024	8.700	3.500 AEWS, 0.822 DEID, 0.378 SWID, 3.000 OCID
Total	61.307	

Appendix F: Water Management Goal

Table F1 — Final Friant Water Contract Supply

Contract Year	Class 1 Total Supply 800 TAF		Class 2 Total Supply 1,401.475 TAF	
	Class 1 Declaration	Volume of Class 1 as Uncontrolled Season	Class 2 Residual Declaration	Volume of Class 2 as Uncontrolled Season
2009	100%	—	10%	21%. Including residual allocation is equivalent to 31%
2010	100%	—	10%	32%. With residual allocation is equivalent to 42%
2011	100%	—	5%	38%. With residual allocation is equivalent to 43%
2012	57%	—	0%	0%
2013	62%	—	0%	0%
2014	0%	—	0%	0%
2015	0%	—	0%	0%
2016	75% Residual	12.5% (100 TAF used, mostly in April)	0%	7%
2017	100%	—	3%	30%. UcS through mid-July. With residual allocation equivalent to 33%
2018	88% Residual	11% (88 TAF used April-May)	0%	9%.
2019	100%	—	0%	49%
2020	65%	—	0%	0%
2021	40%	—	0%	0%
2022	35%	—	0%	0%
2023	100%	—	15%	18%. UcS through late-July. With residual allocation equivalent to 33%
2024	<i>pending</i>	<i>pending</i>	0%	<i>pending</i>

Notes

2009: C1/C2 declaration on 6/12/2009 was 77/18, increased to 100/10 once SJRRP Interim Flows were scheduled for 10/1/2009 release.

2010: Class 2 declaration changed from 15% to 10%, but this did not impact RWA calculation which uses growing season allocation of 15%.

2011: Class 2 declaration changed from 20% to 5%, but this did not impact RWA calculation which uses growing season allocation of 20%.

2012: Class 1 declaration changed from 50% to 57% on 4/27/2012, but this did not impact RWA calculation which uses growing season allocation of 50%.

2013: Final declaration made 7/15/2013.

2014, 2015: Friant Dam releases to satisfy Exchange Contract at Mendota Pool. 2014 final declaration made 5/13/2014. 2015 final declaration made 2/27/2015.

2016: 12.5% of Class 1 was released as Uncontrolled Season water. Class 1 allocation was reduced from 100% to 87.5% (including UcS) at final allocation on 7/18/2016.

2017: Uncontrolled Season through mid-July. Flood flows 1/4/2017 – 7/20/2017.

2018: 11% of Class 1 was released as Uncontrolled Season water. Class 1 allocation was reduced from 100% to 99% (including UcS) before final allocation on 9/26/2018.

2019: Uncontrolled season through 7/15/2019. Flood flows 3/15/2019 – 4/5/2019 and 5/21/2023 – 7/10/2019.

2020: Final declaration 6/24/2020.

2021: Class 1 declaration increased from 20% to 25% in November, increased to 40% in December. Late change did not affect apportionment of RWA impact.

2022: Class 1 declaration increased from 30% to 35% in January associated with 2023 flood flows.

2023: Flood flows 1/5/2023 – 2/5/2023 and 3/8/2023 – 7/26/2023.

2024: Final Class 1 declaration is pending as of this issuance.

Table F2 — Additional Water Supply

Restoration Year	Gross Volume of URF Sales to Class 1	Gross Volume of URF Sales to Class 2	Net Volume of URF Sales to Class 1	Net Volume of URF Sales to Class 2	Gross Volume of URF put into Exchanges	Net Volume of URF put into Exchanges	Gross Volume of URFs spilled	Gross Total URF								
2013	<i>Table Under Development</i>															
2014																
2015																
2016																
2017																
2018																
2019																
2020																
2021																
2022																
2023																
2024																
Total																

Table F3 — URF Reconciliation (URF Distribution to incorrect Class) ^{A8}

Restoration Year	URFs Sales Distributed to Class 1 which should have been Distributed to Class 2	Date Error Extinguished	URFs Sales Distributed to Class 2 which should have been Distributed to Class 1	Date Error Extinguished
2020	0	N/A	0	N/A
2021	0	N/A	0	N/A
2022	0	N/A	0	N/A
2023	0	N/A	0	N/A
2024	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>

^{A8} Reconciliation of URFs was instituted in 2020 and will be codified in Restoration Flow Guidelines version 2.2.