

Willamette River Basin Temperature TMDL Model: Model Scenarios



By

Robert Annear,

Mike McKillip,

Sher Jamal Khan,

Chris Berger,

And

Scott Wells

Technical Report EWR-03-04

School of Engineering and Applied Science
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon 97201-0751

April, 2004

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	i
List of Figures	ii
List of Tables	xliii
Introduction.....	1
Time Series Comparisons	8
System Potential 1, 2001.....	8
Continuous Temperature.....	8
Continuous Flow.....	35
Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature	61
Daily seven day average flow	87
System Potential 2, 2001.....	113
Continuous Temperature.....	113
Continuous Flow.....	140
Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature	167
Daily seven day average flow	194
System Potential 1, 2002.....	221
Continuous Temperature.....	221
Continuous Flow.....	248
Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature	275
Daily seven day average flow	302
System Potential 2, 2002.....	329
Continuous Temperature.....	329
Continuous Flow.....	356
Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature	383
Daily seven day average flow	410
Sensitivity to boundary flow rate	437
Continuous Temperature.....	437
Continuous Flow.....	463
Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature	490
Daily seven day average flow	517
Sensitivity to boundary temperature	544
Continuous Temperature.....	544
Continuous Flow.....	570
Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature	597
Daily seven day average flow	624
Sensitivity to vegetative shade	651
Continuous Temperature.....	651
Continuous Flow.....	677
Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature	704
Daily seven day average flow	731
Sensitivity to biological opinion flows	758
Continuous Temperature.....	758
Continuous Flow.....	771
Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature	785
Daily seven day average flow	811
Longitudinal Profile Comparisons	838

Sensitivity to Point Sources	838
Sensitivity to boundary flow rate	847
Sensitivity to boundary temperature	856
Sensitivity to vegetative shade	865
Sensitivity to biological opinion flows	874
Contour Plot Comparisons	883
Sensitivity to point sources	883
Sensitivity to boundary flow rate reduction.....	890
Sensitivity to boundary flow rate increase	899
Sensitivity to boundary temperature reduction.....	908
Sensitivity to boundary temperature increase	917
Sensitivity to vegetative shade	926
Sensitivity to biological opinion flows	935
Summary.....	943
References.....	944

List of Figures

Figure 1: TMDL study area - the Willamette River basin with drainage basins delineated.....	1
Figure 2: Willamette River and modeled tributaries.....	3
Figure 3: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	9
Figure 4: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	10
Figure 5: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	11
Figure 6: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	12
Figure 7: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95.....	13
Figure 8: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14.....	14
Figure 9: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29.....	15
Figure 10: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.03	16
Figure 11: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	17
Figure 12: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	18
Figure 13: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	19
Figure 14: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	20
Figure 15: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	21
Figure 16: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	22

Figure 17: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	23
Figure 18: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	24
Figure 19 Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	25
Figure 20 Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	26
Figure 21 Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	27
Figure 22: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	28
Figure 23: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	29
Figure 24: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	30
Figure 25: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	31
Figure 26: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	32
Figure 27: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	33
Figure 28: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	34
Figure 29: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	35
Figure 30: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	36
Figure 31: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	37
Figure 32: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	38
Figure 33: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	39
Figure 34: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	40
Figure 35: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29	41
Figure 36: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	42
Figure 37: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	43
Figure 38: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	44
Figure 39: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	45
Figure 40: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	46

Figure 41: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	47
Figure 42: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	48
Figure 43: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	49
Figure 44: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	50
Figure 45: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	51
Figure 46: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	52
Figure 47: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	53
Figure 48: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	54
Figure 49: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	55
Figure 50: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	56
Figure 51: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	57
Figure 52: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	58
Figure 53: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	59
Figure 54: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	60
Figure 55: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	61
Figure 56: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	62
Figure 57: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	63
Figure 58: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51 ..	64
Figure 59: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the MiddleFork Willamette River at RM 13.95	65
Figure 60: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	66
Figure 61: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29 ...	67

Figure 62: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	68
Figure 63: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	69
Figure 64: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	70
Figure 65: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	71
Figure 66: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	72
Figure 67: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	73
Figure 68: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	74
Figure 69: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	75
Figure 70: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133.0.....	76
Figure 71: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11.....	77
Figure 72: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	78
Figure 73: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69.....	79
Figure 74: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09.....	80
Figure 75: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72.....	81
Figure 76: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	82
Figure 77: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	83

Figure 78: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.80.....	84
Figure 79: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05.....	85
Figure 80: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13.....	86
Figure 81: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03.....	87
Figure 82: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	88
Figure 83: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	89
Figure 84: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51.....	90
Figure 85: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	91
Figure 86: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	92
Figure 87: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29	93
Figure 88: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06 ...	94
Figure 89: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	95
Figure 90: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	96
Figure 91: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	97
Figure 92: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	98
Figure 93: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	99
Figure 94: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98 .	100
Figure 95: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4 ...	101
Figure 96: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133.0 ...	102
Figure 97: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11 .	103

Figure 98: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6 ...	104
Figure 99: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69 ...	105
Figure 100: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09 ...	106
Figure 101: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72 ...	107
Figure 102: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22....	108
Figure 103: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	109
Figure 104: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.80 ...	110
Figure 105: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05 ...	111
Figure 106: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	112
Figure 107: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	114
Figure 108: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	115
Figure 109: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	116
Figure 110: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	117
Figure 111: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95.....	118
Figure 112: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14.....	119
Figure 113: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29.....	120
Figure 114: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	121
Figure 115: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	122
Figure 116: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	123
Figure 117: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	124
Figure 118: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	125
Figure 119: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	126
Figure 120: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	127
Figure 121: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	128

Figure 122: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	129
Figure 123: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	130
Figure 124: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	131
Figure 125: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	132
Figure 126: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	133
Figure 127: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	134
Figure 128: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	135
Figure 129: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	136
Figure 130: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	137
Figure 131: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	138
Figure 132: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	139
Figure 133: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	141
Figure 134: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	142
Figure 135: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	143
Figure 136: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	144
Figure 137: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the MiddleFork Willamette River at RM 13.95	145
Figure 138: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	146
Figure 139: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29	147
Figure 140: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	148
Figure 141: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	149
Figure 142: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	150
Figure 143: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	151
Figure 144: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	152
Figure 145: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	153

Figure 146: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	154
Figure 147: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	155
Figure 148: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	156
Figure 149: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	157
Figure 150: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	158
Figure 151: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	159
Figure 152: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	160
Figure 153: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	161
Figure 154: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	162
Figure 155: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	163
Figure 156: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	164
Figure 157: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	165
Figure 158: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	166
Figure 159: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	168
Figure 160: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	169
Figure 161: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	170
Figure 162: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	171
Figure 163: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	172
Figure 164: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	173
Figure 165: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29	174
Figure 166: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	175

Figure 167: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	176
Figure 168: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	177
Figure 169: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	178
Figure 170: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	179
Figure 171: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	180
Figure 172: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	181
Figure 173: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	182
Figure 174: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133.....	183
Figure 175: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11.....	184
Figure 176: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	185
Figure 177: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69.....	186
Figure 178: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09.....	187
Figure 179: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72.....	188
Figure 180: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	189
Figure 181: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	190
Figure 182: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8.....	191

Figure 183: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05.....	192
Figure 184: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13.....	193
Figure 185: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03.....	195
Figure 186: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	196
Figure 187: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.13.....	197
Figure 188: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	198
Figure 189: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	199
Figure 190: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	200
Figure 191: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29	201
Figure 192: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06 ..	202
Figure 193: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	203
Figure 194: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	204
Figure 195: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	205
Figure 196: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	206
Figure 197: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3 ...	207
Figure 198: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98 ..	208
Figure 199: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4 ...	209
Figure 200: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	210
Figure 201: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11 ..	211
Figure 202: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6 ...	212
Figure 203: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69 ...	213

Figure 204: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09 ...	214
Figure 205: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72 ...	215
Figure 206: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22....	216
Figure 207: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	217
Figure 208: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.80 ...	218
Figure 209: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05 ...	219
Figure 210: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	220
Figure 211: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	222
Figure 212: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	223
Figure 213: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	224
Figure 214: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51	225
Figure 215: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95.....	226
Figure 216: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14.....	227
Figure 217: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29.....	228
Figure 218: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	229
Figure 219: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	230
Figure 220: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	231
Figure 221: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	232
Figure 222: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	233
Figure 223: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	234
Figure 224: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	235
Figure 225: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	236
Figure 226: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133.....	237
Figure 227: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	238

Figure 228: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	239
Figure 229: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	240
Figure 230: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	241
Figure 231: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	242
Figure 232: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	243
Figure 233: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	244
Figure 234: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	245
Figure 235: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	246
Figure 236: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	247
Figure 237: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	249
Figure 238: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	250
Figure 239: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	251
Figure 240: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51	252
Figure 241: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	253
Figure 242: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	254
Figure 243: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29	255
Figure 244: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	256
Figure 245: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	257
Figure 246: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	258
Figure 247: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	259
Figure 248: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	260
Figure 249: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	261
Figure 250: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	262
Figure 251: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	263

Figure 252: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133	264
Figure 253: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	265
Figure 254: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	266
Figure 255: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	267
Figure 256: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	268
Figure 257: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	269
Figure 258: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	270
Figure 259: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	271
Figure 260: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	272
Figure 261: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	273
Figure 262: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	274
Figure 263: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	276
Figure 264: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	277
Figure 265: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	278
Figure 266: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51	279
Figure 267: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	280
Figure 268: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	281
Figure 269: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	282
Figure 270: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	283
Figure 271: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	284

Figure 272: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	285
Figure 273: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	286
Figure 274: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	287
Figure 275: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	288
Figure 276: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	289
Figure 277: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.40.....	290
Figure 278: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133.....	291
Figure 279: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11.....	292
Figure 280: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	293
Figure 281: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69.....	294
Figure 282: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09.....	295
Figure 283: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72.....	296
Figure 284: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	297
Figure 285: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	298
Figure 286: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8`	299
Figure 287: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05.....	300

Figure 288: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13.....	301
Figure 289: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03.....	303
Figure 290: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	304
Figure 291: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	305
Figure 292: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51	306
Figure 293: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	307
Figure 294: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	308
Figure 295: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	309
Figure 296: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06 .	310
Figure 297: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	311
Figure 298: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	312
Figure 299: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	313
Figure 300: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	314
Figure 301: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3 ...	315
Figure 302: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98 .	316
Figure 303: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4 ...	317
Figure 304: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133	318
Figure 305: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11 .	319
Figure 306: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6 ...	320
Figure 307: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69 ...	321
Figure 308: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09 ...	322

Figure 309: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72 ...	323
Figure 310: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22....	324
Figure 311: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	325
Figure 312: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	326
Figure 313: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05 ...	327
Figure 314: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	328
Figure 315: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	330
Figure 316: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	331
Figure 317: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	332
Figure 318: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51	333
Figure 319: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95.....	334
Figure 320: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14.....	335
Figure 321: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29.....	336
Figure 322: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	337
Figure 323: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	338
Figure 324: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	339
Figure 325: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	340
Figure 326: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	341
Figure 327: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	342
Figure 328: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	343
Figure 329: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	344
Figure 330: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133	345
Figure 331: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	346
Figure 332: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	347

Figure 333: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	348
Figure 334: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	349
Figure 335: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	350
Figure 336: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	351
Figure 337: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	352
Figure 338: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	353
Figure 339: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	354
Figure 340: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	355
Figure 341: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	357
Figure 342: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	358
Figure 343: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	359
Figure 344: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51	360
Figure 345: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	361
Figure 346: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	362
Figure 347: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	363
Figure 348: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	364
Figure 349: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	365
Figure 350: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	366
Figure 351: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	367
Figure 352: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	368
Figure 353: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	369
Figure 354: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	370
Figure 355: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	371
Figure 356: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133	372

Figure 357: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	373
Figure 358: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	374
Figure 359: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	375
Figure 360: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	376
Figure 361: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	377
Figure 362: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	378
Figure 363: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	379
Figure 364: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	380
Figure 365: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	381
Figure 366: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	382
Figure 367: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	384
Figure 368: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	385
Figure 369: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	386
Figure 370: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51	387
Figure 371: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	388
Figure 372: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	389
Figure 373: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	390
Figure 374: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	391
Figure 375: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	392
Figure 376: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	393

Figure 377: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	394
Figure 378: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	395
Figure 379: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	396
Figure 380: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	397
Figure 381: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	398
Figure 382: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133.....	399
Figure 383: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11.....	400
Figure 384: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	401
Figure 385: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69.....	402
Figure 386: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09.....	403
Figure 387: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72.....	404
Figure 388: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	405
Figure 389: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	406
Figure 390: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8.....	407
Figure 391: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05.....	408
Figure 392: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13.....	409

Figure 393: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03.....	411
Figure 394: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	412
Figure 395: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	413
Figure 396: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51	414
Figure 397: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	415
Figure 398: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	416
Figure 399: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	417
Figure 400: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06 .	418
Figure 401: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	419
Figure 402: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	420
Figure 403: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	421
Figure 404: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	422
Figure 405: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3 ...	423
Figure 406: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98 .	424
Figure 407: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4 ...	425
Figure 408: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133	426
Figure 409: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11 .	427
Figure 410: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6 ...	428
Figure 411: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69 ...	429
Figure 412: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09 ...	430
Figure 413: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72 ...	431
Figure 414: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	432

Figure 415: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	433
Figure 416: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	434
Figure 417: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05 ...	435
Figure 418: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	436
Figure 419: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	438
Figure 420: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	439
Figure 421: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	440
Figure 422: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	441
Figure 423: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	442
Figure 424: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	443
Figure 425: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	444
Figure 426: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	445
Figure 427: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	446
Figure 428: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	447
Figure 429: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	448
Figure 430: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	449
Figure 431: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	450
Figure 432: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	451
Figure 433: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	452
Figure 434: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133.....	453
Figure 435: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11.....	454
Figure 436: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	455
Figure 437: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69.....	456
Figure 438: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09.....	457

Figure 439: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72.....	458
Figure 440: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	459
Figure 441: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	460
Figure 442: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.80.....	461
Figure 443: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05.....	462
Figure 444: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13.....	463
Figure 445: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03.....	464
Figure 446: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	465
Figure 447: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	466
Figure 448: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51.....	467
Figure 449: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95.....	468
Figure 450: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14.....	469
Figure 451: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29.....	470
Figure 452: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	471
Figure 453: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	472
Figure 454: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	473
Figure 455: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	474
Figure 456: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	475
Figure 457: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	476
Figure 458: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	477
Figure 459: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	478
Figure 460: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133.....	479
Figure 461: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11.....	480
Figure 462: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	481

Figure 463: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	482
Figure 464: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	483
Figure 465: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	484
Figure 466: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	485
Figure 467: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	486
Figure 468: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	487
Figure 469: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	488
Figure 470: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	489
Figure 471: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03.....	491
Figure 472: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	492
Figure 473: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	493
Figure 474: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51.....	494
Figure 475: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	495
Figure 476: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	496
Figure 477: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	497
Figure 478: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	498
Figure 479: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	499
Figure 480: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	500
Figure 481: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	501
Figure 482: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 9.75	502
Figure 483: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	503
Figure 484: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	504
Figure 485: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	505
Figure 486: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	506

Figure 487: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	507
Figure 488: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	508
Figure 489: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	509
Figure 490: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	510
Figure 491: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	511
Figure 492: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	512
Figure 493: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	513
Figure 494: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	514
Figure 495: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	515
Figure 496: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	516
Figure 497: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	518
Figure 498: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	519
Figure 499: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	520
Figure 500: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	521
Figure 501: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	522
Figure 502: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14.....	523
Figure 503: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29.....	524
Figure 504: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	525
Figure 505: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	526
Figure 506: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	527
Figure 507: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	528
Figure 508: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	529
Figure 509: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	530
Figure 510: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	531

Figure 511: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	532
Figure 512: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	533
Figure 513: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	534
Figure 514: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	535
Figure 515: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	536
Figure 516: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	537
Figure 517: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	538
Figure 518: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	539
Figure 519: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	540
Figure 520: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	541
Figure 521: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	542
Figure 522: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	543
Figure 523: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 °C) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	545
Figure 524: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 °C) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	546
Figure 525: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	547
Figure 526: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	548
Figure 527: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	549
Figure 528: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	550
Figure 529: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	551
Figure 530: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	552
Figure 531: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	553
Figure 532: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	554
Figure 533: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	555
Figure 534: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	556

Figure 535: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	557
Figure 536: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	558
Figure 537: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	559
Figure 538: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	560
Figure 539: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	561
Figure 540: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	562
Figure 541: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	563
Figure 542: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	564
Figure 543: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	565
Figure 544: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	566
Figure 545: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	567
Figure 546: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	568
Figure 547: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	569
Figure 548: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	570
Figure 549: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	571
Figure 550: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	572
Figure 551: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	573
Figure 552: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	574
Figure 553: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	575
Figure 554: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	576
Figure 555: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	577
Figure 556: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	578
Figure 557: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	579
Figure 558: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	580

Figure 559: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	581
Figure 560: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	582
Figure 561: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	583
Figure 562: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	584
Figure 563: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 169.4.....	585
Figure 564: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133.....	586
Figure 565: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11.....	587
Figure 566: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	588
Figure 567: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69.....	589
Figure 568: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09.....	590
Figure 569: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72.....	591
Figure 570: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	592
Figure 571: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	593
Figure 572: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8.....	594
Figure 573: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05.....	595
Figure 574: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13.....	596
Figure 575: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03.....	598
Figure 576: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	599
Figure 577: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	600
Figure 578: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51.....	601
Figure 579: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	602
Figure 580: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	603
Figure 581: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	604
Figure 582: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	605

Figure 583: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	606
Figure 584: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	607
Figure 585: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	608
Figure 586: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	609
Figure 587: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	610
Figure 588: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	611
Figure 589: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	612
Figure 590: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	613
Figure 591: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	614
Figure 592: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	615
Figure 593: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	616
Figure 594: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	617
Figure 595: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	618
Figure 596: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	619
Figure 597: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07.....	620
Figure 598: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	621
Figure 599: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	622
Figure 600: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	623
Figure 601: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	625
Figure 602: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	626
Figure 603: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	627
Figure 604: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 5.51	628
Figure 605: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95.....	629
Figure 606: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14.....	630

Figure 607: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29.....	631
Figure 608: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	632
Figure 609: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	633
Figure 610: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	634
Figure 611: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	635
Figure 612: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	636
Figure 613: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	637
Figure 614: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	638
Figure 615: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	639
Figure 616: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	640
Figure 617: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	641
Figure 618: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	642
Figure 619: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69.....	643
Figure 620: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09.....	644
Figure 621: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72.....	645
Figure 622: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	646
Figure 623: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	647
Figure 624: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8.....	648
Figure 625: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05.....	649
Figure 626: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	650
Figure 627: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03.....	652
Figure 628: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	653
Figure 629: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	654
Figure 630: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	655

Figure 631: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	656
Figure 632: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	657
Figure 633: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	658
Figure 634: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	659
Figure 635: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	660
Figure 636: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	661
Figure 637: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	662
Figure 638: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	663
Figure 639: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	664
Figure 640: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	665
Figure 641: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	666
Figure 642: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	667
Figure 643: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	668
Figure 644: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	669
Figure 645: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	670
Figure 646: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	671
Figure 647: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	672
Figure 648: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	673
Figure 649: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	674
Figure 650: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	675
Figure 651: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	676
Figure 652: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	677
Figure 653: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	678
Figure 654: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	679

Figure 655: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.13	680
Figure 656: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	681
Figure 657: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95.....	682
Figure 658: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14.....	683
Figure 659: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29.....	684
Figure 660: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	685
Figure 661: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	686
Figure 662: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	687
Figure 663: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	688
Figure 664: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	689
Figure 665: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	690
Figure 666: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	691
Figure 667: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	692
Figure 668: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133.....	693
Figure 669: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	694
Figure 670: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	695
Figure 671: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69.....	696
Figure 672: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09.....	697
Figure 673: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72.....	698
Figure 674: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	699
Figure 675: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	700
Figure 676: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8.....	701
Figure 677: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05.....	702
Figure 678: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13.....	703

Figure 679: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03.....	705
Figure 680: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	706
Figure 681: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	707
Figure 682: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	708
Figure 683: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	709
Figure 684: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	710
Figure 685: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	711
Figure 686: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	712
Figure 687: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	713
Figure 688: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	714
Figure 689: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	715
Figure 690: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	716
Figure 691: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	717
Figure 692: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	718
Figure 693: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	719
Figure 694: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	720
Figure 695: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	721
Figure 696: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	722
Figure 697: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	723
Figure 698: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	724
Figure 699: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	725
Figure 700: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	726
Figure 701: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	727
Figure 702: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	728

Figure 703: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	729
Figure 704: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	730
Figure 705: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	732
Figure 706: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	733
Figure 707: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	734
Figure 708: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	735
Figure 709: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95.....	736
Figure 710: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14.....	737
Figure 711: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29.....	738
Figure 712: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	739
Figure 713: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	740
Figure 714: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	741
Figure 715: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	742
Figure 716: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	743
Figure 717: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	744
Figure 718: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	745
Figure 719: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	746
Figure 720: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133.....	747
Figure 721: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11.....	748
Figure 722: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	749
Figure 723: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69.....	750
Figure 724: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09.....	751
Figure 725: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72.....	752
Figure 726: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	753

Figure 727: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	754
Figure 728: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8.....	755
Figure 729: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	756
Figure 730: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	757
Figure 731: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	758
Figure 732: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	759
Figure 733: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	759
Figure 734: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	760
Figure 735: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	760
Figure 736: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	761
Figure 737: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	761
Figure 738: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	762
Figure 739: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	762
Figure 740: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	763
Figure 741: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	763
Figure 742: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	764
Figure 743: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	764
Figure 744: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	765
Figure 745: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4.....	765
Figure 746: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133.....	766
Figure 747: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	766
Figure 748: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6.....	767
Figure 749: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69.....	767
Figure 750: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09.....	768

Figure 751: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72.....	768
Figure 752: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22.....	769
Figure 753: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 5.07.....	769
Figure 754: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8.....	770
Figure 755: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05.....	770
Figure 756: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13.....	771
Figure 757: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03.....	772
Figure 758: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	772
Figure 759: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	773
Figure 760: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	773
Figure 761: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	774
Figure 762: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	774
Figure 763: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29	775
Figure 764: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	775
Figure 765: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	776
Figure 766: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	776
Figure 767: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	777
Figure 768: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	777
Figure 769: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	778
Figure 770: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	778
Figure 771: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	779
Figure 772: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	779
Figure 773: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	780
Figure 774: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	780

Figure 775: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	781
Figure 776: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	781
Figure 777: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	782
Figure 778: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	782
Figure 779: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	783
Figure 780: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	783
Figure 781: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	784
Figure 782: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	784
Figure 783: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03.....	785
Figure 784: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28.....	786
Figure 785: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18.....	787
Figure 786: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	788
Figure 787: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95	789
Figure 788: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14	790
Figure 789: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29	791
Figure 790: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06	792
Figure 791: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39	793
Figure 792: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99	794
Figure 793: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75	795
Figure 794: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64	796
Figure 795: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3	797
Figure 796: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98	798
Figure 797: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	799
Figure 798: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	800

Figure 799: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	801
Figure 800: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	802
Figure 801: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	803
Figure 802: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	804
Figure 803: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	805
Figure 804: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	806
Figure 805: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	807
Figure 806: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	808
Figure 807: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	809
Figure 808: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	810
Figure 809: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03	812
Figure 810: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28	813
Figure 811: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18	814
Figure 812: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51	815
Figure 813: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95.....	816
Figure 814: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14.....	817
Figure 815: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29.....	818
Figure 816: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06.....	819
Figure 817: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39.....	820
Figure 818: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99.....	821
Figure 819: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75.....	822
Figure 820: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64.....	823
Figure 821: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3.....	824
Figure 822: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98.....	825

Figure 823: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4	826
Figure 824: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133	827
Figure 825: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11	828
Figure 826: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6	829
Figure 827: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69	830
Figure 828: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09	831
Figure 829: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72	832
Figure 830: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22	833
Figure 831: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07	834
Figure 832: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8	835
Figure 833: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05	836
Figure 834: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13	837
Figure 835: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River	839
Figure 836: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River ..	840
Figure 837: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River	841
Figure 838: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River	842
Figure 839: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River	843
Figure 840: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River	844
Figure 841: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River	845
Figure 842: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River	846
Figure 843: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River	848
Figure 844: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River ..	849
Figure 845: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River	850
Figure 846: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River	851

Figure 847: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River 852

Figure 848: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River..... 853

Figure 849: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River..... 854

Figure 850: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River 855

Figure 851: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 °C) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River..... 857

Figure 852: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River..... 858

Figure 853: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River. 859

Figure 854: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River 860

Figure 855: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the UpperWillamette River..... 861

Figure 856: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River..... 862

Figure 857: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River 863

Figure 858: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River..... 864

Figure 859: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River..... 866

Figure 860: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River 867

Figure 861: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River 868

Figure 862: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River 869

Figure 863: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River 870

Figure 864: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River..... 871

Figure 865: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River 872

Figure 866: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River 873

Figure 867: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River..... 875

Figure 868: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River 876

Figure 869: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River	877
Figure 870: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River	878
Figure 871: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River	879
Figure 872: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River.....	880
Figure 873: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River	881
Figure 874: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River	882
Figure 875: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River.....	884
Figure 876: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River	885
Figure 877: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River	886
Figure 878: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River	887
Figure 879: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River.....	888
Figure 880: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River	889
Figure 881: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River.....	891
Figure 882: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River	892
Figure 883: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River	893
Figure 884: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River	894
Figure 885: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River	895
Figure 886: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River.....	896
Figure 887: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River	897
Figure 888: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River	898
Figure 889: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River.....	900
Figure 890: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River	901
Figure 891: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River	902
Figure 892: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River	903

Figure 893: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River	904
Figure 894: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River.....	905
Figure 895: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River	906
Figure 896: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River	907
Figure 897: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 °C) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River	909
Figure 898: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River ..	910
Figure 899: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River.....	911
Figure 900: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River	912
Figure 901: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River	913
Figure 902: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River.....	914
Figure 903: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River.....	915
Figure 904: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River	916
Figure 905: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River	918
Figure 906: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River ..	919
Figure 907: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River.....	920
Figure 908: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River	921
Figure 909: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River	922
Figure 910: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River.....	923
Figure 911: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River.....	924
Figure 912: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River	925
Figure 913: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River.....	927
Figure 914: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River	928
Figure 915: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River	929
Figure 916: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River	930

Figure 917: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River	931
Figure 918: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River.....	932
Figure 919: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River	933
Figure 920: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River	934
Figure 921: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River	936
Figure 922: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River	937
Figure 923: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River	938
Figure 924: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River.....	939
Figure 925: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River.....	940
Figure 926: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River	941
Figure 927: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River	942

List of Tables

Table 1: Willamette River TMDLs Mainstem Model simulations (ODEQ, 2003)	3
Table 2: CE-QUAL-W2 Model Scenario output locations, based on ODEQ (2003).....	5
Table 3: Longitudinal Plot Sensitivity Analysis Comparisons	7
Table 4: Contour Plot Sensitivity Analysis Comparisons	7

Introduction

The State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is developing a TMDL for temperature in the Willamette River basin shown in Figure 1. The study area included the Willamette River and all major tributaries (except the Tualatin River where a TMDL process was already concluded). A large section of the Columbia River was also modeled to provide adequate boundary representation of tidal flows in the lower Willamette River. The Willamette River below the Oregon City Falls in the Portland metropolitan area has a typical diurnal tidal range of 1 m. The development of a dynamic model of temperature and hydrodynamics of the entire river basin incorporating shading were primary requirements of this modeling study. The model would be used by DEQ to set temperature limits on point source dischargers and to evaluate the impact of management strategies on river temperatures to improve fish habitat. Some of these strategies included modifications of the dam at the Willamette River Falls south of Portland and channel reconfigurations.




Figure 1: TMDL study area - the Willamette River basin with drainage basins delineated.

CE-QUAL-W2 Version 3.1 (Cole and Wells, 2002), a two dimensional (longitudinal-vertical), laterally averaged, hydrodynamic and water quality model developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

(USACOE) Waterways Experiments Station, was chosen as the appropriate model tool for this system for the following reasons:

- Dynamic temperature predictive capability
- Dynamic shading prediction based on detailed topographic and vegetative shading information
- Ability of the model to be used for water quality after the temperature study where parameters of interest are algae, periphyton, pH, dissolved oxygen
- Ability to model complex hydraulic flow paths with multiple interconnected branches using hydraulic elements (weirs, pumps, spillways) between branches
- Ability to evaluate the stratification potential of deep pools in the Willamette River where water quality and temperature data have shown significant stratification
- Ability to model estuary hydrodynamics
- Ability to model an entire river basin including upstream deep-density stratified reservoirs
- Public domain executable and source code for quality-assurance and testing

The river basin model was originally divided into several reaches. Individual models were developed for each reach. These reaches were (see also Figure 2):

- **Columbia River** - from Beaver Army Terminal (Columbia River Mile 53.8) to Bonneville Dam (RM 144.5) (Willamette River enters the Columbia River at Columbia River Miles 87 and 101);
- **Tidal Willamette River** – Lower Willamette River from mouth to Willamette Falls (RM 26.5), including the Willamette Channel and the Multnomah Channel;
- **Non-tidal Willamette River** – Willamette Falls (RM 26.5) to confluence of Coast and Middle Forks (RM 187); this section was divided further into the following reaches: Middle Willamette from the Willamette Falls (RM 26.5) to the city of Salem (RM 85); Upper Willamette from the City of Salem (RM 85) to the confluence of Coast and Middle Forks (RM 187)
- **Clackamas River** up to River Mill Dam/Estacada Lake (RM 26);
- **Santiam River** (all 12 miles), North Santiam River up to Detroit Dam (RM 49), South Santiam River up to Foster Dam (RM 38);
- **Long Tom River** to Fern Ridge Dam (RM 26);
- **McKenzie River** to RM 56, and South Fork McKenzie River to Cougar Dam (RM 4);
- **Middle Fork Willamette** to Dexter Dam (RM 17), Fall Creek to Fall Creek Dam (RM 7);
- **Coast Fork Willamette** to Cottage Grove Dam (RM 30), Row River to Dorena Dam (RM 7.5);
- **Columbia Slough** in the tidal portion of the Willamette River (about 9 miles in length)

Once the models were set-up for each section of the Willamette basin, the model was calibrated to field data and management strategies were evaluated. These are the subjects of two other reports: Annear et al. (2004) and Berger et al. (2004).

This report outlines the results of implementing model scenarios for each of the model sections or elements for specific time periods. The model scenario simulation periods used to investigate management scenarios required boundary condition data that extended past the model calibration periods. The model simulation period for year 2001 was from June 1 to October 31 and for year 2002 from April 1 to October 31.




Figure 2: Willamette River and modeled tributaries.

There were twenty one model scenarios run as shown in Table 1, based on a technical memo developed by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ, 2003).

Table 1: Willamette River TMDLs Mainstem Model simulations (ODEQ, 2003)

Sim No.	Current or System Potential	Year	Description
1	Calibration	2001	2001 calibration conditions
2	Calibration	2002	2002 calibration conditions
3	System Potential 1	2001	no point sources
4	System Potential 1	2001	point sources, current
5	System Potential 1	2001	point sources, design
6	System Potential 2	2001	no point sources
7	System Potential 2	2001	point sources, current
8	System Potential 2	2001	point sources, design
9	System Potential 1	2002	no point sources
10	System Potential 1	2002	point sources, current

Sim No.	Current or System Potential	Year	Description
11	System Potential 1	2002	point sources, design
12	System Potential 2	2002	no point sources
13	System Potential 2	2002	point sources, current
14	System Potential 2	2002	point sources, design
15	Calibration	2001	with 20% boundary flow rate reduction
16	Calibration	2001	with 20% boundary flow rate increase
17	Calibration	2001	with upstream boundary flow rates set to NFMS biological opinion flow rates
18	Calibration	2001	with 5°C boundary temperature reduction
19	Calibration	2001	with 5°C boundary temperature increase
20	Calibration	2001	with no vegetative shade
21	Calibration	2001	with System Potential vegetative shade

Model output results are presented in three output formats; time series plots of flow and temperature at specific site locations, longitudinal temperature plots for a specific data, contour plots of temperature difference over time and space comparing results between two model scenarios. The model output results are described in more detail:

1. Time series output at each location in Table 2
 - Hourly temperature and flows
 - Daily 7-day moving average of daily maximum temperature and 7-day average flow

Table 2: CE-QUAL-W2 Model Scenario output locations, based on ODEQ (2003).

River Reach	Upstream Point Location	Downstream Point Location	River Mile Location for Output	Large Pt. Sources to be included in calibrated model	River	Landmarks	CE-QUAL-W2 Model	Model Seg	RM
5.1 – 0	Gage nr Clackamas	Mouth	5.1 Gage #2110		Clackamas	USGS14211010	Clackamas	117	5.07
23.4 – 5.1	River Mill Dam	Gage Nr Clackamas	23.2 Gage #2100		Clackamas	USGS14210000	Clackamas	2	22.22
Row R	Dorena Lake dam	Mouth	Row R RM 5.4 Gage #1555		Row River	USGS14155500	Coast/Middle	206	5.51
Fall Creek	Fall Cr Dam	Mouth	Fall Cr RM 6.1 Gage #1510		Fall Creek	USGS14151000	Coast/Middle	363	6.29
11.2-0	Fall Creek	Dexter	11.2		Middle Fork		Coast/Middle	283	11.14
11.2-16.8	Dexter Dam	Fall Creek	14.2 Gage #1500		Middle Fork	USGS14150000	Coast/Middle	263	13.95
20.8-0	Row R	Mouth	20.8		Coast Fork		Coast/Middle	57	20.18
					Coast Fork		Coast/Middle	51	21.28
29.4–20.8	Gage below Cottage Grove	Row R	u/s Cottage Grove POTW	Cottage Grove POTW	Coast Fork		Coast/Middle	4	29.03
187–171.8	MF/CF confluence	McKenzie R	187	Eugene POTW (MWMC)	Willamette		Coast/Middle	354	187.06
25.7 – 0	Fern Ridge Dam	Mouth	6.7 Gage #1700		Long Tom	USGS14170000	Long Tom	153	4.64
13.1–3.4	Hawthorne Br	Multnomah Ch	13.1	Wacker Siltronics, OMSI	Willamette		Lower Willamette	64	13.05
24.8–13.1	Clackamas R	Hawthorne Br	24.8	Tryon Creek POTW, Oak Lodge POTW, Kellogg Cr. POTW	Willamette		Lower Willamette	6	24.80
					Willamette		Lower Willamette	89	4.13
3.4–0	Multnomah Ch		3.4	Oregon Steel Mills	Willamette		Lower Willamette	85	6.13
13.7 – 0	Mohawk R.	Mouth	13.7	WeyCo Springfield	McKenzie		McKenzie	337	9.75
41.3 – 13.7	Vida	Mohawk R	41.3		McKenzie		McKenzie	150	37.99
59.8 – 41.3	South Fork	Vida	59.8		McKenzie	USGS14159500	McKenzie	4	60.39

35.7–24.8	Molalla River	Clackamas R	35.7	TriCities POTW, Blue Heron, West Linn Paper, Canby POTW	Willamette		Middle Willamette	338	35.72
54.9–35.7	Yamhill River	Molalla River	54.9	Wilsonville POTW, SP Newsprint, Newberg POTW	Willamette		Middle Willamette	198	55.09
84.1–54.9	Salem Gage	Yamhill River	84.1	Salem Willow Creek POTW	Willamette		Middle Willamette	4	84.69
109-84.1	Santiam R	Salem Gage	109		Willamette		Upper Willamette	508	108.60
119.4-109	Calapooia/ Albany Gage	Santiam R	119.4	Albany POTW, WeyCo Albany	Willamette		Upper Willamette	433	120.11
132.1-119.4	Marys River	Calapooia/ Albany Gage	132.1	Corvallis POTW	Willamette		Upper Willa mette	342	133.00
149-132.1	Long Tom R	Marys River	149	Halsey Fort James, Pope & Talbot, Evanite	Willamette		Upper Willamette	239	149.40
161.2–149	Harrisburg Gage	Long Tom R	161.2		Willamette		Upper Willamette	156	161.98
171.8–161.2	McKenzie R	Harrisburg Gage	171.8		Willamette		Upper Willamette	68	175.30

2. Longitudinal Plots for August 10, 2001
 - 7-day moving average of daily maximum temperature
 - The following model scenarios were compared:

Table 3: Longitudinal Plot Sensitivity Analysis Comparisons

Model Sensitivity Comparisons, Longitudinal Plots	Comparison Simulations
Sensitivity to point sources	3 vs. 5
Sensitivity to boundary flow rate (boundary flows adjusted +/- 20%):	1 vs. 15 and 16
Sensitivity to boundary temperature (boundary temps adjusted +/- 5°C)	1 vs. 18 and 19
Sensitivity to vegetative shade (System Potential shade vs. no vegetative shade)	1 vs. 20 and 21
Sensitivity to biological opinion flows – pre-bio opinion operation vs. post-biological opinion operation	1 vs. 17

3. Contour Plots over the each model reach and over the 2001 simulation time period
 - 7-day moving average of daily maximum temperature
 - The following model scenarios were compared:

Table 4: Contour Plot Sensitivity Analysis Comparisons

Model Sensitivity Comparisons, Contour Plots	Comparison Simulations
Sensitivity to point sources	3 vs. 5
Sensitivity to boundary flow rate reduction (boundary flow rates reduced 20%)	1 vs. 15
Sensitivity to boundary flow rate increase (boundary flow rates increased 20%)	1 vs. 16
Sensitivity to boundary temperature reduction (boundary temperatures reduced 5°C)	1 vs. 18
Sensitivity to boundary temperature increase (boundary temperatures increased 5°C)	1 vs. 19
Sensitivity to vegetative shade (System Potential shade vs. no vegetative shade)	21 vs. 20
Sensitivity to biological opinion flows – pre-bio opinion operation vs. post-biological opinion operation	1 vs. 17

Each model results section presents the figures with results from the furthest up stream reaches of the coast and Middle Forks of the Willamette River downstream to the Lower Willamette River with any modeled tributaries presented before each Willamette River Reach. The model reaches are presented in the following order:

- Coast/Middle Fork Willamette River
- McKenzie River
- Long Tom River
- Upper Willamette River
- Middle Willamette River
- Clackamas River
- Lower Willamette River

Time Series Comparisons

System Potential 1, 2001

System Potential 1 (ODEQ, 2003) was run for the summer of 2001 for three scenarios with varying discharges from the large point sources in the Willamette River system. The point sources were simulated as having no discharge, their current discharge in 2001, and their maximum permitted discharge. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of time series plots. There are four types of time series output for each of the 21 locations identified above in Table 2: continuous temperature, continuous flow, the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature, and the seven-day average of daily average flow.

Continuous Temperature




Figure 3: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 4: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 5: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 6: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 7: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 8: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 9: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 10: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.03




Figure 11: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 12: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 13: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 14: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 15: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 16: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 17: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 18: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 19: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 20: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6







Figure 21: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69







Figure 22: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 23: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 24: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 25: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 26: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 27: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 28: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Continuous Flow




Figure 29: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 30: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 31: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 32: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 33: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 34: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 35: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 36: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 37: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 38: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 39: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 40: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 41: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3







Figure 42: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 43: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 44: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 45: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 46: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 47: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 48: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 49: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 50: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 51: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 52: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 53: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 54: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature




Figure 55: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 56: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 57: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 58: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 59: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 60: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 61: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 62: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 63: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 64: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 65: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 66: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 67: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 68: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 69: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 70: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133.0




Figure 71: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 72: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 73: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 74: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 75: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72



Figure 76: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 77: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 78: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.80




Figure 79: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 80: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day average flow




Figure 81: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 82: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 83: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 84: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 85: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 86: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 87: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 88: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 89: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 90: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 91: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 92: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 93: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 94: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 95: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4



Figure 96: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133.0




Figure 97: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 98: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 99: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 100: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 101: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 102: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 103: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 104: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.80




Figure 105: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 106: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

System Potential 2, 2001

System Potential 2 (ODEQ, 2003) was run for the summer of 2001 for three scenarios with varying discharges from the large point sources in the Willamette River system. The point sources were simulated as having no discharge, their current discharge in 2001, and their maximum permitted discharge. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of time series plots. There are four types of time series output for each of the 21 locations identified above in Table 2: continuous temperature, continuous flow, the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature, and the seven-day average of daily average flow.

Continuous Temperature




Figure 107: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 108: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 109: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 110: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 111: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 112: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 113: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 114: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 115: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 116: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 117: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75





Figure 118: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64







Figure 119: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 120: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 121: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 122: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 123: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11







Figure 124: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6







Figure 125: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 126: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 127: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 128: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 129: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07







Figure 130: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 131: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 132: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Continuous Flow




Figure 133: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 134: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 135: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 136: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 137: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 138: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 139: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 140: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 141: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 142: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 143: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 144: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 145: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 146: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 147: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 148: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 149: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 150: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 151: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 152: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 153: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 154: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 155: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 156: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 157: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 158: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature




Figure 159: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 160: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 161: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 162: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 163: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 164: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 165: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 166: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 167: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 168: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 169: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the dai ly maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 170: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 171: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 172: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 173: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 174: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 175: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 176: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 177: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 178: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 179: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 180: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 181: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 182: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 183: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 184: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day average flow




Figure 185: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 186: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 187: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.13




Figure 188: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 189: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 190: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 191: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 192: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 193: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 194: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 195: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 196: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 197: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 198: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 199: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 200: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 201: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 202: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 203: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 204: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 205: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 206: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 207: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 208: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.80




Figure 209: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 210: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

System Potential 1, 2002

System Potential 1 (ODEQ, 2003) was run for the summer of 2002 for three scenarios with varying discharges from the large point sources in the Willamette River system. The point sources were simulated as having no discharge, their current discharge in 2001, and their maximum permitted discharge. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of time series plots. There are four types of time series output for each of the 21 locations identified above in Table 2: continuous temperature, continuous flow, the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature, and the seven-day average of daily average flow.

Continuous Temperature




Figure 211: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 212: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 213: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 214: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 215: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 216: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 217: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 218: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 219: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 220: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 221: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 222: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 223: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 224: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 225: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 226: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 227: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 228: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 229: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 230: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 231: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 232: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 233: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 234: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 235: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 236: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Continuous Flow




Figure 237: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 238: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 239: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 240: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 241: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 242: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 243: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 244: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 245: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 246: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 247: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 248: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 249: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 250: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 251: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 252: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 253: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 254: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 255: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 256: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 257: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 258: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 259: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 260: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 261: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 262: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature




Figure 263: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 264: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 265: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 266: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 267: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 268: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 269: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 270: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 271: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 272: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 273: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 274: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 275: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 276: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 277: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.40




Figure 278: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 279: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 280: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 281: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 282: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 283: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 284: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 285: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 286: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8`




Figure 287: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 288: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day average flow




Figure 289: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 290: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 291: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 292: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 293: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 294: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 295: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 296: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 297: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 298: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 299: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 300: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 301: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 302: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 303: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 304: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 305: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 306: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 307: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 308: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 309: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 310: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 311: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 312: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 313: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 314: Calibrated model and System Potential 1 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

System Potential 2, 2002

System Potential 2 (ODEQ, 2003) was run for the summer of 2002 for three scenarios with varying discharges from the large point sources in the Willamette River system. The point sources were simulated as having no discharge, their current discharge in 2001, and their maximum permitted discharge. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of time series plots. There are four types of time series output for each of the 21 locations identified above in Table 2: continuous temperature, continuous flow, the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature, and the seven-day average of daily average flow.

Continuous Temperature




Figure 315: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 316: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 317: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 318: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 319: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 320: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 321: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 322: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 323: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 324: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 325: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 326: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 327: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 328: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 329: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 330: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 331: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 332: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 333: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 334: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 335: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 336: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 337: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 338: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 339: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 340: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Continuous Flow




Figure 341: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 342: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 343: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 344: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 345: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 346: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 347: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 348: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 349: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 350: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 351: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 352: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 353: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 354: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 355: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 356: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 357: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 358: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 359: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 360: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 361: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 362: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 363: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 364: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 365: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 366: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) continuous flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature




Figure 367: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 368: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 369: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 370: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 371: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 372: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 373: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 374: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 375: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 376: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 377: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 378: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 379: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 380: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 381: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 382: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 383: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 384: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 385: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 386: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 387: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 388: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 389: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 390: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 391: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 392: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day average flow




Figure 393: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 394: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 395: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 396: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 397: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 398: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 399: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 400: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 401: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 402: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 403: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 404: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 405: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 406: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 407: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 408: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 409: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 410: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 411: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 412: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 413: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 414: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 415: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 416: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 417: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 418: Calibrated model and System Potential 2 (varying point source discharges) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow comparison for 2002 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Sensitivity to boundary flow rate

The sensitivity of the model to upstream boundary flows was examined by simulating the summer of 2001 and adjusting the upstream boundary flows by +/- 20%. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of time series plots. There are four types of time series output for each of the 21 locations identified above in Table 2: continuous temperature, continuous flow, the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature, and the seven-day average of daily average flow.

Continuous Temperature




Figure 419: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 420: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 421: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 422: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 423: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 424: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14






Figure 425: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 426: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 427: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39






Figure 428: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99






Figure 429: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 430: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64






Figure 431: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 432: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98






Figure 433: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 434: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 435: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11






Figure 436: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 437: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 438: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 439: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72






Figure 440: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22






Figure 441: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 442: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.80






Figure 443: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 444: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Continuous Flow




Figure 445: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 446: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 447: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 448: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 449: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 450: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 451: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29






Figure 452: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 453: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39






Figure 454: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 455: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 456: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64






Figure 457: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 458: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 459: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 460: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 461: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11






Figure 462: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 463: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 464: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09






Figure 465: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72






Figure 466: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 467: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 468: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 469: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 470: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature




Figure 471: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 472: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 473: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 474: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 475: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 476: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 477: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 478: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 479: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 480: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 481: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 482: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 9.75




Figure 483: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 484: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 485: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 486: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 487: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 488: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 489: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 490: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 491: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 492: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 493: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 494: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 495: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 496: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day average flow




Figure 497: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 498: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 499: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 500: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 501: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 502: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 503: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 504: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 505: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 506: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 507: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 508: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 509: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 510: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 511: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 512: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 513: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 514: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 515: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 516: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 517: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 518: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 519: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 520: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 521: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 522: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary flow (+/- 20%) 7-day moving average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Sensitivity to boundary temperature

The sensitivity of the model to the upstream boundary temperature was examined by simulating the summer of 2001 and adjusting the upstream boundary temperatures by ± 5 °C. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of time series plots. There are four types of time series output for each of the 21 locations identified above in Table 2: continuous temperature, continuous flow, the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature, and the seven-day average of daily average flow.

Continuous Temperature






Figure 523: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 °C) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 524: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 °C) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 525: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 526: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 527: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 528: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous te mperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 529: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29






Figure 530: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous te mperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 531: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39






Figure 532: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 533: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 534: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 °C) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64






Figure 535: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3






Figure 536: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 537: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 538: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 539: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11






Figure 540: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 541: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 542: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 543: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 544: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 545: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 546: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8






Figure 547: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 548: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Continuous Flow




Figure 549: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 550: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28






Figure 551: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 552: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 553: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 554: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 555: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 556: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 557: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 558: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 559: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 560: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 561: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 562: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 563: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 169.4




Figure 564: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 565: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 566: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 567: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 568: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 569: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 570: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 571: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 572: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 573: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 574: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature




Figure 575: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 576: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 577: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 578: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 579: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum te mperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 580: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 581: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 582: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 °C) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 583: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 584: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 585: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 °C) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 586: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 587: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 588: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 589: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 590: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 591: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 592: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 593: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 594: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 595: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 596: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 597: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 598: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 599: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM13.05




Figure 600: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day average flow




Figure 601: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 602: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 603: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 604: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (± 5 °C) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 5.51




Figure 605: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 606: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 607: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 608: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 609: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 610: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 611: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 612: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 613: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (± 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 614: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 615: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 616: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 617: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 618: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 619: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 620: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 621: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 622: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 623: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 624: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 625: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 626: Calibrated model compared with varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Sensitivity to vegetative shade

The sensitivity of the model to the varying vegetative shade was examined by simulating the summer of 2001 with no vegetative shade and System Potential vegetative shade. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of time series plots. There are four types of time series output for each of the 21 locations identified above in Table 2: continuous temperature, continuous flow, the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature, and the seven-day average of daily average flow.

Continuous Temperature




Figure 627: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 628: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28






Figure 629: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 630: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous te mperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51






Figure 631: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 632: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14






Figure 633: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 634: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06






Figure 635: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39






Figure 636: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 637: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 638: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64






Figure 639: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3






Figure 640: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 641: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 642: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 643: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11






Figure 644: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6






Figure 645: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69






Figure 646: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 647: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72






Figure 648: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22






Figure 649: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07






Figure 650: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 651: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05






Figure 652: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Continuous Flow




Figure 653: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 654: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 655: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.13




Figure 656: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 657: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 658: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 659: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 660: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 661: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 662: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99






Figure 663: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 664: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 665: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 666: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 667: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 668: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 669: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 670: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 671: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 672: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 673: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 674: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 675: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 676: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 677: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 678: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature




Figure 679: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 680: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 681: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 682: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 683: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 684: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 685: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 686: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 687: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 688: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 689: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 690: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 691: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 692: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 693: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 694: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 695: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 696: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 697: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 698: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 699: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 700: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 701: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 702: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 703: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 704: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day average flow




Figure 705: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 706: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 707: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 708: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 709: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 710: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 711: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 712: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 713: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 714: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 715: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 716: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 717: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 718: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 719: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 720: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 721: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 722: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 723: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 724: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 725: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 726: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 727: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 728: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 729: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 730: Calibrated model compared with varying vegetative shade, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Sensitivity to biological opinion flows

The sensitivity of the model to using the National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinion (NMFS BIOP) flows for the upstream boundary flow condition was examined by simulating the summer of 2001. The results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of time series plots. There are four types of time series output for each of the 21 locations identified above in Table 2: continuous temperature, continuous flow, the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature, and the seven-day average of daily average flow.

Continuous Temperature




Figure 731: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 732: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 733: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18





Figure 734: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51





Figure 735: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 736: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 737: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 738: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 739: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39





Figure 740: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99





Figure 741: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75





Figure 742: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64





Figure 743: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3





Figure 744: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98





Figure 745: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4





Figure 746: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133





Figure 747: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 748: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 749: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69





Figure 750: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09





Figure 751: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72





Figure 752: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22





Figure 753: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 5.07





Figure 754: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8





Figure 755: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 756: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Continuous Flow




Figure 757: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 758: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28





Figure 759: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18





Figure 760: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 761: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 762: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 763: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 764: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06





Figure 765: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39





Figure 766: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99





Figure 767: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75





Figure 768: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 769: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 770: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 771: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 772: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 773: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 774: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6





Figure 775: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69





Figure 776: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 777: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 778: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22





Figure 779: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07





Figure 780: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 781: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 782: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, continuous flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day moving average of daily maximum temperature




Figure 783: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 784: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 785: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 786: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 787: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 788: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 789: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 790: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 791: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 792: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 793: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 794: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 795: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 796: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 797: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 798: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 799: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 800: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 801: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 802: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 803: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 804: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 805: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 806: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 807: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 808: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily maximum temperature for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Daily seven day average flow




Figure 809: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 29.03




Figure 810: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 21.28




Figure 811: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River at RM 20.18




Figure 812: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Row River at RM 5.51




Figure 813: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 13.95




Figure 814: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River at RM 11.14




Figure 815: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for Fall Creek at RM 6.29




Figure 816: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 187.06




Figure 817: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 60.39




Figure 818: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 37.99




Figure 819: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the McKenzie River at RM 9.75




Figure 820: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Long Tom River at RM 4.64




Figure 821: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 175.3




Figure 822: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 161.98




Figure 823: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 149.4




Figure 824: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 133




Figure 825: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 120.11




Figure 826: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 108.6




Figure 827: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 84.69




Figure 828: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 55.09




Figure 829: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 35.72




Figure 830: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 22.22




Figure 831: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Clackamas River at RM 5.07




Figure 832: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 24.8




Figure 833: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 13.05




Figure 834: Calibrated model compared with NMFS Biological Opinion flows, 7-day average of the daily average flow for 2001 for the Willamette River at RM 6.13

Longitudinal Profile Comparisons

Sensitivity to Point Sources

System Potential 1 (ODEQ, 2003) was run for the summer of 2001 for two scenarios with varying discharges from the large point sources in the Willamette River system. The point sources were simulated with no discharge and their maximum permitted discharge. These results were then compared in a series of longitudinal profiles for each river reach modeled. All of the longitudinal plots show the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for August 10, 2001 (ODEQ, 2003) and begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream.




Figure 835: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River




Figure 836: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River




Figure 837: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River




Figure 838: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River




Figure 839: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River




Figure 840: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River




Figure 841: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River




Figure 842: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Sensitivity to boundary flow rate

The sensitivity of the model to upstream boundary flows was examined by simulating the summer of 2001 and adjusting the upstream boundary flows by +/- 20%. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of longitudinal profiles for each river reach modeled. All of the longitudinal plots show the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for August 10, 2001 (ODEQ, 2003) and begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream.




Figure 843: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River




Figure 844: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River




Figure 845: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River




Figure 846: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River




Figure 847: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River




Figure 848: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River




Figure 849: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River




Figure 850: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary flows (+/- 20%) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Sensitivity to boundary temperature

The sensitivity of the model to the upstream boundary temperature was examined by simulating the summer of 2001 and adjusting the upstream boundary temperatures by ± 5 °C. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of longitudinal profiles for each river reach modeled. All of the longitudinal plots show the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for August 10, 2001 (ODEQ, 2003) and begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream.




Figure 851: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 °C) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River




Figure 852: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 °C) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River




Figure 853: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River




Figure 854: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 °C) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River




Figure 855: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River




Figure 856: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River




Figure 857: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River




Figure 858: Calibrated model vs. varying boundary temperature (+/- 5 oC) longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Sensitivity to vegetative shade

The sensitivity of the model to the varying vegetative shade was examined by simulating the summer of 2001 with no vegetative shade and System Potential vegetative shade. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of longitudinal profiles for each river reach modeled. All of the longitudinal plots show the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for August 10, 2001 (ODEQ, 2003) and begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream.




Figure 859: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River




Figure 860: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River




Figure 861: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River




Figure 862: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River




Figure 863: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River




Figure 864: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River




Figure 865: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River




Figure 866: Calibrated model vs. varying vegetative shade longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Sensitivity to biological opinion flows

The sensitivity of the model to using the National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinion (NMFS BIOP) flows for the upstream boundary flow condition was examined by simulating the summer of 2001. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model in a series of longitudinal profiles for each river reach modeled. All of the longitudinal plots show the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for August 10, 2001 (ODEQ, 2003) and begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream.




Figure 867: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River




Figure 868: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River




Figure 869: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River




Figure 870: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River




Figure 871: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River




Figure 872: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River




Figure 873: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River




Figure 874: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow longitudinal profile comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Contour Plot Comparisons

The sensitivity of the model was tested by making specific changes to the model and comparing the results with the results from other scenarios. A comprehensive way to examine the model sensitivity is generate a contour plot of the difference between two model scenarios over an entire river reach and for the duration of the summer of 2001. The model scenario results were analyzed to generate the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for each model segment and for the whole simulation period. Then one model scenario temperature statistic was subtracted from another model scenario temperature statistic. The resulting change in temperature between the two scenarios (delta plot) was then plotted a contour plot with River mile along the x-axis and Julian day along the y-axis and color gradations representing the temperature differences between the two scenarios

Sensitivity to point sources

System Potential 1 (ODEQ, 2003) was run for the summer of 2001 for two scenarios with varying discharges from the large point sources in the Willamette River system. The point sources were simulated with no discharge and their maximum permitted discharge. The difference between the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for each scenario was then taken and plotted as contour plot for each river reach modeled (ODEQ, 2003). The contour plots begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream. Since there were no point sources discharges simulated in the Long Tom River and Clackamas River model reaches the difference between the two scenarios would be zero so no contour plots were generated.

Coast Fork Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
System Potential 1, Maximum Permitted Point Sources, Run 5 - No Point Sources, Run 3




Figure 875: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River

Middle Fork Willamette River
 7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
 System Potential 1, Maximum Permitted Point Sources, Run 5 - No Point Sources, Run 3




Figure 876: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River




Figure 877: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River

Upper Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
System Potential 1, Maximum Permitted Point Sources, Run 5 - No Point Sources, Run 3




Figure 878: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River

Middle Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
System Potential 1, Maximum Permitted Point Sources, Run 5 - No Point Sources, Run 3




Figure 879: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River

Lower Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
System Potential 1, Maximum Permitted Point Sources, Run 5 - No Point Sources, Run 3




Figure 880: Maximum Permitted Point Sources vs. No Point Sources contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Sensitivity to boundary flow rate reduction

The sensitivity of the model to a 20% reduction in upstream boundary flows was examined by simulating the summer of 2001 and comparing it to the calibrated model. The difference between the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for each scenario was then taken and plotted as contour plot for each river reach modeled (ODEQ, 2003). The contour plots begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream.

Coast Fork Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Reduction, Run 15 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 881: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River

Middle Fork Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Reduction, Run 15 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 882: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River

McKenzie River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Reduction, Run 15 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 883: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River




Figure 884: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River

Upper Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Reduction, Run 15 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 885: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River

Middle Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Reduction, Run 15 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 886: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River

Clackamas River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Reduction, Run 15 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 887: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River

Lower Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Reduction, Run 15 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 888: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow reduction (- 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Sensitivity to boundary flow rate increase

The sensitivity of the model to a 20% increase in upstream boundary flows was examined by simulating the summer of 2001 and comparing it to the calibrated model. The difference between the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for each scenario was then taken and plotted as contour plot for each river reach modeled (ODEQ, 2003). The contour plots begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream.

Coast Fork Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Increase, Run 16 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 889: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day ave average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River

Middle Fork Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Increase, Run 16 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 890: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River




Figure 891: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River




Figure 892: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River

Upper Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Increase, Run 16 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 893: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River

Middle Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Increase, Run 16 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 894: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River




Figure 895: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River

Lower Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Flow Increase, Run 16 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 896: Calibrated model vs. boundary flow increase (+ 20%) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Sensitivity to boundary temperature reduction

The sensitivity of the model to a 5 °C reduction in the upstream boundary temperature was examined by simulating the summer of 2001 and comparing it to the calibrated model. The difference between the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for each scenario was then taken and plotted as contour plot for each river reach modeled (ODEQ, 2003). The contour plots begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream.




Figure 897: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 °C) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River




Figure 898: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River

McKenzie River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Temperature Reduction, Run 18 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 899: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River




Figure 900: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River




Figure 901: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River




Figure 902: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River




Figure 903: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River




Figure 904: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature reduction (- 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Sensitivity to boundary temperature increase

The sensitivity of the model to a 5 °C increase in the upstream boundary temperature was examined by simulating the summer of 2001 and comparing it to the calibrated model. The difference between the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for each scenario was then taken and plotted as contour plot for each river reach modeled (ODEQ, 2003). The contour plots begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream.

Coast Fork Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Temperature Increase, Run 19 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 905: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River

Middle Fork Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Temperature Increase, Run 19 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 906: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River




Figure 907: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River




Figure 908: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River

Upper Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Temperature Increase, Run 19 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 909: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River




Figure 910: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River

Clackamas River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
Boundary Temperature Increase, Run 19 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 911: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River




Figure 912: Calibrated model vs. boundary temperature increase (+ 5 oC) contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Sensitivity to vegetative shade

The sensitivity of the model to the varying vegetative shade was examined by simulating the summer of 2001 with no vegetative shade and System Potential vegetative shade. The difference between the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for each scenario was then taken and plotted as contour plot for each river reach modeled (ODEQ, 2003). The contour plots begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream.

Coast Fork Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
No Vegetative Shade, Run 20 - System Potential Vegetative Shade, Run 21




Figure 913: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River




Figure 914: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River

McKenzie River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
No Vegetative Shade, Run 20 - System Potential Vegetative Shade, Run 21




Figure 915: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River




Figure 916: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River

Upper Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
No Vegetative Shade, Run 20 - System Potential Vegetative Shade, Run 21




Figure 917: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River




Figure 918: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River




Figure 919: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Clackamas River




Figure 920: No vegetative shade vs. System Potential vegetative shade contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Sensitivity to biological opinion flows

The sensitivity of the model to using the National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinion (NMFS BIOP) flows for the upstream boundary flow condition was examined by simulating the summer of 2001. These results were then compared with the results of the calibrated model. The difference between the seven-day moving average of the daily maximum temperature for each scenario was then taken and plotted as contour plot for each river reach modeled (ODEQ, 2003). The contour plots begin in the furthest upstream reaches of the watershed and move downstream. Since there were no NMFS Biological Opinion flows for the Clackamas River model reach the difference between the two scenarios would be zero so no contour plots were generated.

Coast Fork Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
NMFS BIOP Flows, Run 17 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 921: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Coast Fork Willamette River

Middle Fork Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
NMFS BIOP Flows, Run 17 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 922: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Fork Willamette River




Figure 923: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the McKenzie River

Long Tom River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
NMFS BIOP Flows, Run 17 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 924: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Long Tom River

Upper Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
NMFS BIOP Flows, Run 17 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 925: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Upper Willamette River

Middle Willamette River
7-day Moving Average of the Daily Maximum Temperature Difference
NMFS BIODIVERSITY FLOWS, Run 17 - Calibrated Model, Run 1




Figure 926: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Middle Willamette River




Figure 927: Calibrated model vs. Biological Opinion flow contour plot comparison, 7-day average of the daily maximum for August 10, 2001 for the Lower Willamette River

Summary

References

Annear, R. L.; McKillip, M. L.; Khan, Sher Jamal; Berger, C. J.; and Wells, S. A. (2004) "Willamette River Basin Temperature TMDL Model: Boundary Conditions and Model Setup," Technical Report EWR-01-04, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Portland State University, Portland, OR.

Berger, C. J.; McKillip, M. L.; Annear, R. L.; Khan, Sher Jamal; and Wells, S. A. (2004) "Willamette River Basin Temperature TMDL Model: Model Calibration," Technical Report EWR-02-04, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Portland State University, Portland, OR.

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (2003) "Willamette River TMDLs Mainstem Modeling Scenarios," Draft, August 13, 2003. 8 pgs.