



Bryce Contor <bcontor.uidaho@gmail.com>

Water budget files in incoming folder on FTP site

2 messages

Stacey L Taylor <tayls1@if.uidaho.edu>

Tue, Jun 8, 2010 at 2:40 PM

To: Allan Wylie <allan.wylie@idwr.idaho.gov>

Cc: Bryce Contor <bcontor.uidaho@gmail.com>, Rick Raymondi <Rick.Raymondi@idwr.idaho.gov>

Hi Allan,

So NOW the new water budget files (dating to today – 6-8-2010) are uploaded to the incoming box on the FTP website. This includes the correct NIR file that Bryce has been working on.

Stacey

Stacey L. Taylor*Research Hydrologist***Idaho Water Resources Research Institute**

1776 Science Center Drive

Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Tel: (208) 282-7759

Fax: (208) 282-7950

tayls1@if.uidaho.edu

Bryce Contor <bcontor.uidaho@gmail.com>

Tue, Jun 8, 2010 at 2:48 PM

To: Stacey L Taylor <tayls1@if.uidaho.edu>, Allan Wylie <allan.wylie@idwr.idaho.gov>, Rick Raymondi <Rick.Raymondi@idwr.idaho.gov>

Great Stacey, thanks.

"Different" may be a better word than "Correct." It uses the ESPAM1.1 algorithm which has three advantages:

- 1) It matched the spatial distribution of precipitation;
- 2) It more or less matched the gross volume of non-irrigated recharge that Garabedian used, which happened to balance both his water budget and the ESPAM1.1 budget (almost).
- 3) It attempts to achieve theoretically correct relationships between precip and recharge, including snow accumulation and snow melt.

Its big disadvantages are:

- 1) It makes no allowance for differences in intensity and duration of storms within a given month.
- 2) Except for the "maximum abstraction" calculations that confirmed the transition to a linear relationship, the USGS' water-budget residual work is the only indication we have of the actual amount of recharge.

B

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Bryce Contor
Research Hydrologist
Idaho Water Resources Research Institute
University of Idaho
Idaho Falls Center
(208) 282-7846
