**An Analysis of Reservoir Levels in California (WIP)**

*Jeremy Chan, Fourth-Year Economics and Statistics Major*

**Table of Contents**

**1 Summary 2**

**2 Introduction 2**

**3 Methods 3**

3.1 Initial Data Cleaning and Inspection 3

3.2 Fitting a Time Series Model 3

3.3 Forecasting 5

**4 Results and conclusions 6**

4.1 Initial Data Cleaning and Inspection Results 6

* 1. Fitting a Time Series Model Results 7

4.3 Forecasting Results 9

**5 Code Appendix**  12

**1 Summary**

This report contains an analysis of water reservoir levels in 11 selected California reservoirs. The ultimate goal of the report was to provide a summary of the current reservoir storage as a percentage of total capacity and to provide a forecast of these values for the year of 2016. As the report was written in May of 2016, there are already some data points from 2016 which will be compared with the forecasted points. To accomplish the task, first the data was plotted and inspected. A stationary time series was then modeled and predictions made from the residuals of that model. Lastly, the forecasts were plotted and listed in the results section. Additionally, the model for each reservoir was used to predict 2014 and compared against actual values to further test the accuracy of the models.

**2 Introduction**

Since 2012, California has faced severe drought conditions, the likes of which the state has not seen since the 1970s. As not only the most populous state but also the state which produces the most food[[1]](#footnote-1), California faces unique challenges during a drought. It is, therefore, of great interest to track the level of drought which California faces and to make predictions on if and when the state will return to normal water levels.

According to the United States Geological Service, “a drought is a period of drier-than-normal conditions that results in water-related problems” resulting from “less than normal [rainfall] for several weeks, months, or years.”[[2]](#footnote-2) One key indicator of drought conditions is reservoir levels. During period of drought, reservoirs will The California Department of Water, provides reservoir information on 199 different reservoirs all throughout the state[[3]](#footnote-3). Of these, 199 reservoirs, eleven were selected for analysis in this report. The 11 that were selected were part of a group of 12 which the California Department of Water uses for their daily report on the conditions for “major reservoirs.”[[4]](#footnote-4) These 11 reservoirs create a fairly representative picture of the overall reservoir levels in California and have been a steady indicator of drought levels. Thus, it is of interest to analyze and predict the levels in these reservoirs.

All of the data from the remaining reservoirs was retrieved through a query function from the California Department of Water Resources through the California Data Exchange Center. The data for each reservoir’s capacity was queried at a monthly level, from the first recorded measurement to the most recent measurement of April 2016 and measured in acre-feet, with one acre-foot being equivalent to 325,851 gallons of water.

The ultimate goal of this report is to provide an overview of the selected reservoirs’ raw storage as a percentage of its capacity, provide a forecast of these values for the 2016 calendar year for each reservoir, and to compare each reservoir’s forecasted storage levels with the actual observations from 2016, up through the present time. To accomplish this, the first step is to retrieve, inspect, and clean the data which has been retrieved. Any outliers will be removed if they are deemed as incorrect readings and any non-stabilized variance will be corrected for. Additionally, if there are any reservoir readings which appear clearly non-linear, they will be adjusted for on a case-by-case basis.

The next step is to remove any deterministic component from each time series. Trend and seasonality will be removed and once stationarity has been established, a model will be fitted to the remaining residuals. From that model, a 12-month forecast for the calendar year of 2016 will be created. If the residuals from the model are normal, then a prediction interval will be provided in addition to the point forecasts.

Finally, the model will be evaluated against the actual values from 2016. Since 2016 is an El Niño year, the resultant models may not be accurate. As such, each model will also be used to forecast 2014 and compared against actual 2014 values to determine if the models are accurate for both El Niño and non-El Niño years.

**3 Methods**

In this section, the methods used for analysis is detailed. The analysis will be split into the following sections: Data Retrieval, Data Cleaning, Data Visualization, Removing Deterministic Components, Fitting a Time Series Model, and Forecasting. Due to the number of reservoirs that are being analyzed, all of the above tasks were combined into a single function in R which simplifies the actual coding analysis aspect of this report.

**3.1 Data Retrieval**

All of the data contained in this report was retrieved from the California Department of Water through the California Data Exchange Center (CDEC). To automate the retrieval of this data, the package “sharpshootR” was used. The package contains a function called CDECquery which retrieves the reservoir levels for a given reservoir between a certain date range and at a certain frequency.

For this report, the following 11 reservoirs were used as a representative sample of California’s overall reservoir levels (Reservoir abbreviations denoted in parentheses): Trinity Lake (CLE), Lake Shasta (SHA), Lake Oroville (ORO), New Melones (NML), Folsom Lake (FOL), Don Pedro (DNP), San Luis (SNL), Millerton Lake (MIL), Pine Flat (PNF), Castaic Lake (CAS), and Lake Perris (PRR).

The data was retrieved on a monthly basis spanning from when each reservoir was first opened up through April 2016. Each reservoir’s data contained the following: date and time of each observation, year of each observation, month of each observation, the raw reservoir storage, and the ID of each reservoir (the three letter reservoir abbreviation).

After retrieving the raw storage readings for each of these reservoirs, the capacity of all California reservoirs was retrieved from the CDEC[[5]](#footnote-5). From this table of reservoir capacities, the specific capacities for our reservoirs of interest were saved within R.

The raw reservoir storage was divided by each reservoir’s overall capacity, resulting in a percentage of capacity for each reservoir (henceforth referred to as a reservoir’s capacity level). Capacity level was used as the primary unit of observation for ease of interpretation. Since converting to percentage of capacity is a linear transformation, it should not affect the final results of the time series model and forecast.

Note: Each reservoir was stored in a list; moving forward, an individual item in this list will be referred to as a “reservoir object” which contains all of the data for a single reservoir including date and time of each observation, year of each observation, month of each observation, the raw reservoir storage, the ID of each reservoir (the three letter reservoir abbreviation), and the reservoir’s capacity level.

**3.2 Data Inspection**

After the data had been retrieved, each reservoir’s historic capacity levels were plotted to look for the following problems: inconstant variance, large number of NA values, any sharp trend changes in the data, and outliers in the observations. Following that step, notes were made on which reservoirs needed additional inspection based on immediate visual inspection.

If inconstant variance was found, a log transformation would have been introduced to stabilize the variance so that the time series could be properly modeled. However, no times series were found to have seriously inconstant variance.

To check for NA values, each reservoir had its total number of NA values summed up. If they had a NA values that were spaced at least two values away from another NA value, the value was handled by imputation (detailed in Section 3.4).

Sharp trend changes and outliers in the data were handled on a case-by-case basis. To address a sharp trend change, historical data was consulted to see if the change in trend was due to a statewide drought or water shortage. Additionally, that same time period was cross-checked with other reservoirs to see if there was a trend across the state. All sharp trend changes and outliers were explained by either historical water occurrences or documented changes to the reservoir, thus, no further transformation was required.

**3.3 Data Cleaning**

To clean the data, the aforementioned NA checking process was utilized. NAs which were found to be far enough away from each other were handled by imputation. Any NA values which did not fit this process were handled on a case-by-case basis and are described in the individual results (detailed in Section 4). Additionally, as there was only reservoir with a major drop not related to state-wide water conditions, the data for that reservoir was handled in a singular manner (detailed in its individual results in Section 4).

**3.4 Forecasting**

To forecast the 2016 calendar year for each reservoir, a generalized function was created which would take a reservoir object in as an input. The function (henceforth referred to as forecast.all) then works to derive a stationary time series and model that time series. Forecast.all was written in such a way that it will predict the calendar year for the latest month it has data for, e.g., if your latest observation is January 2017, it will predict all of 2017. For the purposes of this project, 2016 was the predicted year.

Forecast.all first generates a time series of reservoir capacity percentages based on the first January observation and the last December observation in preparation for using sum of harmonics to remove seasonality from the time series (this abbreviated series will be henceforth referred to as “year series”). After creating the time series, any missing values are imputed by calculating an average of the two previous and two following observations around the NA value. If there are less than two values before after the missing value, a simple average of the previous and next value is used.

Next, forecast.all removes any deterministic trends from the year series. First, a first-order difference operation is used to remove any trend. Next, a sum of harmonics operation is used to remove the seasonality from the year series and fit a model. The residuals are then obtained from the de-trended and de-seasonalized year series.

These de-trended residuals are then evaluated for stationarity using both the Kwiatkowski-Phillips-Schmidt-Shin (KPSS) test and the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) tests for stationarity. If the de-trended residuals are found to be not stationary by either of these tests, a warning is produced by forecast.all stating that the resultant series is not stationary, but the function continues the process of forecasting.

Next, the de-trended residuals are tested for independence using the Ljung-Box test for independence. If the de-trended residuals are found to be dependent, forecast.all produces a warning, indicating that other methods of de-trending the year series may be necessary.

After testing for independence, the de-trended residuals are tested for normality for the use of creating a prediction interval. The residuals are tested using the Shapiro-Wilk test and forecast.all will produce a warning if the residuals are found to be non-normal by this test. Additionally, a histogram of the residuals is produced, which is often a better indication of normality of the residuals. The histogram is displayed within the R plot panel. If the residuals are not normal, the prediction intervals may not be accurate.

Finally, the forecasting begins with forecasting the noise from the de-trended residual model. 12 periods corresponding to the 12 months of 2016 are forecasted at a 95% confidence level. The seasonal values are then fitted back onto the noise forecast, along with the upper and lower bound of the noise forecast, creating a 95% prediction interval. Finally, the seasonalized noise forecast and upper and lower seasonalized bounds are undifferenced, creating three vectors: a point forecast, an upper bound, and a lower bound.

Forecast.all then generates four separate time series: one with all of the observed values from the CDEC, one with the point forecast for 2016, one with the upper prediction bound for 2016, and one with the lower prediction bound for 2016. Finally, forecast.all produces a series of plots: the raw data, the cleaned data, the cleaned data with the forecast and prediction interval, and a zoomed-in view of the cleaned data, forecast, and prediction interval including the year predicted and the year prior.

The function thus returns four plots of the data, a histogram of the residuals, and a number of other objects (the fitted model, point forecast, lower prediction bound, upper prediction bound, and residuals) in text form to the user for analysis and presentation.

**3.5 Forecast Comparison**

As a method of analyzing the relative prediction power of the forecasting process, a separate forecasting function, forecast.2014 was created. Forecast.2014 is a replication of the forecast.all function, but it specifically creates a forecast for 2014, as 2014 was the last year without an El Niño and without any effects of the onset of an El Niño as 2015 had. This serves as a visual check to assess the predictive power of the forecasting process during non-El Niño years in comparison to its predictive power during El Niñoyears. After running each reservoir’s data through forecast.2014, the graphs were inspected in comparison to the 2016 predictions.

**4 Results**

The results section will be divided by individual reservoir for ease of finding specific reservoir forecasts. Please refer to the table of contents for a page numbers for each reservoir.


**4.1 Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE) Forecast Results**

**4.1.1 Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE) Data Retrieval**

Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE) data was retrieved from the CDEC using sharpshootR for the date range of October 1961 to April 2016 at a monthly level, totaling 655 observations. The raw reservoir storage was then divided by Trinity Lake’s capacity of 2,447,650 acre-feet of storage capacity to find the capacity percentage of every observation.

**4.1.2 Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE) Data Inspection**

Upon initial inspection, the data for Trinity Lake (shown below in **Figure 1**) did not appear to require any additional transformation or cleaning.




**Figure 1.** Raw data for Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE).

After checking for any NA values, none were found, meaning that no imputation was required for this reservoir. Sharp drops in the late 1970s, early 1990s, and early 2010s were accounted for by statewide drought conditions during those times. As such, the observations are recorded as intended and are not incorrect measurements.

**4.1.3 Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE) Data Cleaning**


No data cleaning was required for Trinity Lake capacity percentage observations. The cleaned data is presented below in **Figure 2**.



**Figure 2.** Cleaned data for Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE).

**4.1.4 Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE) Forecasting**


Using the forecast.all function, an ARMA(3,2) model was derived to fit the stationary data. The residuals are presented below in **Figure 3**.



**Figure 3.** Histogram of residuals from the ARMA(3,2) model fitted to Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE).

Based on the histogram, it appears that the residuals are mostly normal with a slightly right skew. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, normality is rejected, but the histogram demonstrates that the residuals are approximately normal. The 95% prediction intervals presented in **Figure 4** below may not be accurate, but should be

pretty close.



**Figure 4.** 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE). On the left is the observed data in the black with the point forecast in solid red and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines. On the right is the observed data in black with the point forecast in solid red lines with month markers and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines, zoomed in for the time span of 2015-2017.


As seen in the graph rightmost, the forecast for 2016 is accurate through January and February, but for March and April, the forecast generally underestimates the amount of water in the Trinity Lake Reservoir. The predictions for January and February are also low, but are still within the upper bound of the 95% prediction interval. The exact numerical values for the 2016 forecast are presented along with the first four months of actual data below in **Table 1.**

**Table 1.** Numerical values for 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE). Values reported as a percentage of total reservoir capacity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | Lower 95% | Point Forecast | Upper 95% | Actual |
| January | 17.47742 | 24.28285 | 31.08828 | 28.375421 |
| February | 22.05884 | 29.19314 | 36.32744 | 34.901395 |
| March | 27.22113 | 34.40041 | 41.57968 | 52.276224 |
| April | 31.02766 | 38.20834 | 45.38903 | 61.018405 |
| May | 30.89573 | 38.07831 | 45.26090 | - |
| June | 26.73980 | 33.93493 | 41.13006 | - |
| July | 20.99687 | 28.19806 | 35.39925 | - |
| August | 16.41748 | 23.62966 | 30.84184 | - |
| September | 14.17302 | 21.39087 | 28.60871 | - |
| October | 14.54228 | 21.76793 | 28.99359 | - |
| November | 17.24260 | 24.47274 | 31.70288 | - |
| December | 21.29829 | 28.53383 | 35.76937 | - |

**4.1.5 Trinity Lake Reservoir (CLE) Forecast Comparison**

To check the accuracy of the forecasting process for Trinity Lake Reservoir, the same modeling process was repeated for the 2014 year. The comparison between forecasts and 95% prediction interval is presented below in **Figure 5**.



**Figure 5.** 2014 and 2016 point forecasts and prediction intervals for Trinity Lake. On the left is the 2014 forecast and on the right is the 2016 forecast. For both graphs, the observed data is given in black, the point forecast is given by the solid red line with month markers, and the prediction interval is given by the dotted red line.

In comparison to the forecasts in 2016, the 2014 forecasts seem to overestimate the amount of water in the Trinity Lake reservoir. January through March of 2014 seem to fall within the 95% prediction interval, but the rest of the year is below the lower 95% bound. Thus, the forecasting process does not seem to fit very well for predicting Trinity Lake Reservoir’s water capacity levels in both


**4.2 Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA) Forecast Results**

**4.2.1 Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA) Data Retrieval**

Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA) data was retrieved from the CDEC using sharpshootR for the date range of October 1953 to April 2016 at a monthly level, totaling 751 observations. The raw reservoir storage was then divided by Lake Shasta’s capacity of 4,552,000 acre-feet of storage capacity to find the capacity percentage of every observation.

**4.2.2 Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA) Data Inspection**

Upon initial inspection, the data for Lake Shasta (shown below in **Figure 6**) did not appear to require any additional transformation or cleaning.




**Figure 6.** Raw data for Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA).

After checking for any NA values, two were found, at indexes 31 and 196. The large number of observations in between the two NA values allowed for imputation to create values at those indexes.

Sharp drops in the late 1970s, early 1990s, and early 2010s were accounted for by statewide drought conditions during those times. As such, the observations are recorded as intended and are not incorrect measurements.

**4.2.3 Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA) Data Cleaning**

No data cleaning was required for Lake Shasta capacity percentage observations. The cleaned data is presented below in **Figure 7**.



**Figure 7.** Cleaned data for Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA).

**4.2.4 Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA) Forecasting**


Using the forecast.all function, an ARMA(3,0) model was derived to fit the stationary data. The residuals are presented below in **Figure 8**.



**Figure 8.** Histogram of residuals from the ARMA(3,0) model fitted to Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA).

Based on the histogram, it appears that the residuals are mostly normal with a slightly right skew. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, normality is rejected, but the histogram demonstrates that the residuals are approximately normal. The 95% prediction intervals presented in **Figure 9** below may not be accurate, but should be

pretty close.



**Figure 9.** 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA). On the left is the observed data in the black with the point forecast in solid red and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines. On the right is the observed data in black with the point forecast in solid red lines with month markers and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines, zoomed in for the time span of 2015-2017.


As seen in the rightmost graph above, the forecast for 2016 has so far not been accurate in predicting the capacity levels for Lake Shasta. The model seems to consistently underestimate capacity levels for Lake Shasta through April.

**Table 2.** Numerical values for 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA). Values reported as a percentage of total reservoir capacity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | Lower 95% | Point Forecast | Upper 95% | Actual |
| January | 28.02210 | 36.86662 | 45.71115 | 51.53833 |
| February | 36.27259 | 45.24952 | 54.22646 | 60.76714 |
| March | 41.12166 | 50.10676 | 59.09186 | 88.45940 |
| April | 40.63212 | 49.62642 | 58.62072 | 92.99453 |
| May | 35.21288 | 44.20846 | 53.20403 | - |
| June | 26.84539 | 35.84112 | 44.83684 | - |
| July | 18.22264 | 27.21837 | 36.21411 | - |
| August | 14.78451 | 23.78025 | 32.77599 | - |
| September | 13.53565 | 22.53139 | 31.52713 | - |
| October | 14.33408 | 23.32982 | 32.32556 | - |
| November | 17.21553 | 26.21127 | 35.20701 | - |
| December | 21.88132 | 30.87706 | 39.87280 | - |

**4.2.5 Lake Shasta Reservoir (SHA) Forecast Comparison**

To check the accuracy of the forecasting process for Lake Shasta Reservoir, the same modeling process was repeated for the 2014 year. The comparison between forecasts and 95% prediction interval is presented below in **Figure 10**.



**Figure 10.** 2014 and 2016 point forecasts and prediction intervals for Lake Shasta (SHA). On the left is the 2014 forecast and on the right is the 2016 forecast. For both graphs, the observed data is given in black, the point forecast is given by the solid red line with month markers, and the prediction interval is given by the dotted red line.

In comparison to the forecasts in 2016, the 2014 forecasts seem much more accurate. Every observed value in 2014 falls within the 95% prediction interval or is almost exactly on the point forecast. Thus, the forecasting process seems to be more accurate in non-El Niño years than in El Niño years for Lake Shasta.


**4.3 Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO) Forecast Results**

**4.3.1 Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO) Data Retrieval**

Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO) data was retrieved from the CDEC using sharpshootR for the date range of October 1967 to April 2016 at a monthly level, totaling 583 observations. The raw reservoir storage was then divided by Lake Oroville’s capacity of 3,537,577 acre-feet of storage capacity to find the capacity percentage of every observation.

**4.3.2 Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO) Data Inspection**

Upon initial inspection, the data for Lake Oroville (shown below in **Figure 11**) did not appear to require any additional transformation or cleaning.




**Figure 11.** Raw data for Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO).

After checking for any NA values, none were found, meaning that no imputation or data cutting was necessary.

Sharp drops in the late 1970s, early 1990s, and early 2010s were accounted for by statewide drought conditions during those times. As such, the observations are recorded as intended and are not incorrect measurements.

**4.3.3 Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO) Data Cleaning**


No data cleaning was required for Lake Oroville capacity percentage observations. The cleaned data is presented below in **Figure 12**.



**Figure 12.** Cleaned data for Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO).

**4.3.4 Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO) Forecasting**


Using the forecast.all function, an ARMA(1,0) model was derived to fit the stationary data. The residuals are presented below in **Figure 13**.



**Figure 13.** Histogram of residuals from the ARMA(1,0) model fitted to Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO).

Based on the histogram, it appears that the residuals are mostly normal with a slightly right skew. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, normality is rejected, but the histogram demonstrates that the residuals are approximately normal. The 95% prediction intervals presented in **Figure 14** below may not be accurate, but should be

pretty close.



**Figure 14.** 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO). On the left is the observed data in the black with the point forecast in solid red and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines. On the right is the observed data in black with the point forecast in solid red lines with month markers and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines, zoomed in for the time span of 2015-2017.


As seen in the rightmost graph above, the forecast for 2016 has so far not been very accurate in predicting the capacity levels for Lake Oroville. Through April, the model has consistently underestimated capacity levels, with only January’s observation falling within the 95% prediction interval.

**Table 3.** Numerical values for 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO). Values reported as a percentage of total reservoir capacity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | Lower 95% | Point Forecast | Upper 95% | Actual |
| January | 25.61116 | 34.21714 | 42.82313 | 43.36963 |
| February | 31.22582 | 40.28758 | 49.34934 | 52.71034 |
| March | 36.98575 | 46.09568 | 55.20562 | 86.49259 |
| April | 39.46869 | 48.58385 | 57.69901 | 96.10589 |
| May | 35.83631 | 44.95204 | 54.06777 | - |
| June | 27.85548 | 36.97127 | 46.08706 | - |
| July | 20.61901 | 29.73480 | 38.85060 | - |
| August | 16.85860 | 25.97440 | 35.09019 | - |
| September | 15.43127 | 24.54706 | 33.66286 | - |
| October | 15.16527 | 24.28107 | 33.39686 | - |
| November | 16.73845 | 25.85425 | 34.97005 | - |
| December | 20.52142 | 29.63721 | 38.75301 | - |

**4.3.5 Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO) Forecast Comparison**

To check the accuracy of the model for Lake Oroville Reservoir, the same modeling process was repeated for the 2014 year. The comparison between forecasts and 95% prediction interval is presented below in **Figure 15**.



**Figure 15.** 2014 and 2016 point forecasts and prediction intervals for Lake Oroville (ORO). On the left is the 2014 forecast and on the right is the 2016 forecast. For both graphs, the observed data is given in black, the point forecast is given by the solid red line with month markers, and the prediction interval is given by the dotted red line.

In comparison to the forecasts in 2016, the 2014 forecasts appear to be much more accurate. Every observed value in 2014 falls within the 95% prediction interval with the predicted values with June, July, and August falling almost exactly on the point forecast. Thus, the forecasting process may be more accurate in non-El Niño years than in El Niño years for Lake Oroville.


**4.4 New Melones Lake Reservoir (NML) Forecast Results**

**4.4.1 New Melones Lake Reservoir (NML) Data Retrieval**

New Melones Lake Reservoir (NML) data was retrieved from the CDEC using sharpshootR for the date range of October 1975 to April 2016 at a monthly level, totaling 487 observations. The raw reservoir storage was then divided by New Melones Lake Reservoir’s capacity of 2,400.000 acre-feet of storage capacity to find the capacity percentage of every observation.

**4.4.2 New Melones Lake Reservoir (NML) Data Inspection**

Upon initial inspection, the data for New Melones Lake (shown below in **Figure 16**) did not appear to require any additional transformation or cleaning.




**Figure 16.** Raw data for Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO).

After checking for any NA values, none were found, meaning that no imputation or data cutting was necessary.

The low initial values, drops in the early 1990s, and drops in the early 2010s were accounted for by statewide drought conditions during those times. As such, the observations are recorded as intended and are not incorrect measurements.

**4.4.3 New Melones Lake Reservoir (NML) Data Cleaning**


No data cleaning was required for Lake Oroville capacity percentage observations. The cleaned data is presented below in **Figure 17**.



**Figure 17.** Cleaned data for New Melones Lake Reservoir (NML).

**4.4.4 Lake Oroville Reservoir (ORO) Forecasting**


Using the forecast.all function, an ARMA(1,3) model was derived to fit the stationary data. The residuals are presented below in **Figure 18**.



**Figure 18.** Histogram of residuals from the ARMA(1,3) model fitted to New Melones Lake Reservoir (NML).

Based on the histogram, it appears that the residuals are mostly normal with a slightly right skew. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, normality is rejected, but the histogram demonstrates that the residuals are approximately normal. The 95% prediction intervals presented in **Figure 19** below may not be accurate, but should be

pretty close.



**Figure 19.** 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for New Melones Lake Reservoir (NML). On the left is the observed data in the black with the point forecast in solid red and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines. On the right is the observed data in black with the point forecast in solid red lines with month markers and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines, zoomed in for the time span of 2015-2017.


As seen in the rightmost graph above, the forecast for 2016 was fairly accurate for January and February, but has underestimated capacity levels for March and April. January’s observation fell almost exactly on the point forecast, while February’s observation was slightly above the point forecast, continuing the trend of the models consistently underestimating capacity levels.

**Table 4.** Numerical values for 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for New Melones Lake (NML). Values reported as a percentage of total reservoir capacity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | Lower 95% | Point Forecast | Upper 95% | Actual |
| January | 10.791137 | 15.316986 | 13.670318 | 16.37167 |
| February | 11.702429 | 16.843336 | 21.98424 | 19.11267 |
| March | 11.508911 | 16.767981 | 22.02705 | 25.72267 |
| April | 11.706703 | 17.081779 | 22.45686 | 25.92083 |
| May | 12.060120 | 17.485482 | 22.91084 | - |
| June | 9.868835 | 15.316189 | 20.76354 | - |
| July | 6.631219 | 12.088226 | 17.54523 | - |
| August | 4.869878 | 10.331131 | 15.79238 | - |
| September | 4.381035 | 9.844155 | 15.30728 | - |
| October | 5.111567 | 10.575509 | 16.03945 | - |
| November | 6.636709 | 12.101014 | 17.56532 | - |
| December | 8.205855 | 13.670318 | 19.13478 | - |

**4.4.5 New Melones Lake Reservoir (NML) Forecast Comparison**

To check the accuracy of the model for New Melones Lake Reservoir, the same modeling process was repeated for the 2014 year. The comparison between forecasts and 95% prediction interval is presented below in **Figure 20**.



**Figure 20.** 2014 and 2016 point forecasts and prediction intervals for New Melones Lake Reservoir (NML). On the left is the 2014 forecast and on the right is the 2016 forecast. For both graphs, the observed data is given in black, the point forecast is given by the solid red line with month markers, and the prediction interval is given by the dotted red line.

In comparison to the forecasts in 2016, the 2014 forecasts surprisingly overestimate the true percentage capacity levels for the New Melones Lake Reservoir. Although January, February, and March fall within the 95% prediction interval, the rest of the year does not follow the forecast. Thus, the forecasting may not be the best fit for New Melones Lake Reservoir.


**4.5 Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL) Forecast Results**

**4.5.1 Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL) Data Retrieval**

Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL) data was retrieved from the CDEC using sharpshootR for the date range of October 1955 to April 2016 at a monthly level, totaling 727 observations. The raw reservoir storage was then divided by Folsom Lake Reservoir’s capacity of 977,000 acre-feet of storage capacity to find the capacity percentage of every observation.

**4.5.2 Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL) Data Inspection**

Upon initial inspection, the data for Folsom Lake (shown below in **Figure 21**) did not appear to require any additional transformation or cleaning.




**Figure 21.** Raw data for Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL).

After checking for any NA values, none were found, meaning that no imputation or data cutting was necessary.

The only major unexpected drop occurs in the late 1970s, which was a result of the statewide drought conditions during that time. As such, the observations are recorded as intended and are not incorrect measurements.

**4.5.3 Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL) Data Cleaning**


No data cleaning was required for Folsom Lake capacity percentage observations. The cleaned data is presented below in **Figure 22**.



**Figure 22.** Cleaned data for Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL).

**4.5.4 Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL) Forecasting**



Using the forecast.all function, an ARMA(1,3) model was derived to fit the stationary data. The residuals are presented below in **Figure 23**.



**Figure 23.** Histogram of residuals from the ARMA(1,3) model fitted to Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL).

Based on the histogram, it appears that the residuals are mostly normal with a slightly right skew. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, normality is rejected, but the histogram demonstrates that the residuals are approximately normal. The 95% prediction intervals presented in **Figure 24** below may not be accurate, but should be

pretty close.



**Figure 24.** 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Folsom Lake Reservoir (NML). On the left is the observed data in the black with the point forecast in solid red and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines. On the right is the observed data in black with the point forecast in solid red lines with month markers and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines, zoomed in for the time span of 2015-2017.



As seen in the rightmost graph above, the forecast for Folsom Lake underestimated capacity percentage levels for January through April of 2016. Not a single observation from 2016 even falls within the 95% prediction interval.

**Table 5.** Numerical values for 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL). Values reported as a percentage of total reservoir capacity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | Lower 95% | Point Forecast | Upper 95% | Actual |
| January | 18.63760 | 32.44900 | 46.26040 | 54.10061 |
| February | 27.94453 | 41.79150 | 55.63848 | 61.98106 |
| March | 39.37734 | 53.31724 | 67.25714 | 70.76469 |
| April | 49.44489 | 63.57261 | 77.70034 | 84.59048 |
| May | 47.98741 | 62.22871 | 76.47002 | - |
| June | 35.95113 | 50.26141 | 64.57168 | - |
| July | 26.30936 | 40.66163 | 55.01390 | - |
| August | 20.83794 | 35.21581 | 49.59369 | - |
| September | 14.86996 | 29.26346 | 43.65697 | - |
| October | 11.78026 | 26.18330 | 40.58635 | - |
| November | 12.98064 | 27.38951 | 41.79839 | - |
| December | 15.78775 | 30.20018 | 44.61262 | - |

**4.5.5 Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL) Forecast Comparison**

To check the accuracy of the model for Folsom Lake Reservoir, the same modeling process was repeated for the 2014 year. The comparison between forecasts and 95% prediction interval is presented below in **Figure 25**.



**Figure 25.** 2014 and 2016 point forecasts and prediction intervals for Folsom Lake Reservoir (FOL). On the left is the 2014 forecast and on the right is the 2016 forecast. For both graphs, the observed data is given in black, the point forecast is given by the solid red line with month markers, and the prediction interval is given by the dotted red line.

In comparison to the forecasts in 2016, the 2014 forecasts fit the observed values very well. All of the observed percentage capacity readings fall within the 95% prediction interval with July through October’s observations falling particularly close to the point forecasts for those respective months. Thus, the forecasting process appears to create well-fitting predictions in non-El Niño years, but not in El Niño years.


**4.6 Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP) Forecast Results**

**4.6.1 Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP) Data Retrieval**

Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP) data was retrieved from the CDEC using sharpshootR for the date range of October 1970 to April 2016 at a monthly level, totaling 547 observations. The raw reservoir storage was then divided by Don Pedro Reservoir’s capacity of 2,030,000 acre-feet of storage capacity to find the capacity percentage of every observation.

**4.6.2 Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP) Data Inspection**

Upon initial inspection, the data for Don Pedro (shown below in **Figure 26**) did not appear to require any additional transformation or cleaning.




**Figure 26.** Raw data for Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP).

After checking for any NA values, none were found, meaning that no imputation or data cutting was necessary.

The first major drop occurring in the late 1970s coincides with statewide drought conditions. The next drop also coincides with the statewide drought which took place from 1986-1992. The sharp increase in capacity percentage immediately following the low values in 1992 is associated with the 1992-1993 El Niño. Finally, the drop in the early 2010s is representative of current California drought conditions. As such, the observations are recorded as intended and are not incorrect measurements.

**4.6.3 Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP) Data Cleaning**


No data cleaning was required for Don Pedro capacity percentage observations. The cleaned data is presented below in **Figure 27**.



**Figure 27.** Cleaned data for Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP).

**4.6.4 Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP) Forecasting**



Using the forecast.all function, an ARMA(0,5) model was derived to fit the stationary data. The residuals are presented below in **Figure 28**.



**Figure 28.** Histogram of residuals from the ARMA(0,5) model fitted to Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP).

Based on the histogram, it appears that the residuals are mostly normal with a slightly right skew. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, normality is rejected, but the histogram demonstrates that the residuals are approximately normal. The 95% prediction intervals presented in **Figure 29** below may not be accurate, but should be

pretty close.



**Figure 29.** 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP). On the left is the observed data in the black with the point forecast in solid red and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines. On the right is the observed data in black with the point forecast in solid red lines with month markers and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines, zoomed in for the time span of 2015-2017.



As seen in the rightmost graph above, the forecast for Don Pedro underestimated capacity percentage levels for January through April of 2016. While January and February fell within the upper 95% prediction bound, March and April far exceeded the expectations of the forecast.

**Table 6.** Numerical values for 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP). Values reported as a percentage of total reservoir capacity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | Lower 95% | Point Forecast | Upper 95% | Actual |
| January | 31.81845 | 38.51913 | 45.21982 | 40.30926 |
| February | 33.63496 | 40.81791 | 48.00086 | 46.52000 |
| March | 34.20197 | 41.39491 | 48.58785 | 60.01458 |
| April | 37.20773 | 44.40217 | 51.59661 | 67.15256 |
| May | 39.81259 | 47.06435 | 54.31611 | - |
| June | 36.40955 | 43.72681 | 51.04407 | - |
| July | 30.96909 | 38.28635 | 45.60361 | - |
| August | 27.76446 | 35.08172 | 42.39898 | - |
| September | 26.01840 | 33.33566 | 40.65292 | - |
| October | 26.16421 | 33.48147 | 40.79873 | - |
| November | 27.82187 | 35.13913 | 42.45639 | - |
| December | 29.77831 | 37.09557 | 44.41283 | - |

**4.6.5 Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP) Forecast Comparison**

To check the accuracy of the model for Don Pedro Reservoir, the same modeling process was repeated for the 2014 year. The comparison between forecasts and 95% prediction interval is presented below in **Figure 30**.



**Figure 30.** 2014 and 2016 point forecasts and prediction intervals for Don Pedro Reservoir (DNP). On the left is the 2014 forecast and on the right is the 2016 forecast. For both graphs, the observed data is given in black, the point forecast is given by the solid red line with month markers, and the prediction interval is given by the dotted red line.

In comparison to the forecasts in 2016, the 2014 forecast was a relatively better fit to the observed values. While only January through March of 2014 stayed relatively close the point forecast, January through April stayed within the 95% prediction interval. The rest of the year was within a roughly 5% range of the edge of the prediction interval. In general, the forecasting process overestimated percentage capacity values in 2014, but overall seemed to be a better fit, at least through April. The fit of the forecasting process seems inconclusive.


**4.7 San Luis Reservoir (SNL) Forecast Results**

**4.7.1 San Luis Reservoir (SNL) Data Retrieval**

San Luis Reservoir (SNL) data was retrieved from the CDEC using sharpshootR for the date range of October 1968 to April 2016 at a monthly level, totaling 571 observations. The raw reservoir storage was then divided by San Luis Reservoir’s capacity of 2,041,000 acre-feet of storage capacity to find the capacity percentage of every observation.

**4.7.2 San Luis Reservoir (SNL) Data Inspection**

Upon initial inspection, the data for San Luis (shown below in **Figure 31**) did not appear to require any additional transformation or cleaning.




**Figure 31.** Raw data for San Luis Reservoir (SNL).

After checking for any NA values, none were found, meaning that no imputation or data cutting was necessary.

The historical levels of the San Luis Reservoir seem to have a relatively high variance, but the values make sense in the context of major California water events. As such, the observations are recorded as intended and are not incorrect measurements.

**4.7.3 San Luis Reservoir (SNL) Data Cleaning**


No data cleaning was required for San Luis capacity percentage observations. The cleaned data is presented below in **Figure 32**.



**Figure 32.** Cleaned data for San Luis Reservoir (SNL).

**4.7.4 San Luis Reservoir (SNL) Forecasting**

Using the forecast.all function, an ARMA(1,3) model was derived to fit the stationary data. The residuals are presented below in **Figure 33**.





**Figure 33.** Histogram of residuals from the ARMA(1,3) model fitted to San Luis Reservoir (SNL).

Based on the histogram, it appears that the residuals are mostly normal with a slightly right skew. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, normality is rejected, but the histogram demonstrates that the residuals are approximately normal. The 95% prediction intervals presented in **Figure 34** below may not be accurate, but should be

pretty close.

Note: The residuals from the ARMA(1,3) were not found to be independent, according to the Ljung-Box test. The following results may not be accurate.



**Figure 34.** 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for San Luis Reservoir (SNL). On the left is the observed data in the black with the point forecast in solid red and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines. On the right is the observed data in black with the point forecast in solid red lines with month markers and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines, zoomed in for the time span of 2015-2017.

As seen in the rightmost graph above, the forecast for San Luis Reservoir pretty consistently underestimated percentage capacity levels through April of 2016. While January and February were right around the very edge of the upper 95% prediction bound, March and April were beyond the bounds of the forecast, likely due to the unexpected increases rain which accompanies an El Niño year.



An interesting note for this model is that one value of the point forecast dipped below the 0% point. Further investigation is needed to determine why the predicted point forecast value for July manifested as such.

**Table 7.** Numerical values for 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for San Luis Reservoir (SNL). Values reported as a percentage of total reservoir capacity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | Lower 95% | Point Forecast | Upper 95% | Actual |
| January | 14.771423 | 25.112359 | 35.45330 | 33.95502 |
| February | 19.625931 | 31.834724 | 44.04352 | 43.53038 |
| March | 21.438043 | 33.720847 | 46.00365 | 51.87011 |
| April | 14.951787 | 27.441896 | 39.93200 | 46.87139 |
| May | 1.750393 | 14.391697 | 27.03300 | - |
| June | -9.449474 | 3.302547 | 16.05457 | - |
| July | -13.877799 | -1.044474 | 11.78885 | - |
| August | -8.159881 | 4.733271 | 17.62642 | - |
| September | -2.089157 | 10.848082 | 23.78532 | - |
| October | 5.451733 | 18.421496 | 31.39126 | - |
| November | 15.321399 | 28.315175 | 41.30895 | - |
| December | 26.296266 | 39.307780 | 52.31929 | - |

**4.7.5 San Luis Reservoir (SNL) Forecast Comparison**

To check the accuracy of the model for San Luis Reservoir, the same modeling process was repeated for the 2014 year. The comparison between forecasts and 95% prediction interval is presented below in **Figure 35**.



**Figure 35.** 2014 and 2016 point forecasts and prediction intervals for San Luis Reservoir (SNL). On the left is the 2014 forecast and on the right is the 2016 forecast. For both graphs, the observed data is given in black, the point forecast is given by the solid red line with month markers, and the prediction interval is given by the dotted red line.

The 2014 forecast seemed to be relatively closer than the 2016 forecast. In 2014, only three observations (May, June, and July) fell outside of the 95% prediction bounds, with March falling almost exactly in line with the point forecast. It is of note that were the 2014 forecast to be shifted ahead by one month, the shape of the forecast would more closely align with the observed values. Thus, the forecasting process seems to predict better in non-El Niño years for San Luis Reservoir.


**4.8 Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL) Forecast Results**

**4.8.1 Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL) Data Retrieval**

Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL) data was retrieved from the CDEC using sharpshootR for the date range of October 1941 to April 2016 at a monthly level, totaling 895 observations. The raw reservoir storage was then divided by Millerton Lake Reservoir’s capacity of 520,500 acre-feet of storage capacity to find the capacity percentage of every observation.

**4.8.2 Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL) Data Inspection**

Upon initial inspection, the data for Millerton (shown below in **Figure 36**) did not appear to require any additional transformation or cleaning.




**Figure 36.** Raw data for Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL).

After checking for any NA values, none were found, meaning that no imputation or data cutting was necessary.

The historical levels of the Millerton Lake Reservoir have a fairly large, but stable variance, meaning no transformation seems to be required. The sudden drop around 2006 is a result of an agreed upon draining of some of the reservoir capacity. It continues into a slightly larger decrease in capacity percentage in conjunction with the severe drought conditions of the early 2010s in California. As such, the observations are recorded as intended and are not incorrect measurements.

**4.8.3 Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL) Data Cleaning**


No data cleaning was required for San Luis capacity percentage observations. The cleaned data is presented below in **Figure 37**.



**Figure 37.** Cleaned data for Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL).

**4.8.4 Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL) Forecasting**



Using the forecast.all function, an ARMA(0,4) model was derived to fit the stationary data. The residuals are presented below in **Figure 38**.



**Figure 38.** Histogram of residuals from the ARMA(0,4) model fitted to Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL).

Based on the histogram, it appears that the residuals are mostly normal with a slightly right skew. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, normality is rejected, but the histogram demonstrates that the residuals are approximately normal. The 95% prediction intervals presented in **Figure 39** below may not be accurate, but should be

pretty close.



**Figure 39.** 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL). On the left is the observed data in the black with the point forecast in solid red and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines. On the right is the observed data in black with the point forecast in solid red lines with month markers and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines, zoomed in for the time span of 2015-2017.

According to the rightmost graph, the forecast for 2016 has been relatively accurate, as the observed values January, February, and April all fall within the 95% prediction interval. Despite being outside of the prediction interval, March’s observed value is extremely close to the edge of the prediction interval, so the model appears to be relatively accurate compared to some of the other reservoirs.



It is of note that the prediction interval for Millerton Lake is quite wide in comparison to many of the other reservoirs’ forecasts. The forecast band is, on average, about a 40% spread between the upper and lower bounds. More investigation may be required to understand why the band is so large, but an initial guess would be that the large, constant variance of historical observations would be a major contributing factor for an especially wide prediction interval.

**Table 8.** Numerical values for 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL). Values reported as a percentage of total reservoir capacity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | Lower 95% | Point Forecast | Upper 95% | Actual |
| January | 15.084098 | 34.34467 | 53.60523 | 40.02747 |
| February | 19.209684 | 38.49120 | 57.77271 | 51.39885 |
| March | 20.043931 | 40.87801 | 61.71208 | 66.37675 |
| April | 28.989956 | 50.55998 | 72.13000 | 56.59135 |
| May | 32.149083 | 53.80023 | 75.45138 | - |
| June | 15.720135 | 37.37128 | 59.02243 | - |
| July | -1.964849 | 19.68630 | 41.33745 | - |
| August | -7.394815 | 14.25633 | 35.90748 | - |
| September | -10.681035 | 10.97011 | 32.62126 | - |
| October | -5.701302 | 15.94985 | 37.60099 | - |
| November | 4.379901 | 26.03105 | 47.68220 | - |
| December | 13.930136 | 35.58128 | 57.23243 | - |

**4.8.5 Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL) Forecast Comparison**

To check the accuracy of the model for Millerton Lake Reservoir, the same modeling process was repeated for the 2014 year. The comparison between forecasts and 95% prediction interval is presented below in **Figure 40**.



**Figure 40.** 2014 and 2016 point forecasts and prediction intervals for Millerton Lake Reservoir (MIL). On the left is the 2014 forecast and on the right is the 2016 forecast. For both graphs, the observed data is given in black, the point forecast is given by the solid red line with month markers, and the prediction interval is given by the dotted red line.

Through April, the 2016 forecast for Millerton Lake Reservoir seems to do better, as three of the four observations fall within the 95% prediction interval, as opposed to only one observation falling in the prediction interval for 2014. However, the rest of 2014 falls within the prediction interval, so it remains to be seen if the 2016 forecast will be as accurate as the 2014 forecast. The results thus far are inconclusive, but the accuracy seems fairly high for non-El Niño years.


**4.9 Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF) Forecast Results**

**4.9.1 Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF) Data Retrieval**

Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF) data was retrieved from the CDEC using sharpshootR for the date range of December 1951 to April 2016 at a monthly level, totaling 773 observations. The raw reservoir storage was then divided by Pine Flat Lake Reservoir’s capacity of 1,000,000 acre-feet of storage capacity to find the capacity percentage of every observation.

**4.9.2 Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF) Data Inspection**

Upon initial inspection, the data for Pine Flat Lake (shown below in **Figure 41**) did not appear to require any additional transformation or cleaning.




**Figure 41.** Raw data for Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF).

However, after checking for any NA values, 10 values were found, meaning that some data manipulation was necessary to eliminate them.

The historical levels of the Pine Flat Lake Reservoir have a fairly large, but stable variance, meaning no transformation seems to be required. As such, the observations are recorded as intended and are not incorrect measurements.

**4.9.3 Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF) Data Cleaning**

To clean the data, the NA values had to be addressed. Finding the index of the NA values, the first 9 NA values were contained within the first 22 monthly observations, while the last one was at index 322. To correct for this, the first 22 values were dropped from the dataset and the last value was handled through imputation. The cleaned data is presented below in **Figure 42**.




**Figure 42.** Cleaned data for Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF).

As described above, the first 22 values have been left off of the time series and the NA value at index 322 was assigned a value by imputing the average of the preceding and following two months around the value.

**4.9.4 Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF) Forecasting**



Using the forecast.all function, an ARMA(2,0) model was derived to fit the stationary data. The residuals are presented below in **Figure 43**.



**Figure 43.** Histogram of residuals from the ARMA(2,0) model fitted to Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF).

Based on the histogram, it appears that the residuals are mostly normal with a slightly right skew. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, normality is rejected, but the histogram demonstrates that the residuals are approximately normal. The 95% prediction intervals presented in **Figure 44** below may not be accurate, but should be

pretty close.



**Figure 44.** 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF). On the left is the observed data in the black with the point forecast in solid red and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines. On the right is the observed data in black with the point forecast in solid red lines with month markers and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines, zoomed in for the time span of 2015-2017.



According to the rightmost graph, the 2016 forecast for Pine Flat Lake capacity percentage has been fairly accurate. The observation for January fell almost exactly on the point forecast and the observations for February through April all fell within the 95% prediction interval. Relative to most other reservoirs, the forecasts have been much more accurate, although the point forecast continues to underestimate capacity percentage, a trend among other reservoirs.

**Table 9.** Numerical values for 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF). Values reported as a percentage of total reservoir capacity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | Lower 95% | Point Forecast | Upper 95% | Actual |
| January | 5.969645 | 19.938474 | 33.90730 | 20.1894 |
| February | 9.362830 | 23.832846 | 38.30286 | 26.8816 |
| March | 14.569318 | 29.461059 | 44.35280 | 38.6927 |
| April | 25.423740 | 40.473891 | 55.52404 | 52.0303 |
| May | 22.264648 | 37.325024 | 52.38540 | - |
| June | 4.783456 | 19.868235 | 34.95301 | - |
| July | -8.555621 | 6.529245 | 21.61411 | - |
| August | -11.074077 | 4.013113 | 19.10030 | - |
| September | -11.705402 | 3.382046 | 18.46949 | - |
| October | -8.657315 | 6.430261 | 21.51784 | - |
| November | -4.823829 | 10.263816 | 25.35146 | - |
| December | 1.056789 | 16.144436 | 31.23208 | - |

**4.9.5 Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF) Forecast Comparison**

To check the accuracy of the model for Pine Flat Lake Reservoir, the same modeling process was repeated for the 2014 year. The comparison between forecasts and 95% prediction interval is presented below in **Figure 45**.



**Figure 45.** 2014 and 2016 point forecasts and prediction intervals for Pine Flat Lake Reservoir (PNF). On the left is the 2014 forecast and on the right is the 2016 forecast. For both graphs, the observed data is given in black, the point forecast is given by the solid red line with month markers, and the prediction interval is given by the dotted red line.

Through April, the 2016 forecast for Pine Flat Lake Reservoir seems to do around the same as the 2014 forecast, as both forecasts contain the actual observed values within the 95% prediction interval. The 2014 forecast, however, seems to do slightly better as the observed values seem closer to the point forecasts, on average, than the observed values in the 2016 forecast. Overall, the forecasting process seems to perform well.


**4.10 Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS) Forecast Results**

**4.10.1 Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS) Data Retrieval**

Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS) data was retrieved from the CDEC using sharpshootR for the date range of October 1974 to April 2016 at a monthly level, totaling 499 observations. The raw reservoir storage was then divided by Castaic Lake Reservoir’s capacity of 325,000 acre-feet of storage capacity to find the capacity percentage of every observation.

**4.10.2 Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS) Data Inspection**

Upon initial inspection, the data for Castaic Lake Reservoir (shown below in **Figure 46**) did not appear to require any additional transformation or cleaning.




**Figure 46.** Raw data for Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS).

However, after checking for any NA values, one was found at index 48. This observation will be handled by imputation as part of the forecasting process.

The historical levels of the Castaic Lake Reservoir have a fairly stable, if not small variance. No transformation seems required and the large drops in percentage capacity coincide with statewide drought conditions. As such, the observations are recorded as intended and are not incorrect measurements.

**4.10.3 Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS) Data Cleaning**


To clean the data, the NA value was addressed by the forecasting process. The value was imputed as an average between the previous two months and the next two months. The cleaned data is presented below in **Figure 47**.



**Figure 47.** Cleaned data for Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS).

**4.10.4 Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS) Forecasting**



Using the forecast.all function, an ARMA(1,3) model was derived to fit the stationary data. The residuals are presented below in **Figure 48**.



**Figure 48.** Histogram of residuals from the ARMA(1,3) model fitted to Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS).

Based on the histogram, it appears that the residuals are mostly normal with a slightly right skew. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, normality is rejected, but the histogram demonstrates that the residuals are approximately normal. The 95% prediction intervals presented in **Figure 49** below may not be accurate, but should be

pretty close.



**Figure 49.** 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS). On the left is the observed data in the black with the point forecast in solid red and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines. On the right is the observed data in black with the point forecast in solid red lines with month markers and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines, zoomed in for the time span of 2015-2017.



According to the rightmost graph, the 2016 forecast for Castaic Lake capacity percentage has not been very accurate. Only one observation has fallen within the 95% prediction interval and for all observations in general, the forecast seems to overestimate the percentage capacity levels.

**Table 10.** Numerical values for 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS). Values reported as a percentage of total reservoir capacity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | Lower 95% | Point Forecast | Upper 95% | Actual |
| January | 35.96631 | 46.77772 | 57.58914 | 34.15477 |
| February | 41.77378 | 53.14079 | 64.50779 | 25.86985 |
| March | 44.74639 | 56.11501 | 67.48363 | 41.10092 |
| April | 45.64465 | 57.14824 | 68.65184 | 54.63631 |
| May | 43.60664 | 55.20827 | 66.80990 | - |
| June | 42.83154 | 54.50456 | 66.17758 | - |
| July | 41.52016 | 53.24528 | 64.97041 | - |
| August | 40.49572 | 52.25893 | 64.02213 | - |
| September | 38.30407 | 50.09514 | 61.88620 | - |
| October | 39.36372 | 51.17518 | 62.98664 | - |
| November | 42.28336 | 54.10976 | 65.93616 | - |
| December | 47.29740 | 59.13475 | 70.97210 | - |

**4.10.5 Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS) Forecast Comparison**

To check the accuracy of the model for Castaic Lake Reservoir, the same modeling process was repeated for the 2014 year. The comparison between forecasts and 95% prediction interval is presented below in **Figure 50**.



**Figure 50.** 2014 and 2016 point forecasts and prediction intervals for Castaic Lake Reservoir (CAS). On the left is the 2014 forecast and on the right is the 2016 forecast. For both graphs, the observed data is given in black, the point forecast is given by the solid red line with month markers, and the prediction interval is given by the dotted red line.

For both 2014 and 2016, neither year’s forecasts seem to perform well at all. In 2014, only one observation fell within the 95% prediction interval, a pattern which 2016 has followed thus far. In both years, the forecasting process seemed to heavily overestimate the percentage capacity in Castaic Lake Reservoir. Thus, the forecasting process does not appear to work well for Castaic Lake in both El Niño and non-El Niño years.

It should be noted that there seems to be an unusual drop in percentage capacity for Castaic Lake in 2014. Further investigation should be performed to see if this drop was due to human intervention and whether the forecasts should be accordingly adjusted.


**4.11 Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR) Forecast Results**

**4.11.1 Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR) Data Retrieval**

Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR) data was retrieved from the CDEC using sharpshootR for the date range of October 1974 to April 2016 at a monthly level, totaling 499 observations. The raw reservoir storage was then divided by Lake Perris Reservoir’s capacity of 131,452 acre-feet of storage capacity to find the capacity percentage of every observation.

**4.11.2 Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR) Data Inspection**

Upon initial inspection, the data for Lake Reservoir (shown below in **Figure 51**) required some deeper inspection due to fluctuating variance and a sudden abrupt drop around 2005.



**Figure 51.** Raw data for Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR).

After further research, the sharp drop in 2005 was determined to have resulted from water drainage from Lake Perris which occurred over the course of several months. After consultation with a time series analysis professor, the choice was made to simply model Lake Perris’ percentage capacity levels based on post-2005 data to more accurately generate future forecasts.


The drop in the early 2010s is consistent with statewide drought conditions and thus, is recorded as intended.

A single NA value was found at index in the data, but that value is in the portion of the data which will not be included in the modeling process. Consequently, the NA value will not require imputation.

**4.11.3 Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR) Data Cleaning**

To clean the data, all data before and during the water drainage was dropped from the dataset. The new dataset included observations 378 through 499.

The cleaned data is presented below in **Figure 52**.




**Figure 52.** Cleaned data for Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR).

**4.11.4 Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR) Forecasting**

Before starting the forecasting process, it should be noted that because of the much smaller size of clean data for Lake Perris in comparison to other reservoirs, the forecast may be overfitted to recent observations and not accurately represent historical patterns.



Using the forecast.all function, an ARMA(0,2) model was derived to fit the stationary data. The residuals are presented below in **Figure 53**.



**Figure 53.** Histogram of residuals from the ARMA(0,2) model fitted to Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR).

Based on the histogram, it appears that the residuals are mostly normal with a slightly left skew. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, normality is rejected, but the histogram demonstrates that the residuals are approximately normal. The 95% prediction intervals presented in **Figure 54** below may not be accurate, but should be

pretty close.



**Figure 54.** 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR). On the left is the observed data in the black with the point forecast in solid red and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines. On the right is the observed data in black with the point forecast in solid red lines with month markers and the 95% prediction interval in dotted red lines, zoomed in for the time span of 2015-2017.



According to the rightmost graph, the 2016 forecast for Lake Perris has been extremely accurate. The prediction interval is relatively narrow in comparison to most other reservoirs and the four observations from 2016 are almost exactly in line with the point forecasts produced by this process.

**Table 11.** Numerical values for 2016 point forecast and 95% prediction interval for Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR). Values reported as a percentage of total reservoir capacity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | Lower 95% | Point Forecast | Upper 95% | Actual |
| January | 31.69491 | 35.73575 | 39.77659 | 35.99108 |
| February | 31.42529 | 35.48141 | 39.53753 | 34.25661 |
| March | 31.16766 | 35.31959 | 39.47152 | 36.11965 |
| April | 30.97247 | 35.12440 | 39.27633 | 35.99108 |
| May | 30.40648 | 34.55841 | 38.71034 | - |
| June | 30.68221 | 34.83414 | 38.98607 | - |
| July | 30.92457 | 35.07649 | 39.22842 | - |
| August | 29.92103 | 34.07296 | 38.22489 | - |
| September | 29.75921 | 33.91114 | 38.06307 | - |
| October | 30.43911 | 34.59104 | 38.74297 | - |
| November | 29.87313 | 34.02505 | 38.17698 | - |
| December | 29.27376 | 33.42569 | 37.57762 | - |

**4.11.5 Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR) Forecast Comparison**

To check the accuracy of the model for Lake Perris Reservoir, the same modeling process was repeated for the 2014 year. The comparison between forecasts and 95% prediction interval is presented below in **Figure 55**.



**Figure 50.** 2014 and 2016 point forecasts and prediction intervals for Lake Perris Reservoir (PRR). On the left is the 2014 forecast and on the right is the 2016 forecast. For both graphs, the observed data is given in black, the point forecast is given by the solid red line with month markers, and the prediction interval is given by the dotted red line.

Interestingly, the 2016 forecast seems to be much more accurate through the first four months of 2016 than the 2014 forecast was through the same point in the year. While January and February of 2014 fell in line with the forecast, the forecast overestimated the percentage capacity in Lake Perris for the rest of the year. It is interesting that in both 2014 and 2016, the forecasts were exceptionally flat in comparison to forecasts for other reservoirs. While the forecasting process appears to be accurate for 2016, more research is required before conclusively saying that the process works well in either El Niño or non-El Niño years.

1. http://www.ers.usda.gov/faqs.aspx [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. http://ca.water.usgs.gov/data/drought/ [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. http://cdec.water.ca.gov/misc/resinfo.html [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. http://cdec.water.ca.gov/cdecapp/resapp/getResGraphsMain.action [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. http://cdec.water.ca.gov/misc/resinfo.html [↑](#footnote-ref-5)