

Average simulated and observed streamflows for each 7-day low-flow period are listed in Table 2-3 (1993 through 1996) for the gage near the mouth and Table 2-4 (1991 through 1996) for the gage near the wetland. In general, with the exception of 1995, the observed 7-day low flows exceeded the predicted 7-day low flows at both gages.

Table 2-3. Walker Creek at the mouth, 7-day low flows for water-years 1993 through 1996.

Water-Year	Observed Average Flow (cfs)	Calibrated Average Flow (cfs)	Difference (cfs)
1993	1.502	0.923	0.579
1994	0.987	0.833	0.154
1995	0.915	1.077	-0.163
1996	1.719	1.287	0.432
Average Difference	1.281	1.030	0.250

Table 2-4. Walker Creek near wetland, 7-day low flows for water-years 1991 through 1996.

Water-Year	Observed Average Flow (cfs)	Calibrated Average Flow (cfs)	Difference (cfs)
1991	1.208	0.786	0.422
1992	1.098	0.682	0.416
1993	0.800	0.666	0.134
1994	0.670	0.614	0.056
1995	0.256	0.750	-0.494
1996	0.896	0.870	0.026
Average Difference	0.656	0.725	-0.069

2.2.2.3 Des Moines Creek Low Streamflow

Two streamflow gages located in the Des Moines Creek watershed were used in the low-streamflow calibration review (see Figure 2-1). One of these streamflow gages was located near the mouth of Des Moines Creek, and the other gage (11c) was located further upstream.

Average simulated and observed streamflows for each 7-day low-flow period are listed in Table 2-5 (1992 through 1996) for the gage near the mouth and Table 2-6 (1991 through 1996) for gage 11c. In general, the observed 7-day low flows were close to the predicted 7-day low flows at the gage near the mouth, while the observed 7-day low flows at gage 11c exceeded the predicted 7-day low flows.

2.2.2.4 Summary

Low-streamflow analysis calibration review was performed for two gage locations in Miller, Walker, and Des Moines Creeks. Results generally indicated that calibrated low flows at the mouth of each stream were fairly good, while calibrated low flows at the upstream gages typically showed lower flows than observed flows. Groundwater conditions in each of the watersheds are somewhat speculative and may account for these discrepancies at the upstream gage locations.

AR 018521

