

**Idaho Collaborative Cloud Seeding Program
2024-25 Winter Season
End of Season Report**

Prepared by

Idaho Power Company

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 Introduction/History	3
2.0 2024-25 Winter Season Meteorological Conditions	6
3.0 Cloud Seeding Operations	10
4.0 Target Control Analysis	15
5.0 Results	18
6.0 Conclusion	18

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Number of IPC ground generators impacting the basins by years since 2008	4
2 Nino 3.4 SST anomalies (1980 through Sept 2024)	6
3 Mid-September 2024 Plume of ENSO Predictions	7
4 Seasonal Precipitation (Oct 1, 2024 – Apr 30, 2025) for the PNW	9
5 Map of Central Mountains Cloud Seeding Project	10
6 Map of Northern Upper Snake Cloud Seeding Project	11
7 Map of Southern Upper Snake Cloud Seeding Project	11
8 Ground generator run time hours by month by basin	12
9 Ground generator run time hours by basin by month	12
10 Aircraft hours by month by basin	13
11 Aircraft hours by basin by month	13
12 Burn in Place (BIPs) Flares used by month	14
13 Ejectable (EJs) Flares used by month	14
14 Map of Target zones	17

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Years Cloud Seeding Conducted in Snake Basin	5
2 Water Year Monthly Divisions of Average Areal Precipitation	8
3 October 1, 2024 to April 30, 2025 Water Year Precipitation Percent Normal	8
4 Water Year 2025 Monthly Departure from Normal Mean Areal Temperature	8
5 Total number hours/flares used by basin WY 2025	15
6 WY 2025 Target Control results, plus basin averages	18

<u>Equations</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Precipitation percent change	16

Evaluation of the Operational Upper Snake River Cloud Seeding Program in Idaho, 2024-2025 Winter Season

1.0 Introduction/History

The following report was prepared by Idaho Power following the end of cloud seeding operations for the WY2025 cloud seeding season.

Cloud seeding has occurred in the Snake River Basin, in one format or another, since the late 1980s. Early operations were primarily conducted by North American Weather Consultants (NAWC) using lower elevation manually controlled AgI ground based generators (Table 1). These operations were taken over in the Upper Snake in 1996 by the High-Country RC&D (operated by Let It Snow-LIS), also using manual ground-based generators. In the early 1990s, Idaho Power Company (IPC) began investigating the potential of cloud seeding as part of its long-term water management strategy. After a comprehensive climatology study, a pilot project (WY1997) and considerable discussions with the State of Idaho, IPC began cloud seeding operations in the Payette River Basin with seven higher elevation, satellite controlled (remote) ground based generators and one contract aircraft (operated by Weather Modification International – WMI). IPC slowly expanded its operations in the Payette Basin as it saw the effectiveness of its operations. In 2008, IPC began collaborating with the HC RC&D to enhance their program in the Upper Snake. This collaboration was a 5-year pilot project that was part of the Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan (CAMP). The enhancement added remote ground-based generators at high elevations in the Upper Snake region to augment the LIS manually controlled ground generators. Additionally, IPC started working with the Western Wyoming RC&D to evaluate cloud seeding opportunities in western Wyoming. In 2011 IPC began working with the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) to develop a Weather Research and Forecasting model (WRF) based cloud seeding module (CSM) to provide guidance for cloud seeding operations and evaluate cloud seeding effectiveness. Beginning in 2013, IPC started working with the Big Wood Canal Company to use the Payette cloud seeding aircraft to seed in the Wood River Basin when it was not operating in the Payette. This effort was followed in 2015 by further expansion in the Boise, Wood and Upper Snake River Basins with additional remote ground generators and the addition of another aircraft for seeding in the Boise and Wood Basins. This expansion was made possible by collaborative effort with the Idaho Water Resources Board (IWRB), the counties and water users in the Boise and Wood Basins. 2016 saw further expansion in the Upper Snake with the addition of an aircraft and additional remote ground generators collaboratively supported by IPC, IWRB and water users. During January-March 2017, IPC participated in a National Science Foundation (NSF) funded research project in the Payette River Basin. The Seeded and Natural Orographic Wintertime clouds-the Idaho Experiment (SNOWIE) research project aimed to improve the cloud seeding module as

well as extend the scientific understanding of winter orographic clouds over complex terrain, and cloud seeding processes. Since the SNOWIE Project, numerous scientific journal articles have published based upon the SNOWIE research. Two of the higher impact articles were: 1) Preceding of the National Academy of Science, French et al 2018, Precipitation formation from orographic cloud seeding, stated "... first unambiguous evidence that glaciogenic seeding of a supercooled liquid cloud can enhance natural precipitation growth in a seeded cloud, leading to precipitation that would otherwise not fall within the targeted region." And 2) Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, Tessendorf et al 2018, A transformational approach to winter orographic weather modification research The SNOWIE Project, "measurements from SNOWIE aim to address long-standing questions about the efficacy of cloud seeding, starting with documenting the physical chain of events following seeding."

Cloud seeding operations in the Snake River Basin have grown over approximately 30 years with an emphasis on creating more water for water users. A detailed breakdown, by year since 2008, showing this growth for the Idaho Power/Idaho Collaborative Cloud Seeding program through the individual basins can be found in Figure 1 and Table 1 which shows the number of ground generators seeding the basins by year.




Figure 1: Number of IPC ground generators (GGENS) seeding basins by year since 2008.

Table 1: Years clouds seeding conducted in the Snake River Basin and the company's that conducted the operations (Since 1997).

Water Year	Payette	Boise	Wood	Northern Upper Snake	Southern/Eastern Upper Snake
1997	AI	*	*	LIS	*
1998	*	*	*	LIS	*
1999	*	*	*	LIS	*
2000	*	*	*	LIS	*
2001	*	*	*	LIS	*
2002	*	NAWC	*	LIS	LIS
2003	IPC	NAWC	*	*	LIS
2004	IPC	NAWC	*	LIS	LIS
2005	IPC	NAWC	*	*	LIS
2006	IPC	*	*	LIS	*
2007	IPC	*	*	LIS	*
2008	IPC	NAWC	*	LIS	LIS
2009	IPC	NAWC	*	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2010	IPC	*	*	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2011	IPC	NAWC	*	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2012	IPC	NAWC	*	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2013	IPC	*	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2014	IPC	NAWC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2015	IPC	IPC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2016	IPC	IPC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2017	IPC	IPC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2018	IPC	IPC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2019	IPC	IPC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2020	IPC	IPC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2021	IPC	IPC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2022	IPC	IPC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2023	IPC	IPC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2024	IPC	IPC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC
2025	IPC	IPC	IPC	LIS/IPC	LIS/IPC

* = No cloud seeding conducted
 IPC = Idaho Power Company
 NAWC = North American Weather Consultants
 LIS = Let it Snow
 AI = Atmospherics Inc

2.0 2023-24 Winter Season Meteorological Conditions

In the western United States, conditions in the Pacific Ocean appear to have a significant impact on winter temperatures and the type and amount of precipitation received in each region. El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) is one of the primary indicators of the temperature of Tropical Pacific waters. El Niño is the warm phase of ENSO and indicates that the 3-month average sea surface temperatures in the central and east-central Equatorial Pacific regions are 0.5 degrees C above or warmer than normal and generally indicates warmer than normal and drier than normal winter conditions in the Snake River Plain. ENSO-neutral indicates that the 3-month average sea surface temperatures in the central and east-central Equatorial Pacific regions are between 0.5 and -0.5 degrees C and do not typically indicate either warmer/cooler or wetter/drier than normal temperatures/precipitation. La Niña is the cool phase of ENSO and indicates that the 3-month average sea surface temperatures in the central and east-central Equatorial Pacific regions are 0.5 or more degrees C cooler than normal and generally indicates milder than normal and wetter than normal winter conditions in the Snake River Plain.

During the fall of 2024, observations indicated the tropical Pacific Ocean was in ENSO Neutral conditions (Figure 2).




Figure 2: SST anomalies of the tropical Pacific (figure by NOAA).

September 2024 model predictions indicated equal chances for La Nina and ENSO-neutral conditions during the fall of 2024 (Figure 3). For the winter of 2024-2025, models leaned toward a weak La Nina, then a return to ENSO-neutral for spring 2025.




Figure 3: ENSO forecast plume from the International Research Institute for Climate and Society and the NOAA Climate Prediction Center showing the ENSO forecast during the fall of 2024.

Forecasts were indicating an increased likelihood of near to slightly below normal temperatures through the cloud seeding period with the season’s precipitation being near- to a little above normal through the basin. These conditions came together to provide a cloud seeding season temperature that averaged 1.0 degree above normal in the Upper Snake reaches and 0.9 degrees above normal in the Middle and Lower Snake reaches. Precipitation was fairly uniform across the basin with the Upper Snake reaches averaging 86% of normal, while the Middle and Lower Snake reaches saw an average of 111% of normal precipitation (Figure 4, Tables 2, 3, and 4).

Tables 2, 3 and 4 were created using data sourced from the National Weather Service’s Pacific Northwest River Forecast Center (<https://www.nwrfc.noaa.gov/rfc/>).

**Table 2: Water Year 2025 Monthly Divisions Average Mean Areal Precipitation October 1, 2024 through April 30, 2025
Snake River**

DIVISION NAME	Oct		Nov		Dec		Jan		Feb		Mar		Apr	
	OBS (in)	% NORM	OBS (in)	% NORM	OBS (in)	% NORM	OBS (in)	% NORM	OBS (in)	% NORM	OBS (in)	% NORM	OBS (in)	% NORM
Henry's Fork River Basin	1.01	43	2.39	86	3.33	90	1.51	44	4.54	185	3.24	112	1.74	63
Upper Snake Tributaries	0.85	40	1.55	63	3.17	106	1.45	47	3.78	162	3.02	116	1.42	56
Upper Snake River Basin abv American Falls Dam	0.67	39	1.52	80	2.38	96	1.1	45	3.34	191	2.41	118	1.01	50
Middle Snake Tributaries	0.7	47	2.94	153	2.87	98	1.27	50	3.99	222	2.3	103	1.14	59
Malheur-Owyhee-Boise River Basins	0.65	55	2.6	164	3.33	141	1.1	52	4.08	292	1.73	98	0.93	59
Payette River Basin	1.04	49	6.21	183	5.15	101	2.67	62	7.35	244	3.83	105	0.85	31
Snake River Basin abv Hells Canyon Dam	0.65	46	2.43	136	2.91	114	1.2	51	3.8	237	2.06	105	0.87	49

**Table 3: October 1, 2024 to April 30, 2025 Water Year Precipitation Percent Normal
Snake River**

DIVISION NAME	OBSERVED (in)	NORMAL (in)	DEPARTURE (in)	PERCENT of NORMAL
Henry's Fork River Basin	17.7	20.4	-2.6	87
Upper Snake Tributaries	15.2	18.1	-2.8	84
Upper Snake River Basin abv American Falls Dam	12.4	14.4	-2	86
Middle Snake Tributaries	15.2	14.9	0.3	102
Malheur-Owyhee-Boise River Basins	14.4	12	2.4	120
Payette River Basin	27.1	24.3	2.8	112
Snake River Basin abv Hells Canyon Dam	13.9	13.4	0.5	104

**Table 4: Water Year 2025 Monthly Departures from Normal Mean Areal Temperatures (Deg F)
Snake River**

DIVISION NAME	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Seasonal
Henry's Fork River Basin	5.2	-0.6	7.2	-3.9	1.0	1.9	1.6	1.5
Upper Snake Tributaries	5.0	-2.2	5.5	-5.0	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.4
Upper Snake River Basin abv American Falls Dam	5.0	-1.4	6.1	-4.0	0.6	1.3	1.4	1.0
Middle Snake Tributaries	4.5	-1.2	5.8	-1.8	-1.2	0.9	1.8	1.0
Malheur-Owyhee-Boise River Basins	3.6	-1.2	5.1	-1.0	-1.5	1.2	2.6	1.0
Payette River Basin	3.6	-1.0	5.3	-1.3	-2.3	1.0	1.5	0.7
Snake River Basin abv Hells Canyon Dam	4.0	-1.3	5.3	-2.2	-1.0	1.2	2.0	0.9




Figure 4: Seasonal Precipitation (Oct 1, 2024–April 30, 2025) for the Pacific Northwest (figure by the Northwest River Forecast Center) shows below normal seasonal precipitation across most of the basin with a few sub-basins at or near normal.

3.0 Cloud Seeding Operations

During the WY2025 cloud seeding season, in the Central Mountains IPC operated 39 remote ground-based cloud seeding generators, 2 cloud seeding aircraft (operated by WMI), 1 automated surface observing system (ASOS), 2 radiometers and 11 high resolution precipitation gauges focusing on the Payette, Boise and Wood River Basins (Figure 5). Of the 39 remote ground-based cloud seeding generators, 32 were AgI generators and 7 were liquid propane (LP) generators. In the Upper Snake Basin, the High-Country RC&D (HC RC&D) operated 25 manual ground based cloud seeding generators (operated by Let It Snow), IPC operated 1 cloud seeding aircraft (operated by WMI) and 25 remote ground based cloud seeding generators, 1 ASOS, 2 radiometers and 2 high resolution precipitation gauges (Figure 6). As part of the collaborative efforts in the Upper Snake Basin, IPC provides its weather and cloud seeding operations forecasts and other scientific support to Let It Snow in support of its operation of manual ground generators.




Figure 5: Central Mountains Cloud Seeding Project




Figure 6: Upper Snake Cloud Seeding Project

3.1 Ground Generator Operations

Ground generators saw a little over 3000 hours in the season, with 1818 hours in the western project and 1210 in the eastern project during WY 2025 operations. Figure 7 shows the monthly trend as well as runtime hours by month, figure 8 shows a slightly different look at the ground generators operations with total hours by basin.




Figure 7: IPC Ground generator run time hours by month by basin.




Figure 8: IPC Ground generator run time hours by basin by month.

3.2 Aircraft Operations

Aircraft operations for the season saw 70 hours of operation by the two aircraft in the Western Project, while the Eastern Project aircraft saw 40 hours of operation, only having one aircraft in the Eastern Project limited the number of hours flown as often seedable conditions occurred at the same time in multiple locations in the project which forced us to focus on one area over another. Figures 9 and 10 show the number of hours flown by month and by basin. Figures 11 and 12 show the number of flares used by month and basin.




Figure 9: Aircraft hours by month by basin.




Figure 10: Aircraft hours by basin by month.




Figure 11: Burn in Place (BIPs) Flares used by month.




Figure 12: Ejectable (EJs) Flares used by month.

3.3 Total Operations

Total operations for the year were below normal for ground generators and aircraft operations. This year conditions were quite variable but proved to be very successful when the right conditions were located. Table 5 shows the total number of hours/flares used in basin during the WY2025 cloud seeding season.

Table 5: Total hours/flares

	Payette		Boise		Wood		Henry's Fork		Upper Snake	
	2025	Average	2025	Average	2025	Average	2025	Average	2025	Average
Agl GGENS	559	790	793	955	466	577	438	570	772	1025
LP GGENS	515	N/A	28	N/A	38	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
A/C Hours	22	52	32	50	16	22	18	26	22	26
BIPs	38	250	70	223	42	88	22	115	48	117
Ejs	95	1472	673	1361	275	564	524	510	437	421

4.0 Target Control Analysis

4.1 Target Control Methodology and Data

The statistical technique used in this analysis is the "target" and "control" comparison (T/C). Dr. Arnett Dennis describes this technique in his book entitled "Weather Modification by Cloud Seeding (1980)". This technique is based on the selection of a parameter that would be affected by seeding (e.g., liquid precipitation, snowpack, or streamflow). Data for the parameter(s) of interest is collected for a historical period (during which seeding did not occur in the basins of interest) for as many years as possible. The data is divided into "target" area data and "control" area data. Target sites are those expected to be affected by cloud seeding. The control sites are those outside of the areas expected to be affected by cloud seeding operations. Preferably control sites should be selected in an area meteorologically analogous to the target area. These data are evaluated for the same seasonal period as seeding is conducted.

The target and control data sets from the unseeded seasons are used to develop a statistical relationship that estimates the amount of precipitation (or other selected parameter) in the target area, based on precipitation observed in the control area. This relationship is usually expressed as an equation (normally from a linear regression). This equation is then applied to the seeded period to estimate what the target area precipitation would have been without seeding, based on the precipitation observed in the control area(s). This method allows for a comparison between the predicted target area "natural" precipitation and the "observed/actual" precipitation that was observed during the seeded period. This target and control technique works well where a good historical correlation can be found between target and control area precipitation. An equation indicating perfect correlation would have an r value of 1.0, but in natural systems this seldom if ever occurs. For precipitation and snowpack assessments, a correlation coefficient (r) of 0.90 is acceptable as it would indicate that over 80 percent of the variance (r²) in the historical data set

would be explained by the regression equation used to predict the parameter (expected precipitation or snowpack) in the seeded years. Generally, the goal is to develop a relationship that has a correlation coefficient (r) of 0.95 accounting for 90 percent of the variance (r²) in the historical data. Data source for the data used is from the USDA/NRCS SNOTEL/Snow Course network.

The steps for developing the T/C are as follows:

- Collect period of record SNOTEL/Snow Course data from NRCS sites within the target area that represents the basin.
- Collect period of record SNOTEL/Snow Course data from NRCS sites within the control area that represents the basin.
- Separate the data into two sets, one representing the period prior to cloud seeding in the target area (historic) and the other representing the period since cloud seeding commenced.
- Using the data from the period prior to cloud seeding, develop a linear regression where the average (pooled) value from the control sites is regressed against the average (pooled) value from the target sites to produce a regression coefficient plus an intercept value.
- For each of the years since cloud seeding began, using precipitation for the control area calculate the target area precipitation using the developed regression coefficient and intercept value. This will be the expected precipitation in the target area if cloud seeding had not occurred.
- Calculate (equation 1) the difference between “expected” (unseeded) and observed (seeded) basin precipitation values and convert into a percentage to estimate the percent difference in basin precipitation attributable to cloud seeding. A positive % would indicate an increase in precipitation in the seeded basin.

Equation 1: Precipitation percent change

$$\% \text{ change} = \left(\frac{\text{ObservedPRECIP} - \text{ExpectedPRECIP}}{\text{ExpectedPRECIP}} \right) * 100$$

Note 1: This technique can be applied to most parameters of interest in the T/C analysis (i.e., precipitation, snow water equivalent, snow depth, etc.), selection of which parameter to use is generally determined upon the available data set length/quality.

Note 2: The T/C analysis can be conducted upon a multitude of time spans, from monthly to seasonal. Length of analysis dependent upon the available data set length/quality and if acceptable statistical relationships can be developed.

4.2 Locations for Target Control Analysis

The Snake River Basin is divided in sub basins based upon areas targeted for precipitation enhancement. This season those basins have been further divided to better represent where cloud seeding benefits are being seen, these new target control basins were shown in last years end of year report and are illustrated in Figure 14. The basins going forward will be:

Western Project:

WP1 - Middle and South Forks of the Payette River Basin

WP2 - Mores Creek, Middle and North Forks of the Boise River Basin

WP3 - Southern Boise River Basin

WP4 - Big Wood River and Camas Creek

WP5 - Little Wood River

Eastern Project:

EP1 - Mud Lake

EP2 - Henrys Fork and Fall River

EP3 - Teton River

EP4 - Upper Snake River North

EP5 - Gros Ventre River

EP6 - Upper Snake River South




Figure 14: Map of Target/Control zones

5.0 Results

Target control is a statistical model used here to estimate cloud seeding benefits. Results from target control are best interpreted as a long-term average, shown in Table 6. In the Payette, the 22 year average benefit has been a 9.8% increase. Over a 12 year period the Boise and Wood basins saw an 8.7% and 8.1% average benefit respectively. In eastern Idaho, Henry’s Fork and the Upper Snake saw a 4.9% and 8.3% average benefit, respectively.

Table 6: Water Year 2025 target control results as well as the average basin benefit for the period of operations (period of operations shown in Table 1).

November 1 - April 1			
Zones	Basin	Years	Average Benefit
WP1	Payette	2003-2025	9.8%
WP2	Boise	2013-2025	9.1%
WP3	Boise	2013-2025	8.3%
WP4	Wood	2013-2025	7.7%
WP5	Wood	2013-2025	8.5%
EP1	Henry's Fork	2008-2025	4.1%
EP2	Henry's Fork	2008-2025	5.7%
EP3	Upper Snake	2008-2025	9.1%
EP4	Upper Snake	2008-2025	8.2%
EP5	Upper Snake	2008-2025	8.3%
EP6	Upper Snake	2008-2025	7.4%

6.0 Conclusion

Water year 2025 had its challenges in regard to cloud seeding. Starting with November, although temperatures were cooler than average for the month and mean areal precipitation was 123% across the project area, conditions didn’t quite come together for ground-based seeding. A lot of the time this was due to winds not being in the direction to transport seeding material into the target area. December also saw minimal ground-based seeding. Winds again were a factor, but the main issue was the monthly temperature being 5.7°F above normal through the project area. January had the most success in regard to generators thanks to the temperature being 2.7 °F below normal. However, the mean areal precipitation was only 50% of normal. February had near normal temperatures and 216% of normal mean areal precipitation. However, in February operations were suspended due to extreme avalanche risk for 2 days. March was a good month

for both aircraft and ground generators with near normal temperatures and precipitation. April aircraft seeding ceased; however, ground generators ran a fair amount.

In the end, an average positive benefit continues across all years of seeding with an 8.7% increase in the Central Mountains (Payette 9.8%, Boise 8.7%, and Wood 8.1%) and 7.1% increase in the entire Upper Snake (Henry's Fork 4.9%, and Upper Snake 8.3%).