

DRAFT
Meeting Minutes
DEFT-NoName Coordination Team (DNCT)
September 29, 1998
1:00pm to 5:00pm

Participants

Jim White, Pete Chadwick, Bruce Herbold, Steve Roberts, Paul Fujitani, Serge Birk, Pete Rhoads, BJ Miller, Dave Fullerton, Dave Briggs, George Barnes, Peter Louie, Grace Chan, Rick Woodard, Tom Cannon, Ron Ott

George Barnes Presentation - Water Supply Studies

George summarized study results (see handout). He reviewed benefits of VAMP, E/I adjustments, and new storage. Discussion points follow:

- South of Delta storage
 - least effective in dry and critical year
 - carryover would help in dry years
- Joint Point of Diversion would reduce potential benefits and flexibility.
- Upstream or in-Delta storage may be more beneficial than south of Delta storage because it would not be as constrained by project facilities, and it can be captured quicker.
- Concerned about how environmental water would be used - as that would affect operations. Need to know.
- Extra demands actually provide more flexibility by freeing up San Luis storage.
- Joint Point and adjusting E/I don't require new facilities.
- ISDP, in-Delta storage, and new upstream or downstream storage provide more flexibility
- Relaxing E/I is about the only thing to provide new water without new storage.
- New storage is a great way to get enviro water, but cost and footprints are a problem.
- Issues that need resolution:
 - We have to determine how to share and use water.
 - Need to decide how much storage and where.
 - Biologists have to determine how much is needed.
 - Need to come up with rules that benefit fish, but have minimal affect on water supply.
- Need to determine Stage 1 actions for gaining water supply to make up for new restrictions.
 - new storage such as Delta wetlands
 - use of East Side Reservoir
 - reoperation of east San Joaquin reservoirs
 - water purchases
 - use existing south of Delta storage (San Luis, Los Vaqueros)
 - Kern water bank

- Semi-tropic
- Madera Ranch ground water
- other groundwater options
- Need to put forth several bundles of these options over the next several months.
- Requires analyses of each to determine how they would work and how much new supply we can obtain. NoName should provide these answers.

BJ Miller Presentation

Basic theme is that environmental water storage works.

Questions:

- When is it available to store and how much is available.
- How are our available array of storage facilities able to accommodate env storage
- Can new storage help.
- What are some reasonable bundling packages for handling this env water.
- How much water is needed under a wide array of conditions - targets.
- What specific benefits are we trying to achieve with the water.
- How specifically would the env water be used under a wide array of conditions.
- How much of the new stored water can be used for water supply.

NoName should help us address these questions by going to the people who run these facilities and finding constraints and costs, and potential feasibility. DEFT should define the need - how it would be used. DNCT should define how much of new water would go to env and water supply.

Goal should be no net effect on water supply.

Once we define some bundling options we should kick it up to Policy and Management to get their input and support.

Ron's Presentation - Charge from Management

Ron presented his charts (see handout).

- Need several operational scenarios for Stage 1 that address both env and water supply (DNCT)
- Need to define how we are going to evaluate these new scenarios (DEFT)
- Need to reconcile differences in the technical interpretations of the environmental assessments as to benefits to water supply and towards recovery of key species.
- By Oct 20 we need list of scenarios, plus benefits and impacts.
- By Nov 24 we need short list of scenarios with adequate evaluation of effects and certainty of recovery.
- Need weekly progress reports.

How are we going to accomplish this charge?

- Intuitive modeling
- Can't tell benefits and impacts exactly - but on a relative basis

Comments:

1. Scenarios will not fix all species.

BJ Miller's Baby Example

Our new scenarios should include:

- more stringent standards
- flex operations with fish triggers
- env water and sharing of new water supply

Steps in developing new scenarios:

1. Develop a trial set of flex operation rules and fish triggers - preferably on big 5 fish species (ds, cs, sb, sp, st) - tradeoffs among species
2. Estimate fish benefits and water supply impacts (from an Accord-only Base)
3. Adjustments and refinements to make up impacts to water supply (new supplies) and any problems among fish species.
 - start with existing facilities
 - add new facilities (storage etc.) To provide more water and flexibility.
4. Back to #2 to see if balanced out.
5. Determine if the tool is worthwhile.
6. If so, then determine how to use it.

Comments:

1. How can we model this.
2. Need a feeble pass through of this by Oct 24.
3. Need to test several of these scenarios.
4. Need to know how we would use any developed env water.
5. Flexible operations are only once aspect of a scenario: also need to include the following:
 - habitat actions
 - harvest actions
 - new standards
 - structural changes
 - operations changes
6. Need to define what species we are trying to trigger responses in.
7. Need a subset of DEFT to do this.
8. DEFT needs to define additional protection needed.
9. Whole DEFT should take a shot at priorities; smaller group should knock out scenarios.
10. Need DEFT buyin including inputs from ESA members. Get them to meetings.
11. Will water year type matter? Yes - actions would likely differ by water year.

Peter Louie Presentation

Presented cumulative frequencies of salvage densities. If we define a cutoff, then the plot will show trigger density. (e.g. 10% level identifies a trigger density of 0.1 smelt/TAF.

Comments:

1. We should manage on something other than salvage numbers to trigger action.
2. Fish triggers may be disruptive to system operations - we should consider system wide reoperation in our models to maximize effectiveness and flexibility.
3. Need a stabilizer to reduce instability in operations caused by our actions - (e.g. new storage is a stabilizer)
4. Pre-delivery is a stabilizer - need 100-300 TAF
5. Should look at upstream operations
6. Should look at system reoperations (e.g. San Luis reoperation)
7. Need operators help to do this and help us come up with most effective fish triggers.
8. Reoperation upstream and of San Luis may not help us get new water.
9. Crucial to get buy in from ESA agencies.

Russ Brown's Presentation

Russ presented real example of tool. Followed BJ's approach to apply a trigger, then see water cost and env benefit; feedback and adjust to make up deficit. Outflow is most limiting, thus we can add to env water supply simply by releasing more and exporting more if storage is available.

Comments:

1. Should include ESA actions in the 1993 and 94 examples so we account for these new actions. Could build these in if we so recommend. ESA impacts were higher than ours.
2. Russ has made a good start.

DNCT - Instructions to DEFT

- Prioritize operational fish protection actions for species and live stages
- DEFT should specify where env storage releases would have the greatest benefits.

DNCT - Instructions to NoName

- NoName to follow up on available storage in the candidates sites in Stage 1.
- Define operational actions to improve drinking water quality in Stage 1.
- Define ability of conveyance to transfer water.

BJ Miller Presentation on Salmon/Splittail Adult Equivalents

- Because salmon salvaged are all about same size, adult equivalent exercise is unnecessary.
- Splittail however have great difference in export size, thus adult equivalent approach has merit.

Comment: Bruce Herbold stated again problem with adult equivalent approach as for delta smelt:

because there is no stock recruitment relationship, we can't simply convert to adults. Mortality rate is highly variable from year to year.