DRAFT
DNCT Steering Committee
Meeting Notes
10/15/98
10:00am-12:00pm

Participants
Mike Thabault, Gary Stern, Pete Chadwick, Bruce Herbold, Elise Holland, Pete Rhoads, Dave Fullerton, George Barnes, Chet Bowling(phone), Curtis Creel, Dave Briggs(phone), BJ Miller(phone), Ron Ott

Agenda:
i. Scenarios.

Action Items
1. Dave F is to address scenario 1B.
2. Ron to change his overheads describing scenarios.

Highlights
I. Developed descriptions for scenarios.
II. Defined three types.
III. Defined new numbering system.
IV. Defined common objectives

Scenario Framework
i. Framework

Strict Standards + flex ops	Mixed	Relaxed Standards + flex ops

ii. General Scenario (Conceptual)

iii. Detailed Scenario (Specific) - Adequate evaluation done here for Nov 24th. Use flex tools developed by DEFT for export limitation, VAMP, and X2.

What scenarios will we present to management.
- rules and baselines
- range of scenarios

Dave F. expressed concern that this was too limited a set of tools.

Discussion of Ron's presentation to management

Water Quality
- WQ issues assigned to NoName - can expect modest improvements in Stage 1. EPA's new rules in 2002 will overlap with Stage 1. WQ improvements will affect water supply.

D-015235

Tradeoffs

- Certainty - "if I do this will it work"
- The more we build in flex, the less likely we are to get ESA assurances.
- The more faith we have in protections, the more faith we will have in meeting goals.
- The tighter the standards, the more assurances, and visa versa.
- Flexible operations will necessitate taking risks.
- We must balance potential returns/benefits with the risk.
- It shouldn't be necessary to have high fixed standards to have certainty and assurances.

ISDP

- All the facilities are needed to increase the SWP capacity.
- Agreed to accept the ISDP with its mitigation package.

South of Delta Storage

- instructed to take out Madera Ranch from Stage 1 package

Discussion of Scenario Charts

All have Common Objectives of improving WS, WQ, and Env.

Scenario #6

- Change Scenario #6 to 1A and 1B.
- 1A = fixed strict standards to relax; 1B = less strict standards

1. BJ is concerned that this approach implies that high env protection can only occur with strict standards.
2. Dave F stated that protection can be achieved in different ways: strict standards is only one way.
3. Bruce: how predictable protection is is important.
4. Mike T: Scenario 6 is conservative fixed standards with flex ops applied to meet other user needs (WQ & WS).
5. BJ: we need an solution that does not have this nasty tradeoff.
6. Pete R: scenario is ok if we tighten standards over time and water supply is increased.
7. Mike T: no problem with with concurrent approach. More flexibility early in stage 1 and more water supply later to balance the scenario.
8. Bruce: Early in Stage 1 heavy monitoring could allow serious relaxations to maintain water supply. Later we can add in new water supply and reduce the level of monitoring and amount of relaxation necessary to meet water user needs.
9. Pete C: kidding ourselves if we think that relaxation will match water lost to new standards. New water supplies are not reflected in our documents.
10. Dave F: Ok to have strict standards - but they should be acceptable (no risk of losing water supply). Make standards more stringent as water supply comes on line. Suggests two scenarios - (1A) one that shares benefits from flex; (1A) other shares in new water supply. Dave will come up with a 1b scenario.
11. Curtis: where does water supply go from flex ops and from new supply? Shared?

12. Mike T: He did not specify. He simply thought the following:
    - we would operate to standard
    - we would not specify how new water would be used.
    - flex ops would offset effects to water supply from standards.
    - water supply development tools would be applied independently - would not specify how to use water supply.
    - tools providing new water supply would have a separate judgement for sharing from flex operations.
13. Dave F: How flex operations and new supply benefits are shared are important features to be worked out in the scenarios.
14. Bruce: they are separate implementation issues for this scenario type.
15. Pete C: Implementation tools include water transfers, water conservation, new storage, new conveyance facilities, modification of standards, etc.

Scenario #5

- Scenario 5 becomes 3A
- Description: Develop substitute standards for E/I ratios.
- Ecomanager can restrict exports during a prescribed number of days for a specified total amount of water restriction that may vary with water supply or water year type.
- Day of shutdown normalized.
- Water users made whole by eliminating restrictions on other days. "Equates to the amount of water presently allocated to E/I ratios. Water obtained from eliminating E/I ratios equates to normalized amount of water from days curtailed."
- eliminate E/I's
- never apply more days curtailment than water gained by eliminating E/I's
- could take credits for relaxation in many ways - "other things".

Scenario #3

- Scenario 3 becomes 2A.
- Description: Use existing standards; develop new water supplies; first meet Delta AFRP; adjust standards based on new water supplies developed.
- Env water use determined by eco manager.

Scenario #2

- Scenario 2 becomes 2B.
- Description: same as 2A.
- Flex operations to reduce mortality at pumps
- Broader mortality reduction program where exporters get export credits for reducing mortality or increasing productivity elsewhere.

What is negotiable? What are features or factors that may vary in each Scenario?

1. Fixed export rates
2. Other standards (X2, etc)
3. Flex export standards

4. Export credits for improving non-export related fish survival or production
5. Sharing of water obtained from relaxed standards and new water supply
6. Access to and use of existing storage and conveyance facilities
7. Who pays for what
8. Who makes decisions to flex ops
9. The extent of regulatory certainties
10. Measures developed for new water supply.