

General Scenario Issues

11-10-98

How to make up water supply reductions.

- reduce demand for exports from Delta
- purchase water
- relaxation of environmental standards
- add new water supply facilities

Who pays for new water supply facilities.

Scenario A: Features

1. Start with Accord + all AFRP
2. Set new more protective environmental standards to augment existing standards.
3. Set rules to relax environmental standards to expand exports.
4. All water made by relaxation of environmental standards goes to water supply.
5. Water created by new NoName Group actions goes to water supply.

Scenario A: Issues

1. With more protective environmental standards, achieving water supply goals may be difficult.
2. Could cause a reduction in water deliveries from the Delta.
3. Environment has no interest in new water supplies.
4. In-Delta effects of NoName actions must be addressed by implementation of new environmental standards.
5. Does not allow discretion in applying environmental standards.

Scenario B: Features

1. Start with Accord + all AFRP
2. Phase in new more protective environmental standards as environmental water supply is developed.
3. Set rules to relax environmental standards to expand exports.
4. Water supplies from new facilities are applied to meeting new environmental standards after which additional water supplies developed go to water users.

Scenario B: Issues

1. Assurance of species recovery is contingent on implementation of the NoName Group water supply actions because implementation of environmental standards is dependent on them.
2. In-Delta effects of NoName Group water supply actions must be addressed by implementation of environmental standards.
3. May not be able to give as good of assurances toward recovery until water supply tools are implemented.
4. Does not allow discretion in applying environmental standards.

Scenario C: Features

1. Accord + all AFRP minus E/I ratios
2. Water that would have been applied to E/I standard would go into an environmental water account that would then be applied at the discretion of the Eco manager. This water would have no storage priority.
3. Water supply and storage actually generated during a year by NoName Group actions is shared 50/50.
4. Eco Manager decides when and how to use water in the environmental water account.

Scenario C: Issues

1. Difficulty in defining the amount of environmental water.
2. New storage will be required to assure carryover of the environmental water account.
3. Difficulty in making environmental protection decisions on a real-time basis.

Scenario D: Features

1. Accord + all AFRP Actions minus Delta AFRP actions 1, 3, 5, 7, and 8.
2. Environmental water account is given contract amount of water supply based on water supply developed from NoName Group actions.
3. Annual allocation is a percentage of the contracted amount determined by hydrologic conditions.
4. Water that would have been applied to E/I standards that have been relaxed or eliminated by the Eco Manager would go into an environmental water account that would then be applied at the discretion of the Eco Manager. This water would have no storage priority.
5. The process for annual water allocation to the environment would be similar to that used for CVP/SWP contractors, and usually increases from December 1 to April 15.
6. NoName water supply actions for the purpose of contract allocation will assume to be used to implement AFRP In-Delta standards first. The In-Delta AFRP standards would not be implemented if no additional water supplies are developed.
7. Once In-Delta AFRP standards are met, new water supply would be shared.
8. The Eco Manager could use environmental water for any purpose (not necessary to do AFRP In-Delta actions first).

Scenario D: Issues

1. How will the initial environmental annual water supply be determined.
2. Adequacy of environmental protection.

3. Assurance of species recovery is contingent on implementation of the NoName Group water supply actions because implementation of environmental standards is dependent on them.
4. New storage will be required to assure carryover of the environmental water account.
5. Difficulty in making environmental protection decisions on a real-time basis.
6. Requires coordination of water supply and environmental protection contract water use.

Scenario E: Features

1. Baseline of Accord + Upstream AFRP minus E/I standards
2. Develop a set of experimental rules for export restrictions based on salvage (fish densities) at each of the export pumps. Eventually expand rules to include hydrologic

factors, and remote monitoring.

3. Water that would have been applied to E/I standard would be shared; that portion placed into an environmental water account would have no storage priority and would be applied to export curtailments.
4. Environmental water account is also given a contract amount of water supply based on water supply developed from NoName Group actions.
5. The process for annual water allocation to the environment would be similar to that used for CVP/SWP contractors, and usually increases from December 1 to April 15.
6. If water users take additional actions to reduce fish mortality from sources other than salvage, then exports could be increased to match losses avoided and water shared (e.g., screening other Delta diversions).

Scenario E: Issues

1. Using salvage may be too late, fish may have already been drawn into areas of higher mortality.
2. Fish may remain in the area of influence of pumps during curtailment. Salvage losses may increase upon resumption of pumping.

3. The opportunities to have multiple species and ecosystem benefits is less because triggers are specific to single species.
4. How will the initial environmental annual water supply be determined.
5. Adequacy of environmental protection.
6. Assurance of species recovery is contingent on implementation of the NoName Group water supply actions because implementation of environmental standards is dependent on them.
7. New storage will be required to assure carryover of the environmental water account.
8. Difficulty in making environmental protection decisions on a real-time basis.
9. Requires coordination of water supply and environmental protection contract water use.