

DNCT/EWA
Draft Committee-On-Games Meeting Minutes
8/17/99
9:30-12:30

Attendees:

Dave Fullerton, Bruce Herbold, George Barnes, Mike Fris, Karl Halupka, Dave Briggs, BJ Miller, David Forkel, Spreck Rosekrans, Jim Snow, Tom Boardman, Russ Brown, Tom Cannon, Ron Ott, Dale Flowers

Agenda:

Review and discuss Dave Fullerton's memo on future games.

List of Outstanding Gaming Issues

1. Do we include more years in simulation? Some argued to keep consist with the 5 years we have now. The majority felt that 15 years would be better to ensure we cover as many potential circumstances as possible. We decided to use 1981-1995. We debated including 96-99 or at least 99, but felt it was not necessary, although we would have more real-time data with these years.
2. Do we have the right assets, amount of assets; do we need more assets; how should they be shared? We decided to put the list together with options for the EWADT. We agreed to "meld assets to baseline". DWR, FWS, and NMFS will define. Water users want water provided by Accord+Upstream AFRP baseline + share in new assets.
3. Do we construct a game that satisfies everyone as much as possible? More a question of a fair distribution of the available assets.
4. Do we game with subgroups? Possibly, but not defined as yet.
5. Should we make "old" games the baselines for new games? Yes, where feasible and realistic, but always capable of comparison with baseline and historic.
6. Do we need more postprocessing? We agreed that we would provide more reports of output of the daily model. Russ has already made some progress toward this effort. For example he has a report on EWA storage assets.
7. Do we need to upgrade daily model in key areas? Yes. Russ has started on this.
8. Should we upgrade model to do our accounting that we did by hand? Russ agreed to include the accounting functions in his model.
9. Should we sequence games? Yes, in a logical order.
10. Should we make the games an iterative process - adjusting as we go? We can also stop and go back to the beginning of game making adjustments that make the game more realistic.

Something like back out of blind alleys. We should evaluate our decisions as we go - adjust game to correct deficiencies - make sure we are satisfying all parties as we go.

- 11. Should we use extremes in assumptions to develop bookends by have forks in the road and the model provide two answers? Some were concerned that there may be too many forks in the road and the bookends would be too far apart. Others felt there would only be one or two forks, and that would be manageable. The forks and degree of difference should be kept realistic so that the bookends are not too far apart.
- 12. Should we incorporate the ERP and AFRP water? Coordination among those is a given. Some felt we should not include b(2) because we don't know what the decision will be ("tar baby"), and we can't get involved in the decision. Others felt we should include what we think it will be (and be involved in the decision). FWS is trying to convert b(2) into identifiable assets that we could use. We concluded that we will make adjustments when the decision comes in September. For now b(2) should be part of baseline. B(2) assumptions? How do we build it into baseline? Concerns were expressed about amount of discretion on b(2) and its effect. Especially since b(2) is done as a fixed standard.
- 13. Should we include more real-time data in our gaming? We agreed to include beach seine and egg&larval data in our gaming evaluation process. A committee of the biologists will work toward this with help from Russ and TomC. Tom will get data from appropriate sources (e.g. BJ suggested Allison Britton for E/L survey data). Tom will provide salvage data summaries for all 15 years to committee. Russ will provide his salvage database that is in the daily model as well. Concern was expressed that egg and larval data were limited to a subset of years. Agreed to try to simulate factors relating to egg and larval distribution so we could predict info for non-survey years.
- 14. Should we use both the daily model and DWRSIM or CALSIM if it is available? Agreed that the daily model provides the information we need. Will continue to use DWRSIM and CALSIM to satisfy water users that accurate accounting is being done. CALSIM may be available in fall. More realistic CVP part in CALSIM by end of year.
- 15. What should we do about the demand/delivery issue? Agreed to have water supply subcommittee (George, Art, Russ, JimS, Tom, BJ) prepare monthly delivery table for the 15 years modeled. This would be hard-wired into model, but some flexibility would be defined.. Amounts would be built from actuals with consideration for new facilities and changes in demands (e.g. 30% increase in permanent crops since the 1980's). Also consider the shift in deliveries because of the Accord. Focus will be on deliveries for 87-92 drought period - whether deliveries can be several hundred TAF more than historical as Shuster predicted in his model. Was the extra deliveries due to new assets (e.g., San Felipe Unit). Agreed to have demand adjustable for weather (e.g., lower summer demands in 1999 than predicted by model). DWRSIM 95-level of demands may be too high, especially for CVP. Subcommittee will work with BOR on the CVP demands too make sure they are realistic. Agreed to compare monthly deliveries in the daily and DWRSIM models (Russ and George). Team will meet beginning on 8/18 and will report next Tuesday.
- 16. Should we look into delivery shifting and cutting? Subcommittee agreed to look into this. For example, discussion with MWD may find opportunities using East Side and other southern Cal reservoirs. Agreed to look into the effect of changing storage levels in San Luis and its effect on deliveries and shifting deliveries. Consider some pre-processing?

17. How should we use expanded Banks and how should its assets be shared? Should we use it in the fall or in dry years, or should we limit its use to wet winters?
18. What baseline should we use for showing effect on water supply for water users? Agreed to show comparison with supply generated by Accord + upstream AFRP.
19. Does the monthly model overestimate deliveries? We think yes. Daily model show that some deliveries are not possible. New physical assets will allow deliveries to catch up with monthly model delivery predictions. Water users are not as well off as they think based on predictions of the monthly models.
20. How will DNCT interact with EWADT? DNCT will provide input and support.
21. Should we check out assets with asset owners? EWADT will do that.

Next Meeting

Thursday meeting this week canceled to allow committees to get together and get some work done.
Will meet again next week.