

**DRAFT**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**DEFT-NoName Coordination Team (DNCT)**  
**October 19, 1998**  
**1:00pm to 5:00pm**

**Participants**

Jim White, Pete Chadwick, Bruce Herbold, BJ Miller, Dave Fullerton, George Barnes, Jim Snow, Curtis Creel, Peter Louie, Arthur Hinojosa, Grace Chan(phone), Russ Brown, Warren Shaul, Tom Cannon, Ron Ott, Dave Briggs(phone)

**Agenda:**

- i. Review of DEFT Scenario work.
- ii. NoName Input

**Action Items** (see highlighted items in context within text of notes below)

**Highlights**

- A. NoName presented output on benefits of their tools (new 300-400 TAF of water supply).
- B. NoName has not factored in potential benefits of flexibility of new tools or potential changes in demands from such things as water conservation or reclamation.
- C. Discussed scenario development and evaluation.
- D. Need for NoName to analyze more tools.
- E. Defined how daily and monthly models will evaluate scenarios.
- F. Need for daily and monthly models to work together to evaluate scenarios with daily and monthly models respectively.
- G. Many actions items identified.
- H. Agreed to begin looking at key issues.

**NoName Tool Development Progress - Dave B**

- For water supply they are developing linkages between tools.
- For WQ they have begun brainstorming ideas.
- Supply tools being analyzed include: Eastside Reservoir (MWD), internal demands, refined Madera Ranch groundwater project, raising Shasta level six feet (through structure operations, not raising dam) -
- Total new is 300--400TAF.
- Supply (AF) Analysis - Base: Accord + all AFRP:

critical period	without tools (AF)	with all tools* (AF)	with some tools*
1928-1934	3881	4202	3984

long term (73 yr)	5382	5766	5663
-------------------	------	------	------

\* all tools = Shasta raised, Delta Wetlands, Kern Water Bank, JPOD, ISDP, and Madera; some tools = without Shasta, Delta Wetlands, and Kern.

- Sensitivity analyses have been performed on DEFT tools (e.g., shift E/I in Fall from .65 to .45 costs about 160 TAF of water supply).

Discussion/Comments:

1. Dave F: Benefits of NoName tools go beyond just water supply: can be used as a means for saving fish or make water supply more effective. Delta Wetlands could be a useful tool to environment even without water yield benefits.
2. Bruce: May allow San Luis to be filled earlier with higher quality water.
3. Pete C: Doubts that enlarged Shasta could be a Stage 1 action. Dave B: stated USBR was optimistic for allowing a 6.5 ft increase max in maximum elevation with minor construction efforts on outlet gates.
4. B.J.: need to show results (benefits of tools) for Accord + only upstream AFRP, and for those tools that can be implemented in Stage 1. Most of our potential benefits for water supply and biol in Stage 1 are going to come from flex ops. The water supply tools will have even greater water supply benefits with flex ops.
5. Elise: Greater water supply and water supply reliability from the prescribed new tools will not be enough: we have to have other tools such as conservation.
6. Dave B: analyses assumes a constant demand level - does not include an demand level reduction tools being considered by CALFED.
7. Grace C: we have assumed 1995 level of development and future BMP, which seems reasonable.
8. Dave F: What if CALFED were to pay for 100 TAF of reclamation/conservation? Would NoName consider this?
9. Bruce/Elise: CALFED has a demand reduction element in their Common Program and it should be considered by NoName.
10. Grace C: NoName will not likely to do this.
11. Elise: NoName is an arm of CALFED and should be doing this.

12. George: concerned about how we consider such actions.
13. Dave F: CALFED will not likely fund actions that cost \$1000/AF to develop. Transfers may suppress demands and be more cost effective; these are considered either. **Action:** need guidance from management on demand reductions. CALFED could decide to boost Stage 1 funding for demand reduction to match losses in water supply from DEFT actions.
14. Pete C: CALFED need to be pushed to provide input to NoName on conservation actions. **Action:** Issue should be taken to management.
15. B.J.: Yes, but on the other side we are only considering reductions in exports to benefit env - we are not considering benefits of ERP.
16. Bruce: No, not the same. DEFT is focusing on fish problems left by holes in the Accord + ERP. We recognize we have come a long way with the Accord and ERP - there are just a few areas where the Accord does not work - the main one is export limitations to protect fish from entrainment - that is where DEFT is focusing.
17. B.J.: We should consider relaxations from the Accord because of benefits of ERP.
18. Bruce/Elise: We have - splittail is no longer on the playing board.
19. Ron: DEFT is developing and analyzing tools for fish; NoName should be doing the same level of development for water supply.
20. Bruce: NoName has to look at full list - and identify most flexible, not necessarily the most efficient in terms of water supply. Other tools dropped or not considered by NoName because they lack new yield should be considered by NoName if they provide some flexibility benefits, which have as yet not been quantified by NoName.
21. George: the model (DWRSIM) can be used to see what water supply actions can be matched up against the DEFT actions.
22. Bruce: San Luis is the bottleneck to focus on. Emphasis should be placed on the benefits potential.
23. George: Before Accord they used to try to fill San Luis by April 1; now they have less water to fill it because of Accord, but try to make it up by shifting upstream storage to San Luis as early as possible. It is a game the operators have to play each year. They try to optimize meeting their demands within the rules. Filling San Luis could occur later or

earlier depending on the tools and the rules.

24. Bruce: we still don't know which new tools will provide the most benefit.
25. George: It will take a lot of modeling and sensitivity analyses to test the tools.
26. Bruce: Extending VAMP to 60 days allows relaxing export restrictions beforehand to allow San Luis to be filled earlier.
27. Bruce: DEFT actions and associated operational rules are not be considered as yet by NoName. The flexibility provided needs to be figured in much like we did in 95-96.
28. Pete C: these flex features should add to benefits of the new operational rules.
29. Bruce: Yes, our new tools provide a lot of flexibility that should be factored in.
30. Grace C: Can we look at potential benefits of demand shifting?
31. George: Joint Point changes timing of demands. Don't know if this could provide biol benefits. We do show water supply benefits in our model runs for Joint Point, but we don't operate it for biol benefits - but we could.
32. Pete C: Bruce is saying that we have yet looked at the potential benefits of system flexibility. NoName tools could provide additional biol benefits from their flexibility even though they may not provide yield or even lose yield by providing the biol benefits. **Action:** DEFT needs to look at the larger NoName action list. No Name is not receiving enough input from DEFT.
33. B.J.: Russ's daily model should be used to evaluate flex operations and then provide feedback from his model to DWRSIM to evaluate effects on water supply. Russ should run the DEFT scenarios to show env benefits and export restrictions. Russ's model can simulate these new scenarios, whereas DWRSIM cannot.
34. George: We could look at some of the changes with DWRSIM if we get the changes in the right framework - such as a specific change in standards.
35. B.J.: Reiterated that flex ops gives more water supply to share and more hope of success in meeting all of our water supply and env objectives.
36. Elise: Reiterated that even more flex with the new tools.
37. Bruce: **Action:** the linkage from Russ's daily and George's monthly water should be

worked out immediately.

**Action:** George's Assignment:

- 1) Run Accord + AFRP (all) - E/I standards
- 2) Compare effects of fish triggers on exports between Russ and George.
- 3) Run constrained export conditions with inputs from Russ.
- 4) George will do his runs by next week

**Action:** B.J.'s Suggestions:

- 1) Russ and Peter L should start with actual daily Delta inflow for a year.
- 2) Apply flex op rules to generate daily exports - convert these to monthly exports.
- 3) George should then run DWRSIM using monthly exports as constraint and produce monthly flows.
- 4) Check monthly inflows against these of Russ (step 1).
- 5) Finally adjust daily inflows and repeat process.

**Action:** Dave B. Will look at other tools that may help fish.

**Action:** Dave F. Will look at water use efficiency and transfers as efficiency tools to help make better use of fish tools.

**Action:** DEFT will send 6 scenarios on Thursday to NoName.

**Action:** Russ's Assignment:

- 1) run scenarios for specific years
  - 2) translate into export constraints to input to George.
  - 3) prepare table showing tradeoffs
38. Bruce: Suggestion: with fewer delta smelt in population the greater the significance of export losses - thus we should not use the same trigger of salvage protection in every year. Triggers used by Russ are suitable only for 93 type population. **Action:** A variable trigger matrix should be developed by DEFT/Russ for delta smelt for our simulation.
39. Peter L: **Action:** Jim Snow should check out Russ's figures for operation realism.
40. Dave B: Difficulty for DWRSIM to model DEFT features. We need to develop biol variables in DWRSIM that work better.
41. Bruce: DEFT is trying to pullout modeling factors (e.g. wet vs dry year actions). Affects

should be developed as follows: flex ops actions >> Russ's model >> DWRSIM.

**Action:** DEFT will refine response variables that are consistent with George's model by next week.

**Action:** NoName should come back to DEFT with suggestions for refinements to scenarios and how to make actions consistent with DWRSIM needs. They will also help to define how we make up water in the amounts Russ's may identify.

**Action:** Russ will provide interpretive outputs that will make clear some of the factors for DWRSIM.

42. B.J.: The distribution of delta smelt in wet and dry years in the estuary - where does this come from?
43. B.J.: Suggested a subgroup of DEFT to look into indirect mortality and other important issues, and then refer these issues to DEFT.
44. Elise: questions on technical issues need to be framed in terms of hypotheses.

**Action:** B.J. agreed to develop an e-mail on issues.

45. Ron: Issues are to be worked on in 1999. Difficult in next 10 days.
46. Elise: summarized three DEFT types:
  - 1) relaxation of Accord rules
  - 2) more rigorous standards than Accord with rules for relaxation
  - 3) balancing as we go - up or down from Accord

**Ron's Summary:** NoName needs to do the same thing for water supply as DEFT did for env. Then combined scenarios will developed at DNCT and carried back to policy.

**Next Meeting:** Steering Committee - Thursday at 10 AM. DNCT next week Tuesday 9:30-12:30.