

**DNCT/EWA**  
**Draft Meeting Minutes**  
**7/22/99**  
**9:00-11:30**

**Attendees:**

Mike Fris, Karl Halupka, Pete Chadwick, Pete Rhoads, Art Hinojosa, Dave Fullerton, BJ Miller, Jim Buell, Matt Vandenburg, Russ Brown, Tom Cannon, Ron Ott, Guy Masier, Dale Flowers

**Agenda:**

1. **More Conclusions**
2. **EWA Implementation Planning**
3. **Structure of "now to November"**

**Salmon Evaluation - Jim White**

Jim presented a handout showing results of further analysis including comparison of Newman-Rice, Pathway, and Geibel model runs.

- some cases where salvage increased due to EWA actions
- 1995 Problem - EWA and Baseline exported more than historically because had to make up debt in San Luis in winter. Also model results were simulated from daily model as DWRSIM could not run 1995.
- 

C: Two issues: (1) how well EWA performed over baseline; and (2) how much did we accomplish with EWA versus what happened historically. We should address these questions separately. A broader series of years should be evaluated to effectively address question #2. We also need to have some goal for recovery to address both questions.

C: Newman-Rice and Pathway models provide consistent and similar results, as compared to Geibel which has erratic results.

Q: Do exports influence the survival of Sacramento salmon? R: Results indicate EWA has little effect on Sacramento salmon.

C: The fraction of Sacramento salmon at risk to export effects may be so small as to be insignificant.

R: We have an index of direct and indirect mortality that is hard to relate to population effects. Indirect mortality may be an important issue.

Q: Why not consider ocean tag returns in the model rather than just Chipps returns? R:

C: Different management approaches are dictated for role of DCC and export pumps.

Q: What about safety margins on protections?

R: Efficiency implies a need for close tolerances - EWA is trying to shave tolerances, thus tighter tolerances are needed.

Q: Did EWA have sufficient resources to be effective?

R: We are hedging on that question because although we had some positives, we also had some negatives.

C: Two questions; (1) how much improvement did we accomplish with and without the EWA? (2) Compared to historical conditions, is the EWA providing sufficient benefit for recovery of the target species?

C: The EWA provided better protection in certain months than the prescriptive approach.

C: Salmon certainly benefitted from any month with lower exports. R: Everyone agreed. Question is on balance were shifts in exports plus new export demands better than historic?

C: EWA with flex can be more protective than prescriptive. R: Concern again that in balance is the EWA approach providing overall near the same level of protection. No doubt we did some good things and some times, but we are not comfortable that we did enough or that we had sufficient assets to do enough. The way we have it now seems to put an overly positive spin on what we are able to do with EWA.

C: Suggest: "EWA allows you to reduce exports at times of high fish presence, when prescriptive approach may not."

R: Depends on what prescriptions are and what EWA assets are available.

C: Key advantage to EWA is flexibility: but you do not have the breadth of protections that prescriptive standards have.

Q: Key question: on balance does the flexibility provide as much or more protection than prescriptive standards?

C: We should improve efficiency and magnitude of assets.

C: Suggest: " The EWA approach is more efficient than the prescriptive approach."

R: There is more of a safety margin in prescriptive standards, but the EWA has the flexibility to be more efficient.

C: The whole issue is efficiency.

C: Salmon people are saying the potential rewards of EWA are high for salmon, but the risk is high because the resources are limited and only cover a narrow window of opportunity. We should be aware of the risks with this type of variable life history strategy - many components that we might be able to always protect.

C: The EWA offers us the opportunity to "really" improve things when we need to - which might be far more effective way to protect these fish.

C: We are not saying prescriptive approach is better - that approach may miss what EWA can cover. EWA's success depends on its ability to forecast and react - needs good monitoring. Better information - less risk.

C: Comparison of EWA and prescriptive approach may be flawed:

- shooting for comfort in recovery

- we do not directly compare or judge, prescriptive approach is just a benchmark for comparison

**- we have already decided that the EWA is more efficient.**

R: Agreement that comparison with prescriptive is good.

Ron: we want to put these detailed evaluations in an appendix. One or two pages. We will send them to Tech Teams. There will be an attachment for each evaluation factor (e.g., salmon, smelt, striped bass, water, supply, water quality)

#### **Steelhead Evaluation - Jim White**

4. steelhead entrainment does not appear to be a problem.

#### **More on EWA Evaluation -**

C: We need Progressive Asset Development and Timing

C: Each asset has its own owner (except for money)

C: Need agreement between owner and EWA entity

C: We need negotiate agreement - attempting to negotiate and agreement will drive process.

C: We have a huge debt this year, but EWA has no one at the controls.

C: We have yet to demonstrate there is anything in this for water users - we need to develop a win-win option.

C: EWA should provide some benefits to asset owners, otherwise there is no incentive for them to contract with EWA. R: what benefits? R: Regulatory assurances. R: We have no one dealing with EWA assurances.

C: Who concept assume buy-in.

C: Higher levels must hashout EWA CALFED deal.

C: Regulatory agencies will need certain assets to seal deal. Once we define needs we can seal deal.

C: To get assurances we have to show how regulatory agencies can influence use of the assets.

C: Projects will have to carry out responsibilities and actions.

R: Projects will be there.

C: EWA can't do it all.

C: The regulatory track record is poor in this area - need a negotiated process. Who? How? This is a huge problem.

C: Need a process - framework approach.

### **EWA Organization Chart - Dave Fullerton**

C: We need a full time professional to be the EWA manager.

C: Manager need not be one of those who formulated concept - he or she could be more entrepreneur.

C: EWA management team has to be designed carefully for us to have any confidence in them.

C: CVPIA has a new management team for the 800 TAF of accounting.

Q: Why not include EWA in that team? R: Yes

C: Proposal Team - need representation from ag, enviro's and Policy.

C: They can put together operating manual for EWA.

C: Transfers cut across all areas of the team.

C: Size of the account has to be considered.

C: There are three tasks:

- 1) define assets
- 2) amount of assets
- 3) use of assets

C: Priority of use -

C: Should not create expectations that are not realistic -

C: There should be provisions for modification as new information becomes available - adaptive management - actions should also be designed as experiments to provide new information.

C: Honcho needs to be an implementor

C: Implementation Team - Management Team ---- Small Group subset + ag/urban + enviro's (8-10 people)

### **Assignments**

- Russ Brown - write a page on modelling
- BJ - page on water supply
- Brigg's - page on water quality

**Conclusions:**

**Ron:** two points of approach: (1) what it takes to negotiate work; and (2) what it takes to make EWA work.

**BJ:** Suggested organization chart.

**C:** This is a huge job.

**C:** Follow format of South Delta Implementation Plan

**C:** Tell Q/S that we need this team now.

**C:** Also tell Q/S that baseline and other issues need to be resolved.

**Ron:** rough draft tomorrow; formal draft on Tuesday.