

DRAFT
DNCT Team
Meeting Notes
2/18/99
9:30-12:30

Attendees:

Agenda:

1. Work Group Summary
 - a. Modeling
 - b. Biology
 - c. Water Quality
2. Scenario Development
3. Modeling
 - a. evaluation
 - b. gaming.
4. Schedule
 - a. Next week
 - b. This week
 - c. May 15

A. Highlights

- I. Discussed overall process and getting EWA water from relaxing E/I, new facilities (e.g., JPOD), and purchasing efficiency.
- II. Relaxing E/I ratio could lead to contract water for EWA.

B. Actions: (see bold-underlined items below)

C. Ron Ott presented slides for Quinn/Spear Workgroup presentation on EWA for February 23, 1999.

List of features for evaluation with each scenario: Considerable discussion took place on the features to be evaluated for each scenario. Features included the following:

- a. size of the EWA
- b. New facilities/actions
- c. Rules for flexibility
- d. Accounting procedures
- e. Rules and priority of conveyance and storage
- f. Style of protection (prescriptive vs flexible)
- g. Effect on exports (yield to project and EWA)
- h. Cost and repayment scheme

BJ Miller described how we broke effort into parts: We developed a process and a table of the features described above. Each scenario is a line in the table and each feature is a column.

Four part of the effort are as follows:

- How to get water into account
- How to use water
- How to account/manage water
- Trouble shooting

Comments/Questions:

Q: What is the purpose of the presentation? A: To provide a table to compare EWA scenarios developed by the teams.

C: We should add a description of how EWA would affect or relate to existing standards.

C: We should add a feature that describes the spatial distribution of the EWA assets (where we need to keep the water).

Q: How do we integrate the different activities? A: show results in table.

Q: Who decides size of the account? A: Policy call.

Q: When do we do the things outlines? A: need to show pathways.

C: E/I contract approach is only one way to get EWA via relaxing E/I Ratio.

C: Add benefits to biology as another feature.

C: Need to give management a coherent report on where we are going. No need to put in details at this point.

C: Better off starting with biology to put in context of what is driving us.

C: Need decision tree to identify our approach. For example, we can take the contracting approach for E/I relaxation or the strict accounting approach. Contract approach should define water for both sides. Strict accounting is real time approach.

Q: Are we presenting this to an informed group? A: Some are, but some are new.

C: We should attempt to get new members up to speed in our presentation.

C: Relaxing E/I is just one example of how to generate water for EWA.

C: We should call this the Implementation Team.

C: JPOD: short term is ok. Long term could be tied up in COA negotiation, because there is not a lot in it for SWP contractors. Could be a take away for SWP, but could help CVP and environment. This is a big policy issue.

C: Suggestion to put JPOD with Expanded Banks as a logical pairing of actions.

C: Three topics: how much water, how do we account for it, and what are the implementation issues.

C: It would help to provide an overview of the full conceptual approach.

C: We have to game the process to determine how much water is needed in the EWA.

C: Concern was expressed about the Delta Storage example.

Three Questions:

1. Is there a linkage between actions and problems.
2. Is there a better way to solve the problems.
3. Is this a problem - what is the nature of the problem - how important is it.

C: What we do with the water may change from year to year. If you have an account you will use it in real time. We can play this game but we can't decide priorities.

Rephrasing the Three Questions:

1. What problems is the action trying to resolve and how important is it to the fish population?
2. How effective is the action in solving the problem?
3. Are there other ways to solve the problem?

C: Should deal with problem first and actions to solve it second. Need a layered approach.

C: We may have an unlimited need for the EWA, so we should focus on how much we can develop. Then we should worry about what the priority should be for its use.

C: We need to clarify the variability in opinion as to how big the problem is, because it will help decide how to address the problem - whether it is more prescriptive, flexible, or experimental.

C: We seem to have to issues that are different: What we need the EWA for, and how much water is available.

C: Maybe our list of actions isn't complete and ready for management/policy committees.

C: We need to define the process for addressing the issues.

Assignment for Biology Group:

1. List problems
2. List actions and subactions
3. Relate actions/subactions to problems

Two Issue Teams: salmonid and nonsalmonid

address the following relative to specific issues:

- agree

-disagree

- if disagree, then how do we get to agreement by next milestone.

C: Need to layout process for resolving unknowns in Stage 1.

C: How does that relate to two fundamental EWA questions: where to get water and how to use it.

C: We should be giving teams specific questions to address.

C: Tech teams should have short term goals for April and long term goals for October.

C: We shouldn't be "reducing salvage"; we should be reducing diversion effects.

C: Teams are juries - they should be charged with coming to agreement/alignment/compromise.

C: Teams should keep identifying areas of agreement and disagreement and focus on coming to more agreement with time by analyzing more and more information - at some point they may not be able to reach agreement, then they should identify what needs to be done to resolve disagreement.

C: We already went through this process in DEFT last year; why do it again; simply look at DEFT results.

Suggested Table:

List of Actions/ Fish Benefits/ Issues / Water Cost

Where does water need to be for this actions/ Where does water have to come from

C: From this table we can show pros and cons, and use to contract and develop mixes and matches.

C: We should start with actions because there are multiple benefits of actions (rather than start with problems).

C: The table would help toward ranking actions.

C: We should get the account first before fighting over how to use it.

C: Water users are concerned about how the EWA water will be used just as the environmentalists are concerned about how the water users use the water.

C: The table will help determine whether we approach problems with prescriptive, flexible, or experimental/adaptive measures.

C: It is not imperative that we have to agree - we can't agree on everything - we just have to decide where to disagree so we can provide the right measure to address a problem.

CALL for more Gaming:

C: Our gaming brought progress. It helped us determine where we really need water.

C: Gaming was oversimplified - progress/agreement was an illusion.

C: We can go further in gaming.

More on Tech Teams:

Q: Do we need tech teams if we game? A: Tech teams are necessary peer review - in DEFT we were too quick to conclude or agree, when we did not have the necessary expertise.

C: Have tech teams develop a range of hypotheses through a Stage 1 adaptive management approach - that would add significantly to DEFT work.

C: We have to look at alternative hypotheses, otherwise we will build a false sense of what we are achieving and whole process will blow up. It is important that we set up this new process with tech teams.

C: Can we try harder to resolve longstanding issues at least by October.

C: A better description of competing hypotheses will help focus CALFED study efforts toward resolving issues, which will better define how to use EWA effectively.

C: There is more to the CALFED effort: it is finding problem, cause, and how to fix it.

C: Example is delta smelt: is it too late to save delta smelt once they show up at the pumps? Should we keep them from getting to the south Delta or protect them once they are there?

C: Teams could resolve conflicts such as this in a month or six months.

C: Such dynamics have not occurred because we have not had the imperative to agree and sit down and really study the issue and data.

C: October seems a reasonable time frame for this approach. But what do we do for April?

Q: what info is available for short term to address issues? What studies can be done to resolve uncertainties. We should call them out.

C: Not sure we can set EWA use priorities for April?

C: New people in tech teams will have new learning curve.

C: Management will provide additional direction. They will ask us how much, where, and why.

RapUp:

C: Water/AG team needs to get going on developing EWA water for 99.

C: Need to break up our work into bite size pieces - we all try to do everything and get little done. We have too many meetings and get nothing done.

C: Many of us have other jobs.

C: What is the role of this group relative to the team efforts? A: Progress review, approval, checks, and balance.

C: We should add green sturgeon, longfin smelt, and splittail to tech team agenda.

Water Quality Memo Distributed: