

DNCT Meeting Notes  
7/29/99  
9:30-12:30

Attendees

Agenda

1. EWA Paper
2. Evaluation Summaries
3. Next Step

SUMMARY

1. Tech Teams and Issue Papers

We discussed melding the ERP and EWA tech team processes. ERP process is broader and longer term. Concern that ERP process can meet EWA needs. We resolved to try and make it happen effectively through coordination and communication – with email reflectors, workshops, and white papers. Explain to Policy how we hope to accomplish this mission – a strategy. Coordinate with ERP. Use process to tee-up issues for EWA negotiations.

2. Suggestion for Fixing Paper

There were many suggestions for improving paper: reorganizing, eliminating redundancy, follow problems with solutions, and refrain from negotiating.

3. Should EWA be more than a fish account?

Many points were made for yes and no – EWA could cover water supply and water quality, but that is really job of Overall CALFED Water Management Strategy. Missouri Compromise – EWA is really an element of overall Strategy. Is there an Overall CALFED Water Management Strategy, or as Dave Brigg's says – is this the only game in town.

4. Must baseline be defined?

Again, many pros and cons. Pro's say baseline is needed to negotiate and provide ESA assurances. Con's say we can start without all that – just give us some resources and we can provide consensus improvements plus get more info to address the issues. We can negotiate on case by case issue, while EWA is underway.

5. How should EWA be managed?

General concurrence that there are two distinct roles: developing and implementing EWA. Two different managers or management systems needed. Does the developer get involved in negotiations? Others do negotiations.

EWA TECH TEAMS AND ISSUE PAPERS – ERP TECH TEAMS AND WHITE PAPERS

Q: Who are they and how will they function? Are they one in the same? R: Salmon, shallow water, and open water teams. The intent is for them to address our issues/hypotheses. They will prepare white papers and then hold facilitated workshops. Build consensus. Define data and resource programs. Resolve conflicts. They plan to move from ERP Strategic Plan toward Stage 1 guidance. Their agenda and issues are broader than EWA issues. Unlikely that their process will meet EWA time table.

Q: what are topics? Process? Workshops? R: ERP staff are putting those together.

C: DNCT issue papers could be done separately but in conjunction with ERP effort.

C: Concern about make up of teams and whether our hypotheses will be addressed. White papers may not have what we want. R: check out everything through email reflectors.

Q: Will they buy into our hypotheses? R: yes.

C: Policy Issue – Policy has to demand resolution of these issues.

C: We need a white paper on ERP action priority and implementation (with focus on early implementation (1999-2000)).

C: We will likely have to build bridge the gaps in the two processes. Foresee technical questions that can be addressed by our EWA issues teams. Get tech teams to respond in a timely manner.

C: We do not have to solve every issue to define EWA – simply make it big enough to be responsive to our needs.

C: Early issue papers would help.

Action Items:

- Go to Peter Kiel and ask whether his tech teams can provide tech input by Oct 1. Can they give us their best shot early.
- Pete C. and BJ will support Ron in getting this done.
- Report on progress at next meeting.

EWA/ERP White Paper Strategy:

- deal with our hypotheses and schedule
- develop highly functional teams
- Clearly define what we want from them
- EWA/ERP teams work together
- Provide interface between overlapping white papers
- Teams will provide valuable input to EWA negotiation process
- Tee up issues in short term for the negotiation process.
- Ask them whether there are any data to support the hypotheses (and alternative hypotheses) we have listed.
- Provide for outside review and input to this process.

EWA PAPER

- Philosophy of paper - EWA is not here to provide water supply or water quality – it is for fish protection.
- Sample solution in not the strawman
- Looking for Steve and Lester's comments on draft as well.
- Mike Spear wants to present the paper to Small Group next Tuesday.

Q: What is the intent of the sample solution? R: Mike Spear asked for an answer – a place to start negotiations. The sample shows that this is a big deal. Helps in structuring asset needs. Sample assets help in implementation phase – help by providing benchmark to start from. Ballpark targets help in getting cost and basis.

C: We need to negotiate the preliminary assets and rules. The potential stakeholder response to these is a concern.

C: We should negotiate a baseline list of assets.

C: We should be clear in nomenclature – e.g., speak to entrainment not salvage.

C: Concern that the EWA Paper is trying to stake out a negotiating position rather than defining what needs to be negotiated.

Specific Suggestions for Paper:

- move sample solution up in paper
- paper needs an intro that spells out where we are (we have yet to negotiate details)
- reorganize and eliminate redundancy
- take out negotiating things – put in implementation ideas
- spell out short-term versus long-term
- feature negotiating needs and issues
- strike a balance
- discuss assumptions underlying specific actions
- reserve point that there are disagreements on individual actions.
- Follow-up problems with solutions
- Arrange problems/issues under structure
- Need action averted plan

Should EWA be more than a fish account?

- C: EWA is more than fish!! It should cover water supply and water quality.  
C: Problem with all water from relaxation of standards going to fish. EWA generated water is not just for fish.  
C: We should leave open options for multiple benefits.  
C: EWA is more about sharing resources.  
C: EWA is in reality also about water quality.  
C: EWA uses water thus affects what is available for other users.  
C: We should identify assets for water supply and fish  
C: We should develop rules for dividing assets among users. (E.g. we should define how JPOD is used and shared.)  
C: EWA is about balancing competing demands among users.  
C: EWA is really the overall CALFED Water Management Strategy  
C: EWA is really only an element of the overall strategy.  
C: What overall strategy – the EWA process seems to be that.  
C: If we speak of the EWA as the water management strategy than the EWA mission broadens, but the process becomes more interesting – we would include negotiations of water user assets.  
C: EWA Stage 1 negotiations have to define sharing rules – some prescriptive and some flexible.  
C: EWA has water supply implications but is a fish part of the overall strategy.  
C: EWA is the only planning process involving water supply and water quality – should take on these responsibilities as well.  
C: EWA is about making a more effecting Water Management Strategy/System.  
C: Creating a real problem – sounds like a shell game with water supply and water quality trying to get some of the assets being set aside for fish. Water supply should not be our objective – only be aware of it and not have indirect effects on it.  
C: We are shifting water supply around – maybe EWA should have a new name. R: Yes.  
C: We want a process – we can't solve this issue.  
C: We are the defacto Stage 1 Ops Group – a group that looks at the broader water issues.  
Q: Do we really want the EWA to be the CALFED Water Management Strategy group? R: Yes  
C: Concerned that the EWA tools will be env tools – flexibility and gains will all go to fish. This won't fly.  
C: The opening paragraph of the paper needs to highlight this issue. Temper expectations for all parties.  
C: This is not that way we have been going. EWA has to work from within an overall management strategy – EWA and other processes will have effects on all users.

Missouri Compromise:

- Q: Who develops Stage 1 operating rules?  
C: Simply emphasize that flexible operations will work.  
C: If we go beyond our EWA objectives it becomes more difficult to meet goals.  
C: Need a forum for making decisions.  
C: EWA will not take over water management – but it should lead by example.  
C: A limited focus EWA is a good idea.  
C: We want to hug our EWA water, not the tools and facilities that make it.  
C: The water supply community wants back some of the water it lost in 19994. If all new water goes to the EWA, then it will be a non-starter. Policy needs to address this in the overall water management strategy if EWA does not.  
C: Water supply is finite – new facilities to increase water supply should benefit both water supply and fish.  
C: We were not shifting export timing – we were reducing exports and trying to make up.  
C: More reservoirs would help. R: Yes.  
C: New reservoirs are close to the edge of feasibility.

Should we define baseline?

- C: baseline has to be defined.  
Q: Why?  
Q: Do we have to address all operating rules in Stage 1?

- C: EWA is integrally tied to baseline.  
Q: How do we negotiate without a target?  
C: We don't need to resolve baseline issues to implement EWA in Stage 1.  
C: We need to put enough assets into EWA next year and simply work with them without resolving issues – maybe implementation of EWA in an adaptive management mode would help address issues.  
C: We could agree on this approach in principle, but at least we have to know whether EWA is responsible for VAMP.  
C: We can negotiate such things on a case by case basis – based on priorities.  
C: Need to plot such a strategy.  
C: If we don't know baseline, then we could be better or worse off – assuming b(2) is in place.  
Q: How can we provide any ESA assurances without knowing the baseline?  
Q: How can we get ROD without resolving baseline issue.

EWA Management Organization

- EWA manager builds tools and assist in ways to use them.
- We need a builder and a manager/implementer
- Two people with different roles.
- Team develops but does not implement
- IDT negotiate? Yes? No?
- Sets up process only?
- Who does negotiating? Not our job.
- Structure for setting Stage 1 deal.