

DNCT Committee Meeting Notes 11/12/98 1:00-5:00

Attendees: Bruce Herbold, Elise Holland, Pete Chadwick, Pete Rhoads, Jim White, Karl Halupka, Dale Sweetnam, Gary Stern, Serge Birk, Spreck Rosekrans, George Barnes, Sushil Arora, Tom Cannon, Art Hinojosa, Ron Ott, BJ Miller(phone).

Assignments and Action Items

Must have all Scenarios evaluated for Management by November 23rd which includes the following:

- I. George run FWS Scenario, with and without 2,000 cfs Hood, worst case and most expected by next Thursday.
II. Ron get input from fish facilities team on screens for DEFT. (CCF, Tracy, Hood)
III. DEFT: Increase ESA assurances in B, C, D, and E.
IV. NoName water supply measures for A-E
V. DEFT: Define rules for E (and all scenarios) so that we can model and evaluate the degree of ESA assurance.
VI. NMFS/FWS: will provide feedback as to the degree of assurances in each of the scenarios.
VII. DEFT: Also provide criteria for Ag/Urban scenario.
VIII. Russ: run model for different years based on the actual number of day restrictions to provide 20% and 50% savings for that year using the salvage patterns for each of the 17 years for both CVP and SWP.
IX. DEFT Subcommittee: team up to develop hypotheses. B.J.; Pete R; Pete C; Karl, and Elise. Due in three weeks, but weekly progress reports.
X. NMFS/FWS: list hypotheses behind their recommended standards.

Agenda:

- i. Evaluation of FWS scenario with NNG tools
ii. How do we increase ESA protection and water supplies in Scenario Types I, II, and III.
iii. The potential development of hybrids.
iv. Timing (stage 1 detail)
v. How will the env water account be set up. (How much is available.)
vi. Biocriteria of FWS scenario as developed by Mike T.
vii. Review Ag/Urban Scenario

Highlights

- Discussed new FWS/NMFS ESA Assurance Scenario in detail.
- Develop assignments for George (DWRSIM model runs); Russ (daily model runs); and DEFT team (rules and ways to increase assurances for scenarios)
- Discussed issues and need to formulate hypotheses but not debate them.
- Briefly discussed ag/urban proposal and need for DEFT to flush out.
- Agreed to evaluate all seven scenarios (original A-E, plus new NMFS/FWS and Ag/Urban)

Scenario Matrix

Type I	Type II	Type III				
FWS/						
NMFS	A	B	C	D	E	Ag/Urban
Hood Diversion	Run with	and	w/o			
New Tracy Fish Screen	Yes					
New CCF Fish Screen	10,300 SWP; and	4,600 CVP				
Biological Trigger / Criteria	FWS defined	triggers				

Scenario Discussion

1. Bruce: Can we substitute FWS operation rules for those we put into Scenario A last week? Can we stay with original five scenarios.
2. Consensus agreement that we would stay with 5 scenarios and not combine down to three types.
3. Ron: Ok, but we need more detail on the five and options available in each.
4. Pete C: We should analyze water costs for various options in each scenario. For example: we should analyze A with and without Hood diversion.
5. Pete R: surprised at not seeing Hood in FWS proposal.
6. Gary S: upstream passage is still an issue on Hood.
7. George: Its not important to work out details of accounting process at this point. We should focus on the amount of water available in each scenario - we can handle that much.
8. Bruce: That would not fly - not adequate for ESA assurances - need a guarantee with real water in it.
9. George: as we go into a year we won't know if env or water supply will take a hit. Relaxing E/I may create more water in San Luis, but it may fill and spill anyway and provide no new water for the EWA. Cutting exports may create a hole that may fill anyway by end of spring. Neither situation would affect the water account.
10. Bruce: we still need a credible accounting system designed by NNG.
11. Dale: DEFT should evaluate the new scenarios.
12. Elise: DEFT needs to create triggers for scenarios so modelers can provide us with results.

FWS/NMFS Scenario - Gary S.

baseline Accord + full AFRP + SWRCB Decision on Sharing

No Hood diversion; otherwise all DEFT and NNG actions.

Oct-Jan (late fall, winter, and spring run smolts)

October: DCC closed if real time monitoring of fish indicates fish at risk at DCC.

November-January: DCC closed

QWEST must be positive for the remainder of the period, if return of cwt late-fall salmon smolt releases from upriver reaches 1/2% at pumps, or 2.5% from Delta releases; otherwise E/I ratio unchanged.

Feb-Mar (San Joaquin fall run fry)

QWEST must be positive (replaces E/I)

if Jan was dry (eight river index < 1MAF), then QWEST > 1000 cfs.

Apr-Jun (San Joaquin fall run smolts and delta smelt)

75 day VAMP beginning on Apr 1 - if monitoring at Mossdale indicates no risk to salmon smolts yet, then can be delayed to Apr 15. If salmon and delta smelt are no longer at risk on June 1, then terminate VAMP, otherwise continue through June 15.

Otherwise original E/I's apply.

Jul-Sep - original E/I's apply

13. George: maintaining a positive QWEST will be very costly - 800 TAF?
14. Gary: rarely triggered - usually only in Jan.
15. Pete C: Modeler's will likely overestimate water supply cost unless we definable trigger. How do we get a realistic estimate? Defining criteria for op studies will be a huge problem.
16. Gary: for modelling sake, we propose 40% of January's, and for below normal and above normal water years.
17. Sprecht: we should try to model reasonable things. Go with expected - not book ends, except for simulation purposes - do not take worst case approach.
18. Gary: The last 5 or 6 years we had a late fill of San Luis; we should see what affect would be. With this ESA assurance scenario there is no need for an EWA. This is best assurance we can give - but there are always reopeners. This would give a lot less water cost than the original E/I's. San Joaquin fry would not build into high numbers until late January, but they can last 10 weeks at salvage facilities. The scenario has the same triggers as the spring run protection plan.
19. Bruce: this scenario provide full ESA assurances for the 10 years of Stage 1. If shorter period, then could be less stringent.
20. Elise: we need to look at the two A scenarios side by side to chose one or the other.
 21. Bruce: his original A could easily be substituted for this new one - his features were placeholders and not fixed in concrete.
23. Pete C: we should model both to see differences.
24. Karl: some adaptive management opportunities, but limited in Stage 1. But if we get improvements from these measures, then more room for experiments.
25. Serge: this scenario still has limited room for adaptive management.
26. Jim W: this is still draft with room for tweaking. This measure for QWEST is not

triggered in many wet years because QWEST is high, even when fry are abundant in salvage.

27. George: will do runs with this; average and worst case simulations, because single year impacts are important.

28. Gary: protections in single years is important too; the effects of the single drought year in 1977 have lasted two decades on winter run.

29. Elise: we need to look at extremes for both fish and water supply. Each interest does not come with the same amount of equity.

30. Bruce: winter run will most likely be affected primarily by conditions above Red Bluff; but Delta actions also affect populations.

31. Serge: we can't forget our directions - fish and water supply have to get a little better.

32. Elise: reiterated her concern that more water from non Delta export sources needs to be applied to meet demands and deliveries.

Facilities

33. Pete C: is SWP limited to 6,000 and CVP to 4,600?

34. Bruce: when delta smelt are present and we need 0.2 ft/sec approach velocity at screen; otherwise we can pump 15,000 at 0.33.

35. Gary: agreed. Assume that approach velocities will not constrain pumping.

36. George: will run model with and without this feature.

37. Bruce: will you continue to give the SWP the winfall of the CVPIA water releases from upstream reservoirs?

38. George: Potter gave credit the last two years.

39. Pete C: Need to have original teams write up their evaluations of these facilities and discuss with DEFT.

40. Ron: original concept was that Tracy research facility would provide insights for what to do a CCF and Hood.

41. Bruce: the teams would go along with what we have stated here about capacity versus flows and approach velocity.

Issues:

42. B.J.: How do we handle issues?

43. Pete R: need everyone's conceptual models on the issues. Show differences and assumptions. Service's need to relate the hypotheses behind their recommended standards.

44. Elise: we need to at least agree on what are the hypotheses. Don't debate, simply list.

45. Bruce: Yes, then CMARP can develop programs to test hypotheses.

46. Pete C: Water folks should list what they consider are fundamental differences.

47. **Action:** team up to develop hypotheses. B.J.; Pete R; Pete C; Karl, and Elise. Due in three weeks, but weekly progress reports.

48. **Action:** NMFS/FWS list hypotheses behind their recommended standards.

Ag/Urban scenario - B.J.

49. VAMP ramping - Gary: less than existing VAMP

50. Relax X2 and env gets benefit

NoName Group, Fish Team, 01:46 PM 11/13/98 -0800, DNCT Minutes and Next weeks Schedule

- 51. Relax E/I - shared
- 52. Big Banks - shared