

**Speer/Quinn Committee
Meeting Notes
12/11/98**

Agenda:

- i. Is the EWA Implementable?
- ii. Is the fish protection adequate?
- iii. Is the water supply adequate?

Action Items

Shuster will provide more years of output.

Dave Schuster Summary of Runs

- Accounting process for EWA is doable.
- It is hard getting water into the EWA. Started in 1922 with it full; it was empty by 1924.
- 100TAF of project water was moved to Kern Water Bank to keep the EWA solvent in drought.
- Getting only 170-200 TAF into the account on average each year.
- Most of that was from purchasing 100 TAF.
- Limited capability to get new water above the baseline (Accord + full AFRP); many system limitations: recharge, storage, and conveyance are all limiting factors.
- Will provide other years of output.
- DEC-MAR Qwest standard cost little water.
- Surface storage would work best; provided it protected for carryover.
- Ground water has recharge capacity limitation.
- Need to work on rules for water rights and priorities.
- If EWA get priority, then water users will lose.
- Working with 50TAF of storage provided by MWD (East Side Reservoir).
- In some sequences of years the EWA gets deep in debt.
- Account size should fit water available so that it does not get into debt.
- E/I is not very controlling.

Discussion:

1. Elise: limited by storage. San Luis storage would provide greater flexibility.
2. Dave F: The holes upstream need to be filled in.
3. Pete R: We did not use the \$30 million account to make up the debt.
4. Chet: Can't pump in dry year freshets because too many fish at pumps.

Issues:

1. Sharing facilities; priorities (especially for San Luis storage)
2. Limitation of ground water extraction and recharge, and storage.
3. How big should the account be? Specific assets and linkages
4. How much debt can it be allowed?
5. What should be its starting fund?
6. North of Delta water supply options

7. Ability to fill local holes - can't fill at key times north and south.

Is the EWA implementable? Why should we do it?

1. Substantial benefits over strict prescriptive standards.
2. Protects fish when they are vulnerable regardless of hydrology.
3. Allows protection to shift depending with target populations depending on need.
4. Protects more under good env conditions.
5. Focuses on species at risk.
6. It uses only the amount of water necessary to do the job.
7. Water supply advantages over strict conventional standards (assuming adequate data and monitoring)
8. Flexibility - standards are not flexible especially in handling spring problems that crop up at various times in the spring of each year.
9. Hybrid provides some fixed standards and flexibility.
10. We can learn from experiences/experiments. We can test effectiveness of measures. We did not build adaptive management into exercise, but we would in real world.
11. Would have synergistic benefits with habitat measures. (Habitat measures would have more benefit with EWA, and visa versa.)
12. We can't allow tradeoffs between Delta and upstream resources.
13. Alignment of interests: EWA gives ecosystem its own means/assets, thus reducing conflicts. Pay users for assets they would have used. As a result we are not going to be in each others faces. Both sides will still care about how the other uses its water.
14. Creates strong incentive to leverage assets for all.
15. There will be strong interest in having good science to evaluate effectiveness and create efficiency.
16. Provides greater efficiency (water supply) and more protection (environment).

Issues:

- a. Is the EWA sized right?
- b. Is the risk of going into debt and not being able to protect fish too great?

Solutions:

- i. Buy more water for EWA.
- ii. Provide more north of Delta, in-Delta, and south of Delta storage.

Discussion:

17. Jim W: We did not consider the indirect effects of actions in rivers below dams. Feedback should be considered.
18. Paul: Would add to difficulty in project planning for all project aspects including power production and forecasting water supply.
19. BJ: EWA did better than federal agency proposal in protecting fish, and it was more water supply efficient.

Is Fish Protection Adequate? What changes will help.

1. We can do better with our assets.

2. Need better mixture of groundwater and surface water assets. Need more north and south of Delta storage.
3. More in-Delta storage.
4. More (100 TAF) south of Delta storage would help if water quality isn't a problem.
5. North of Delta storage would be best; holes were larger upstream.
6. Target 100 TAF upstream and downstream of Delta.
7. Versality in surface storage.
8. We can expect additional fish protection support from ERP and AFRP.
9. Larger extraction pumps may help get water out of GW storage quicker. Also need better means of getting water into ground water storage.
10. Option contracts with exporters would help.
11. 50 TAF in East Side Reservoir is not enough.
12. Need a better mix of tools to make it work and provide assurances.
13. Have to have some new water.
14. Need numbers and ranges for env and water supply.

Discussion:

1. Dale S: more micromanaging of hydrology system will get us further from natural conditions. Single species are getting too much emphasis
2. Bruce: X2 standards are protecting ecosystem values; here we are trying to reduce export fish impacts.
3. Dick: We don't know all the answers so we are committing to ecosystem type evaluations in our ecoprogram - proximity to the natural hydrograph will be an ecosystem indicator.
4. PeteR: additional options and experience would improve EWA.
5. BJ: we could suggest more to protect environment and water supply.
6. Bruce: it will take time to learn how to protect environment. We expect other programs will add further protection for environment. May need more water in EWA now to protect fish and then less later after we learn how to protect; otherwise we may not be able to provide assurances in early years without more water in EWA.
7. PeteC: Skeptical as to whether we can get enough water in the account to do the job. After 7 years we are not likely to allow the account to be reduced.
8. Bruce: the standard based scenario was a good scenario, but our new approach has more flexibility to negotiate changes over time based on experience.
9. Mike F: Speer would like to hear we are happy with EWA and that it provides equal or more protection than the federal proposal.
10. Elise: They need to know that they are getting assurances. If package is right, we will have assurances.
11. Ed W: We may have to describe two tracks in Phase II report. State position is that In-Delta AFRP actions are not State Project responsibility. We can try to flex the heck out of SWP to get everything accomplished. We can get something above baseline, but not much. We can't be sure now.
12. Mike F: Some of the actions we employed could have indirect effects we can't gage (i.e., more negative QWEST at times).
13. Elise: size issue will be hard to resolve - may have to recommend a range.
14. BJ: ability to flex in-Delta AFRP actions would give more flexibility.

15. George: Everyone will learn more about project operations and limitations under this EWA approach. We will get better use of water for env if it is not locked into standards. We will learn how big EWA should be with experience. Water users and env will work together - takes out win/lose situation. Start smaller and build from that experience.
16. BJ: We need to show them what is needed for an agreement. Our job is to help them reach agreement. We need to show them what is needed.
17. Bruce: agrees with BJ. We need to identify the additional tools that would give both sides assurance and that will allow agreement. Suggests: transfers for water quality; and south of Delta options on high quality ag water.
18. BJ: four ways to provide water we need:
 - 1) add storage
 - 2) buy water
 - 3) buy conservation
 - 4) flex standards more
 - 5) combinations
19. Bruce: how much and how do we get these done?
20. BJ: These things will bridge the gap; we haven't figured out exactly how much of each will be needed.
21. Dale: timing of these supplies is also important.
22. BJ: we should also consider non-flow improvements.

Next Meeting

Monday 9:45-12:00