

Speer/Quinn Meeting Notes
12/14/98

Agenda:

- i. Phase II report content
- ii. South Delta facilities

South Delta Facilities - Stein Buer

1. Tech track:
 - a. Water quality and hydrodynamics
 - b. Effects of new screen on CCF have been modelled
 - c. Evaluation of alternatives - next two months

2. Phase II Report:
 - d. Level of uncertainty about barriers
 - e. Summarize language relating to barriers
 - f. Screens on CCF and Tracy
 - g. Intertie
 - h. Options and screen approach velocities remain to be resolved.
 - i. Bruce: linkage between North Delta and South Delta, water quality, hydrology.
 - j. Stein: DCC closure affects water quality; possible new screened intake at Hood will be mentioned but only as mitigation for water quality effects of DCC closure.
 - k. Channel modifications to allow full Banks pumping;
 - l. Will start with 8500 cfs existing capacity at Banks + existing temporary barriers.

EWA Document

3. Need three pages on the principles of the EWA.
4. Lester: need a description of EWA and a list of issues (funding, water amount, and mechanisms)
5. Schedule: Thursday deadline for Phase II report; Wednesday meeting.
6. Gary B: should describe approaches/options? Hybrid is only one being considered. What are other parts of hybrid proposal? - Default rules.
7. Elise: other approaches are different and are not presented.
8. Gary: we are still looking at a range of scenarios - should have language that so states in the report.
9. EdW: EWA is a means for continuous improvement.
10. Tim Q: EWA is a broad envelope that still include the prescriptive measures in the other scenario types - these prescriptions will be dropped over time as the EWA begins to work.
11. DaveF: default op rules are prescribed standards; the EWA is less prescriptive.
12. Bruce: Need section on the prescriptive standards in our hybrid description in Phase II report.
13. Sprecht: Table would be nice as a reference - compare to existing standards.

14. Tim Q: Default rules should not be a concern - we are trying to work out the full AFRP even though its not the responsibility of the SWP.
15. Roger: We have to be clear on what is being offered in EWA above the AFRP.
16. Sprecht: we are not going to resolve baseline by Thursday.
17. Bruce: two options (1) gallon per gallon matching where we can't finess baseline; and (2) contract approach where we can finess baseline.
18. Mike S: Baseline? Who pays? Phase II won't settle these questions. But we can describe the EWA and how it needs to do something beyond the AFRP+Accord.
19. Tim Q: Neither side will agree on baseline - need to focus on the EWA approach - that it can improve upon existing baselines - positive approach that we can all agree on.

Question 2:

20. Ron: hybrid - 200 additional TAF and original 350 TAF should provide what we need.
21. TimQ: we can't come to closure on these numbers yet.
22. Ron: upper end of range may not give assurance - 99 tests will provide some information for assurances. Our numbers will be starting point - will change over time in Stage 1.
23. Lester: can we put forth a report without the numbers?
24. Tim Q: numbers are important in selling concepts to our constituents.
25. Lester: Phase II report could have no numbers - just keep numbers on side.
26. Bob P: need basic philosophies - no dip for example.
27. Mike S: Aspects that will require further analysis could be listed in report.
28. Tim Q: can relate that we have made progress
29. Mike S: Who pays? Refer to finance section. Concerned about allocation to ensure protection for species is provided.
30. BobP: just need to agree htat we have three year process in front of us to resolve details. Lets wait to see what next admin wants to see.
31. Lester: we have only 10 months. Must resolve by November.
32. MikeS: Don't really know numbers for EWA to provide assurances.
33. BobP: Allocating water to a problem that may not be resolvable with water.
34. MikeS: the numbers define package of tools - clearly point to need for more EWA water.
35. BobP: What is doable in next 7 years? And then share that amount.
36. TimQ: Numbers help to show which approach is superior and to provide assurances - each group needs numbers in order for them to agree with confidence. If we don't do this, there is a possibility that one side will back out.
37. Roger: principles are most important.
38. Lester: Lets have principles and provide numbers as an example.
39. **BJ: offered 8 principles (handout)**
40. Elise: can provide an illustrative approach, but also describe walls on access to EWA water. Eg. Groundwater in and out are a problem. - Key cornerstone of agreement. The checkbook game we played taught us about uncertainty and that learning will continue.
41. Sprecht: BJ's #2: Need to look at how much water is used over baseline.
42. Lester: we need a range from a mix of tools in #2.
43. Roger: a lot of work needs to be captured in the report. Describe each scenario - what it

- does and doesn't do.
44. Elise: example of what EWA could not do.
 45. Ron: Illustration
 46. Bruce: #5 - value of NOD options/contracts - rather than purely SOD contracts. Include example in report and show updates on Web page.
 47. EdW: examples have different baselines that could be misleading.
 48. Roger: vote for half an example - with no numbers - say we believe we can get it to work.
 49. Dave S: agrees.
 50. Sprecht: could we have graphs for examples?
 51. MikeT: inherent question about storage and option/contracts - better to focus on pros and cons of different tools that would make account effective.
 52. BJ: we created and tried EWA - worked out, but came up short in our example. But confident that adjustments to make it work for both sides. Many options to make it work even better.
 53. Elise : we came up short on both sides. Used salvage data to set restrictions - we don't know if that would be effective.
 54. JimW: We got a good feel for the workings of an EWA. Lacks water and facilities.
 55. Bruce: first bullet- monitoring is key to EWA.
 56. Kathy: demonstrate this coming year.
 57. DaveS: use Kern and Banks
 58. Roger: need to include some storage and build some assets. Use operations and purchases of water to demonstrate.
 59. TimQ: Kern/MWD are a start. Santa Clara has some storage. Upstream options.
 60. Kathy: these are good things to put into report
 61. TimQ: agrees.
 62. Shuster: agrees
 63. JimS: we will run into baseline sooner or later in 1999.
 64. Sprecht: use JPOD to fund EWA - get water in earlier.
 65. Ron: put numbers in BJ's #2.
 66. Mike S: no numbers. Water must be immediately available; funding must be assured. Problem with BJ #7. Relies heavily on transfer market. Emphasize monitoring. Notion of continuous implementation relative to ESA does not fit. ESA is a threshold situation. No problem with continuous improvement, but with assurances.
 67. GaryB: Questions losing all of draft text. Need to discuss key issues.
 68. Bruce: give more rather than less. Issues are important to discuss.
 69. Tim Q: summarize in 2-3 pages and provide detailed discussion in 10-12 pages.
 70. Lester: we can build good example for January on how it works.
 71. Elise: suggests putting in ranges on the components / tools.
 72. EdW: we have done a lot of work on the tools - agrees.
 73. JimB: how are upstream actions integrated into this? Deferred consequences.
 74. DaleS: we had no way to assess the consequences of this on fish populations.
 75. George: will have to try it to see if it works.
 76. Elise: up front we have to say that we have not tried it.

77. DaveB: Doc covers water quality but will make some suggestions to improve.
78. MikeS: put in Water Quality section.