

Quinn/Spear Meeting Notes

7/19/99

9:00-12:00

Attendees

Mike Thabault, Mike Fris, Matt Vandenberg, Karl Halupka, Pete Chadwick, Jim White, Bruce Herbold, Pete Rhoads, Art Hinojosa, Dave Fullerton, Dave Briggs, Russ Brown, BJ Miller, Paul Fujitani, Tom Cannon, Ron Ott, Guy Masier, Dave Forkel, Jim Snow, Cathy Kelly, Wayne White, Perry Herrgesell, Ryan Broddrick, Curtis Creel, Tim Quinn, Mike Spear

Agenda

1. Review of Games
2. Evaluation of Games
3. Issues for Tech Teams
4. Next Games.
5. Implementation Issues

Games Summary – Dave Fullerton

- Focused on Games 2, 4, and 5
- Q: Was prescriptive standards a game? R: It was just a model run for comparison. It had late Stage 1 baseline.
- Q: Did we compare water supply effects in games? R: Yes.

Delta Smelt – Mike Fris

- Showed results in figures.
- Salvage numbers – predictions
 - Salvage is our best tool
 - On face value we did not do well for delta smelt young
 - Worked on shoulders of VAMP
 - Did not compute benefits of earlier flow actions, thus number salvage is probably biased high.
 - Baseline had higher exports than historic for 91-95 period.

- C: Likely will have post-VAMP needs in wet years for delta smelt – like 99.
- C: Game 4 did relatively poor.
- Q: Given 93/95 had most angst, were 93 and 95 successful? R: marginal.
- Q: In 93 and 95 did you pay more attention to delta smelt? R: yes.
- C: Did not do well according to graph. R: May 1993 may be an anomaly.
- Q: Were you constrained by EWA assets? R: We probably needed a bit more water.
- Q: Did you try to move smelt out of the way? R: We raised SJ flows, but our model does not respond to flow benefits, which is why we believe it is conservative.

Delta Smelt – Bruce Herbold

- Showed results in figures.
- In games we exported more than historical.
 - EWA does least in early Stage 1 and more later in Stage 1 for smelt.
 - Q: Why were exports so much higher? R: new facilities and higher demands.
 - C: Historic exports – we were higher because of antecedent conditions in DWRSIM.
 - C: Comparison of historic and baseline conditions is like comparing apples and oranges. Model has different demands than historically. It is not legitimate to compare with historic flow and salvage.
 - R: Issue is demands. Model-vs-historic comparisons are apples and oranges.

- C: Your main conclusion is that we improved water supply and saved smelt. R: Yes, but we did it by also making up for higher exports.
- C: Delta smelt also benefited from salmon actions.
- Q: Why not show EWA exports along with baseline exports? Show how exports were affected by EWA.
- R: EWA simply shifted timing and did not adjust exports – but there were inter-year changes that would show up as changes.
- Q: What is the percent loss of the smelt population from these losses?
- R: No way to know.
- R: We have to look at distribution as well as salvage when applying EWA actions.

Salmon: Jim White

- Showed results of survival models.
- Computed salvage changes for San Joaquin salmon
 - Looked at upstream benefits.
 - We had three different approaches to Sacto salmon, and have not resolved issues relating to using one model or the other.
 - Getting benefits to salmon is a problem.
 - Winter run and spring run came out worse because it was hard to get and make up water in fall and early winter.

- Q: How much better or worse? R: Absolute value of index does not mean much – differences are key.
- Q: We appear to be getting better survival in prescription? R: No.
- C: Lot of trouble seeing comparison with historic conditions. R: point is noted.
- C: EWA looks much better if you use historic demands.
- R: But you have predictions for greater exports in future under Accord and other baselines.

Salmon: Karl Halupka

- Showed results for SJ salmon.
- Water supply and salmon benefited from games 2, 4, and 5.
 - Current mix of assets does not let us do a lot for San Joaquin salmon in all years.

- C: It may not be possible to help in all years, as long as we do well in some years and keep from wiping them out in others.
- C: Significant benefit in only one year of five. Need more years. Also 95 had most benefits – this was already a good year for salmon.

Upstream Benefits: Karl Halupka

- Upstream release volumes were presented showing significant potential benefit in both Sacramento and San Joaquin river systems.
- Could triple B(3) benefits in Sacramento and double benefits in San Joaquin.

Striped Bass: Pete Chadwick

- No actions for striped bass – effects were incidental.
- Shift in exports increased salvage 40 % for baseline.
- EWA improved things and balanced out higher salvage in terms of yearling equivalents.

Water Supply: B.J. Miller

- Our task was to translate exporters statements of water supply goals above the Accord + Upstream AFRP.
- End of Stage 1
 - 73 year average 5825 TAF
 - critical year period 4486 TAF
- Day 1, Stage 1

- 73 year average 5555 TAF
- critical year period 4087 TAF

	73 year average	Critical year period
Game 2	-219 + (100) (TAF)	-510 + (150)
Game 3	-25 + (100)	-409 + (150)
Game 4	-62	-190
Game 5	124	-15

- EWA was 1 maf in hole at end of game.
- No game has fulfilled water users needs.
- More critical year problems.
- Assets in games 2 and 3 are not realistic.

C: This is the water users' version of prescriptive standards (spoken as joke).

Q: Why was Game 2 so poor given all the great assets developed? R: had to pay off so many debts from trying to control expanded exports.

Q: Do you have a comparison for 91-95? R: No.

Q: What would satisfy water users if game 3 did not?

R: Would have to relax more than just E/I. Need more give.

Water Quality – Dave Briggs

- Drinking water quality concerns
- Adding assets for water users helped.
- FEB-MAR DOC problem helped by cut in exports by EWA.
- In-Delta storage may make things worse, but deferring to CUWA/CALFED study.
- Drinking water needs to be addressed in EWA forum. Only forum for drinking water quality and operating rules.
- This is forum where operating risks are being addressed.

Q: Has anyone requested taking out WQ from EWA gaming? R: No.

C: Concern that WQ actions will be charged to EWA.

C: This forum is where we are trying to do most complete job of improving the system. Thus best to handle WQ here. Conflicts are also best addressed here.

Implementation – Dave Briggs

Table of problem areas versus tools presented.

- Work in progress
- Needs other elements involved in process: legal, governance, and assurances.

Q: What about other rules (transfers, carryovers)

- Institutional barriers
- Do we need rule changes
- Assumptions about increasing Banks to 10.3
- Decisions on operating rules
- Legal changes
- Agreements between projects
- EWA could not work without some rule changes
- Example – EWA cannot change expanded Banks rules without some review.

Q: Should this group ID need for EWA agent?

R: governance meetings are very broad. This group should ID what types of governance is needed and soon. Governance group would benefit from input from this group.

C: Timing of big picture:

- EWA and governance are top CALFED tasks
- EWA is still a creature being formed – it must be formed here in this group.

- We have until Thanksgiving to create EWA, rules, operations; so we can write final document in spring for ROD – EWA will be an important piece.
- We should be ready to write by Thanksgiving

C: We should define how EWA shares facilities, rules for access, annual or 7 year contracts, spot market versus long term market.

C: Need to broaden representation for EWA.

C: May require additional tech expertise and legal assistance – this group is just biologists who can't handle institutional aspects.

Gaming – Dave Fullerton

- 1999 tough challenge year – help define EWA workings
- Max flex game – few standards
- Second generation gaming
- More years
- Changes in demands
- Modify sharing formulas
- more upstream actions
- examine conflict with transfer market

C: Some would criticize for not coordinating with other CALFED programs

C: Need to resolve new AFRP flows.

C: Need to flex game for prescriptive standards.

Closing Remarks – Mike Spear

- encouraged, but inherent problems in models
- good integration
- if we had a policy team – how would we put EWA together
- start breaking it down into pieces
- games should be picked to resolve future issues
- get tech advice to fix problems
- we can use Small Group to tee-up for Policy

- Need a draft paper from this team for the Small Group

- 4 or 5 pages
- what we have done
- here is what is needed
- problems
- questions
- needs

- Q/S will take to Small Group and Policy to show what we need.

- Expect EWA to broaden CALFED perspective.
- Put EWA into context with other CALFED/CVPIA actions
- Proportional benefits
- Tradeoffs between areas.
- EWA asset use versus other program asset use.
- We should develop structure for our process rather than more gaming.
- Get down what we have learned
- What further is needed
- Then consider what we to game later

- Need draft by end of week so Q/S can polish for Small Group in two weeks.

- Technical and policy issues need to be laid out

- Other things will go forward, but we need help setting up Policy first. When we get to new year we will have 4-6 months to write up everything. We want everything to fit and be finished by the end of the year.

C: to game or not to game? Subcommittee could game without detracting from other effort.

R: Ok.

Closing Remarks – Tim Quinn

- Some encouragement, some confusing aspects to the presentation
- Sort through moving forward
- Memo needs to ID implementation issues
- How to alleviate worries on both sides
- Implementation issues lead to policy issues
- There are a lot of areas of disagreement – need to articulate these to increase the stakes for Policy people.

Q: Do we package white paper for differences or agreements? R: Both

C: Hope some policy questions drive gaming – run sensitivity modeling exercise to answer critical questions.

C: Paper needs to move process onto new fields.

Q: Hold off on policy and implementation issues? R: No – put into paper.

Technical Issues

Technical issues were not presented. They will be sent to other forums.

September 10, 1999

Name
Agency
Address

Sincerely,

Mike Spear
Regional Director
US Fish and Wildlife Service

Tim Quinn
Deputy General Manager
Metropolitan Water District

Attachment: Proposed EWA Management Structure

Dear X,

As you are aware, the establishment of an Environmental Water Account (EWA) has been explored as one element of CALFED's Water Management Strategy. This work has shown that an EWA would be inextricable linked to other aspects of the CALFED program. Therefore, CALFED is broadening its approach to developing the EWA to incorporate other aspects of water management. We are writing to request your participation in refining the EWA concept, and in developing a framework to guide its implementation as an element of a broader Water Management Account (WMA). We are calling this group the WMA Development Team (WMADT). Governor Davis and Secretary Babbitt have requested that a framework be completed by mid-December.

A collaborative agency/stakeholder effort has been on going since March 1998 to evaluate various aspects of an EWA. Several workgroups, including the Diversion Effects on Fish Team, the No Name Group, and the DEFT-No Name Coordination Team (DNCT), have done extensive modeling, analysis, and evaluation of various tools that could be used to structure and implement an EWA, as well as identified the scope of potential environmental benefits. The objective in doing this work has been to develop a set of assets and operating rules that can be used flexibly to achieve environmental benefits in response to real time assessment of need. Overall, the EWA would function to optimize the efficient use of water resources to provide the greatest environmental benefits for listed species in particular and the Bay-Delta ecosystem in general. At this point there is a need to establish a framework for the EWA that goes beyond the conceptual phase and to further incorporate an EWA with other aspects of water management in the system. The WMADT will thus consider issues broader than the EWA as those issues are relevant to the development of a WMA.

The WMADT will be composed of agency and stakeholder representatives. It is envisioned that the WMADT will meet on a weekly basis through mid-October to make decisions critical to the development of the WMA. As the process moves forward, the meeting schedule may intensify. To support the WMADT effort, CALFED has established a WMA Coordination Team (WMACT). This group will provide modeling and technical analysis. Representatives from the WMACT and the WMADT will be called upon from time to time to present status reports to the Bay Delta Advisory Council.

With the short timeline in mind, we invite you to attend the first meeting of the WMADT on Wednesday September 22, 1999 from 1:00-4:00pm in Room 1131 of the Resources Building. We also request that you identify an alternate who can attend future meetings in your absence, should that be necessary, and who can participate in the decision-making process.

If you have any questions please call Ron Ott at (916) 657-3319 or Elise Holland at (415) 896-5900. We look forward to seeing you on the 22nd in Sacramento.

D-059660