

DRAFT
OPTIONAL APPROACHES FOR DEALING WITH THE B(2) ISSUE IN
DEVELOPING AND ANALYZING SCENARIOS
October 8, 1999

Alternative A Approach

In this approach, at least two and possibly three scenarios would be created at a time. One scenario would embody the b(2) position of DOI, another scenario would use the water users position on b(2), and, possibly, a third scenario would be set up in accordance with the position of environmental interests on b(2).

Each scenario could have a different baseline of environmental requirements and different sharing formulas and operating rules to better balance the benefits, given the basic b(2) assumption for the particular scenario.

Each scenario would be analyzed for its environmental, water supply, and water quality benefits. The results of these analyses would be reported to the DT who would decide how the scenarios should be modified or combined.

Alternative B Approach

This approach is designed to permit exploring the relative benefits of various combinations of assets without first deciding how b2 would be treated. The baseline would be the Accord, Trinity, VAMP and existing COE constraints at Banks. Each set of assets, with selected operating criteria and sharing formulas, would be evaluated through a gaming exercise with the assets used to provide environmental, water supply and water quality benefits in addition to those provided by the base. After each gaming exercise was completed, the amount of b2 water used in the scenario would be estimated using each of the various definitions of b2.

The output of each gaming exercise would therefore be a display of benefits, with each interest group knowing how close the exercise came to satisfying their definition of b2 water. *If a combination of assets were found which supplied sufficient benefits to satisfy each interest group, this approach might be an important step towards a resolution without resolving the b2 issue.*

If that were not the case, the approach would at least help identify the most promising combinations. Before one of those combinations of assets could be selected as part of the recommended framework, it would have to be reevaluated with the selected definition of b2. That would be necessary because some definitions of b2 would use up so much of the existing flexibility in the CVP/SWP system that they would diminish the benefits that could otherwise be derived from the asset.