DRAFT NOTES:
Water Management Coordinating Team Meeting – 10/28/99
9:30-1:00

AGENDA:

- **Tuesday presentation to DT**
- **Asset papers status**
- **Gaming COA**
- **Status**

I. Assets

- discussed new items on lists
- Expanded Banks: 7100 cfs early; 8500 mid; 10,500 late
- Assets can be used for fish, WS, or WQ
- Write ups due on Nov 3.

II. Tuesday Presentation to DT

- Scenarios 1A and 1B by Tuesday meeting
- Water supply effects by year and scenario total - Jim Snow and George Barnes
- Water quality effects by year
- Fish effects by year and total

Water supply impacts:

- Early stage 1 with assets - SWP does not lose water; CVP has b(2) related impacts.

Water user requirements:

1. - need to compare runs 1A and 1B with Accord + upstream AFRP baseline.
2. - compile water supply impacts by year
3. - need some water supply benefits late Stage 1 - (1B) from new assets + paybacks for fish actions

Accuracy of two independent models and gaming

1. - comparison of output of two models will be difficult
2. - will learn from output of both models
3. - learn something different from Daily model
4. - both are sources of information
5. - daily model will make adjustments from DWRSIM results (e.g., deliveries, reservoir releases, upstream b(2) costs, etc)
6. - daily model will game new assets and fish actions, while DWRSIM will not
7. - daily gaming provides a sense of how to use assets and provide fish benefits but may not accurately asset water supply effects

8. - daily gaming is only way to see range of effects of Delta b(2) actions on hydrology and water supply
9. - daily gaming will show the benefits to SWP water supply from upstream b(2) actions
10. - track year by year with two models to see how we are doing will help assure maximum realism
11. - compare differences in the base runs in the two models to see how well they are simulating
12. - both models provide independent pictures of effects of scenarios, assets, b(2) actions.
13. - both models are trying to use the same deliveries, but not sure these are accurate especially in very wet years - adjusted for supply provided from upper San Joaquin and Kern.
14. - Daily model has no way to adjust deliveries in anticipation of shortage or San Luis low point - requires active gaming by operators to adjust deliveries or upstream storage transfers to San Luis.

Other issues:

- delivery effects
- effects on San Luis Low-Point
- compare effects on SWP/CVP separately
- leave out Trinity (Trinity is in DWRSIM runs)
- Accord is base; need effect of upstream AFRP + Trinity 340
- lack of benefits to SWP
- all impacts of b(2) to CVP

Model Runs:

Run 1A

Modeling Tool	Model Runs	Year Columns
DWRSIM Model Runs	**Accord (study #2)**	**81.. 82.. 83.. 84.. .....**
	Accord + Upstream AFRP (#5)	
	Game Base (#4)	
Daily Model	**Accord + Upstream AFRP (using input from DWRSIM study #3)**	

	Game Base (includes gaming actions for b(2) and assets	

Run 1B

(ditto above with additional assets for late Stage 1)

DWRSIM Model Stepwise Approach:

14. D1485 base
15. add WQCP
16. add prescription upstream AFRP actions (study #2)
17. add upstream AFRP with other b(2) actions (study #2a)
18. Game base study (study #4) - add Intertie, expanded Banks, JPOD, VAMP exports

Original Requested DWRSIM Model Runs:

Study #1 - D1485 + upstream ESA
Study #2 - add VAMP flows
Study #3 - add assets
Study #4 - add upstream AFRP and VAMP exports

Add New Study:

Study #5 - Accord + upstream AFRP

Actions:

- Need complete descriptions of each model run including inputs, what is included, and assumptions
- put Intertie in Daily model

III. Water Quality

Water Quality Actions & Tools:

- Cut exports or increase outflow (operations)
- Source control programs
- Exchanges
- Compare to baseline and CUWA vision (WQ bar)
- Leave to CUWA to determine how to attack each WQ issue.
- Keep track of changes made specifically for WQ or as a consequence of WQ actions.
- Actively game WQ in Daily gaming
- Game on top of or in combination with b(2) actions each month in gaming.

- Score by comparison with WQ template showing target for each month of 15 years.
- Evaluate tools through gaming.
-

San Luis WQ Modeling:
Action: Need to evaluate clorides and TOC in San Luis Res. Add monthly cloride balance in San Luis to Daily model that adjusts for changes caused by deliveries to and from the reservoir.

Exchanges versus Delta hydrological controls:
Exchanges are more cost effective way to improve water quality of export water than through Delta controls.

Need to show tradeoffs between WS and WQ

IV. *Presentation for Tuesday to DT*
S: Present results to date on Tues even if we don't have 1A and 1B complete. R: OK, but needs to be fairly complete and informative for WS, WQ, and F.

V. Fish Gaming Results to Date

S: Present results in terms of percent accomplished of A, B, and C priorities. R: OK.
S: Present consequences in terms of changes in take and relative to BO take limits. R: OK. Note that new take limits will be prescribed with new BO's for CALFED solution. Note also that only applies to smelt because we can't accurately identify winter run take.
S: Qualify take effects with discussion of population effects.
S: Prepare game reports describing the above. R: provide several weeks to develop
Q: How do we describe performance?
R:

		Scenario 1A	Scenario 1B
Targets	A	% of targets addressed versus how well (%) overall problem addressed (e.g. 90%/70%)	
	B		
	C		

These would be based on qualitative assessment and such things as changes in take predicted by model.

VI. To Do List

1. Define what we put in late Stage 1 as assets and how to game and model them so we can do Scenario 1B.
2. Cut # of years in gaming for 1A so we can do 1B by end of Monday.
3. Prepare results for presentation to DT on Tuesday morning.
4. Game Thursday afternoon, Friday, and Monday.