

WMCT Meeting Notes - 11/10/99

Agenda:

- 1. Model Workshop Results and Actions
- 2. Questions from last week and responses on b(2)
- 3. Next stop on Gaming - evaluation of assets.

Model Workshop Results

- Differences: inflows, reservoir starting levels, different operating rules.
- Adjustments: DAILY OPS will run off DWRSIM inputs for inflows, demands, etc.
- Daily patterns were retained in DAILY OPS. DWRSIM provides best estimate of water supply impacts and effects of new constraints and assets.
- Differences were also found in daily-monthly allowance of exports - about 20% lower. Daily historical patterns may not be as variable in future as projects provide better control. Also releases from upstream could be adjusted to make up exports.
- Differences in some accounting algorithms for some features (e.g., handling VAMP rules) - consumptive use in Delta was also different. X2 calculation affected by four-river index.
- Some difference in demands (south of Delta deliveries) was also different
- Update DWRSIM based on DAILY OPS gaming. Agreement!! Blend two models.
- Correction of monthly model exports: monthly model overestimates exports in monthly averaging - filling in behind a descending limb of Delta inflow with upstream storage releases would cost more water (also may require maintaining additional flows in Nov and DEC as rules don't allow reductions in river flows after Oct).

Q: If you reset DWRSIM monthly with DAILY OPS output you could be on track? R: YES.

Q: Oroville could respond partially to the hole in latter part of Oct. R: but not all because of restraints on additional Oroville releases.

C: DAILY OPS has been modified.

C: Operators could adjust operations during gaming or some things prior to gaming. R: Operators would adjust operations during gaming.

C: Separating projects in DAILY OPS? What if baseline does not include JPOD? R: Difficult to compare model differences on this topic. DWRSIM does a good job of this.

Q: Delta depletions? R: DWRSIM has an algorithm model.

Q: Operators review daily-adjusted flows to see if that is acceptable. R: in gaming. DAILY OPS will use DWRSIM consumptive use.

Workshop for DT

Q: Need a model workshop for DT? R: No. But ask DT.

Questions for B(2)

- 1. Q: Re-credits for reservoir refill? R: Only through January. Change in storage is key. Change not a refill but change in storage from model base. Base is 1992 D1485 and D1400. Tracked daily for budgeting purposes. If you want to game it as b(2) does then Russ should have that built into the gaming model.

- 2. DWRSIM can receive new inputs from DAILY OPS on b(2) effects and adjust reservoir levels.
- 3. What if the base remains a question for Policy. Whether the b(2) accounting resets each year. Three different opinions as to how to account for b(2).

Response of Russ Brown to our questions: (see original questions list)

- 1. DAILY OPS resets each year
- 2. Annual accounting for re-credits - Different from b(2) team
- 3. No opinion
- 4. NA
- 5. We use b(2) water for exports.
- 6. Day by day losses cost b(2)
- 7. No b(2) carryover, some banking. - may be different
- 8. Decreases in releases - no crediting - major difference
- 9. Send a letter if you don't use all water. JPOD should not be included in b(2) base as DAILY OPS does.
- 10. No we use JPOD - assumed b(2) costs to CVP. Major difference (management suggested using state formula) - gives greatest benefit to water supply.
- 11. New Melones can be gamed in b(2) - only releases above salinity control is charged to b(2)
- 12. We did some banking. Upstream releases were normally allowed for export. Could game dedication for outflow or banking.
- 13. No ERP water. ERP water may be different from b(2)
- 14. Storage Targets? B(2) gamers have to balance between release and storage needs.
- 15. Model can track gaming elements. Accounting for 800 TAF does not get charged against new infrastructure. B2 is based on existing infrastructure.

Can we do gaming?

What is measure of what b(2) costs are in the Accord? R: Change in storage, releases, and exports. Compared baselines.

Meaningful to game? With present problems.

How to deal with changes of infrastructure in 1b? So how can we game 1b.

We would have to do both 1a and 1b again so we can compare.

Changes in infrastructure will require changes in COA an BO's.

Game with basic assumptions and write out assumptions.

What about allocation priorities for b(2) water?

Process is fraught with assumptions - list of assumptions - alternatives plus effects. Assumption Nazi - BJ Miller. List of questions is a start on the list.

Purpose of the gaming?

1. Agreement of fish biol teams.
2. Assess w/s benefits of new assets
3. Evaluate benefits of b(2)