BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Technical Scenario Teamlet Conference Call

May 30, 2003

1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Dial in: (800) 582-8948
Guest #: 5519

AGENDA

1)	Discuss proposed approach to develop standardized rankings of soft constraints	1:00 – 2:00

May 30, 2003

BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Technical Scenario Teamlet

May 30, 2003
1:00 to 2:00
PSE Office (One Bellevue Center)
Bellevue, WA

FINAL DRAFT MEETING NOTES

Teamlet Leader: Paul Wetherbee, 425-462-3746, paul.wetherbee@pse.com

PRESENT: Paul Wetherbee, (PSE), Ruth Mathews on phone (The Nature Conservancy), Margaret Beilharz on phone (USFS), Mark Killgore (The Louis Berger Group), Stuart Beck on phone (R2), and Lyn Wiltse, facilitator (PDSA Consulting, Inc.).

FUTURE REGULAR WORKING GROUP DATES/LOCATIONS
June 6 IN PERSON MEETING from 10:00 to 2:00 at Louis Berger Office at 12011 Bellevue-Redmond Road, Suite 200, Bellevue. Phone: 425-451-7400.

Driving directions to Louis Berger Office:

Heading SOUTH on 405: Take Exit #13B and take the NE 8th East ramp, and merge onto NE 8th. Turn left onto Bellevue-Redmond Road. The office is at 12011 Bel-Red Rd. on the south side of the road just beyond Barrier Motors and on the second floor.

Heading NORTH on 405: Take Exit #13B and keep right at the fork in the ramp. Merge onto NE 8th. Turn left onto Bellevue-Redmond Road. The office is at 12011 Bel-Red Rd. on the south side of the road just beyond Barrier Motors and on the second floor.

Other Meetings from 10:00 to noon: June 13, June 27, July 11, July 25

To attend these meetings by conference call: Dial 1-866-280-6429. Enter participant code 144995#.

AGENDA FOR MAY 21, 2003

10:00 – noon at PSE Office in Bellevue (14th floor conference room)

1. Review Notes
2. Discussion of Soft Constraints and ranking
3. Set agenda for June 6 (in-person) meeting
4. Set additional future meeting dates and times

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Paul: Make sure we have input/representation from Terrestrial, Cultural, and Recreation resource interests for ranking session on June 6.
- Paul: Integrate Ruth's comments into 5/21 draft minutes and send out as final.
- Paul: Send out sensitivity analysis of soft constraint ranking on example flow regime in preparation for the June 6 meeting.
- All: Check your email on Wednesday for email from Paul. Review these in preparation for the June 6 meeting.
- Phil: Generate new time series for unregulated flows for the Baker River. Include updated area-volume curves for both reservoirs and historic hydrologic data including flows and reservoir elevations. Make these data available on CD for those interested.
- Phil: Prepare memo outlining when SCL fisheries settlement was actually implemented. Review and revise if necessary the rankings of the biologically-based ratios for selection of periods of analysis.
- Mark: Analyze Phil's selected periods (see above) for their reasonableness in supporting economic analyses. Identify additional periods of analysis if necessary.
- Paul/Mark: Send out seasonal analysis with transmittal memo for Lower Baker inflows (1981 – present).
- Lloyd: Talk with Gary about why power prices jump around so much in 2006 and 2007 (according to Appendix K).
- Paul: Send out list of all HYDROPS technical information available on the website.
- Paul: Check back with Powel to see when they can update and distribute HYDROPS demonstration PowerPoint slides.
- Paul: Analyze sensitivity of spawning/incubation flow calculation method, prepare short brief and present to TST at next meeting.
- Paul: Complete example model run request form using Margaret's changes, distribute to group, and discuss at the next meeting.

SOFT CONSTRAINTS AND WHY THEY MATTER

Paul explained our need to rank the following soft constraints:

- Flow ramps a.k.a. ramping rates (min/max)*
- Powerhouse discharge (min/max)**
- Lake levels for Baker and Shannon (min/max)*
- Spill – any non-generating water release (min/max)
- Total release (min/max where minimum = minimum instream flow)*

* These are the constraints we need to concern ourselves with ranking, as the others remain pretty much static.

** This may have value for comparing dependable capacity trade-offs with other resources.

He explained further that these constraints are not physical hard constraints. They won't cause the HYDROPS model to shut down. The model will instead track the frequency with which they are violated. The effect of soft constraints on system performance is provides information for the evaluation of alternative operational scenarios. An example of ranking operational constraints would be to prioritize constraints such as lake levels and instream flows. Frequency curves will change with different ranking of operational constraints.

Note: Please keep in mind that anybody can come up with model run requests, including how they chose to designate the soft constraints for that run. Our ranking of constraints for comparative purposes will not diminish the ability of folks to create their own runs, specifying their favorite order of soft constraints.

In our process, we are trying to come up with a preferred alternative. Part of that process involves our considering the resource trade-offs along the way. We will be ranking how the soft constraints should be prioritized for comparison purposes as we swim downstream toward settlement. Consistency in how soft constraints are prioritized will be helpful for general analysis purposes. It will also help ensure that we haven't neglected a particular constraint. It would also be nice to be able to reassure ourselves that the model is functioning well for the constraints we have defined.

Paul outlined the following possible approaches we might use to come up with a prioritized ranking of soft constraints and asked for reactions and/or additional suggestions:

1. We could set up a single set/ranking of soft constraints that would balance competing resource interests. (We need to do this eventually, in order to make like comparisons.)
2. We could define a separate set/ranking of soft constraints for each distinct resource area if sensitivity analysis is desirable. Recent conditions and the preferred alternative could have different rankings.
3. Margaret suggested that is would be helpful to look at how output from various runs changes depending on the prioritizing of soft constraints and then make recommendations about how to rank the constraints accordingly. There would be value in observing the interdependencies of the various soft constraints. She also felt that it would be otherwise a difficult exercise to do either of the two options listed above. We may end up wanting to alter priorities based on inflow sequences.

PDEA UPDATE

We will be using likely different rankings for the recent conditions and the preferred alternative. Mark explained that we will be providing the Louis Berger Group input for these between June 15 and June 30 for inclusion in the draft version of the PDEA coming out in draft form in August to the Working Groups and then October 1 for the formal 90-day comment period.

HYDROPS STATUS REPORT

Paul reported that R2 has completed mathematical adjustments to inflow series to account for the datum conversion. These revised values still need to be incorporated into the HYDROPS model.

PREP FOR JUNE 6 MEETING

Paul will look at putting together timelines and key decision points in the process that concern this teamlet. He will also put together some sensitivity analyses for us to review so we can gain an understanding of the model outputs from different soft constraint rankings. We need to get used to looking at input forms for run requests.

DRAFT AGENDA FOR JUNE 6, 2003

10:00 – 2:00 at Louis Berger Office at 12011 Bellevue-Redmond Road, Suite 200, Bellevue
Box lunches will be provided.

10:00 – 10:15	Welcome, Introductions Review Notes (briefly) and Agenda
10:15 – 11:45	Sensitivity Analysis
11:45 – noon	Prep for Discussion of Ranking of Soft Constraints
Noon – 12:20	Lunch: Review Outstanding Action Items
12:20 – 1:45	Play Results Comparison
	Create Preliminary Draft Ranking of Soft Constraints
1:45 – 2:00	Set Agenda for June 13 Meeting
	Confirm additional future meeting dates and times
	Evaluate the meeting

FUTURE ISSUES TO ADDRESS

- Standard Outputs
- Dependable Capacity
- Fisheries Definition: Tie to R2 outputs format (flow sections from A24)

PARKING LOT

- The Capability to construct artificial periods by selecting seasons within selected/different years for analysis purposes.