

Aspinall EIS Hydrology Group Meeting
June 30, 2005
Grand Junction, Colorado

Attendance List Attached.

Coll Stanton presented a general overview of Riverware along with a handout. Then went into a more detailed discussion of the Aspinall Daily Operation Model he has been developing. Coll distributed and reviewed a handout describing the Model.

Highlights/concerns:

- Need to consider places to put in depletions and other gains and losses.
- Period of Record – Will 29 years be enough? Can other Riverware Models be used to utilize longer periods of record?
- Useful to have rules that guide Coll written down for future meetings.
- Add another operation and demand below the Canyon to the weekly forecast.
- Hourly pattern may be inconsequential on other environmental resources, but needed to develop financial impacts on power.
- What tools are we going to need? Everyone needs to be comfortable with the model.
- Index Sequential Run Discussion
 - 29 traces with 29 years of data.
 - Coll will look into what it would take to have his model do this.
 - How would depletions be considered in a trace model? One big block in the beginning or staged? F&WL liked the way it was done on Flaming Gorge.
 - Will trace runs provide a more thorough analysis?
- How will existing aggregate demands be characterized?
- How will we tie this model to other models?
- StateMod isn't set up to do iterative traces.
- Want to see demands over all hydrologic conditions.
- Clayton would like to see a forecast tool similar to Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge.
 - More data making synthetic forecasts.
 - Different forecasting method requires iterative traces.
- State Mod – Based on allocation and priority
 - StateMod would provide inflows to Coll's Aspinall model.
 - Outflow from Coll's model would then become inflow into a downstream StateMod run.
 - The models need to be married.
 - Dave Harpman expressed concern that married models could produce some inconsistencies. This happened on the Snake.
 - Redlands Call is important to analyze.
- Don't want the process to take 8 years.
- Coll going to describe and run the no-action alternative.

- Backcast 10 years.
 - Look at what it would take to do an iterative trace method.
- Model Distribution
 - DK-Important to analyze different scenarios. Adding tree ring data would help the analysis.
 - There is an advantage to understanding analysis if you have access to the model.
 - Important for everyone to have a viewer.
 - Wait for no-action in the model. Distribute it in viewer, then decide where to go from there.
- Depletions – Dave Kanzer is unsatisfied with depletion considerations. Would like to see improved data set through some kind of iterative process. Use the State C.U. tool to do the accounting for upper basin depletions. Make it consistent with the Big River Model. Concerns about changes in and how to handle Ag depletions
 - Michelle said we should compare historic to present day depletions.
 - Dan Lueke would like clarification in the notes concerning future depletions.
- Next Steps
 - The Regional Office will look into Synthetic Forecasting methods
 - Coll will see what it will take to make iterative runs.
 - Michelle and Coll will continue to work together to see how they can get StateMod to interface with Coll's Riverware model.
- General Comments
 - Iterative Process could take a lot of time.
 - Depletions haven't changed substantially
 - Don't make Statemod an iterative model. Use it to obtain knowledge to run the other model.
 - Flow recommendations will likely increase the number of days of Redlands Call. This could be addressed in the qualitative analysis
 - To avoid problems down the road it might be better to give the model to those who want to run it.,
- Next Meeting – August 24th, 9:30 a.m., Western Colorado Area Office – Grand Junction