

From: "CLAYTON PALMER" <CSPALMER@wapa.gov>

To: <pfbenemelis@adwr.state.az.us>, <amyheuslein@bia.gov>, <lorjac@citlink.net>, <gzimmerman@crb.ca.gov>, <plehr@crc.state.nv.us>, <btaubert@gf.state.az.us>, <ramsey@grandconyontrust.org>, <LKuwanwisiwma@hopi.nsn.us>, <begayrmii@hotmail.com>, <steffentlyrod@lycos.com>, <arp4@mail.infomagic.net>, <zcre@nm.net>, <Joe_Alston@nps.gov>, <jdantonio@ose.state.nm.us>, <creda@qwest.net>, <pam@southwestrivers.org>, <rod.kuharich@state.co.us>, <JSHIEL@state.wy.us>, <DBECKMANN@uc.usbr.gov>, <RGOLD.4ucro@uc.usbr.gov>, <RPETERSON.4ucro@uc.usbr.gov>, <MGABALDON@usbr.gov>, <larryanderson@utah.gov>, <tedrampton@worldnet.att.net>, <spaicons@xpressweb.com>

Date: 12/10/03 11:41AM

Subject: Experimental Flow Proposal by WAPA

Hello:

I'd like members of the AMWG to know that I've been working with USBR and the TWG regarding a proposed change in the experimental flow - the part that relates to non-native fish suppression.

As you remember, the January - March experiment calls for a flow regime that varies from 5,000 cfs to 20,000 cfs. The 20,000 cfs occurred for 9 hours each day. The ramp up occurred for 3 hours at 5,000 cfs/hr. The ramp down was at 2,500 cfs/hr and took 6 hours.

It turns out that our customers scheduled the "on-peak" portion of their CRSP electrical power with us for more than the 9 hours in which Glen Canyon was generating at 20,000. In fact; 13 to 16 hours. [Our customers have the flexibility to schedule CRSP power as needed to meet retail electrical demand. We purchase electricity from the market to make up for what is not generated by the CRSP units]

The fact that Glen Canyon was releasing only 5,000 cfs and that conditions were very dry elsewhere in the CRSP system while our customers demand was rising caused us to purchase large amounts of power in the early hours of the morning (6 AM to 10 AM). People who own thermal generating units and sell us electricity were not at all interested in selling us 4 hours of power in the morning and lose the opportunity to sell to someone else during the entire day! So, when we could find a 4 hour block of electricity to buy on the market, it was very costly. Financially, this turned what we thought was going to be an advantageous experiment into a costly experiment.

We, at Western have brooded about this for sometime, knowing that if GC stayed at 20,000 during all 16 hours of the peak period, it might alter the non-native fish experiment to a significant degree. Recently, we've come up with something that may work. We've been talking to USBR about it and we've now been talking to the TWG at its last two meetings.

Western is proposing that the Jan - March experiment include 2 additional hours of 20,000 cfs in the morning (for a total of 11).

This year, the hydrological conditions at the Aspinall units (Blue Mesa - in Colorado) aren't as dire as last year. We can use these units to "cover" the additional morning hours that turned out to be so crucial last year. This is why the WAPA proposal is to only add 2 more hours at Glen Canyon, instead of 4 or more.

Of course, this would mean more water is released. This has an impact on both sediment conservation and release requirements to the Lower Basin. Therefore, we also propose that on Sundays we eliminate the fluctuations altogether. Sundays would be at minimum flows: 5,000 cfs

at night, 8,000 cfs during the day. This arrangement makes it so that almost the same amount of water is released in a week under Western's proposal as was released in a week last year.

I've attached an Excel spreadsheet that shows last year's flow regime and WAPA's proposal, both on a chart and in a table.

Please note that our purpose in making this proposal is to enable the non-native fish suppression, but in a way which is implement able in the long term, given that the Federal government has contractual obligations with respect to the power produced.

SCHEDULE

During the conference call scheduled for December 17th, I want to just check with everyone to make sure that the AMWG members are aware of the proposed change.

Then, this proposal will be a topic for the TWG meeting on Jan 7th & 8th (or whenever the TWG meets in January). GCMRC will bring the analysis necessary to consider the resource implications of this proposed change so the TWG can have a meaningful discussion. I hope that the TWG will have a recommendation to make to the AMWG following this discussion.

Finally, I will propose an AMWG conference call in January, following the TWG meeting. This may result in a recommendation to alter the experiment. Given the FACA notice requirements, this January AMWG conference call will likely need to be scheduled during our December 17th meeting.

Thanks for your time. I know that you will have some questions about this. Let me know about these questions and any suggestions you may have. Also, your TWG representative should be able to clarify some things.

THX

Clayton Palmer
Manager, Environmental and Resource Planning
CRSP-MC
Western Area Power Administration
cspalmer@wapa.gov
(801) 524-3522

CC: <LWHETTON.4UCRO@uc.usbr.gov>

Non-Native Fish Suppression Flows January - March, 2004

