At the July Meeting, you gave the facilitation team permission to look into the 'slide 55' questions Rick raised. We teased out the issues in Rick's e-mail, discussed them with Rick and Rosemary and continued an ongoing discussion in various ways. The point wasn't to fix "slide 55" in amber and then analyze it to death. In many ways, the success of this discussion is that slide 55 should become history--it was meant to prompt discussion and it has succeeded in that!

In the meantime, the City's and Stratus's analyses and thinking about the process were becoming more sophisticated. A way emerged. Here is a summary of that emergence:

- In your packet you will find Rosemary's Concept Paper for the formation of a Modeling and Forecasting Working Group. There will be negotiations about this to be sure! But in the meantime, these are the kinds of things that should be shared in such a context:
    - The data on which any graphs are based, such as supply data
    - More detailed information about different instream flow regimes
- The Ctte would benefit with greater shared knowledge about how/when/why Loch Lomond is drawn from and the relation of this management choice to risk. (Supporting this Ctte understanding would presumably be one of the goals of the Working Group). These might include:
    - Management issues related to draw-down, instream flow, peak demand etc.
    - Inputs, outputs and assumptions related to the rule curve and
    - Discussion about which of these management approaches to use in the baseline
    - Clarity about which demand assumptions are being used.
- As new model are shared with and beyond the working group, each graph should be accompanied by a short list of information about inputs;
- Expected benefits from alternatives do not go in the baseline, nor does maintenance, However:
- As the Ctte is able to identify alternatives that are universally loved and relatively reliable, what Karen calls the "Small But Powerful", it would be beneficial to consider a graphic that shows the expected diminution in the supply-demand gap. That would happen ~early in the Real Deal.

The summary above captures the grist of the discussion. On the following pages, which are attached for background (or in case you suffer from insomnia), the left-hand column is taken from the e-mail Rick sent to the Committee on August 1st, 2014. The 'underlying interests' reflect ongoing conversations with Rick and Rosemary. The 'notes' are... notes. And the 'resolution' captures a convergence of thinking between Rick and Rosemary that I believe the rest of the Ctte would find positive--and certainly can raise issues about if there is hesitation or disagreement. This discussion would be most likely to come up in the agenda related to the proposed Modeling and Forecasting Working Group and in the discussion Bob will lead about baselines.

<table>
<tr><th>Issue</th><th>Underlying Interest</th><th>Notes</th><th>Resolution</th></tr>
<tr><td>1977 model be updated with this year's hydrology.</td><td rowspan="3">• Current information
• Clarity about what goes into the each S/D graph
• Clarity about how those inputs are analyzed
• Have solid Ctte agreement on baseline and other foundational work
• Keep focus on Ctte rather than having numerous dueling analyses outside of Ctte
• Ability to explain direction of Ctte to constituents</td><td colspan="2" rowspan="2">RESOLUTION:
• As new graphs are created, each graph should show "hydrology from year X, previous reservoir levels from year Y, in-stream flows from system Z" and so forth;
• Creation of "model and forecasting" Working Group where assumptions and inputs will be discussed.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Make assumptions and data public.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Reconcile slide 55's 650 mg shortfall with April Water Commission presentation predicting 383 mg.</td><td>Used different fish flow assump-tions.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Assume state will grant water rights; want to subtract the expected benefit of that into the estimated shortfall</td><td>• Make sure that the graph that describes your expected shortfall is accurate or, if accuracy is too much to ask given levels of uncertainty, then at least show the uncertainty of the expected shortfall.
• If the graph is more intense and compelling than is warranted, find ways to make it more 'true'</td><td>• Water rights and subsequent managemen t changes is an alternative
• It is not a universally loved alternative</td><td>• Benefits of alternatives do not belong in the baseline.
• If there is a population of alternatives that are universally loved and whose benefits are relatively certain, may be a way to express those in a Real Deal "this is the state of our problem" graph. But we are not there yet.</td></tr>
<tr><td>In normal years Loch Lomond supply an amount of water = to max water rights for the reservoir (1 bg/ year)</td><td>Understanding</td><td>There just seems to be a lot of confusion about the rule curve!</td><td>Shared learning! (The proposed subctte would help with this.)</td></tr>
</table>

Issue	Underlying Interest	Notes	Resolution
Actual avg allocation ~ half what it could be Is Loch Lomond being drawn down too little?	• Making the wisest use of the "insurance policy" that that extra water in Lock Lomond represents • Being transparent about that water, what it represents, how it could be used and its relation to risk	Notes: •This is a fascinating risk issue. • One argument, which I think fits in a "no big capital investment" view, is that one should draw down as *little* as possible so that dry years then require less curtailment. Another view is that one should draw down as *much* as possible in order to give more to the fish.	
Are various ongoing measures considered in the baseline?	A clear and intellectually rigorous baseline	Bob is going to explain baseline approaches, and this will probably include a discussion of various gray areas.	• If it is an alternative, the benefits don't get calculated into the baseline • If it is maintenance, there is nothing to put in the baseline • If it really is ongoing and will result in higher yield or less demand, then it should be calculated in the baseline (and that should be made explicit in the work of the Working Group).
Is DFG-5 the ceiling on in-stream fish flow requirements?		No.	
Quoting CaDFW (from DEIR comments?)		I think this is probably not on point.	

Issue	Underlying Interest	Notes	Resolution