

Meeting Minutes
Diversion Effects on Fisheries
April 9, 1998
9:30 to 12:00pm

Action Items

- 1) Species teams will send their draft matrixes with as much supporting text as possible to the team by May 1st.
- 2) Pete Rhoads will talk to Steve Mcaulay about the involvement of Chuck Hanson on the team. He will also talk to BJ Miller about the appropriate time to share the data base developed by the CUWA/AG group.
- 3) Ron Ott will call the species team leaders to review process schedule. He will draft a memo on the status, process, expectations and schedule of the team for management and policy meetings and e-mail to group for comment before meeting.
- 4) Bruce Herbold will present the contents of the memo at management and policy meetings.
- 6) Next Meeting, Thursday, May 7th, 9:30 - 4:00, Room 1147 at CALFED.

CUWA/AG

Pete Roads gave a status report of the CUWA/AG work of reviewing salvage records at Skinner and Tracy fish facilities. Purpose of the group is to look at innovative ways to reduce the amount of salvage by optimizing pumping, and/or increase the level of pumping opportunities while attaining the same level of salvage. This includes the Skinner, Tracy and future Hood points of diversion. The species of interest are, salmon (all four runs), steelhead, Delta smelt, splittail and striped bass.

They are reviewing daily salvage records, filling in the gaps, and have a complete data base for years 1993 and 1994. The plan is to go back in time as far as possible. They are filling in the gaps for the remainder of the years and then a group from UCLA will develop the computer model to forecast salvage of for different pumping scenarios. In the process they will develop an adult equivalent algorithm for all species. Hoping to develop an equation that gives adult equivalent mortality at the pumps given day of year, type, and length. Will have the work complete in 4 to 6 weeks. The group has suggested that they share the data base and results with this team. Pete will check with BJ on the appropriate time.

Species Team Reports

Lee Miller reviewed the work of the Striped Bass team:

- Had difficulty in deciding on baseline.
- Set all scores for "existing conditions" to "0", i.e. did not use "0" as a "no effect". Instead used "0" as a base to compare the remaining alternatives against.
- The level of development for years 1950 and 1970 were evaluated. With 1950 being pre-

- project and thus scored most positive.
- Reviewed a first draft matrix with the team.

Pat Brandes reviewed the progress of the Salmon team:

- Tried to develop an absolute scale for "existing conditions". i.e "0" is "no effect".
- Found that they needed a larger negative scale than with "-3" as a maximum. It did not allow enough definition to differentiate between alternatives.
- Will a draft matrix for team review by May 1.

Mike Thabault reviewed the progress of the Delta Smelt team:

- Also used an absolute scale for "existing conditions".
- Had trouble deciding on what scale means. Used "0" no effect, "-1" small percent of population effected, "-2" order of magnitude increase of the population effects, and "-3" additional orders of magnitude of effects (i.e. similar to a log scale).
- Had trouble considering common program effects in differentiae the alternatives. Will add impacts of common programs for each alternative in next draft.
- Will a draft matrix for team review by May 1.

Baseline/Scale/Weights

- The consensus of the team that all species teams use an absolute scale in evaluating alternatives. i.e. "0" means "no effect".
- Each team will use the range of scale that is most meaningful to them. The values can always be normalized later, i.e the team may define the highest positive value to represent an achievement of a goal for the species. A suggestion was made that there be a additional column to the matrix that suggests level of recovery of a species.
- In summarizing the score for the impact areas by month for a species, the teams need to provide the supporting narrative on weights used. May eventually use weights on categories on impacts, time periods, and life stages of a species.

Supporting Narrative

The matrixes are a tool to guide the teams on what is important and what is not. A supporting narrative that explains and documents the teams thought process, what is known and not known, and associated risk or chance of success is probably most important for the Policy group.

Management and Policy

The CALFED Management team meets on April 20th and the Policy team meets on May 1st. Need to have a issue paper on "Diversion Effects on Fisheries" for presentation to Management team and if the approve presented to Policy. Ron Ott will call the species team leaders to review process schedule. He will draft the paper, process, expectations and schedule of the team for management and policy meetings and e-mail to fisheries team for comment. Bruce Herbold will present the contents of the memo at management and policy meetings

General

- The team discussed that if the alternatives are going to be staged, this team should have major input into that process.
- Mark Cowin from CALFED offered to provide information from the modeling team on past runs or run new scenarios that the team needs to perform their evaluation.

Next Meeting

Review Matrixes, issues paper, and Policy reaction.

Thursday, May 7th, 9:30 - 4:00, Room 1142 CALFED