

**DRAFT**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Diversion Effects on Fish Team (DEFT)**  
**July 7, 1998**  
**9:30 to noon**

**Participants**

M. Thabault, M. Fris, P. Brandes, K. Halupka, P. Chadwick, J. White, K. Urquhart, D. Sweetnam, B. Herbold, S. Greene, L. Brown, P. Rhoads, E. Holland, J. Buell, M. Cowin, R. Ott, P. Nader, S. Seneviratne, G. Bardini, D. Samson, D. Odenweller, D. Hayes, J. Starr, C. Bowling, G. Gartrell, C. Creel, P. Fujitani, L. Snow

**Charge from Management**

Lester Snow lead a discussion on the charge to the team from management.

1. Since CALFED's primary strategy is a through Delta conveyance, with a contingency strategy being a dual system conveyance, DEFT should first concentrate its efforts on developing, from a fisheries point of view, a best through Delta alternative (30 year vision) while considering water supply and water quality benefits. The alternative should not include actions that will preclude the option of moving to a dual system if needed to meet CALFED objectives. Both physical and operational actions in the Delta and in the river systems upstream should be considered. As the alternative is being developed specific actions should be recommended for implementation in Stage 1 (7-10 years) of the CALFED Program. Once the through Delta is complete the Team will address the dual system and its staging.
2. The through Delta alternative with its Stage 1 actions will be reported to Policy Team at their August 13-14th meeting. The final draft of the DEFT report, which includes our issues and impacts report, and the recommendations for the staged thru Delta and dual system, is due to policy at their September 14-15th meeting.
3. Although our primary focus is biological, DEFT's should work with the NoName Group and the Water Quality Technical Team to recommend actions that improve water supply reliability and water quality. The prioritized list of water management options generated from the NoName Group (NNG), actions from the Water Quality Technical Teams and the ERP Core group will be considered in close coordination with these groups.
4. The DEFT should consider actions in the rivers upstream of the Delta.
5. The analysis is not limited to Phase II document Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.

**Issues with Alternative 2 and available information**

### Sacramento River Salmon

- Interior Delta survival improved
- Reduced flows below hood
- losses at Hood screens
- Upstream delayed migration and increased straying

### San Joaquin River Salmon

- Improved flow distribution in interior Delta
- Improved screens in the south Delta
- Existing conditions are low (may need more VAMP time to improve)
- Water drawn out of the Joaquin towards pumps

### Delta Smelt

- Common programs provide most benefit
- Change in central Delta hydrodynamics will affect all live stages
- In upstream process only approx 10 percent of the population is at Hood and Mokelumne
- Flows below Hood an important variable in that they affect X2 and transport in the Delta
- Small percent of population in the Sacramento River below Hood
- Most smelt at pumps come from eastern half of the Delta. Didn't give much benefit to a positive QWEST

### Striped Bass

- Potential increased entrainment of eggs & larvae (north and south Delta)
- Transport flows for eggs and larvae possibly decreased and mortality increased
- Decreased mortality of entrained juveniles
- Improved QWEST
- Adult passage problems and detrimental change in spawning location
- Improved fish screens in south Delta

### Fish Facilities Team

- Double screen exposure at Hood and south Delta
- Priority of species in design
- Much more uncertainty with effectiveness of design of facility in south Delta than at Hood
- Need to know species, numbers and timing to design effective upstream passage

### Water Quality Tech Team

- Parameters of concern for in Delta water quality
- Consequences of actions on in Delta water quality and fisheries
- Draft Report due on August 28<sup>th</sup>

### Modeling

- Runs for EIS/EIR and Phase II report

- Runs used in IDT process
- Particle Tracking Runs
- Rerunning VAMP
- Reservoir Screening
- Delta Modeling
  - South Fork Mokelumne conveyance option
  - Hydraulic barriers
  - Mass tracking
  - 7500 cfs IF
  - Water quality at locations
  - Delta levee failure
  - Operations model improvements

### TEAM STRUCTURE

The expanded DEFT includes representatives from the following:

- DEFT species teams
- Interagency Fish Facilities Technical Team
- Water Quality Technical Team
- No Name Group
- USBR operations
- DWR operations
- DWR modeling
- CALFED staff
- Stakeholders

A smaller workgroup of the expanded DEFT was formed to develop and execute the teams process , make assignments to other team members and groups, and produce the reports to management and policy. Members Include:

Fish Facilities Team - Dan Odenweller (DFG)

Stakeholders - Pete Rhoads (MWDSC), Jim Buell (MWDSC), Elise Holland (Bay Inst), Serge Birk (CVPWA)

Salmon - Sheila Greene (DWR)

Striped Bass - Lee Miller (DFG)

Delta Smelt - Mike Thabault (USFWS)

Water Quality - Rick Woodard (CALFED)/Paul Marshall (CALFED)( formally regional board)

DWR Operations - Curtis Creel (DWR)/Steve Roberts (DWR)

USBR Operations - Chet Bowling (USBR)/Paul Fujitani (USBR)

USFWS - Mike Thabault/Mike Fris

NMFS- Gary Stern/Karl Halupka

DFG - Pete Chadwick

Modeling - Francis Chung (DWR)

NoName Group - Bruce Herbold  
Upstream River system - ???????? (need someone)  
Ecosystem Restoration Habitat - ?????? (need someone)(Core Team?)

The work team will meet every Thursday afternoon from 1:00pm to 4:30pm (except tomorrow when we will met from 1:30pm to 4:30pm). The total DEFT will meet on a scheduled bases to review the work of the work team.

### **NEXT MEETING**

Thursday, July 9<sup>th</sup>  
1:30pm to 4:30pm  
Room 210

### **AGENDA**

- Develop list of questions that need to be answered:
  - Those we can answer in two months from data
  - Those we can answer from modeling
  - Those that should be answered as we go through the first Stage
- What operational recommendations can we make , and what are the limits
- What types of structural actions can we suggest
- Determine the process for structural and operational changes
- Analytical efforts
- Assignments to special teams (such as particle tracking)