

**DRAFT  
Meeting Minutes  
DEFT Team  
October 8, 1998  
1:00pm to 5:00pm**

**Participants**

Pete Chadwick, Peter Rhoads, Jim Buell, Jim White, Mike Thabault, Larry Brown, Elise Holland, Bruce Herbold, Serge Birk, Gary Stern, Paul Fujitani, BJ Miller, Karl Halupka, Joe Miyamoto, Peter Louie, Jim Buell, Curtis Creel, Tara Smith, George Barnes

**Agenda:**

- i. Prioritizing structure and habitat actions for Mngt.
- ii. Finalizing Draft DEFT Rpt.

**Action Items:**

- 1. EH, BH, MT, and JW will define five new scenarios and will email to group by next Wednesday (Oct 14).
- 2. Tom Cannon will revise draft report and present to Pete R and Pete C for review. Tom will revise as instructed. Pete R and Pete C will present to DEFT for review.

**Highlights:**

- I. Defined structure and habitat action priorities.
- II. Will develop scenarios from combinations of export limitations, VAMP, and X2 constraints.
- III. Consensus to go ahead with the DEFT report, but limit details and focus on points of agreement. Provide minority opinions but limit arguments; add arguments and balance points for majority opinions.

**Prioritizing Structure Actions:**

The team voted on priorities and ranked the four structure actions in terms of importance as follows:

- 1. Screens on entrance to Clifton Court Forebay - considered biggest problem and possible point of future joint diversion.
- 2. Head of Old River Barrier - easiest and quickest fix, high cost-benefit.
- 3. New screen system at Tracy - federal mandate and funds available
- 4. New Hood diversion test facility - most controversial with redirected impacts, but high interest in testing.

**Prioritizing Habitat Actions:**

The team voted on priorities and ranked 10 habitat actions recommended earlier by the team as follows:

**Group A - Highest Priority**

1. Suisun Bay/Marsh tidal wetland restoration
2. Tidal Yolo Bypass restoration (North Delta National Wildlife Refuge)
3. Riparian/SRA corridors in Delta rivers/sloughs (Sacramento River, San Joaquin River, Georgiana Slough, and Steamboat Slough)

**Group B - Second Priority**

4. Floodplain/wetland habitat restoration in San Joaquin River corridor from Stockton to Mossdale.
5. Riparian/SRA/floodplain habitat corridors of Cosumnes and Mokelumne Rivers immediately above the Delta.
6. Floodplain/wetland habitat corridor of Sacramento River channel in Delta below Sacramento.

**Group C - Third Priority**

7. Riparian/SRA corridors of south and north forks of Mokelumne and east Delta dead-end sloughs.
8. Floodplain habitat restoration in non-tidal northern Yolo Bypass.

**Group D - Lowest Priority**

9. Pilot habitat restoration in south Delta channels.
10. Restoration of shallow water and marsh habitats in Frank's Tract.

**Prioritizing Operation Actions:**

Rather than prioritize the many possible operations actions and combinations of actions, the team agreed to focus on developing scenarios from combinations of three action categories:

- A. Entrainment Reduction Actions - export reductions, inflow modifications (E/I ratios)
- B. VAMP - various options for San Joaquin flows and export reductions in the spring.
- C. X2 - various options for spring outflows to keep X2 lower in estuary.

**Operational Scenarios**

The team then shifted focus to developing a process for building scenarios from the three operational categories.

Discussion:

1. Mike T. reiterated his concept of two approaches: (1) stringent standards with triggers for relaxation; and (2) less stringent standard with triggers for greater operation stringency.
2. Pete C. suggested we vary VAMP by the number of fixed constraint days (e.g., 15-60 days) and have triggers that relax or make more stringent the number of days.
3. Process boils down to a question of where we want to spend our addition money/water above the baseline of the Accord+AFRP.
4. Jim B. reiterated his concern that the distribution of fish, not just salvage, should be factored into any triggers we develop.
5. Mike T. suggested prioritizing within a scenario.
6. Pete C. suggested prioritizing different scenarios. People have different preferences as to which of the three actions categories should be varied in a scenario.
7. Elise suggested that we develop a range of combinations within scenarios.

General consensus that combinations of the three operational categories represent different scenarios. We can show env and water supply benefits and cost for each scenario developed. Scenarios will represent fish components of scenarios sent to DICT. Scenarios will have different themes/objectives.

Discussion then centered on the first category - whether it should be defined as E/I ratio or simply entrainment reduction.

8. Mike T. suggested we either get rid of E/I's, lower them, raise them, set them only in dry years, or limit exports only.
9. Bruce H. reiterated his problem with using E/I ratio as a control factor - we should use export manipulations in combination with inflow regulation. In some cases entrainment effects are due to export independent of flow. E/I provides no protection in wetter years - need to use export limitations.
10. Jim S. stated that winter run controls started with QWEST and went to E/I. E/I has protective benefits beyond just entrainment.

There was general consensus to change this category from E/I to "reduce entrainment" and that the reductions be focused on the 4 races of salmon, striped bass, delta smelt, and steelhead, and perhaps splittail, but not for now. For the salmon the concerns were: (1) fry in Delta, (2) spring run in fall; and (3) San Joaquin subyearling smolts in spring (Mar15-Jun15)

The following table was devised to develop scenarios.

Species of Concern	Reduced Entrainment Effects	VAMP	"X2" Days
San Joaquin Fall Run		30-90 days	
Fry in Delta			
Spring Run in fall			
striped bass			
delta smelt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Reduce E/I</li> <li>2) Reduce export</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) March</li> <li>2) April</li> <li>3) March + April</li> <li>4) none</li> <li>5) Feb (but not from storage)</li> </ul>
splittail			
steelhead			

Comments:

11. Elise suggested holding two columns constant at a time to develop scenarios.
12. Gary stated concern for using water for X2 in Feb as it may set up potential summer problems for winter run.
13. Elise stated that we should not constrain our treatments based on existing water supply constraints.

A scenario development team was formed: EH, BH, MT, JW

**Ron defined the format of a scenario**

- specified operations scheme will be main feature
- common structures
- common habitats

Ron defined schedule: email to group by Wednesday of next week.

**DEFT Report**

Ron asked for recommendations from DEFT members:

Joe:

- minority opinions should be expressed
- hypothesis and justification should be provided for minority and majority opinions

Jim B:

- Since we are not of one mind and Policy asked us to portray our differences, we should present them.
- Assumptions should be presented with a clear statement of difference of opinions.
- No need for detailed point-counterpoint presentation

Serge:

- should reflect whole story
- concerned about the purpose of the report
- too much uncertainty to be a valuable tool

Mike:

- Minority is ok.
- don't need a lot of justification to portray different points of view.

Pete R:

- What is purpose of report?
- The scenario presented has no future, so why present it?

Elise:

- Ok with presenting alternative hypotheses.
- Report can simply document progress, where we are going, how we intend to develop best through-Delta alternative.
- Be clear that something more is coming.

Pete C:

- Suggests two reports: (1) progress report on a scenario analyzed; and (2) recommendations to management for a preferred alternative with Stage 1 needs.
- Why do the progress report for an alternative we don't support?
- Minority statements are ok; but provide equal treatment for majority (or simplify minority position and justification to level of present majority statements).

Bruce:

- report shows how we approached the process
- new scenario was an improvement - good to show this progress
- laying out our assumptions is good.
- provided a snapshot of our thinking - so people can see what we did and do.
- concerned about the suggested representation of minority hypotheses, as this is not an accurate representation of the group dynamics that occurred.

- We should focus more on our points of agreement.
- No need to widely distribute this report - mere documentation/progress report.

Carl:

- agrees with Bruce
- good to document our efforts
- calibration aspect is useful
- need to document salmon team addressing upstream effects.
- minority opinion documentation is valuable.

Ron:

- report did not help impact analysis effort
- we were asked how we considered our differences.
- how can we address these differences in the next year
- how Adaptive Management will resolve these differences should be put in this and later reports.
- we should consider a separate document on issues that we will address over the coming years

There was a general consensus that we should prepare a report.

**Ron suggested an outline of the report:**

- a. Main Report - what we did only. Short.
- b. Species Reports
  - delta smelt
  - salmon (including upstream report)
  - striped bass
- c. Habitat Report
- d. Harvest Management Report
- e. Separate report on differences/issues

Discussion:

- Focus on points of agreement, not disagreement
- Why should we submit scenario A? Why not just the five new ones?
- We should provide the ranking for our habitat actions in the habitat report.
- In the species report introductions, we should present the purpose of the example scenario.
- Alternative hypotheses should also be included in separate reports, not just main report or paper on differences.
- No need for a "Structures Report" as they were not analyzed.
- Leave the report simple: strip out extraneous material.
- Discard 75% of present draft.

- Present areas of disagreement, but not the specific arguments
- Ok to present the different points of view and the basic reasons why, but keep them short and to the point.
- How we state things matters - hypotheses and assumptions are important

**Ron's final instructions:**

1. Pete R. And Pete C. will work with Tom on a new draft. (Tom will prepare a new preliminary draft for Pete and Pete to review. Tom will then revise and Pete and Pete will present to DEFT.)  
Elise Holland, Bruce Herbold