

**DNCT Meeting Notes**  
**6/29/99**  
**9:30-12:30**

**Agenda**

1. Evaluations
2. Issues/Hypotheses
3. Modelling
4. Integration
5. Future games.
6. Tech Team assignments

**Intro Comments**

C: Project exports have increased in last few days as restrictions are lifted for delta smelt – smelt salvage remains high but most smelt are in western Delta. Projects are getting close to limits anyway, 14k outflow and near E/I limits. They have been adding 1000 cfs per day to Banks pumping.

C: Could water transfers be a fatal flaw of EWA? Or could EWA be the water broker and buffer to make water transfers really work. Dave will speak to Lance Johnson about this.

C: Concern that EWA would compete with ERP for water and drive up price and limit supplies.

C: Because Russ's model incorporates historic pumping, transfers are included in his model, unlike DWRSIM. In 91-92 800TAF were purchased and 400 TAF of transfers occurred; the balance went to Delta following.

C: San Luis Low-Point remains a major concern for EWA.

**Hypotheses/Issues**

1. We agree on what assumptions are being used in the model, but we do not agree that the assumptions are correct.
2. We need to focus on issues where we have agreement and where we do not.
3. Is the EWA dealing with issues that are better handled by other approaches (e.g., habitat improvements).
4. We should begin with a focused list of hypotheses for the EWA – after we are done with these we can then go on to other issues.
5. We should list issues by types – keep discussions of the different types separate.
6. There are other processes underway to deal with issues (e.g., ERP and CMARP).
7. Start with hypotheses that bring EWA into focus.
8. Need to get exchanges with other forums – that is why Peter Kiel is here.
9. Need to address hypotheses in terms of population level effects.
10. Many questions about the effectiveness of DCC closing – Newman/Rice or Geibel.
11. Dilemma- to fully flush out hypotheses for CMARP is a big effort – need to convey a sense of what EWA is.
12. Need to build a technical foundation for EWA.
13. ESA issues are not all population related – recovery issues need to be laid out.
14. C: ESA actions are too conservative. R: Not true – take limits for smelt are being exceeded but pumping is increasing is a case in point.
15. Concern about ESA agencies undermining the basic assumptions of the EWA process.
16. EWA has a different way of dealing with take.
17. There should be an interactive or phased approach for addressing hypotheses in the technical groups.
18. Stage 1 should be a quick review.

19. Should focus on 4 or 5 key analyses that will help. Examples include X2 analysis, salmon survival rates, and VAMP.
20. Likely will find need for more analyses.
21. Need to sharpen the charge for the teams if we are going to address issues in next few months.
22. How do we proceed with issues? How do we schedule issues work?

#### **Schedule for Quinn/Spear Meeting**

- 7/6 – List of three months of work tasks.
- 7/8 – Fish team comments are do.
- 7/9 – Distribute comments.
- 7/13 – DEFT Fish Team to concur on statements of hypotheses to give to tech teams; concur on what goes to CMARP
- 7/19 – Q/S Meeting 9-11 AM – present assignment recommendations for tech teams

#### **Peter Kiel on ERP**

- Looking for an EWA paper.
- CMARP paper.
- Salmonid life history paper.
- Delta smelt paper.

#### **Evaluations**

- Need to define what water supply is needed in any one year. BJ is working on federal, while Shuster is working on SWP.
- Nothing on WQ.
- July 8 meeting of fish team evaluators at FWS.
- What to present at Q/S?
- 7/15 – salmon evaluation and conclusions for Q/S
- 7/13 – smelt evaluation and conclusions for Q/S
- Bruce will work on a draft conclusion statement for smelt by end of week.

#### **Salmon Evaluation – Presentation and Discussion of Jim White handout**

- Jim presented two survival models he developed to assess benefits of EWA on salmon.
- Key assumption is whether Sac salmon are affected by export rate and DCC.
- EWA generally improved over baseline.
- Baseline often better than baseline because Accord is in Baseline.
- EWA did not benefit winter run and spring run as much as other races.
- Issue as to what means the most for SJ salmon – flow or export reductions? EWA does both.
- Carl is working on upstream benefits and angst factor.
- EWA may not do much for Sac salmon, but will benefit SJ salmon.
- Need a parallel run using Newman-Rice to compare to Jim's Geibel model.

#### **Upstream Evaluation**

- Compile actions with upstream consequences
  - Looking for patterns of interpretation
  - Types of benefits
  - Volume of water used for events.
  - Assessment in phases.
  - Assessment will be qualitative.
- C: Can we use IFIM models on tribs. R: we did not specify river sources.

#### **Draft Conclusions for Q/S**

1. EWA benefit to SJ in Delta on survival and direct mortality
  - quantify

- quantify versus water supply
- 2. EWA effects on Sac salmon depends on choice of model – much disagreement
- 3. Historic worse in years with DCC open – so benefits with all models.
- 4. Upstream benefits sometime- substantial change in volume of water affected by EWA.

**Other Issues**

- Driving factors on SJ side are still at issue.
- Depending on model used – result vary.

**Assessing Benefits**

Need to see the following steps when identifying benefits:

1. Accord
2. Accord + AFRP
3. Accord + AFRP + EWA