

To: sergebirk@msn.com, lbrown@mp.usbr.gov, buell@interserv.com, chadwick@s3.sonnet.com, ddaniel@water.ca.gov, michael_fris@mail.fws.gov, sgreene@water.ca.gov, hagler.tom@epamail.epa.gov, Karl.Halupka@NOAA.gov, chansonnenv@aol.com, bherbold@aol.com, eholland@bay.org, lmiller@delta.dfg.ca.gov, prhoads@compuserve.com, dsweetna@delta.dfg.ca.gov, michael_thabault@mail.fws.gov, kurquhar@delta.dfg.ca.gov, jwhite@hq.dfg.ca.gov
From: Ron Ott <ronott@water.ca.gov>
Subject: salmon evaluation
Cc:
Bcc:
Attached:

Team,

BJ Miller ask me to forward this on to you. I a setting up e-mail reflecter. It should be done today.

Ron

>From: Bjmill <Bjmill@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 14:56:31 EDT
>To: ronott@water.ca.gov
>Subject: salmon evaluatibn
>X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 84
>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by goldeneye.water.ca.gov id LAA25840
>
> May 11, 1998
>

>Ron Ott and Diversion Effects Group
>

>I have continued to reflect on information presented in the morning of last
> Thursday's meeting. I am particularly concerned about the salmon information.
>

>The salmon sub-group had prepared a table summarizing their initial cut at
> evaluating the effects of different CalFed alternatives. The rows were
> different factors affecting outmigrating salmon smolts as they pass downstream
> through the Delta. The columns were months of the year. The table was filled
> in with positive or negative values of 0, 1, 2, or 3, reflecting the sub-
> group's opinions about the importance of various effects.
>

>The first four rows on the table listed components of direct mortality at
> Banks and Tracy. Farther down was a row labeled "reverse flows (QWEST)." All
> the numbers in these rows were either 0 or negative, and there were several
> -3's.
>

>In response to questions, the sub-group explained that there was a large
> component of outmigrating smolt mortality unaccounted for and that they had
> associated that mortality with QWEST, which, or course, is closely related to
> exports.
>

>Here are some undisputed facts about salmon mortality:
>

>The fraction of outmigrating smolts suffering direct mortality at the export
> pumps for the period 1979-1991 averaged 1.5%. Any actions taken to affect that
> mortality could, therefore, only change the total mortality of outmigrating
> smolts by fractions of a percent.
>

>The mortality of outmigrating smolts passing through the Delta is in the range
> of 50% with considerable year-to-year variation.
>

>The mortality of adult salmon from legal harvest is 50-70%.
>

>Given these facts, why is direct mortality even included in the evaluation
> table? If it is included, why aren't all the numbers "0" or why aren't all
> other factors that could be having a 1-2% effect also listed?
>

>As for the QWEST row--attributing unaccounted for mortality to QWEST (and,
> therefore, to exports) seems like a real stretch.
>

>The thing that most concerns me about the salmon evaluation is the strong

> tendency to focus on exports, to include direct mortality even though it is
> insignificant when compared to other sources and to indirectly attribute
> unaccounted-for mortality to exports.
>
>What is the basis for this focus? I fear that this is another example of the
> old paradigm that has dictated project operational requirements for years,
> namely, that water project operations, especially Delta operations, are the
> sole significant cause of all fishery problems. I have heard the disavowals of
> this paradigm, but Thursday morning made me think that maybe it's still alive
> and well.
>
>
>B.J.
>
>