

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Diversion Effects on Fish Team (DEFT)**

September 3, 1998

1:00pm to 5:00pm

**Participants**

Pete Chadwick, Dale Sweetnam, Jim White, Sheila Greene, Pete Rhoads, Paul Fujitani, Tara Smith, Jim Snow, Joe Miyamoto, Stephanie Brady, Matthew Vandenberg, Bruce Herbold, Mike Thabault, Gary Bobker, Mark Cowin, Param Dhillon, Paul Marshall, Gary Bardini, Ron Ott, Jim Buell (phone), Tom Cannon

**Input from Management:**

1. What guidance do we want from the Policy Group?
2. We have agreement on the objective that our recommended alternative would move us toward recovery.

**DEFT Scenario/Alternative:**

3. We are going to recommend a suite of actions as a recommended DEFT scenario.
4. We are going to analyze the environmental performance of the recommended DEFT scenario.
5. We will determine water supply costs of the DEFT scenario.
6. DEFT will define a set of water project operation rules that will most benefit fish.

**Working with No Name:**

7. No Name will also develop rules to benefit water supply.
8. Both groups will work together to develop a flexible set of rules that meets both needs.
9. Both groups will analyze benefits and costs.
10. See how close the groups can get.
11. Need to develop boundaries on operational flexibility.
12. DEFT Operational Scenario is a new concept with a env. water account.

**DEFT Report**

13. **due 9/15 for inclusion in CALFED Phase 2 report.**
14. Working toward a preferred alternative for inclusion in the 12/15 EIR/EIS.

**Alternative Evaluations:**

15. Next Thursday we should compare new DEFT Alt to DEFT matrices for Alt 2 and 3 performance using table matrix.
16. We need to consider other operational options.

**Salmon Team:**

17. Developing an array of upstream actions to go with Delta actions.

18. Also looking at East Side stream actions.
19. Looking at harvest actions.
20. Looking also at species/run type specific operational actions.
21. Some flaws in the upstream actions - need to determine what actions should be included.
22. Feather runs are higher than historic levels, but includes hatchery benefits; team is unsure as to how much further emphasis should be given to habitat improvements for wild fish.
23. Difficult integrate upstream , in- Delta and harvest into one recovery score.

### **Delta Smelt Team:**

24. Concern that the recovery criteria is consistent with approach other teams are using.

### **Striped Bass Team:**

25. Team does not see need to limit harvest despite egg production being limited. (Harvest rate is too low to be a factor in turning around population.)

### **Operation Criteria:**

Started looking at what parameters could be flexible and what could be fixed. Some suggestions were:

26. Export/Inflow ratio - Nov55% (flex), Dec(flex)Jan45%, Feb-Jun25%, Sep-Oct75%, 65% baselines; biological triggers for flex, otherwise fixed.
27. 61 day VAMP (AprMay) - flow flexible, export fixed.
28. X2 at 1962 LOD
29. DCC closure Nov-Jan.

### **Structural Actions:**

30. Agreed on the 2500 cfs capacity Tracy Research Demonstration Test Fish Facility. Approach velocity at 2500 cfs would be designed at 0.2 fps. Diversions above 2500 would be drawn either from new Intertie with CCF or by simply pumping added water through the new screen with increased approach velocity. Existing fish facility would not be used.
31. Agreed on new fish facility at entrance to CCF with 6000 cfs capacity at 0.2 fps approach velocity and 10,300 cfs capacity at <0.4 fps. Existing facilities would not be used.
32. The cost of these facilities would not be "stranded" as all future scenarios would include south Delta pumping option. Also, new facilities are essential over short-term (7-10 years), especially if operations allow 10,300 cfs diversions from State facility.
33. Concluded that this scenario provides most flexibility and most protection with limited stranded cost.
34. Considerable benefits would occur for salmon and striped bass.
35. Benefits would be derived even for delta smelt because new screens would keep some smelt out of fish facilities whereas that is not the case with existing fish facilities.
36. The capacities of both pumping plants will be provided by low head pumps behind the screen systems. Pumps may not always be needed but they will be available, and allow more operating flexibility and even demands.

37. Recommend Head-of-Old-River Barrier.
38. DEFT does not support south Delta barriers. Concern for delta smelt effects.
39. Need evaluation of fishery benefits before recommend intertie.
40. 2000 cfs test screen facility for Hood (**species teams will have recommendation by next DEFT meeting**). Water would be diverted to North Mokelumne or returned to Sacramento River. Would be operated under DEFT export rules, thus diverted water to North Mokelumne would contribute directly to QWEST and there would be no effect on Delta outflow or X2.
41. Water quality actions have not been evaluated.

**Discussion Points:**

42. Alt 3's export restrictions were more restrictive than Alt 2's. We should consider an alternative (bookend) that has this level of export restrictions but would be through-Delta.  
**ACTION: Make computer run by next meeting**
43. CVPIA B2 analysis started with 60 actions - now is down to 5.
44. FWS will not demand Alt 3 as preferred alt.

**Discussion Points:**

45. Need better answers as to how we derived recommendations and conclusions.
46. Describe what we have learned.
47. Need a summary table with DEFT alt and alts 1-3 performance based on our criteria.
48. Triggers will be needed for operational regimes. No triggers for delta smelt outside of salvage.
49. Need to assess benefits of each recommended actions as well as overall suite of actions.