

MEMO

To: Pete Chadwick
From: Ron Ott
Subject: Telephone Conversation with Bruce Herbold on Fisheries Memo
Date: February 10, 2002

On call Ron, Bellory, Bruce, and Susan?

Tidal vs Mean Flows

Figure 1A: Is the no action alternative, yet is being compared as Alternative 1 in the text. Alternative 1A does not show barriers. Need to add alternative 1C figure for comparison. Flows in Figures 1, 2, and 3 are not tidal flows but net flows. In the text we call them tidal flows but they are net flows. Need to distinguish between net and tidal flows. The entire analysis does not reflect tidal influence on species. Net flows not important in western Delta.

Sacramento River Bypass

Need to incorporate the results learned from the USGS partial tracking model. Transport of eggs and larvae are important in the Sacramento River below Hood. Alternative 1 has a definite advantage in that area. Bruce thought that IDT determined to not screen Alternative 2. In all figures need to show remaining bypass flows left in the River. We under emphasize the importance of the bypass flows in the river. Need to emphasize the reduced transport issue in the river and in the Delta.

Storage

The storage discussion is incomplete. Need to talk about benefits of storage to upstream tributaries. Also talk about other measures that could derive the same benefits as storage. The statement that storage may be too expensive to use is out of place. Take discussion beyond conveyance.

X2

Talk about year types that effect X2. Need to see month changes in "X2" and the effects on critical species. Look at dry years and worst case month. Averages distort picture. Need to show monthly ranges by year type. Species like shrimp and flounder may respond more to salinity changes. Some upstream species may be effected by X2.

Graphs Figures 3 and 4

Need to brake out by species. Reading text would give you a different conclusion than graph. Need to narratively tell about advantages and disadvantages of each important specie such as residents, migratory, downstream species. Ok to say we think that the specie as a result of habitat will increase by 40% etc....Then roll them up. What is said now doesn't agree with graph.

Page 2
February 10, 2002

Page 3.

Don't try to solve the controversy between up and downstream benefits to fisheries. Use words out of the ERPP to show benefits for both areas.

General:

Using means tends to only show the benefits of alternative 3. We need to show the real benefits of Alternatives 1 and 2 or else the public will think we are stacking the deck. Paper shouldn't go to BDAC as is.