

Preliminary Thoughts on Review of the FWS/NMFS/DFG "Biological Bar."

- The traditional peer review process uses qualified, independent scientists to review a formal scientific document.
- In this case, I'm not aware of a document on this subject that could be peer reviewed.
- One alternative would be to have such a document prepared by the agency staffs and submit it to independent review and local peer review.
- Another alternative to the traditional approach would be to form local scientific review teams to prepare suitable scientific documentation for subsequent review. This would also allow points of agreement and disagreement on various aspects of the proposal to be identified. Independent scientists would review the documents developed by these local review teams. This approach has the potential advantage of putting more scientific resources on bringing the issue to closure, but the disadvantage that all potential team members are fully committed on other activities. Experienced professional facilitation would likely be necessary to make timely progress and avoid dysfunctional interactions.
- Potential issues and teams:

Topical issue underpinning the proposal	Potential team members
San Joaquin salmon smolt survival as a function of flow, exports and barriers	Herbold, Hanson, Brandes, Fox
Sacramento salmon smolt survival as a function of flow, exports and barriers	Kjelson, Brandes, White, Buell, Fox
X2 and estuarine fish abundance	Kimmerer, Miller, Mongan, Hanson, Herbold
QWEST relationships to fish abundance	White, Fris, Buell, Miller
Relationship of Delta smelt take at the pumps to abundance	Bennett, Hymanson, Fris, Buell, Herbold
Relationship of non-water action benefits to proposal	Danial, Rhoads, Larry Brown, Chadwick

- Carefully developed, specific questions would form the basis for the teams' efforts and would be agreed upon by all parties for each topical issue.
 - Strength, sensitivity and breadth of relationships? Magnitude of uncertainty? Alternative hypotheses? Limitations of analysis? Limitations of data? Magnitude of potential threats and/or benefits?
- Issues: What time frame? Who pays? Support staff? How to get real commitments? Who to facilitate? Process for reporting? Who for independent review?

P. Rhoads
10-28-99

Possible Solution
Early Stage 1

B(1)/ b(2) use in Delta.	B(2) in Delta limited to greater of VAMP or 150 kaf. No b(1) reoperations, except as generated by EWA.
Carryover of B(2)	B(2) water not used or transferred under Section III lapses at end of water year.
Slight expansion of Banks	SWP
DMC/ CA Aq. Intertie	CVP
JPOD	Projects 50%. EWA gets storage credit at SLR for 50% of water moved using JPOD or may reduce JPOD usage by 50%. EWA SLR storage is first to spill.
Right to access unused Project capacity	USFWS has top priority for unused USBR capacity for Section III b(2) transfers. EWA has next priority for state and federal facilities.
Right to borrow storage using collateral	EWA. Collateral based upon purchase options + b(2) available for transfer from upstream under section III of b(2) criteria + any b(2) water available after VAMP export cuts + 90 percentile water available from EWA share of JPOD. However, no water will be transferred under Section III for EWA during October – January.
Purchase option for: • 100 kaf upstream • 100 kaf export area	EWA
E/I relaxations	EWA
“No harm”	EWA will assure no harm to any delivery, including contract deliveries and unscheduled water.

Late Stage 1

B(1)/ b(2) use in Delta.	B(2) in Delta limited to greater of VAMP or 250 kaf. No b(1) reoperations, except as generated by EWA.
Carryover of B(2)	B(2) water not used or transferred under Section III lapses at end of water year.
Expansion of Banks	SWP
DMC/ CA Aq. Intertie	CVP
500 kaf groundwater	Projects 400 kaf. EWA 100 kaf
200 kaf Delta storage	CVP 100 kaf. EWA 100 kaf.
290 kaf Shasta expansion	CVP
JPOD	Projects 50%. EWA gets storage credit at SLR for 50% of water moved using JPOD or may reduce JPOD usage by 50%. EWA SLR storage is first to spill.
Right to access unused Project capacity	USFWS has top priority for unused USBR capacity for Section III b(2) transfers. EWA has next priority for state and federal facilities.
Right to borrow storage using collateral	EWA. Collateral based upon purchase options + b(2) available for transfer from upstream under section III of b(2) criteria + any b(2) water available after VAMP export cuts + 90 percentile water available from EWA share of JPOD + groundwater storage + Delta storage. However, no water will be transferred under Section III for EWA during October – January.
Purchase option for: • 100 kaf upstream • 100 kaf export area	EWA
E/I relaxations	EWA
“No harm”	EWA will assure no harm to any delivery, including contract deliveries and unscheduled water.
CALFED Efficiency investments: 100 kaf	Credit to EWA in BN/AN/W years. Credit to water users in D/C years.